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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

War and Peace and Ashes are landmark novels of tremendous importance to their national literatures. This "functional" similarity is one of many that exist between the two works. Many Polish, Russian, and foreign literary scholars and critics have pointed out quite early and rather frequently the convergencies and affinities of the two novels.¹ This was done, however, for the most part in a rather general and non-analytical manner, more in casual hints than by actual comparisons. Until the present day, with a few exceptions, neither Polish nor Russian literary scholarship can boast a full-length comparative study of these two epic novels.² The aim of this dissertation is to fill the existing gap and remedy this unusual situation.

The two novels have definite similarities of a thematic and ideological nature, as well as of a structural and methodological nature. At the same time there are fundamental differences in both novels. Thus the basic guidelines of my study may be defined as a comparison of:

a) the similar thematical elements in both works treated in a similar manner by the two authors,
b) those elements which are similar thematically but differ greatly in treatment,
c) those topics completely absent in one novel but present in another.

These guidelines apply also to Chapter II where the development of both novels is discussed.

The main criteria in the selection of the topics for the comparison resulted from those elements which the two novels had in common, and these elements will be discussed with the previously mentioned guidelines in mind.

[...] Żeromski is a writer to whose works is connected a whole epoch of development of his native literature. Without his literary production the world importance of Polish culture is inconceivable.³

These words of Viviana Vladimirovna Vitt, a young Soviet literary scholar, concisely and eloquently describe Żeromski's place in Polish literature. The greatness of Żeromski should be a subject of another study. Here we will deal with only one of his works, Ashes. According to the Polish literary critic Wacław Borowy, Ashes is Żeromski's most ambitious work⁴ and occupies in his literary production a place roughly equal to that of War and Peace in Tolstoj's.⁵ Stanisław Eile calls the period from Homeless People (1899) to Ashes (1903),
the climactic point in Żeromski's development.\textsuperscript{6}

\textit{Ashes},\textsuperscript{7} an epic novel dealing with the Napoleonic epoch and Poland's role in it, occupies a very special place in Polish literature for many reasons: thematical, ideological, and artistic (structure and style), all of which were innovations in contemporary Polish literature in general and the Polish historical novel in particular. The innovation in topic was Żeromski's shift to themes of the Polish fight for independence soon after the third partition.\textsuperscript{8} The historical element of the novel is connected with a completely new approach to the epoch in question, namely the rejection of the traditional legend that Napoleon was Poland's friend while at the same time offering a positive and patriotic view of events. Closely related with it is Żeromski's realistic and naturalistic presentation of war and war scenes. It differs immensely from the generally accepted (at that time) norms of Sienkiewicz, who glorified and romanticized war and war events. Żeromski also stresses the role of the masses in war as an important history-shaping force. From the artistic point of view, \textit{Ashes} is a historical novel different from the Walter Scott type, which depicted important historical events in connection with adventures of heroes. \textit{Ashes} and \textit{War and Peace} are based on certain philosophical concepts of history. Historical processes and events are presented as if through a prism of psychology in terms of the
behavior of real people. The novel is structurally and stylistically an innovative work because of its open, loose composition and also because of its poetic description of nature and original treatment of love topics. Nature in Żeromski is closely connected with the psychological states of his heroes. It is used less frequently for strictly decorative purposes. Żeromski treats love with frankness and boldness not found in his contemporaries. The author of Ashes skillfully joined the positivist tradition of the nineteenth century with the neoromantic tradition of Young Poland. In this aspect he "continued the work of Mickiewicz and Słowacki" by connecting "the development of an individual with universalism and the love of one's country with universal human ideals."

Żeromski influenced writers of Young Poland by initiating a turn in their interest toward the historical novel dealing with the early period of the Polish fight for independence. Polish literary critic Karol Irzykowski talks about a "school of Żeromski" to which he includes such writers as Juliusz Kaden-Bandrowski and Zofia Nałkowska. Belgian Slavicist Claude Backvis in his article Myśli cudzoziemca o Żeromskim (The Thoughts of a Foreigner about Żeromski) says: "Należy się żeromskiemu jako artyście miejsce niższe oczywiście od Tolstoja, lecz wspólnej z nim kategorii."
Tolstoj, but in the same category.) And from the point of view of qualities common to artists of all mankind, his novel Ashes is described as follows:

In European literature of the past century there are a few novels which will probably remain as the most durable monument to mankind of that epoch. They are Rouge et noir of Stendhal, Balzac's novels, War and Peace and Anna Karenina of Tolstoj, Dostoevskij's Crime and Punishment, Possessed, and Brothers Karamazov. Ashes of Żeromski will be a new contribution to this treasure, one of its most beautiful jewels. 14

Tolstoj held a position of importance for almost sixty years, from 1852—publication date of Childhood—until his death in 1910. War and Peace (1863-1869) 15 is universally acknowledged as a masterpiece of world literature. It presents a cross-section of Russian society during one of the critical periods in that country's history. War and Peace combines elements of the historical novel describing the Napoleonic epoch, especially the events of the war of 1812 with those of a family chronicle, depicting several families over a period of about twenty years. The novel also contains interesting chapters of Tolstoj's philosophy of war and history. This epic work is the supreme achievement of Tolstoj's
entire literary career. Tolstoj's influence on Russian literature and intellectual life is undisputed. He also influenced the literature of various countries. The concern about the possible impact of Tolstoj's novels on English literature was voiced by Joseph Kirkland as early as 1886. He wrote:

Such books as Tolstoi's make the careful observer suspect that unless English fiction can shake off some of the iron trammels that bind it, it must yield all hope of maintaining its long-held supremacy.16

Żeromski wrote *Ashes* some thirty-four years after *War and Peace*. He was introduced to Tolstoj's works by Stanisław Witkiewicz, whose library he used during his stay in Zakopane (April 25 to June 15, 1892). Witkiewicz was an ardent admirer of Tolstoj and especially of his *War and Peace*.17 We know about Żeromski's reaction to Tolstoj's works from letters to his fiancée Oktawia Rodkiewiczowa in which Żeromski frequently mentioned Tolstoj's *War and Peace*. On May 22, 1892 while working on his short story *An Eye For an Eye* he wrote:

> Gdy leją siąpawice - piszę [...] prawie powieść - taką długą nowelę. Ale ja nie mam ani odrobinę żadnych zdolności, piszę głupstwa i mam tyle przynajmniej taktu, że drę i palę w piecu to dzieło. Czytam Tolstoja – i to czytanie naucza mię mądrości i darcia własnych utworów.

> When it drizzles - I write [...] almost a novel - such a long story. But I have not one little bit of ability, am writing nonsense, and have at least enough tact to tear it up and burn [it] in a stove. I am reading Tolstoj and this
reading teaches me wisdom and audacity to tear my own works.18

And next day, May 23, 1892 he related the following about War and Peace: "Czytam Tolstoja Wojna i mir - i uczę się prawdziwej psychologii." (I am reading Tolstoj's War and Peace - and learning the true psychology.)19 In yet another letter shortly before his departure from Zakopane Żeromski said:

Jestem szczęśliwy, że czas ten się kończy, bo czytałem niedawno Tolstoja Wojna i mir i zadrzalałem do głębi duszy, poznawszy nieszczęście, jakie spotkało Natalę.

I am happy that this time of separation is coming to an end, for not long ago I read Tolstoj's War and Peace, and I trembled to the depth of my soul, having learned the misfortune which befell Natasha.20

Żeromski had read also other Russian writers such as Turgenev, Dostoevskij, Karamzin, Lermontov, Puškin, Gogol', and Saltykov-Šchedrin. All were read in the original. According to Michał Sokolnicki Żeromski had a "mimosa-like" susceptibility to Russian writers, and Tolstoj Żeromski called "the biggest genius of our times."21 Tolstoj's influence on Żeromski is undeniable. At one point he confided to Władysław Jabłonowski that "after each work of Tolstoj, he feels as if something stimulated him to creativity."22 The question which now has to be answered is what was the extent and nature of the influence of Tolstoj's War and Peace on Żeromski's Ashes. We will attempt such an answer on the basis of the
findings of this comparative study. Says Ignace Zawacki: "Ashes is comparable to War and Peace without danger of suffering by the comparison."23
NOTES


3V. V. Vitt, Stefan Żeromskij (Moscow, 1961), p. 3.

4Wacław Borowy, O Żeromskim (Warszawa, 1960, p. 123.

5Ibid.

A brief synopsis of both novels will be found at the beginning of Chapter II.

The three partitions of Poland took place toward the end of the eighteenth century. Three neighboring powers participated in them. Various pretexts were given by the partitioners for their action, e.g. to protect "the rights of religious minorities" and to preserve "the equilibrium in Europe." The real causes and reasons of the partitions were the internal strife which led to the weakening of Poland and the growing power and political ambitions of Poland's neighbors, especially Russia and Prussia.

The first partition was carried out in 1772 with Russia annexing the northeastern Polish palatinates (województwa), Prussia the three northwestern provinces, and Austria took all of Galicia except Kraków.

The second partition undertaken only by Russia and Prussia in 1793, reduced Poland to one third of her former area. Russia got all the eastern provinces of Poland, extending from Livonia to Moldavia, while Prussia seized Gdańsk, Toruń as well as Great Poland.

The third and last partition of Poland took place two years later, in 1795, when all of Poland was absorbed by her three neighbors. Prussia took Suwałki, Białystok, Lomża, and Warsaw; Austria occupied Lublin, Siedlce, Radom, and Kielce; and Russia took the rest. Thus Poland disappeared from the political map of Europe. The three co-partitioners pledged themselves never to use the term "Poland" again.


Quoted after Eile, Legenda, p. 54.

Henryk Markiewicz, Prus i Żeromski (Warszawa, 1964). In this book on p. 328 Markiewicz mentions such writers and their works as Kazimierz Tetmajer (Koniec epopei 1913-1917), Wacław Berent (Nurt 1934), Leon Kruczkowski (Kordian i cham 1932), and Tadeusz Hołuj (Królestwo bez ziemi 1956).


15 A brief synopsis of both novels will be found at the beginning of Chapter II.


17 Bazyli Białokozowicz, Z dziejów..., pp. 171-172.


19 Barbara Śniadower, Literatura..., p. 51.

20 Ibid., pp. 50-51.

21 Bazyli Białokozowicz, Z dziejów..., p. 172.

22 Ibid., p. 172

CHAPTER II

THE DEVELOPMENT OF BOTH NOVELS

The Scope of Both Novels

War and Peace

The life of the Russian high society in 1805 went on quite as if nothing of great importance was impending. The threat of Napoleon to Russia seemed ridiculous. War was being waged on foreign soil and was of little importance.

During one of the soirees, Pierre Bezuxov, an illegitimate son of a very rich nobleman, made his social debut. He had a reputation for being a boor. Pierre Bezuxov's closest friend was Prince Andrej Bolkonskij, an arrogant and cynical man, who despised his wife, Liza. She was pregnant but Prince Andrej could stand her no longer. When he received a commission in the army, he left his wife on an estate in the care of his family and went off to war. Another Russian, the young nobleman Nikolaj Rostov, joined the army at the same time.

Pierre's father Count Bezuxov died, leaving Pierre his enormous fortune. In this manner Pierre became one of the most desirable bachelors in Petersburg. Cunning Prince Vasilij Kuragin maneuvered Pierre into a marriage with his daughter, the beautiful but immoral Èlen. The marriage was never a success.
Prince Andrej and Nikolaj Rostov saw some military action in Austria; Nikolaj was injured at Schöngraben and Prince Andrej badly wounded at Austerlitz. He returned home at the time of Liza's confinement, after which she died in childbirth.

Pierre, meanwhile, had joined the Freemasons and was very much taken by their philosophy. He visited Prince Andrej at his estate, where they discussed some of the eternal questions of loneliness and despair. Pierre tried to live according to the ideals of Freemasons by improving the lot of his peasants, but because of some disastrous results, he left his estate in the hands of an overseer.

In 1807 Napoleon and Alexander signed a peace treaty at Tilsit. Nikolaj Rostov thought the war was over. For two years he enjoyed all the privileges of his post in the army without having to endure any of the risks.

Prince Andrej returned to the country. Here he met Nikolaj's sister Nataša and shortly thereafter fell in love with her. The match was approved by Nataša's parents but opposed by the tyrannical old Prince Bolkonskij. He set a condition of one year to elapse before he would give his blessing. Heartbroken Nataša agreed. Soon after Prince Andrej joined the army again. During the time Nataša became infatuated with Anatol Kuragin, Èlen's brother. Their elopement was foiled by Nataša's hostess. Prince Andrej suffered
a terrible blow to his pride. He released Nataša from her promise to marry him.

In June 1812 Napoleon crossed the Niemen River into Russia. From June to August he enjoyed an uninterrupted march to Smolensk. In Smolensk he found burned and wrecked houses. By that time Napoleon began to run into fierce opposition. Old General Kutuzov, now in complete charge of the Russian forces, was determined to halt the French advance. Mainly retreating, Kutuzov led Napoleon to Borodino, where a major battle ended in a draw: the Russians retreated still further, abandoning Moscow, and the exhausted French entered it.

Prince Andrej was gravely wounded at Borodino. He arrived in Moscow when the Rostov family was leaving. Nataša nursed him continuously until his death. Nikolaj, who helped Prince Andrej's sister during her evacuation, fell in love with her and eventually married her.

Pierre Bezuxov, meanwhile, had decided to remain in Moscow. He had a plan to assassinate Napoleon and become a national hero. But in his efforts to rescue a woman being molested by French soldiers, Pierre was captured as a prisoner of war. The retreating French army took their prisoners with them. Traveling with other prisoners, Pierre learned that happiness could consist merely of being warm and having enough to eat. His privations matured him. He learned responsibility and gained courage. He developed a sense of humor at the
irony of his plight. Pierre's moral rebirth was largely due to the influence of Karataev, a strong yet inoffensive peasant. On the road to Smolensk, Cossack guerillas charged the unit with which Pierre was travelling and freed the prisoners. He returned to Orel and only later learned about the deaths of Prince Andrej and his own wife Elen.

Pierre returned to Moscow and renewed his friendship with Rostovs. It was then that he fell in love with Nataša, realizing that she was no longer a child but a mature young woman. At the same time Nikolaj married Princess Mar'ja. Nataša became an efficient wife who dominated her husband, but Pierre loved her and respected her. Nikolaj's marriage, though not entirely romantically motivated, proved happier than expected. The young Rostovs adopted Nikoluška, son of the late Prince Andrej.

And so the families of the Bezuxovs and Rostovs and the Rostovs and Bolkonskijs were united and found happiness in the fulfillment of their dreams.

Ashes

Young Rafał Olbromski paid a visit to his uncle Nardzewski. The old landowner took him hunting. Upon returning home they found an Austrian Hibl on official business. The old nobleman ignored the Austrian's reproaches about taxes and the treatment of peasants and openly defied him by ordering a public flogging of one peasant accused of breaking and entering.
Rafał was sent to his parents shortly before the flogging. Rafał participated in a winter sleigh party during the carnival period. On a spirited horse he followed Helena's sleigh. The party stopped at Rafał's house where his father staged a big celebration which lasted two days. Rafał told Helena that he would come to see her some night.

Together with Krzysztof Cedro, Rafał attended school in Sandomierz. Rafał was not much of a scholar, but he was a leader. One evening the two boys stole a rowboat and went out onto the ice-packed Wisła. The strong current almost carried them away but they managed to land with difficulty. Soaked to the skin they returned to their lodgings. Krzysztof fell ill with fever. Rafał was accused of being an instigator and, because of his refusal to talk, he was to be punished by a beadle. Rafał, however, wounded the beadle and escaped.

Old Olbromski isolated the disgraced son and forbade the family to speak to him. Later Rafał was assigned to work in the fields for several months with the peasants. One winter night he took his favorite mare from the stable and rode through a storm to Helena's house. After a brief spell of happiness he had to make a fast exit in order to escape the fierce watchdogs.

On the way back a storm came up. Rafał lost his way and was followed by wolves. When young Olbromski's horse stumbled and fell, one wolf jumped on the rider, the others attacked
the horse. In a desperate battle Rafał killed the wolf and was himself gravely wounded. He was rescued by an old passing peasant. After he recovered his father, as a punishment, cast him out of the family and sent him to live with his older brother Piotr, who had been cast out years before.

Piotr, in poor health from old war wounds, lived alone. Rafał spent some enjoyable time at his brother's until the arrival of Prince Gintułt, an old comrade of Piotr's. During the visit the two had angry words about the treatment of peasants. The argument left Piotr with a hemorrhage that led to his death. With no place to go, Rafał went to stay with the prince.

In Prince Gintułt's household he was half family, half guest. The prince gave him money for clothes, and others gave him errands to run. Rafał was attracted to the prince's sister Elżbieta, a proud young girl. One day as the two of them were riding in the country Rafał kissed her and had his face slashed with her whip.

With the prince's going abroad, Rafał was sent to school for a year. This time he studied well. At the year's end he was forced to return home, where he worked for four years on the farm. Only with an offer of a position from Prince Gintułt was he released from his duties on his father's estate.

In Warsaw Rafał served as secretary to the prince. He was accepted into a Masonic lodge and introduced to the city's
society. Through the lodge he met Helena again.

Abruptly Rafal and Helena fled the city to the country to enjoy their love. One night they were surprised by a band of robbers. They overpowered Rafal and violated Helena. Helena committed suicide. Heartbroken Rafal tried unsuccessfully to track the villains down. Mistaken for a brigand he was arrested and spent a year in jail.

Returning home penniless and hungry, he met his old friend Krzysztof. Rafal stayed on his friend's estate. It was then and there that their youthful imagination was fired by a Polish soldier, veteran of the early Napoleonic campaigns. They decided to leave their homeland and join the Polish troops under Napoleon. With the help of former Princess Elżbieta, they crossed into French-occupied Silesia.

Krzysztof, as an enlisted man, had crossed Europe with Napoleon and taken part in the Spanish campaign. His most vivid impressions were those of the siege and taking of Saragossa. He fought with valor against the Spanish guerillas and was wounded. It was at this time that he saw the French leader for the first time and spoke briefly to him.

Rafal fought in Poland against Prussians and Austrians. During the Austrian siege of Sandomierz, on the instigation of Prince Gintużt, he interfered with the Polish gunners in order to save an old cathedral. Eventually he escaped to his father's house, taking the wounded prince with him.
When the fighting temporarily died down, Rafal went to live at his late uncle's estate. He was busy rebuilding it when Krzysztof Cedro arrived with the news of the Russian campaign. Reluctant at first, Rafal finally agreed to accompany his friend into battle again. The novel ends with the review of the Grand Army by Napoleon at Orsza. There Krzysztof saw Napoleon for the second time.

The Original Idea and Its Evolution

What prompted both writers to write their novels? What were the ideas that stimulated and sustained them in their monumental creations?

In the case of ToIstoj the embryo of the idea can be traced to the year 1852, when on September 22 (O.S.) he wrote in his diary:

[...] Sostavit' istinnuju pravdivuju Istoriju Evropy nynešnjago veKA. Vot cel' na vsju žizn'. - Est' malo epox v istorii stol' poučitel'nyh, kak ěta, i stol' malо obsužennых bezpristrasno i verno, tak, kak my obsuživaem teper' istoriju Egipta i Rima. - Bogatstvo, svežest' istočnikov i bezpristrasne istoričeskoе, nevidannoe - soveršenstvo. Pered tem, kak ja zadumal pisat', mne prišlo v golovu ešče uslovie krasoty, o kotorom i ne dumal - rezkost', jasnost' xarakterov.

[...] To compose a genuine and true History of Europe of this age. That is a goal for a lifetime. There are few epochs in history as instructive as this one, and so few discussed as impartially and correctly, as we discuss now the history of Egypt and Rome. Wealth and freshness of sources and historical impartiality, unheard of perfection. Before I intended to write, the prerequisite of
beauty occurred to me, something about which I did not think - sharpness and clarity of characters.¹

This fondness for history and a desire to treat it in Tolstoj's own way with added artistic elements evolved eventually into the novel The Decembrists, set in 1856. In his continuous attempts to understand better the hero of the novel, Labazov, Tolstoj moved from one historical period to another (1856 to 1825 to 1812) and eventually stopped at the year 1805.² The novel, however, remained unfinished except for its first three chapters. Further work on the originally conceived novel The Decembrists brought Tolstoj to War and Peace. The center of gravity, however, shifted from 1856 to 1812 and the project became a historical novel. The first rough drafts of War and Peace go back to the spring of 1863 when Tolstoj studied historical works, searched for materials (memoirs and letters) in order to perceive correctly the spirit of the epoch which he was about to depict. To be sure, the novel was not known under its present title. The first part appeared in The Russian Messenger, early 1865 under the title The Year 1805 with War and In the Country as subsequent parts.³ In the twelfth draft the title of the novel was From the Year 1805 to 1814.⁴ However the final title of the novel which Tolstoj hoped to finish by 1867 was to be All is Well That Ends Well.⁵ It was only in 1867 that the work took its final form and was given the present title: War and Peace.⁶
It seems that a casual remark about history in Tolstoj's diary led to the creation of War and Peace after, of course, numerous changes and transformations. Tolstoj's interest in history was stimulated by works of such Russian historians as Mixajlovskij-Danilevskij, Karamzin, Ustrjalov. Also his early "addiction" to absolute truth played an important role in this process. In a diary entry on December 17, 1853 (O.S.) Tolstoj wrote:

Èpigráf k Istorii ja by napisal: "Ničeogo ne utaju." Malo togo, čtoby prjamo ne lgat', nado starat'sja ne lgat' otricatel'no-umalčivaja.

I would write the following epigraph to the History: "I shall hide nothing. It is not enough not to lie directly, but it is necessary to try not to lie negatively - by passing over in silence."

This obsession with truth was Tolstoj's guiding light and sustaining force all through the years of writing War and Peace. He notes in one of his "Epilogue" variants:

Ja ponimaju vse različie vyskazannogo mnoju vzgljada na istoriju ot vzgljada vsex istorikov. Različie takovo, čto očevidno: ili ja imel nes-častie liš'tsja rassudka i prisoedinit' k sočineniju, imevšemu bol'soj uspex, bezumnoe rassuždenie ob istorii, ili vsja ta, tak nazyvaemaja, istoričeskaja nauka, kotoraja tak ser'ezno prepodetsja, i pišetsja, i pečataetsja, est' pustaja i prazdnaja boltovnja. Ja soznaju neizbežnost' ětoj dilemmy vo vsem ee strašnom značenii. Ilī ja sumašedšij, ili ja otkryl novuju istinu. Ja verju v to, čto ja otkryl novuju istinu. V ětom ubezdenii potverždaet menja to nezavisimoe ot menja mučitel'noe i radostnoe uporstvo i volnenie, s kotorym ja rabotal v prodlženie semi let, šag za šagom otkryvaja to, čto ja scitaju istinoj.
I realize the whole distinction between my view and the view of all historians. The difference is such, that it is obvious: either I had the misfortune to become irrational and attach to the work, which was a major success, an insane discourse about history; or all the so-called historical scholarship, which is so seriously taught, written and printed, is an idle and useless twaddle. I realize the inevitability of this dilemma in all its dreadful importance. Either I am insane or I have discovered a new truth. I believe that I have discovered a new truth. In this conviction I am supported by the agonizing and joyful stubbornness and agitation, with which I worked for seven years, discovering step by step that, which I consider truth.®

The truth of Tolstoj differed considerably from what the official historians considered to be the truth. But War and Peace is not just a novel about historical events. Parallel to the historical theme Tolstoj depicts the life of the Russian aristocracy, mainly of two families: Bolkonskijs and Rostovs. Both themes alternate and interweave all through the novel. This "family theme" also underwent a series of changes in the course of writing the novel. For example, in the earlier, shorter version All is Well That Ends Well the lives of Prince Andrej and Petja Rostov are spared; Prince Andrej goes with the Russian army to Paris; and Karataey does not exist. There are also many minor changes.®

In the case of Żeromski the spiritus movens was of a patriotic nature. Żeromski was born in 1864, just after the Polish uprising of 1863-1864. His generation did not experience the bitterness of defeat but through his mother, wife
of an insurrectionist by her first marriage, young Stefan absorbed the traditions of insurrection. His mother handed down to him her own patriotic exaltation together with love for literature, especially Romantic poetry. Later, patriotic ideas were sustained and developed by Żeromski's teachers in the gimnazjum of Kielce: Antoni Gustaw Bem and Tomasz Siemiradzki. Small wonder that in his formative years the future young writer declares himself a patriot, whose first concern is the problem of national freedom. He was, however, not unaware of social problems present in Polish society of his days. His patriotic background stimulated early historical interest in Żeromski. His sensitive and imaginative mind produced such early works as Ravens Will Tear Us to Pieces (1894), Tomb (1894), and About a Soldier, Homeless Wanderer (1896). All three are of deeply patriotic nature, and the last work was Żeromski's first contact with historical material to which he had access in the Polish Museum in Rapperswil, Switzerland, where he worked. It is quite conceivable that the writer had in mind at that time an ambitious plan for a cycle of historical novels. The cycle was to cover various stages of almost a century of the Polish fight for independence: from the legions of Dąbrowski during the Napoleonic wars, the November uprising in 1830-31, Spring of the Peoples in 1848, to the most recent link in this cycle, the January uprising of 1863. Ashes was to be the first novel of the cycle dealing with the life and consciousness of Poles at
home under foreign domination, and abroad either in the
Polish legions or in the ranks of the French army. *Sparks*
(1900) was to represent the people and events of the No­
vember uprising while *Faithful River* (1913) depicted the
January uprising. (The latter was written to commemorate the
fiftieth anniversary of the uprising.)

We do not have precise evidence to substantiate our
speculations about that cycle of novels, but we do have a
kind of "belated" proof in the form of Żeromski's letter to
Witkiewicz (March 7, 1910) in which he said:

Tu w Paryżu mogę znaleźć źródło nieocenione
do trzech momentów, to jest Rok 31, Rok 46 i
Rok 63 - co będzie stanowić całość: Popioły,
stara ramotka z czasu Napoleona, będzie
rodzajem przedmowy do tego obrazu przeszłości,
in którym tragedia roku 46, tragedia Towarzystwa
Demokratycznego, które kona pod nożem Szeli -
przerasta swym ogromem wszystko, co było w
Polsce straszliwego, no i przerośnie oczywiście
moje siły. Ale coś robić?

Here in Paris I am able to find the inval­
uable source to the three [historical] moments,
that is the Year 31, the Year 46, and the Year
63 - which will comprise a whole: Ashes, this
old scribbling from the time of Napoleon, will
be sort of a preface to this picture of the past,
where the tragedy of the year 46, the tragedy of
the Democratic Society dying under Szela's knife-
surpasses by its immensity all that was horrible
in Poland and will most certainly surpass my
strength. But what is one to do?"

In view of this it is reasonable to assume that the plan
for a cycle of historical novels already existed in Żeromski's
mind at the time of the writing of Ashes. This assumption
rules out the possibility that Żeromski decided to write a
Polish counterpart of War and Peace after reading Tolstoj's work, as implied by Edward Rzeszowski. Accepting his suggestion would mean admitting an "inspirational" influence of Tolstoj's work on Żeromski. Żeromski's inspiration was his own. It was more historical than literary in nature, since it falls in the period when Polish historian Askenazy initiated the movement of the revision of Poland's past, i.e., that part dealing with the loss of Polish independence and the early fights for its restoration. Since the author of Ashes knew Tolstoj's work very well, it might be possible that after reading War and Peace he partially utilized its structure and some of its thematical elements, for example, hunt scenes, kulig, and the subject of freemasonry, all of which appear in both novels. We would like to emphasize, however, that this apparent influence of Tolstoj on Ashes is considerably less than it appears, applying least of all to thematical elements. The presence of these elements in Ashes cannot be explained with absolute certainty as a result of the influence of War and Peace because Poland and Russia shared common customs and practices which were either the result of their similar Slavic backgrounds or the cultural influence of Western Europe to which both countries were exposed.
The Significance of the Titles

The first mention of the title War and Peace is found in Tolstoj's letter to M. N. Lavrov on March 24, 1867. There is no explanation as to the origin of the title. Prior to this final title the novel had three others. There are different theories why Tolstoj chose the title War and Peace. The Russian critic Èjxenbaum presents a strong case for the influence of Proudhon and his book La Guerre et la Paix (1861) on Tolstoj. It is his opinion that Tolstoj used Proudhon's title in order to stress the philosophic-historical and epic genre of the novel, as opposed to the previous title of a shorter version All is Well That Ends Well, which had a familial, "English" character. Others see the influence of Glinka and even Puškin. Probably more interesting is the actual meaning of the title to which Tolstoj must have given some thought. In the choice of the title as well as in its interpretation there are not only theories but also actual proofs. The word "war" (in Russian vojna) presents no problem; it means state of hostilities. "Peace," spelled in modern Russian mir, had two pre-revolutionary spellings: миръ, which denoted a state where hostilities are absent. The other spelling of an identically sounding word was миръ, which had a variety of meanings, one of them denoting "people, whole nation, whole world." There seems to be very little
doubt that Tolstoj had the first meaning in mind ("peace"). It can be substantiated by the following: in his novel Tolstoj is concerned with war in its philosophical and historical aspect. Thus peace should be considered as the logical antonym to war. In the novel itself scenes from war and peace alternate with surprising regularity, giving in this manner a full picture of life in the contemporary Russia. This also is the way all translators of Tolstoj's novel have understood the title. Supporters of the second spelling mírь and with it of different meaning, point out that Tolstoj wanted to stress the role of the people in the war.19 That theory is rather weak and far-fetched. The interesting point is, however, that Tolstoj did write mírь on the draft agreement with Katkov. His wife changed it to мирь and he did not object. The novel was printed many times over with this last spelling. Only once, in 1913 edition, did it bear the title Война и мирь.20

Żeromski did not have as many problems with the title of his novel as did Tolstoj. This we can say on the basis of the available source material. His researchers do not mention any title changes. The title is obviously symbolic. One could see it in Żeromski's characteristic outlook on life, sadness for the past,21 and perhaps22 negation of one's total dreams, and national hopes which turn to ashes after a brief splendor.23 This, however, would be an incomplete interpretation. In order to properly understand the title one has to
contemplate the novel as a whole. The novel begins soon after the last partition of Poland (1795) when symbolically speaking the country is in ashes: it has lost its independence, the flame of sovereignty is extinguished. But the situation is not hopeless. "Poland is not dead yet," sing the obstinate few--it is true they are on foreign soil--but they keep the symbolic flame burning, the flame which eventually is brought home to help reignite the smouldering ruins. And it is near Orsza in 1812 where Żeromski leaves us with the flame burning brightly. Another dark period which lasted for over a century descended over the Polish land and people after this bright interval of the Napoleonic era. In fact it was well under way in Żeromski's time. But it was precisely for that reason--to show people some hope for the future--that Żeromski wrote his novel. He wanted to point out the immortality and the indestructibility of the nation and its spirit, which like a mythological phoenix will rise again from its own ashes.

The Sources

In 1928 the Russian critic Šklovskij compiled a list of sources used by Tolstoj during his writing of War and Peace. It consists of fifty-four items, "not a very large number," remarks Šklovskij. In 1955 Zajdenšnur, a student of Tolstoj's work, published another list of Tolstoj's sources. This
time the list contained seventy-four items. It is interesting to note that only thirty-eight items are found on both lists. Thus sixteen sources on Šklovskij's list and twenty-six on Zajdenšnur's are not included in the list of sources. By adding the numbers of the omitted items to the number common to both critics, one would come up with an even number: eighty. The question of a discrepancy is interesting, especially if we ask why Zajdenšnur omitted the books on Šklovskij's list of which she must have known. New books on Zajdenšnur's list can be explained as new discoveries since 1928. But it is really not very important to know how many books Tolstoj used, more important is the nature of the sources and how Tolstoj utilized them.

About two-thirds of the source material is Russian, the remaining one-third is predominately French. When arranged into specific genre groups, the material is about equally divided among:

1. history books
2. documents, letters, memoirs
3. biographies and actual literary works, all of them dealing with the period in question.

Tolstoj was perfectly aware of the deficiencies of the sources he was using, especially in official histories. He writes:
Často, izučaja dva glavnye istoričeskie proizvedenija ètoj epoxi, T'era i Mixajlovskogo - Danilevskogo, ja prixodil v nedoumenie, kakim obrazom mogli byt' napečataemy i čitaemy èti knigi? Ne govorja uz ob izloženii odnix i tex sobytiy samym ser'eznym značitel'nym tonom, s ssylkami na materialy, diametral'no - protivo-položnye odin drugomu, ja vstrečal v ètix istorikax takie opisanija, çto ne znaeš', smejat'sja li ili plakat', kogda vspomnis', çto obe èti knigi edinstvennye pamjatniki toj epoxi i imejut milliony čitatelej.

Often when studying the two chief historical works of that epoch, Thiers and Mixajlovskij-Danilevskij, I was bewildered that such books could have been printed and read. To say nothing of the fact that they present the same events in a most serious, significant tone, citing the sources they have drawn on, and yet in diametrical opposition to one another, in these histories I came across such accounts that I did not know whether to laugh or to cry, remembering that these books are chief memorials of that epoch and have had millions of readers.27

Tolstoj reworked the material available to him according to his own ideas. Usually he edited the material by omitting certain passages for stylistic, ideological, or factual reasons. It is this last reason that somewhat tarnishes the image of truth-loving Tolstoj. For example, not all Russian classes were enthusiastic about the war: Count Rastopčin did not arm the population in the forest belt of Moscow for he did not know "which way the Russian people will turn."28 Davydov's reports contradict Tolstoj's assertion that all peasants hated Napoleon. On the contrary, they helped the French and in some areas even tried to rise against their landowners.29 Also fights between Russian peasants and
Russian troops were not uncommon. In his glorification of Kutuzov, Tolstoj deliberately omitted the fact that Kutuzov forgot to deploy three hundred cannons at Borodino—a mistake which might have tipped the scales of war in favor of the Russians. Tolstoj's unjust downgrading of Napoleon is well-known. Conscious omissions and distortions of fact make a novel historically unreliable and biased. It is true that a historical novelist is not a historian and as such is permitted a certain leeway and freedom, but it seems that Tolstoj overstepped even those limits. This accusation can be formulated as Tolstoj's attempt to "bend" history and make it fit the mold of his philosophy of history. In order to understand the reason behind Tolstoj's presentation of the events of 1812 in a light very favorable to Russia, one ought to go back to Tolstoj's experiences in August 1855 when the Russians surrendered Sebastopol. Tolstoj participated in the Crimean War as an artillery officer on one of the redoubts, and he took the defeat very hard. "Ja plakal, kogda uvidel gorod ob"jatym plamenem i francuzskie znamena na našix bastionax" (I cried when I saw the city engulfed in flames and the French flags over our redoubts). The ending of the last Sebastopol sketch, Sebastopol in August 1855, echoes the same sentiment:

Vyходя на ту сторону моста, поооіі каждыі
солдат снимал шапку і крестильса. Но за этим
чувством было другое, тяжелее, сосущее и более
глубокое чувство: это было чувство, как будто
покоожее на рассказание, стыд и злобу. Поооіі
každyj soldat, vzgljanuv s Severnoj storony na ostavlenyyj Sevastopol', s nevyrazimoju goreč'ju v serdce vzdyxal i grozilsja vragam.

Arrived at the end of the bridge, each soldier, with very few exceptions, takes off his cap and crosses himself. But besides this feeling he has another, more poignant, deeper - a feeling akin to repentance, to shame, to hatred; for it is with an inexpressible bitterness of heart that each of them sighs, utters threats against the enemy, and, as he reaches the north side, throws a last look upon abandoned Sebastopol'.

This pain of the lost war was fresh in his mind and kept alive by Russian polemics about the whole campaign. Thus it was not a coincidence that toward the end of the 1850's and in the early 1860's there was a renewed interest in the events of the 1812-15 period which was a moral antidote to the not-so-glorious 1853-56 war. The war of 1812 was the war against the same enemy but with a happy ending. However in spite of the final Russian victory there were some "rough spots" in it which Tolstoj decided to "adjust" even if it meant consciously tampering with historical truth. In the process of doing it, Tolstoj recognized it as a very opportune moment to express his own ideas on war and history in general, which he very skillfully integrated into his anti-French and strongly pro-Russian position. And so Tolstoj, by his epic work, lent authoritative approval to the legend of 1812, neutralizing at the same time the smarting hurts of 1856.

Żeromski's sources are not as numerous as Tolstoj's. August Grodzicki, one of Żeromski's researchers puts his
bibliography at thirty books.\textsuperscript{35} They are mostly Polish books. Seven of them are in French. To the three-fold division of sources in the case of Tolstoj, here one has to add yet another group of a scientific nature such as \textit{Manual on Field Fortifications}, \textit{Description of the Island of Santo Domingo}, or \textit{Monograph about the City of Sandomierz}. This added group of source material can be easily explained. Żeromski had no military experience and all professional military knowledge had to come from the thorough study of war memoirs or military textbooks. He had never been to Santo Domingo or Spain. Therefore, in order to familiarize himself with countries and places where the action of the Polish legions took place and which he described in \textit{Ashes}, Żeromski had to read quite extensively. Żeromski was familiar with Switzerland and Italy as well as some Italian cities. In the same way he knew his own Poland. Consequently, there are no books on these countries among his sources; only if the required information was very specific and his knowledge of the subject unsatisfactory did he reach for an appropriate book.

Żeromski was rather fortunate with sources for \textit{Ashes}. From 1892-1896 he worked at the Polish National Museum in Rapperswill, Switzerland. From 1897-1904 Żeromski held an appointment as associate librarian at Zamoyski Library in Warsaw. Through his position he had unlimited access to any historical source he wanted. He was especially thorough in
his descriptions of battle scenes. Žeromski would make scale models of cities (e.g., Saragossa) and study the situation, plasticity and above all plausibility of a scene he was about to describe. This characteristic was also typical of Tolstoj, who spent two days riding over the Borodino battlefield examining and checking the terrain, and talking to the eye-witnesses of the battle. Eventually he was able to disprove the official version of the Borodino battle.

While working at Zamoyski Library, Žeromski fell under the influence of his superior, the Polish positivist historian Tadeusz Korzon. The attitude of Korzon to Polish legions can be described not as hostile, but as rather critical. This was reflected originally in the rough draft of Ashes.

In 1900 a Third Convention of Polish historians took place in Kraków. There Szymon Askenazy from Lwów protested sharply the state of Polish historiography dealing with Polish legions and their creator and leader, Jan Henryk Dąbrowski. He also condemned the positivist attitudes of contemporary Polish historians. Askenazy dealt very critically with one of Žeromski's sources: Amilkar Kosiński in Italy 1795-1893. A Collection of Materials to the History of Polish Legions in Italy. Žeromski knew Askenazy's paper and he reworked his narrative material on Polish legions in accordance with the views of Askenazy. In order to "rehabilitate" them and Dąbrowski, Žeromski had to turn to new sources. One of them
was The Letters of Eminent Poles, Explaining History of Polish Legions. Żeromski copied numerous phrases and expressions from this source and used them later in the Chapter "Dąbrowski."

While Tolstoj used some of his sources as a basis for argument (this is especially true of his treatment of strictly historical works and is also applicable to other sources), Żeromski followed his sources rather faithfully, integrating factual material with products of his own imagination. It applies to historical events as well as to his depiction of Polish life and customs. Sometimes he tries to reproduce a particular scene in a very exact manner and conveys undigested source material, at times copying it verbatim. It might be a dry enumeration of armament and weapons, or description of fortifications. It is here that the novel loses its artistic appeal and the reader becomes rather bored. But by and large, integration of source material is very successful. One has difficulty finding where historical source material ends and Żeromski's imagination takes over.

The Variants

The variants of War and Peace reproduced in the Jubilee Edition take up three volumes: volumes thirteen, fourteen, and fifteen. Proofs are also included and discussed in detail. In the years 1863-1864 there were fifteen drafts of the
beginning of the novel alone. I shall deal with the main variants of War and Peace and the problems connected with them.

The Decembrists, a novel about a Decembrist returning from exile, may be considered as a protodraft of War and Peace. This unfinished novel of three chapters was the novel with moral, and not, as one would expect, political, preoccupation. Stylistically it is close to journalistic style. However, Tolstoj's desire to go further into the past to the year 1825 and even to 1812 posed new problems of structure and genre. From a novel with strong moral overtones, the work was transformed into a historical chronicle. Tolstoj referred to it then as "a history of 1812." A title planned for this work was Three Eras, referring obviously to the years 1856, 1825, and 1812. This was what is known as the 1863 draft of War and Peace. Toward the end of 1863 we observe a complete transition from the original novel The Decembrists to War and Peace. Judging, however, from the very early drafts of the novel, it was still far from becoming a historical epic. It was more of a family novel set against the background of the events of 1812. But Tolstoj did not stop at 1812. He went back even further to the year 1805. Éjxenbaum places this decision at December 1863 after Tolstoj's visit to Pogodin. In one of the unpublished drafts of his preface to War and Peace, Tolstoj says:
I tak, ot 1856 goda vozvrativšis' k 1805 godu, ja s ètogo vremeni nameren provesti už ne odnogo, a mnogix moix geroev i geroin' čerez istoričeskije sobytija 1805, 1807, 1812, 1825, i 1856 godov. Razvjazki otnošenij ètix lic ja ne predvižu ni v odnoj iz ètix epox. Skol'ko ja ni pytalsja snačala pridumat' romaničeskju zavžazku i razvjazku, ja ubedilsja, çto èto ne v mox sredstvax, i rešil v opisanii ètix lic otdat'sja svoim privyčkam i silam.

And so having gone back from 1856 to 1805, I now intend to lead not one but many heroes and heroines of mine through the historical events of 1805, 1807, 1812, 1825, and 1856. I do not foresee in any one of these periods a denouement in the relationships between these people. However much I tried at first to think up a novel-like plot and denouement, I was convinced that it was not within my means, and I decided in describing these people to bow to my own practices and my own powers.

This is, as Ejxenbaum points out, a clear transition from a conventional novel to a historical novel-chronicle. The 1864 draft begins with the battle of Austerlitz, an event which marks this change in the novel. From February of 1864 to mid-September of that year, Tolstoj worked hard on the novel, and early in 1865, the first thirty-eight chapters, entitled 1805 were published. Tolstoj had plans for the rest of the novel to be completed in 1867, under the title All's Well That Ends Well. The title War and Peace appeared first in March 1867 on a draft agreement between Tolstoj and Katkov for the printing of the novel with illustrations. Publication of the novel continued as follows: volumes 1, 2, 3, and 4 in 1868, and volumes 5 and 6 in 1869. This was the first edition of War and Peace. The second edition appeared in 1868-1869 also. It has some textual revisions. The third
edition, published in 1873, had significant changes in it: 1. all the French passages were translated into Russian, 2. philosophical discussions on history were deleted from the novel, collected and added at the end of the novel, under the heading Articles about the Campaign of 1812. Other editions which followed were patterned either on one of the first three editions or, at times, a combination of two editions. For example, the fourth edition (1880) was a reprint of the third, while the fifth (1886) returned to the first edition. The sixth edition (1886) was also based on the first edition but without the French text. It also included stylistic changes of the third edition. Later editions were printed according to the fifth edition. The Jubilee Edition is based on the second edition and Tolstoj's corrections of the 1873 edition.

The growth and development of the novel which caused important structural changes left its traces on the character of War and Peace. Initially, their number was smaller, their names were different, and their structural roles were limited. For example old Prince Volkonskij (later Bolkonskij) did not have a son Andrej, only a daughter Mar'ja; Count Rostov was called Count Tolstoj, Prostoj, or Ploxov; Kuragin was Kurakin; Pierre was called Il'ja. Prince Andrej appeared in the 1864 draft and not as one of the main characters but as a secondary one. It was only later that Prince Andrej became an important figure. But even then his future was not definite. In
the shorter version *All's Well That Ends Well*, happy endings abound in the novel: Prince Andrej recovers, Petja lives, and Karatajev is not in the novel. Historical characters such as Alexander I, Napoleon, and Kutuzov appeared in the initial drafts as undeveloped, episodic figures. It was only with the development and growth of the novel that their presentation changed. For example, Kutuzov was without the aura of spiritual grandeur which surrounds him in the final draft. Also, the presentation of Napoleon was originally not as debunking as in the final version of the novel.47

Thus the variants of *War and Peace* enable us to observe several stages of development: 1) The pre-*War and Peace* stage: *The Decembrists* (1856-1860); 2) the first part of the novel: *The Year 1805* (1863-1866); 3) the shorter version: *All's Well That Ends Well* (1866-1867); and 4) the final draft: *War and Peace* (1867-1869). The reasons for many different drafts were continuous changes in the author's plans with respect to the theme and scope of the novel. This in turn caused changes in the work and in the presentation and treatment of the characters.

Żeromski's *Ashes* did not have such a great number of rough drafts and variants as did Tolstoj's *War and Peace*. Tolstoj's work showed fundamental changes in terms of the character of the novel itself (a change from the family type novel to the final epic type); in terms of characters and
their fate (Prince Andrej, Petja Rostov, Platon Karatajev and others), or even the very origin and idea of the novel. Żeromski's work was relatively free from all that.

While the plan of the novel originated in Switzerland during Żeromski's stay in Rapperswil, the actual writing of it started in 1898. Ashes had a rather stormy history: in November 1900, tsarist police confiscated the manuscript during a search of Żeromski's apartment. Only after persistent interventions by the author's wife Oktawia was the manuscript returned. Another manuscript of the novel Sparks dealing with the November uprising was confiscated at the same time and has never been returned. It was to have been the second novel of the planned historical cycle. Żeromski had to reconstruct some of the chapters from Ashes because the manuscript had been returned in a defective condition. Thus the rather inauspicious circumstances of the writing of the novel caused by the tsarist censorship probably did not permit too many variants and drafts. But Żeromski worked continuously on Ashes changing and adding to it. His changes in the novel can be grouped into ideological, factual, stylistic, and simple corrections of printers' errors. Ideological changes, such as, for example, Żeromski's attitude toward the Polish legions, necessitated basic changes. As it was already mentioned, when under the influence of the Polish historian Askenazy, Żeromski decided to alter his stand on the Polish legions and their leader General Dąbrowski. This necessitated many structural
and textual changes. Up to the third convention of Polish Historians in 1900, a major source of information about the Polish legions and their leader was the story of an impoverished nobleman Ojrzyński in the chapter "In the Army, Far Away," who by the virtue of his low rank gave a "worm's eye view" of the Polish legions, and the picture of their leader in his narrative is not reliable, to say the least. Apparently influenced by Askenazy's paper at the convention (the same Askenazy who denounced the unsatisfactory treatment of the Polish legions and their leadership by the Polish historiography) Żeromski introduced three new chapters: "Chiesea aurea," "A Soldier's Lot," and "Mantova." All of them offer new material on the Polish legions and General Dąbrowski, painting a much more complete and positive picture. As a result of these changes Żeromski had to alter the route of Prince Gintułt's journey, which originally led directly to Paris in the chapter called "The Audatious," avoiding Italy. Now Prince Gintułt travels quite extensively in Italy, visiting such places as Venice, Verona where he has his important talk with General Dąbrowski, and later participates in the defense of Mantua. Askenazy supplied Żeromski with materials on another famous historical personage: General Sokolnicki. Żeromski introduces him also in Ashes utilizing the data from Askenazy, who in turn obtained them from family archives of Sokolnicki's. It should be mentioned that all those
changes were almost exclusively ideological in character and did not involve any changes in the basic plot of the novel but altered its structure. Stylistic changes such as adding or eliminating words, expressions, or sentences are always present in any literary work as it undergoes revisions and new editions. In *Ashes* they occur for example, at the very beginning of the novel, which in the manuscript starts with, "wbrew srogim myśliwskim zasadom Rafał zeszedł ze stanowiska i chyłkiem doszedł do szczytu góry" (Against all hunting principles Rafał left his position and stoopingly went to the top of the mountain). The famous opening sentence, "Ogary poszły w las" (The hounds darted off to the woods) of the final version appeared in the manuscript on the second page. Another example of stylistic changes may be a small excerpt from Dąbrowski's conversation with Prince Gintułt in the chapter "A Soldier's Lot" ^52^ (- Powiem) muszę powiedzieć to, co (+się) należy. (-Nie) (sądź) Ujął go pod rękę i olbrzymi (-ą) (+m) (-swój kością) (+przedramieniem) przyczyną (+go) (-do swego boku) (+ku siebie)." Translation: (- I shall tell) I must tell you, it is only proper. (-Do not judge) He slipped his hand under Prince's arm and pressed him to his body (-with his bone) with his huge forearm (-to his side).

One could include many similar examples testifying to the author's constant search for the most appropriate form of expression of his thoughts and ideas. ^53^
The last variant group may be termed technical in nature, for it is precisely that. Zeromski did review and correct various editions of Ashes, but those corrections were minor, concerning printing errors or stylistically rough spots. According to Stanisław Pigoń there are three important editions of the novel: first, the newspaper serialization in 1902-3 in Tygodnik Ilustrowany, then the first edition in book form in Warsaw, 1940, and the second book form edition in Warsaw in 1906. The last one includes several changes made by the author, mostly additions to the existing text. And so Zeromski supplied a whole new stanza to the song of Dys (Chapter - "Val de Penas," Vol. III), added a line to Sokolnicki's prayer (Chapter - "On the Banks of the Rawka," Vol. III), and made two major additions: one of seven lines (Chapter - "In the Old Manor," Vol. III), another of five lines (Chapter - "The Post," Vol. III).

The first seven line addition occurred in the conversation between old Cedro and Trepka. It is another of Trepka's arguments about why Krzysztof left home and joined the Polish troops. Obviously Zeromski felt the ideological arguments of Trepka needed strengthening.

The second addition is of a patriotic nature: "Ja się biję z duszy za kraj!" ("I am fighting with all my soul for my country!") Cedro cries out to Wyganowski during one of their talks in Spain.
The reason for these additions in the 1906 edition was, as Pigoń points out, the change in political climate in Poland which the author of Ashes promptly utilized.

There were four editions of Ashes before 1914. This testifies to the great popularity of the novel among Polish readers. Using the patriotic approach in 1907, the publishers Gebether and Wolf printed a shorter, illustrated version of Ashes: Za wolność i ojczyznę (For Freedom and Fatherland).

Tolstoj's novel was constantly changing in the process of writing, while Żeromski's came out in a more or less definite form. Thus, while Tolstoj was coming to grips with ideological, thematical, and structural problems, Żeromski seems to have followed some established pattern: there were no major ideological or thematical vacillations with the exception of his change of attitude regarding Polish legions. The fairly uniform pattern in writing of Żeromski's novel seems to substantiate further my speculation about the planned cycle of historical novels of which Ashes was to be the first one. Żeromski knew precisely what he wanted to write about in his novel. Żeromski's grasp of Tolstoj's structure of War and Peace emboldened him to explore further the possibilities of this type of novel and utilize them in his own novel.
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CHAPTER III

HISTORY, WAR, AND PEACE IN BOTH WORKS

War and Peace

Tolstoj's philosophical reflections on history and war appear in War and Peace in the opening pages of books nine, ten, eleven, and in the first epilogue. The second epilogue is a summary of his views on history. Tolstoj tries there to determine forces operating in history, to define their laws. He does that by constantly juxtaposing the views of contemporary historians and his own. His philosophy of history is not intellectual: according to Tolstoj no man (no matter what his level of intellect) can control the development of events or the course of history. He disputes the view of biographical historians that the will of a ruler is the force which influences and determines the destiny of a nation. (There is a great philosophical inconsistency in the ideas of the author of War and Peace as will be shown in the discussion of Tolstoj's view on war.) To him, a nation's leaders are "history's slaves." The outcome of a battle is unforeseen by a military commander for it is a sum total of the wills of all the participants on each side. Tolstoj's philosophy of history is
also anti-heroic and anarchistic. Anti-heroic because it does not recognize the hero's power as a force influencing the development of history. Its anarchistic character manifests itself in Tolstoj's rejection of the heroic philosophy of history. Instead of the will of a hero, he replaces it with the individual wills of many people which are almost entirely unpredictable and to a great degree devoid of order in the development of historical events. Having destroyed the heroic theory of history, he hardly offers anything positive in its place. Such an attitude is little more than passive resignation to fate. Thus we may call it a fatalistic philosophy of history.

One must point out two major flaws in Tolstoj's approach to war and history. First, he is inconsistent in his reasoning. For example, he debunks Napoleon and minimizes his historical role and importance, but at the same time Tolstoj blames Napoleon for the enormous human suffering he had caused. Secondly, Tolstoj distorts or completely ignores historical facts in such a way as to support his theories. For example, Kutuzov, according to most Russian and foreign historical sources, was sly, corrupt, and feeble. He was anything but the virtuous, wise, unpretentious, exemplary military leader Tolstoj made him out to be. This brings us to another aspect of Tolstoj's treatment of history: the novelistic aspect. It is here that the events of a military and
peaceful nature, actual war and peace, interweave and alternate, presenting in such manner a complete novelistic picture of the period in question.

Originally, in the early 1863 drafts of *War and Peace*, military events were to serve as a background for the family type novel. The 1864 draft shows the introduction of the military material, this time as an important structural element. In the novel there are two main historical events which serve as terminus a quo and terminus ad quem of the story: the battle of Austerlitz and the battle of Borodino. Basically, they form the framework of the novel. It is with the defeat at Austerlitz in 1805 that the military and historical element in *War and Peace* begins, and ends in 1812 at Borodino. Both battles have psychological significance for the Russians: the battle at Austerlitz ended for them in defeat, for it was fought on foreign soil, under foreign leadership, and for no obvious Russian interests. The morale of the troops, the decisive factor in any battle, was low. In volume three of *War and Peace*, the war moves onto Russian soil. Because of their great numerical superiority, the invaders enjoy initial successes which bring them to Borodino. Recognizing the vital importance of this battle, the Russian troops, outnumbered but strengthened by the awareness of their just cause, make a heroic stand and stop the French. It is true that Kutuzov retreated and the French took Moscow, but
this was by sheer momentum of the original impetus which had almost spent itself at Borodino. After a few weeks of occupation of Moscow, the reverse process starts, that of the retreat of the French. To comprehend fully the psychological impact of the battle of Borodino on both sides one must remember that until then the Napoleonic forces were always victorious on the battlefields of Europe and Africa. It was for the first time that the Russian troops, superior in their morale, were able to say "no" to Napoleon at Borodino, something nobody had done yet before them. This tarnished Napoleon's invincible record. Napoleon was also humiliated by the Russians when he waited in vain for the peace delegation of les boyars, at Poklonny Hill after having taken the Russian capital.

After the battle of Borodino, there are partisan raids on the retreating French, which started after their withdrawal from Moscow, but the main historical events end with Borodino. Thus we have two military landmarks in the novel: the Russian defeat at Austerlitz and the victory at Borodino. Besides the military material, the philosophical digressions play an important structural role. As it was pointed out, Tolstoj's philosophical views appear at the beginning of some of the books (volumes) in the novel. They serve as dividing elements in War and Peace. Tolstoj introduces them for the first time in book nine for it is there that the
epic element is added to the novel and thus contrasts with the first eight books which were of the "English" type novel. A stylistic marker was needed there and the philosophical digression fulfills this function.

What is Tolstoj's position with respect to war? Does he approve or disapprove of it?

Tolstoj approaches war as he does history, from his own philosophical point of view. War to Tolstoj is an immoral act which destroys people and their cultural achievements. It is a senseless slaughter caused by the pride and vanity of nations' leaders. But Tolstoj differentiates between what one could call morally justified and unjustified war. Napoleon's campaign against Russia is obviously unjustified, but the same war is morally justified from the Russian point of view: the war has been thrust upon Russia by Napoleon's unprovoked attack, and the Russians have to defend themselves. Kutuzov echoes the feelings of national indignation by promising to make the French eat horseflesh as he forced the Turks to. But the same Kutuzov, when the fortune of war turned in Russia's favor, advocates mercy toward the fleeing enemy:

Poka oni byli sil'ny, my ix ne žaleli, a teper' i požalet' možno. Tože i oni ljudi. Tak rebjata?

While they were strong we didn't spare ourselves, but now we may even pity them. They are human beings too. Isn't it so, lads?
Thus Tolstoj is rather precise on the issues of war, even a just war. Kutuzov, who frequently expresses Tolstoj's views, dies soon after he fulfills his duty: to drive the French from Russia. He has no purpose in living, for the pursuit of Napoleon across Europe into France proper falls into the category of unjust, morally wrong wars. Actually Tolstoj "kills" Kutuzov for the sake of his arguments and for the novel's structure. The narrative of the novel gives the reader the impression that Kutuzov dies almost immediately after he freed Russia from the French (around the end of 1812). But Kutuzov died four days after the main body of the Russian army entered Dresden, on April 24, 1813.

Tolstoj's philosophical attitude toward war determines his artistic treatment of it, and also acts as his driving force. War is not glorified because of its inherent immorality. It is stripped by Tolstoj of its conventional aura of romanticism. The battle scenes are presented plastically with epic sweep, but we perceive them through the eyes and personalities of the participants of particular battles and their spiritual experiences. For example, we see Nikolaj Rostov's at Schöngraben, Prince Andrej's at Austerlitz, and Pierre's at Borodino.

This treatment of war by the author of War and Peace must have been conditioned, not only by his philosophical attitude, but also by Tolstoj's personal experiences. Tolstoj was a professional officer from 1851 to 1855; during the
Crimean war he was an eye witness to the horrors of war. Most likely his experiences in Sebastopol' shaped his negative philosophical position on war which he presents in *War and Peace*. At the same time Tolstoj in his artistic treatment of war scenes shows restraint and does not present them in a naturalistic manner, with all their gory details, as does Żeromski in *Ashes*. Some twenty years later in 1888 Tolstoj used the naturalistic technique in his play *Power of Darkness*. This shunning of naturalistic description of war scenes in *War and Peace* shows Tolstoj's sense of artistic balance: he does not want to overload the novel by piling up naturalistic details on his already negative philosophical comments on the subject. Instead he turns to psychological perception of war experiences by his characters.

*War and Peace* offers a panoramic view of the cross section of the Russian society in the 1810's through the 1820's. We see aristocratic circles (the Bolkonskij family), nobility (the Rostovs, Pierre Bezuxov), and also the peasants (in Bogučarovo, and in the person of Platon Karataev). The author concentrates primarily on the description of various aspects of the life of the upper strata of the population. And so we witness their soirees (at Anna Scherer's), wild parties of young men (Pierre at Anatole Kuragin's), life on estates (Bolkonskij's at Bald Hills and Bogučarovo, Rostovs' at Otradnoe), balls (at Naryškins'), theater, hunt, Christmas
festivities, and spiritual and intellectual preoccupations (Pierre - freemasonry, Prince Andrej - involvement with Speranskij) - a truly comprehensive presentation of the life of the Russian upper classes in the 1805 - 1825 period. The main body of events deals with lives and fates of the three families: Bolkonskijs, Rostovs, and Bezuxovs, for that is where the main characters of War and Peace originate.

The peasants do not have equivalent representatives in the novel, with the exception of Alpatyč and Dron of Bogucharovo and Platon Karataev. Otherwise they appear as an amorphous mass, for example at the battle of Borodino. And yet we are aware of their presence and feel their importance all through the novel. They are the soldiers who fight the French and defeat them, for their Commander-in-Chief, Kutuzov, acts in the spirit of the people and with their wisdom, and not in the spirit of his foreign advisors who are alien to the Russian cause. It is Natasa who demonstrates those unseen and yet strong ties between the narod and the upper classes when she dances a Russian folk dance at her uncle's after the hunt, in a natural folk way without ever having done it before. It is as if she sheds her foreign (French) cultural polish for a few brief moments. Pierre Bezuxov learns from Platon Karataev the meaning of life—a truth he searched for a long time. Even the arch-aristocrat Andrej Bolkonskij feels better, as an ordinary front-line officer among his soldiers, than he did as a staff officer. The folk seem to have this intuitive,
spiritual strength and wisdom which the nobility does not, but which the nobility regains as soon as they come into contact with the common people. Thus Tolstoj underscores this almost mystical, ever-present characteristic in all the classes of Russian society, namely their Russian-ness.  

War and peace alternate on the pages of Tolstoj's novel with a certain amount of regularity; volume one is mostly about war (battles of Schongraben and Austerlitz), volume two deals with the peaceful intermission before the invasion of Russia begins in volume three. Volume four sees the decreasing of hostilities and return of peace to Russia. This we see in book fifteen (the last part of volume four) and in the first epilogue. Volume three is important in the novel because in it the war is brought home and thus affects everybody, i.e., the civilian population, to a greater or lesser degree. Before, in volume two, the war was something people in Petersburg, Moscow, or Bald Hills heard about either from distorted dispatches or from some of the actual participants returning home. Now the war is right on their doorstep, with all its dangers and in all its fury. Everybody knows this. The private lives of the civilian population, their well-being, are directly influenced by bellicose activities. The best example of it is the Bolkonskij family. They have to leave Bald Hills because of the French advance. Old Prince Bolkonskij suffers a stroke and dies in Bogučarovo as the result of war and his new duties as commander in chief.
of the conscription. Princess Mar'ja runs into trouble with the rebellious peasants of Bogučarovo and her departure is put in jeopardy. Eventually she evacuates herself to her aunt's in Voronež. As the result of all this, Prince Andrej changes his attitude and becomes strongly anti-French and anti-Napoleon. The other two families, Rostovs and Bezuxovs, go through similarly unpleasant, and in the case of Pierre, dangerous experiences; he also becomes anti-Napoleon and even plans to kill the French emperor. But probably the most complete and all-embracing picture of the effect the approach of hostilities had on the civilian population is found in Chapter eleven. It is here that Tolstoj describes the events immediately preceding and following the entry of the French into the city of Moscow: evacuation of the nobility and the rich, looting, complete chaos in the city administration, etc. Because of the absence of the great majority of the city inhabitants and of the presence of enormous wealth, the French soldiers took to looting which assumed enormous proportions. This in turn led to the erosion of discipline on a fearful scale. Napoleon was extremely displeased, especially since it was his famous Old Guard that was participating in the looting. And when it was the turn of the French to leave Moscow they took all their loot with them. According to Thiers, Napoleon was horrorstruck.8

Tolstoj's philosophy is reflected in the depiction of war events. The effect of war, which is now in Russia,
morally justifies the Russian participation in it. The description of the Borodino battlefield gives a visual aspect of the immorality of war and the suffering it causes. The negative result of the war is also reflected in the moral breakdown of the participants (i.e., demoralized French troops) and the complete breakdown of law and order in Moscow.

Ashes

Żeromski does not enter into a philosophical discussion of history as Tolstoj does. To Żeromski, history is not a puzzle which one should solve by discovering its laws of operation, but a period from the past which when viewed correctly can be a useful tool for helping to shape a nation's future. Thus by re-creating the brighter turning points of the past and as if re-living them over again, Żeromski hoped to help the nation bear the not-so-happy present and point the way out of its temporary difficulties.

The time limits of the historical period in which Żeromski's novel is set are clearly defined: terminus a quo; the year 1796 or 1797, while terminus ad quem is 1812. In this period scenes in Ashes alternate: we see life in the Polish countryside (aristocracy, nobility, and peasants) as well as in various Polish cities: Sandomierz, Kraków, and Warszawa. There is another cycle of scenes set in various foreign countries such as Italy, Spain, Santo Domingo, and France. Both
cycles are connected by Polish soldiers who fight under Napoleon all over Europe and beyond. The pages describing their odyssey are probably the most glorious in the novel.

In this presentation of the historical period in question, Żeromski seems to play down consciously the importance of the Stanisław August epoch (1764-1772) which immediately preceded the post-partition period. It was not spectacular in any military achievements but was extremely important for the future of Poland in terms of the moral regeneration of the Polish society. Żeromski claims, quite unjustly, that the moral rebirth of Poles started as the result of the policies of the partitioners, and that it was to a great extent completed in the Napoleonic period. Żeromski's bias in favor of ideas of the epoch of Enlightenment and Sejm Czteroletni (Four Years' Diet 1788-1791), which were akin to the ideology of Warsaw positivism, a weak intellectual movement which in Żeromski's time was in its decline, is quite understandable. Events preceding the period described in Ashes are only mentioned in passing, when the author introduces us to Rafał's brother Piotr, and his friend Prince Gintult. Trepka, a former member of Sejm Czteroletni, is also from that period, but he is a minor character. It is quite clear from the novel that Żeromski approves of a nation taking up arms in order to regain its freedom. He also considers it an important factor for national rebirth. It is this writer's opinion that Żeromski arrived at this view after long and thorough soul
searching, and that the decision was a painful one. The author of Ashes was concerned with the fate of his homeland and torn between the national ideas on one hand and universal ideas of mankind on the other. Thus the conflict within Żeromski the patriot and Żeromski the artist must have been very serious. To prove this point it suffices to look at Żeromski’s treatment of war and of the Polish legions. War to Żeromski is an evil which brings suffering and hardship to all participants, and, what is worse, to those who are not directly involved in it but merely get in its way: the civilian population. In his preface to the Swedish edition of Ashes in 1923 Żeromski says:

If only those real wars would finally end, so that one would have neither to experience them nor to describe them! An artist and a reader will always secretly return to this topic, unfortunately nowhere and never except in war does the human soul manifest both its cruelty and its angelic quality; but what war really is only those know, who have been trampled by its hoofs and wheels. airstrikes

To say that the attitude towards the war by the author of Ashes was shaped by the demands of Polish political life rather than by his own moral and philosophical considerations would be to debase Żeromski. Shortly before World War I, both of the main Polish political parties, socialists of Piłsudski
and nationalists of Dmowski, ultimately advocated the use of armed force. Thus if Żeromski's stand on war was conditioned by them his whole attitude to war and his presentation of it would have been closer to Sienkiewicz, who glorified and romanticized war by describing it as some happy adventure. But Żeromski, guided by his own moral and philosophical criteria, saw the war as an unavoidable and therefore a necessary evil and nothing more. Following in the footsteps of European naturalists, Żeromski depicts it in a naturalistic manner. He did not choose for the part of the Spanish campaign in his book the famous charge of Polish cavalry at Somossiera but a painful, cruel and downright horrifying battle for Saragossa where the civilian population fights hand-in-hand with the Spanish army against the invaders, where the insane suffer from actions of supposedly sane people, and where not even the Church and her servants are sacred. Such blunt and starkly realistic description of the many horrible faces of war is not limited only to the Saragossa episode. There are many more: Mantua, Santo Domingo, Raszyn, Sandomierz.

Equally painful to Żeromski was the subject of the Polish legions closely connected with the problem of war. These Polish units, formed in the eighteenth century during the last days of Polish independence, were fighting on the side of Napoleon with the idea that some day under more auspicious circumstances they would return home, bringing freedom to
Poland. One could summarize their aspiration in paraphrasing the Latin *Per aspera ad astra* into *Per Napoleonem ad Poloniam*. But the road with Napoleon was not an easy one. Polish soldiers fighting on the side of Napoleon were the tools of his tyrannical ideas, suppressing other free peoples, carrying out tasks which were in direct opposition to the ideas that prompted them to take up arms. Żeromski, with merciless frankness, describes the role of the Polish legions in Venice, Santo Domingo and above all Saragossa. Only moral considerations of the highest quality could have prompted Żeromski to arrive at such a frank, honest, and impartial opinion of the Polish legions. In spite of Żeromski's unembellished presentation of the Polish legionnaires, they remain heroes, for their real ideal of a free Poland remains untarnished. It is in the Polish legions, the hard school of modern, new Polish patriotism, that we see an embryo of brotherhood and equality of all classes of Polish society, a picture so strikingly different from the one at home.

*Ashes* of Żeromski does not have the alternation of peace and war themes observed in *War and Peace*. The total number of chapters is split equally between the topics of war and peace. To be precise, out of sixty chapters, twenty-seven deal with peace, twenty-five with war, and the remaining eight chapters can be classified as mixed, for they treat both themes. The major part of volume one, and almost half of volume two are the "peace" parts of the novel. In
them we are introduced to life in Poland under the Austrian and Prussian domination soon after the third partition.

As in *War and Peace* we see a cross section of the society from the highest to the lowest classes. *Ashes* has the same panoramic sweep as does *War and Peace*. Żeromski takes us into aristocratic palaces (Prince Gintultz), into the mansions of middle nobility (the Olbromskis and the Cedros), ending with the peasants' huts in Wygnanka and Falenty Wielkie. Just as Tolstoij, however, the author of *Ashes* concentrates mainly but not exclusively on the portrayal of the life of the upper classes of Polish society. He present is in various situations: at the beginning we witness a hunt, later Shrovetide parties (kulig) of the lesser nobility, and finally life at the rich and not-so-rich country estates (in Grudno, Tarniny and Wygnanka). As in *War and Peace* there is a ball (at Mrs. Ołowska's home) and pursuit of intellectual endeavors by the aristocracy (freemasonry of Prince Gintultz). The life of złota młodzież (gilded youth) in Warsaw offers yet another picture of the Polish society, so very similar to early exploits of Pierre and Doloxov in *War and Peace*. In order to complete the picture of youth, Żeromski also shows the life of gimnazjum students in Sandomierz, and of academy students in Kraków. There are no comparable passages in *War and Peace*. The three families—protagonists in *Ashes* are Olbromskis, Gintultz, and Cedros—an obvious, though not
very exact parallel to War and Peace. The class of peasants is portrayed by Żeromski differently from Tolstoj. While the author of War and Peace seems to be avoiding the direct presentation and discussion of the acute peasant problem, Żeromski emphasizes them. The depiction of peasant life is almost everywhere the reverse image of that of the nobility. The picture and the message are always the same: the extreme poverty and hopelessness of their situation. The reason for this different treatment of peasants by both writers lies in their ideology, which was conditioned by their class origins. Tolstoj was, during the time of War and Peace, a writer with aristocratic allegiances. It was only later, after 1880, that his attitude toward peasants changed. Żeromski, on the other hand, a member of the Polish intelligentsia, was very sensitive to the theme of social injustice, and he carried it over even into Ashes, which is primarily a historical novel.

Besides showing various Polish social strata at home in Poland during a period of peace, Żeromski also shows them in an extremely different situation, namely in war. In peace-time in Poland the aristocracy and the nobility want to preserve the class status quo. They abhor and reject the idea of an equality of classes which would include peasants. Prince Gintułt talks about it to Piotr Olbromski with distinct irony, while Rafał's uncle Nardzewski asserts his power over the peasants by whipping the disobedient ones, in defiance of
the Austrian government which forbade any corporal punish-
ment of peasants by their landlords. No wonder the peasants
are sullen, distrustful, and hostile to their masters. This
short-sighted attitude of the upper classes strikes us as
paradoxical, for Poland could not afford any internal social
strife in that difficult period of her history.

A much brighter picture presents that part of the
Polish society which comprises the legions. By and large the
legionnaires represent a cross section of the Polish society,
for the Polish legions consisted of representatives of the
three main classes. One should, however, add that they were
the cream of that society. Patriotically motivated, they did
not agree with the political and social conditions at home and
had left Poland rather than submit to foreign domination. In
the Polish legions there was no friction on the basis of class
origin. Class consciousness did exist but in terms of brother-
hood and not hostility. For example, Prince Gintułt helps
sick soldiers in Mantua by buying food from his own pocket.
"Panicza nam zabili," yells angry and heartbroken Sergeant
Gajkoś, peasant by origin, when the young nobleman Cedro is
seriously wounded during a charge in Spain. The Polish le-
gionnaires act in the spirit of the emblem they wore on their
uniforms: Ludzie wolni są braćmi (Free Men Are Brothers). The
significance of this slogan comes very much to the fore in
comparing the attitudes of the upper classes to the peasants
at home and in the legions.

The war in *Ashes* takes place abroad and at home in Poland. The war abroad is in *Ashes* more diversified than it is in *War and Peace*. In *War and Peace* the battles abroad take us to Austria (Schöngraben) and Moravia (Austerlitz). The remainder of the hostilities take place in Russia or Russian occupied territories. In *Ashes* we witness the war in Italy, Santo Domingo, Spain, and Poland. The war outside Poland influences very little the life of the Polish society at home. The situation at home was more difficult because the occupying powers were hostile to Napoleon and they knew Polish pro-Napoleonic feelings. Thus the news reporting was limited to actual eyewitnesses of the events or campaigns, such as the wounded veteran of the Polish legions Ojrzyński. It was also subject to witness's interpretation. It is only when the Napoleonic army and with it the Polish legions advance northward that Poland becomes a theater of war. All classes of Polish society are then directly involved or affected. For example, Prince Gintułt turns his Warsaw palace into a military hospital, an action which may be compared to the generous gesture of the Rostov family during their evacuation from Moscow; Rafał's uncle Nardzewski is killed by the Germans; peasant huts in Falenty Wielkie are destroyed to provide a better defensive position for the Polish troops. Thus the war influences the whole Polish nation. There are small skirmishes and big battles on Polish soil, for example the
battle of Raszyn, which can easily be compared to the battle of Borodino in *War and Peace*. There is, however, nothing in *Ashes* which could be compared to the capture of Moscow. In *Ashes* the Polish troops evacuate Warsaw, but this event does not have the proportions or significance of the fall of Moscow. The retreat from Warsaw was a mere military maneuver rather than a historical calamity. The battle of Sandomierz in the novel comes probably closer in its intensity and emotions involved to the fall of Moscow.

Thus we observe a clear similarity in handling the war in both novels: at first it occurs far from the respective homelands of the many characters, then gradually comes closer and finally enters them: Russia in *War and Peace* and Poland in *Ashes*. The effect of the war on the society and individual characters of both countries grows progressively larger with its approach.

There are similarities and differences in the philosophical and moral convictions of both authors, as well as in the novels' structures and societies and characters involved in them.

Tolstoj and Žeromski basically disapprove of wars. But both make exceptions: war is justified if a country fights to preserve its freedom (Russia), or if it is used as a means to regain one's independence (Poland). A war fought for any other purpose is immoral and wrong. Both authors, however, view differently the role of the individual in history. While
Żeromski accepts the heroic philosophy of history, Tolstoj speaks of the individual wills of thousands, which put together history, rather than of one individual. The theme of war plays an important part in the structure of both novels, alternating with the periods of peace. While philosophical digressions in *War and Peace* also fulfill a structural function, *Ashes* lacks them. Żeromski introduces in their place romantic interludes with lyrical descriptions of nature, loosening somewhat the structure of the novel. The depiction of societies in both novels is very similar, with the exception of the peasants. Żeromski treats the peasants fairly but without Tolstoj's tendency to idealize them.

**War and Peace and Ashes as Historical Novels**

It would be incorrect to call both novels historical simply because they deal with the life of a nation in a particular historical period. *Ashes* and *War and Peace* certainly have the characteristics of a historical novel but they also have several other characteristics in common.

Let us then explore the historical novel aspect of both works. It has been said that *War and Peace* and *Ashes* are different kinds of historical novels, that they are innovations in this genre. In order to evaluate both novels properly in this respect, we must turn to the very origins of the historical novel and see how both works compare with the first prototypes.
In a historical novel a writer recreates a distant past in an artistic way. Thus the historical novel combines fiction with the real history. "The historian's task is to say what was, the writer's to show how it was," says Russian critic Belinskij.10 The objective characteristic of a historical novel is the participation in it of historical characters. The more concrete the picture of social life is, the higher is its historicity. The historical novel originated in European literature at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

It is universally acknowledged that Sir Walter Scott is the originator of the historical novel genre. Historical novels before Walter Scott lacked "derivation of the individuality of characters from the historical peculiarity of their age."11 Walter Scott established two rules: not to put too much history into the plot of the novel, and not to use real historical figures as leading characters.12 By and large these rules have been observed ever since: the leading characters are fictitious, while the historical personages play very small and insignificant parts. In Walter Scott's novels dialogue plays an important and new role. The heroes in Walter Scott have a mediocre quality, they are average in every respect: intelligence, moral courage, and self-sacrifice.13 In this non-heroic "hero" Lukács sees a renunciation of Romanticism.14 If we, however, compare the heroes of War and Peace (Prince Andrej, Pierre Bezukhov), we come to the conclusion that they do not fit this mold. One could not call them
middlings. Krzysztof and Rafał from Ashes on the other hand are middlings within their own milieu. Historical personalities are presented by Scott as complete and not in the stages of their development. This is also true of Tolstoj's treatment of Napoleon and Alexander as well as Żeromski's depiction of the French Emperor and Polish leader Dąbrowski. It must be pointed out, however, that there is a difference in Tolstoj's presentation of historical and fictitious characters. The historical characters (with the exception of Kutuzov and Bagration) are made to look unimportant, ludicrous, and puppet-like, while the fictitious ones represent the people, who in real life lead a normal existence and contribute to the development of history. Żeromski's treatment of characters does not coincide completely with Tolstoj's. He acknowledges and recognizes the role of the average heroes, but at the same time he does not go out of his way to make the historical figures look funny. On the contrary, there is in his treatment a quiet respect for them. Scott portrays the historical struggle through his characters, who represent social trends and historical forces. Similarly, Tolstoj concentrates on episodes, usually war episodes, which are of importance for the development of his characters. Those episodes, however, also reflect the mood of the wider strata of the population: the army and the people as a whole. In this respect Żeromski is close to Tolstoj. Probably the best example of it is the depiction of the storming the Saragossa.
I have pointed out some similarities between Walter Scott, Tolstoj, and Żeromski. It is rather remarkable for these similarities to exist independently, since Lukács assures us that Tolstoj did not study Scott very thoroughly,\(^\text{17}\) and one cannot talk, therefore, about Scott's direct influence on the Russian. I was not able to find any proofs of direct literary influence of Walter Scott on Żeromski either. In fact, Tolstoj and Żeromski independently developed Scott's principles of historical novel further: whereas in Walter Scott historical personalities appear when the fate of the main hero demands it,\(^\text{18}\) in Tolstoj and Żeromski they are strictly secondary figures. In Scott's novels the fictional plays the main part in the novel. In *War and Peace* the fictional and the historical interweave and interact, but the historical has the leading role.\(^\text{19}\) Tolstoj, however, does not crowd his novel with historical events. He uses them to illuminate the historical content of the epoch.\(^\text{20}\) This is also true of *Ashes*, but to a lesser extent. The fictional, i.e., the personal, takes up considerably more of the novel than in *War and Peace*. Love in Tolstoj's novel is important only in the personal lives of the heroes, while in Scott's novels it plays the role of a moving force of life.\(^\text{21}\) In Żeromski's work the function of love is closer to that in *War and Peace*, but it is treated more extensively with whole chapters being devoted to it.\(^\text{22}\) The novels of Walter Scott
do not have psychological depth, whereas Tolstoj uses a psychological approach in the portrayal of the historical past. Żeromski is not psychologically penetrating as Tolstoj, but emphasis on psychology in his work is replaced by a very strongly developed emotional feeling (uczucie, uczuciowość). For example, Żeromski is not interested in the psychological side of love, he does not give the dialectics of the love experience but re-creates that which is experienced by the senses. Tolstoj also conveys the social substance of characters and their characteristic traits, differentiating them within their own social environment.

War and Peace and Ashes are modern historical novels of epic proportions. Therefore the presentation of life in them is richer, fuller, and abounding in characters. The stress is on the life of the people, who, according to Tolstoj's philosophy of history, are its moving force.

It goes without saying that there were historical novels written in Polish and Russian literature between the time of Walter Scott and that of Tolstoj and Żeromski. We shall now briefly survey the most important authors and their novels in that period.

The novels of Walter Scott were widely read in Russia. The first writer to realize how successful a historical novel on Russia's own past would be was Puškin (1799-1837). After two unsuccessful attempts Puškin wrote The Captain's Daughter (1836), a by-product "of his extensive and formal historical
study, *The History of the Pugačev Rebellion* (1834). The premise of Puškin's novel was his philosophy of history according to which history is closely connected to the present. The poet aimed at a synthetic understanding of history in its uninterrupted development. He was attracted by the important moments of Russian history: the time of Peter the Great, the Pugačev rebellion and the period of 1812-1825. There are some traces of Walter Scott's influence in the novel, but Puškin's treatment of history differs considerably from that of Scott. For example, Puškin focuses sharply on the role of social conflicts in the novel; he does not pay too much attention to the "local color," reducing its use only to where it is absolutely necessary. The same can be said about the use of historical detail. The realistic representation of life and the absence of some of the superfluous romantic embellishments of the historical makes *The Captain's Daughter* the first realistic historical novel of Russian literature. Another milestone in the development of the Russian historical novel was Gogol's *Taras Bul'ba* (1842). The novel deals with the events of 1638, the uprising of hetman Ostranica. Besides depiction of a historical event, Gogol' portrays a whole period in the life of a nation, and connected with it the clashes of different social structures in varying degrees of social, cultural, and moral development. In this respect, according to Petrov, Gogol' surpasses Scott, who showed
similar collisions in the history of England and Scotland. But Scott never reached the level of Gogol's epic. *Taras Bul'ba* in its realistic representation of the past opposed the romantic idealization of the past, and with its epic sweep prepared the way for the epic novel of Tolstoj's.

One more Russian historical novelist deserves mentioning, A. K. Tolstoj (1817-1875), a distant cousin of Lev Tolstoj. His historical novel, *The Silver Prince* (1863), was written in the romantic style of Walter Scott, contrasting its noble hero Prince Serebrjannyj to the tyrannical and cruel tsar Ivan IV. The novel did not further the development of Russian historical novel, but had, surprisingly enough, influence on the Polish historical novelist Henryk Sienkiewicz.31

The two important names in the development of the Polish historical novel are Kraszewski and Sienkiewicz. Josef Ignacy Kraszewski (1812-1887), one of the most prolific Polish writers, is also an important Polish historical novelist. Eighty-eight of his 144 novels deal with the portrayal of the past.32 They are his main merit. His contribution to the development of the Polish historical novel lies in the establishment of a new genre based on all the possible sources pertaining to a given epoch. His primary concern as a historical novelist was the faithful reflection of historical facts,33 leaving the characters and the plot in a secondary position. On this issue of faithful depiction of the past Kraszewski clashed with the followers of Walter Scott, i.e., the Polish romantic
historical novelists, and especially with Michał Grabowski, a well-known literary critic and novelist. The issue was: scholarship or poetry? Kraszewski chose the scholarly approach against the romantic one of Walter Scott. His best historical novels are *The Countess Cosel* (1874) and *Brühl* (1875). Kraszewski laid the basis for a realistic representation of the past. As a historian (which he primarily was) he attempted to show history in its development, which in itself was a further stage of the historical novel.

Henryk Sienkiewicz (1846-1916), was the most famous Polish historical novelist. Close to twenty years of his literary activity (1882-1900) were devoted to historical novels. Basically he adopted Kraszewski's concept of the dependence of the artistic in a historical novel on the faithful representation of historical facts. Sienkiewicz did considerable research for his novels, but the picture of the events of 1648-1673, the period which attracted him most, was made over according to his own fantasy. His critics pointed out the inaccuracy of the image of historical events and figures, as well as his excessive preoccupation with battle motives to the detriment of the full historical picture, including the social problems of the period. Sienkiewicz defended and explained the use of fantasy in his historical novels as follows: fantasy is an indispensable means of cognition of the past. Since history deals only with the main events and not particular cases, it is the task of the
historical novelist to re-create the particular cases and fill in the gaps and omissions by means of fantasy. The re-construction of the particular cases and omissions, however, must be in logical agreement with the color and mood of the epoch; must not contradict the historical events; and must not show a predominant influence but rather give the impression of the fabric of real contemporary life. In regard to the characters and their lives, the above rules must be in logical agreement with the characters' psychological side. The plausibility and verisimilitude of a historical novel, according to Sienkiewicz, depends on these conditions. Thus Sienkiewicz defended the principle of realism far better than Kraszewski. But as a novelist he was very tendentious, and as such his writings contributed to the furthering of his readers' conservative mentality. His historical novels and their topics are: With Fire and Sword (1884) Polish-Cossack wars, The Deluge (1886) Polish-Swedish wars, Pan Michael (1887-1888) Polish-Turkish wars, Quo Vadis (1896) novel on ancient Rome for which Sienkiewicz was awarded Nobel prize, and The Teutonic Knights (1900).

The Russian and Polish historical novel from the time of Walter Scott to Tolstoj and Żeromski shows a gradual shift away from a romantic to a realistic treatment of the narrative material. The subject matter and its scope change also: Puškin includes social conflicts in his novel, while Gogol'
adds an epic dimension to his representation of the historical period, paving the way for *War and Peace*. Tolstoj in turn represents yet another step in the development of the Russian historical novel: his heroes are not mediocre characters as in Scott's works and the role of love in *War and Peace* is reduced. Tolstoj develops further the epic aspect introduced by Gogol' and adds a new psychological dimension to his novel.

In the case of the Polish historical novel, there was at first a move by Kraszewski toward a historically true depiction of the past at the expense of plot and characters. This realistic presentation of the past was expanded by Sienkiewicz. He used fantasy as means of cognition of the past, but in a strictly defined manner which in turn added plausibility to his novels. In Żeromski, who in some aspects followed Tolstoj, independent characteristics are present: the importance of the strong emotional feeling and a strong focus on the social problems (the peasant question) in the contemporary Poland.

The development of the historical novel of both countries shows its varying process which is fundamentally similar: the slow but continuous elimination of the romantic elements of Walter Scott with the gradual penetration of the realistic ones.
NOTES


4 By the "English" type novel I mean a novel about family life similar to the memoirs genre.


7 The present writer does not agree with the Soviet critics of *War and Peace* who tend to overemphasize the importance of the peasant masses in the novel. Their reasons for this are obviously of a class nature, whereas Tolstoj stresses the national character.

8 Tolstoj, *JE*, 12/91.


9 By the early seventeenth century once the free peasants were reduced to serfs by greedy and short-sighted but very powerful gentry. The first significant sign of improvement of their lot came with the new constitution proclaimed May 3, 1791. The peasantry did not obtain political rights but it was, however, taken "under the protection of the law." The results of even this token improvement were seen in 1794 during Kościuszko's insurrection. At Racławice (April 4, 1794), he fought and won his first battle with the Russians. The scales of the battle were tipped in favor of the Poles by a column of 300 peasants armed with scythes led by Kościuszko himself. Later, in Połaniec Manifesto (May 7, 1794), Kościuszko granted the personal freedom to the peasants, promised them Government protection, ownership of land, and reduction
by one-half of their dues by means of serf labor. Nardzewski in Ashes represents the most conservative segment of the Polish gentry. Josephinian reform in Austria assured peasants of the protection of the law but did not free them from their serf labor obligations to their masters. For the non-fulfillment of them peasants could be punished: not by their masters but by the Austrian authorities.
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31 This interesting literary discovery was made by Ewa M. Thompson in her article "Henryk Sienkiewicz and Alexey K. Tolstoj: A Creative Borrowing," published in *The Polish Review*, Vol. XVII, No. 3, Summer, 1972. In her article the author argues her case by pointing out convergencies and striking parallelisms between *The Silver Prince* of Tolstoj and *The Trilogy* of Sienkiewicz, especially its first part, *With Fire and Sword*.


CHAPTER IV

TREATMENT OF THE FRENCH AND NAPOLEONIC ERA

By Tolstoj: The Realities

*War and Peace* and *Ashes* both depict the Napoleonic epoch, but the treatment by both authors of the historical period in question varies considerably. The reason for this lies in the different philosophical and political approaches of Tolstoj and Žeromski to the Napoleonic epoch.

It is generally accepted (and for the most part it is true) that Tolstoj disliked intensely the French leader and did everything in his power to minimize Napoleon's image. However, if we look closely at Tolstoj's presentation of Napoleon in *War and Peace*, we shall notice that that writer's negative attitude toward Napoleon was not so uniform and monolithic. Let us consider the beginning of the novel. Neither Pierre Bezuxov nor Prince Andrej are initially anti-Napoleonic.¹ To Pierre Napoleon appears to be a representative of some great, new ideas of brotherhood.² Prince Andrej sees in him a great military leader of men. He himself dreams constantly about his own Toulon. Appearing in the novel for the very first time on the eve of the Battle of Austerlitz, Napoleon is shown as a hero beloved by soldiers:

---

¹ Pierre Bezuxov
² Prince Andrej
The soldiers, on seeing him, lit wisps of straw and ran after him, shouting, "Vive l'Empereur!"  

But, as the novel progresses, the attitude of Pierre and Prince Andrej changes. As the result of this change, their sympathy for Napoleon turns into hatred and hostility. 

Prince Andrej's aspirations for becoming a Napoleon-like superman are shattered at Austerlitz, where while laying wounded he begins to realize the futility of grandeur: 

Da! vse pustoe, vse obman, krome etogo beskonechnogo neba. Nicogo, nicogo net, krome ego. 

Yes! All is vanity, all falsehood, except that infinite sky. There is nothing, nothing, but that. 

And when spoken to by Napoleon some time later he sees his former hero as a very ordinary man:

[...] tak melozen kazalsja emu sam geroj ego, s etim melkim tscheslaviem i radost'ju pobedy [...] --cto ne mog otvechat' emu. 

[...] So insignificant seemed to him his hero himself with his paltry vanity and joy in victory [...] that he could not answer him. 

To this intellectual deflating of Napoleon in the eyes of Prince Andrej, Tolstoj shows later more direct reasons which make Prince Andrej hate Napoleon, as for example, the sufferings Napoleon's war has brought to his family: 

Francuzy razorili moj dom i idut razorit' Moskvu, oskorbili i oskorblajut menja
The French have destroyed my home and are on their way to destroy Moscow, they have outraged and are outraging me every moment. They are my enemies. In my opinion they are all criminals. And so thinks Timoxin and the whole army. They should be executed! [...] "Yes, yes," muttered Pierre, looking with shining eyes at Prince Andrej. "I quite agree with you!"

The change is seen here also in Pierre's attitude toward Napoleon. It originated from Pierre's idea that he was L'russe Besuhof who was destined to stop the beast, as it was revealed to him by one of his brother Masons based on the revelation of St. John. The experience of the battle of Borodino strengthens his hatred for the French Emperor and as the result of all this Pierre decides

[...] vstrečit' Napoleona i ubit' ego, čtob ili pogibnut', ili prekratit' nesčast'e vsej Evropy proisxodivščee, po mneniju Pierra, ot odnogo Napoleona.

[...] meet Napoleon and kill him, and either perish or put an end to the misery of all Europe—which it seemed to him was solely due to Napoleon.

But his intent is more symbolic than real: he does not kill Napoleon physically (he does not even get anywhere near him) but rather ideologically within himself on realizing that the man from Ajaccio was not a great benefactor of humanity as he
believed him to be. Thus it was Napoleon himself who caused this change of heart in both men. When he moved the war, with all its inevitable consequences, into Russia, the illusion of idealistic dreams of both characters was shattered.

To Tolstoj personally, Napoleon was always a villain. When in 1857 he visited Paris, in his travel notes we find the following: "Poexal v Hotel des invalides. Obogotvorennoe zlodeja, užasno." ("I went to the Hotel des Invalides. Terrible idolization of the villain."§)

And then eight years later in his diary under March 19, 1865 he wrote:

"Vsja Egipetskaja ekspedicija francuzskoe tsčeslavnoe zlodejstvo. [...] Ploxoj ezdok. V Ital'janskoj vojne kartiny, statui. Ljubit ezdit' po polju bitvy, Trupy i ranenye - radost'. [...] Ešče čelovek pervoe vremja i silnyj svoj odo sostoronnost'ju potom nerešitelen - čtob bylo! a kak? Vy prostye ljudi, a ja vižu v nebesax moju zvezdu. — On ne interesen, a tolpy okružajušcie ego i na kotorye on dejstvuet. Snačala, odo sostoronnost' i beau jeu v sravanenii s Maratami i Barasami, potom oščup'ju — samonadejanost' i sčast'e, i potom sumašestvie — [...]"

The whole French expedition to Egypt is vainglorious villainy. [...] Poor rider. In the Italian campaign paintings, statues. Loves to ride over a battlefield. Dead and wounded are a joy. [...] At first he was a man, strong in his one-sidedness; later indecisive - so that it would be! But how? You are the simple people, I see my star in heaven. — He is not interesting, but only the crowds surrounding him and on whom he has an effect. At the beginning one-sidedness and beau jeu in comparison with the Marats and Barras, later groped his way—presumption and luck, and afterwards insanity. 9
Tolstoj hated Napoleon. It is quite possible that class considerations played an important role in his hatred. Napoleon was not of noble origin, but rather the son of a Corsican lawyer, an upstart (vyskočka, raznočinec) by Russian class standards. It was probably difficult for the arch-aristocrat Tolstoj to reconcile himself to the fact that a man of such low origin dared to invade Russia and could perhaps even influence fates of nations, a right reserved exclusively for the rightfully crowned heads of states and not usurpers. Tolstoj deals harshly with another upstart, a Russian Speranskij. This time it is Prince Andrej who dislikes Speranskij: he laughs "in a high-pitched staccato manner," his hand is unmasculine "soft white." No wonder that after awhile "the very thing that had formerly appeared mysterious and fascinating in Speranskij suddenly became plain and unattractive."10 Prince Andrej became disenchanted with Speranskij.11

Tolstoj's opinion of Napoleon was strongly influenced by Proudhon whom he met in Paris in 1861. Proudhon also had a very negative opinion of Napoleon. In his book La Guerre et la Paix, he debunks Napoleon physically and spiritually.12 Tolstoj tried to prove that all the successes of Napoleon were the result of pure chance (slučajnost') and not of the French leader's will. Tolstoj in War and Peace tried hard to remove Napoleon's aura of fame. He did it by various
means, especially by deflating him and showing him as a comical, insignificant figure. For example, Napoleon is shown naked during his early toilette scene. This exaggerated concern for himself on the eve of the Borodino battle made him appear ludicrous and petty. Tolstoj's choice of verbs and adjectives conveys the meaning especially well: "pofyrkivaja i pokrjaxyvaja" ("snorting and grunting"), "tolstoju spinoj" ("fat back"), "obrosšeju žirnoju grud'ju" ("plump hairy chest"), "lico [...] opuxšee i želtoe" ("face [...] puffy and yellow").13 Another scene containing the portrait of his son as the "King of Rome" exposed his full artificiality. Napoleon acted as if with an audience in mind:

Kogda Napoleon vyšel iz palatki, kriki gvardejcev pered portretom ego syna ešče bolee usililis'. Napoleon naxmurilsja,—

Snimite ego, — skazal on, graciozno — veličestvennyym žestom ukazyvaja na portret.

--Emu ešče rano videt' pole sraženiija.

When Napoleon came out of the tent the shouting of the Guards before his son's portrait grew still louder. Napoleon frowned. "Take him away!" he said, pointing with a gracefully majestic gesture to the portrait. "It is too soon for him to see a field of battle."

In yet another scene the feeling of the Emperor appearing ludicrous is so strong that it is communicated to his suite. It was at Poklonny Hill when Napoleon expected boyars' peace delegation.

There are also other devices Tolstoj uses for deflating Napoleon, such as his strange behavior and use of coarse
language. For example, in the scene with Alexander's emissary, General Balašev, Napoleon pinches the envoy's ear. The language he used to M. de Beausset with respect to his remark on the victory and lunch was simply, "Pošli k..." ("Go to..."). Also, the reference to the false rubles which Napoleon had printed for the 1812 campaign and with which he ordered his troops paid in Moscow is rather debasing. Napoleon was depicted as a despot who is indifferent and contemptuous of people and as an amoral egoist concerned with himself. To him war is a game and not a serious moral issue as it is to Tolstoj:

Napoleon ispytyval tjaželoe čuvstvo, podobnoe tomu, kotoroe ispytyvaet vsegda sčastlivyj igrok, bezumno kidaťši svoi den'gi, vsegda vyigryavšiij, i vdrug, imenno toga, kogda on rassčital vse slučajnosti igry, čuvstvujuščij, čto čem bolee obduman ego xod, tem vernee on proigryvaet.

Napoleon was experiencing a feeling of depression like that of every lucky gambler who, after recklessly flinging money about and always winning, suddenly just when he has calculated all the chances of the game, finds that the more he considers his play the more surely he loses.15

Irony and sarcasm are Tolstoj's main devices in his depiction of Napoleon. In War and Peace Tolstoj totally destroyed Napoleon's image: that of a person and of a great man in history. By doing that he destroyed the legend of Napoleon, juxtaposing Kutuzov to him, an emanation of the people's will. Pictures of both Napoleon and Kutuzov are based on the moral ideas of Tolstoj. And yet there is a
philosophical and logical contradiction in them. It is a historical fact that Napoleon was defeated by the heroism of the Russian people led by Kutuzov and not by fate or some strange inexplicable force.

Sklovskij points out one more important device Tolstoj used in debunking Napoleon: he deprived him of psychological dimension. Psychology, so typical of any major character of War and Peace, is completely absent in Napoleon.16

It is obvious that Tolstoj's presentation of Napoleon is biased and grossly one-sided. This lowering of Napoleon's image was a novelty in European literature, for a host of poets and writers glorified the French Emperor (Byron, Walter Scott, Heine, Mickiewicz, Beranger, Stendhal, Balzac, Hugo, and Thackeray).17 Napoleonic legend came to full bloom during his twenty-year career and soared to the heights of poetry after his death.

With the exception of Napoleon, Tolstoj's attitude to the French is friendly. Captain Ramballe, who almost got killed by Bazdeev's drunken brother, is, during his supper with Pierre, a little pompous but otherwise jovial and friendly; Davout questions Pierre, and there are a few tense moments, but at the end he spares the Russian's life; and the singing French prisoner Morel evokes sympathy and pity rather than hatred. Thus it is quite obvious that the brunt of Tolstoj's wrath for the misfortunes Russia suffered in the 1812 war falls on Napoleon. It was through his action that the proverbial
dubina (cudgel) was set in motion, which mercilessly and with regard for no one was punishing the invaders. With the destruction of Napoleon's myth and his self-deception, and with the defeat and flight of the Grande Armée, Tolstoj felt he had accomplished his task. He left Napoleon for good. We do not see him in the novel again.

Tolstoj's view of Napoleon was not shared by all Russian poets. For example, Lermontov in his poems The Last New Home and St. Helena talks about him as a great, daring hero who at the end was betrayed by "a foolish mob."

The reason for Tolstoj's negative treatment of Napoleon had its roots in the author's philosophy of history. Napoleon as a historical character was a direct contradiction of Tolstoj's slučajnost'. Since he could not be made to fit Tolstoj's mold, he had to be reduced in his historical importance and for all practical purposes destroyed. We observe a similar but unsuccessful attempt with another historical figure, the Russian Peter the Great. Tolstoj's wife recorded her husband's interest in the Petrine epoch under February 15, 1870. He intended to write a novel about it. The most intensive work on the novel was done during 1872 and the beginning of 1873. But Tolstoj's idea was doomed to failure. According to P. I. Birjukov Tolstoj said:

Nikak ne mogu živo vosstanovit' v svoem voobraženii ètu epoxu, vstrečaju zatrudnenija v neznanti byta melоcej, v obstanovke i èto tormozit moju rabotu.
In no way can I recreate in my imagination that epoch; I encounter difficulties because of the lack of knowledge in life's details and conditions, and this impedes my work.\textsuperscript{19}

Tolstoj did not elaborate about the real reasons of failure. The general opinion of his contemporaries and critics is that Tolstoj became disappointed in the personality of Peter I and with him the whole epoch became distasteful to Tolstoj.\textsuperscript{20} An interesting and probably very perceptive opinion about the intended novel was expressed by A. S. Suvorin, who wrote in 1875:

If [Tolstoj] will write a novel about the time of Peter the Great - two years ago there was a lot of talk about it - this dislike of eminent people we shall see even better. According to people with whom L.N. (Tolstoj) talked about Peter the Great, it seems that he will reduce this sovereign to the category of a ludicrous person, rather than a great one. I do not affirm it as the truth but consider it quite possible, for it does not contradict his logic.\textsuperscript{21}

Tolstoj, in his preliminary research on Peter the Great and his epoch, must have found material which defied the premises of the author's philosophy of history. He could not make Peter fit his favorite mold of \textit{slučajnost}' without making himself look ludicrous in the eyes of his contemporaries.
Neither could he destroy Peter the way he had Napoleon. Consequently he gave up. In the case of Napoleon, Tolstoj's task was made easier by the fact that the Frenchman was a foreign invader. Tolstoj utilized this fully. Peter was a famous historical figure glorified by other Russian writers and poets and was well beyond Tolstoj's reach.

The pattern of Tolstoj's treatment of great historical figures emerges quite clearly: they are made to correspond to his philosophy of history and are either "adjusted" (as was Kutuzov) or destroyed by reduction to insignificance (as was Napoleon). If they emerge as unmanageable (as Peter) they are dropped.

George Steiner in his book Tolstoy or Dostoevsky points out how political processes influenced the society and the image of man. The literature of the post-Napoleonic era inquired "into anatomy of spirit." In Russian literature this notion found its champion in Dostoevskij in his work Crime and Punishment, where the hero Raskol'nikov to some extent embodies the Napoleonic complex. But the real "bronze man"--Napoleon--would not need to justify the deed to himself as does Raskol'nikov in the novel.

By Žeromski: The Legend

Žeromski's treatment of Napoleon and his era differs from Tolstoj's, but it would be wrong to assume that Žeromski
glorifies the "Little Corporal" even though such opinions have been raised in Polish criticism. The author of Ashes treats the French leader and the historical phenomena of the period in a much more unbiased and objective way than Tolstoj. His treatment is not conditioned by any particular philosophy of history or national prejudice toward Napoleon. The main yardstick for Żeromski is historical truth and his own patriotic but realistic national conscience which evaluated the events under consideration in the novel.

Just as Tolstoj, who for the very first time in literature presented a negative picture of Napoleon, Żeromski tried to evaluate the role of Napoleon with respect to Poles without the aura of romanticism, discussing the events soberly from the point of view of the Polish national interests in historical perspective. The task was not easy because by and large Napoleon was viewed by the Poles in literature and historiography as a friend of the Polish people. Some eminent Poles criticized Tolstoj for his tendentious depiction of Napoleon. In spite of the unfavorable intellectual climate Żeromski confronted Polish society with the difficult and bitter truth. He pointed out the dual and contradictory character of the Napoleonic wars in which Poles were very much involved by their participation in the legions. By the virtue of this fact, the legionnaires were a tool of Napoleon, who used them to achieve his military and political aims, which at times brought subjugation and loss of freedom to other
peoples. This was the tragic contradiction of the real patriotic aims of the Polish soldiers. Żeromski emphasizes this dichotomy by purposely depicting such episodes as the removal of the horses of Alexander the Great in Venice, the expedition to Santo Domingo, and the Spanish campaign. Poles participated in all of them as allies of the French. But the results of the Napoleonic victories were not entirely bleak: Żeromski seems to soften his denunciation at times by interspersing such scenes in his narrative as the Emperor's proclamation in Spain of the abolition of the holy inquisition and the feudal rights of the rich, which is heard by the wounded Cedro. Before Prince Gintułt witnesses the stealing of the horses from Venice, he sees the achievements of the people of Venice which were made possible only because of French help.

It is not surprising that Polish public opinion saw Napoleon as a friend of Poland. After all, it was he who reintroduced the name of Poland into European politics as an equal partner. Poles became a factor to be reckoned with. Even Tolstoj admitted this fact in War and Peace in the scene between Napoleon and Alexander's emissary General Balašev.


"But what do I care about your allies?" said Napoleon. "I have allies—the Poles. There are eighty thousand of them and fight like lions."
And there will be two hundred thousand of them."\(^{28}\)

A little further Napoleon makes an obvious reference to Poland:

> Da, ja zabrošu vas za Dvinu, za Dnepr i vosstanovlju protiv vas tu pregradu, kotoraja Evropą byla prestupna i slepa, čto pozvolila razrušit'.

> "Yes, I will throw you back beyond Dvina and beyond the Dnieper, and will re-erect against you that barrier which it was criminal and blind of Europe to allow to be destroyed."\(^{29}\)

Napoleon tries to use Poland in his political game. But he could only do it because he had a tangible trump card: the excellent quality of Polish legions proven in battle and loyalty. Under the influence of the charm and dazzling power of Napoleon, only very few leading Poles admitted the possibility of selfish motives in his political power play. But the signs of mistrust of the French appear in Ashes. During the capitulation of the Napoleonic forces in Mantua, the French general Foissac-Latour, under secret agreement with the Austrians, extradited all the Polish legionnaires from the Austrian Empire dominions. An act of such magnitude and importance must have had Napoleon's approval. Said Poles to Foissac-Latour:

"We gave you our life for our cause and honor. We told you as knights: If you want to abandon us to the enemy in order to save the French and yourself, have courage to do it openly. We know what we have to do. You have lied under oath."30

Thus Żeromski implicitly admits the probability of Poland being used as a pawn by the French in their power struggles in Europe. It is interesting to remember that the Polish leader Kościuszko did not want to have anything to do with Napoleon, for he intensely distrusted the man.31

Napoleon appears in the novel twice in a rather brief, fragmentary way. Yet even from this sketchy appearance we can draw certain conclusions. In both scenes, near Madrid and at Orsza, there are Cedro and Napoleon who seem to be mentally communicating with each other. In the scene in Spain, Cedro pleads Poland's case and gets Napoleon's soit (So be it.) At the very end of Ashes, we see with Cedro this Napoleonic soit realized:

Widział oto spełniony na jawie swojego życia wielki sen. Dotrzymał Cesarz słowa honoru, danego pod Madrytem najsłabszemu ze swych żołnierzy, konającemu w polu kalece. Dla tego jednego słowa wielkie pułki złączył, umundurował, wyżywił i poruszył. Sprząż ze sobą obce narody...

For, lo, he sees, in waking life, the realization of his great dream. The Emperor has kept the word given at Madrid to the weakest of his soldiers, to the invalid dying in the field. For that one word he has united regiments, uniformed and fed them, and set them in motion. He has drawn foreign nations to his side...32
There is some secret intuitive link between the two men; they understand each other's thoughts by uttering brief, unfinished, and sometimes monosyllabic sentences. Above all each seems to understand the other simply by the exchange of a glance. In spite of this strange rapport between the French Emperor and the Polish cavalry man, I feel it would be wrong to interpret it as Żeromski's glorification of the Napoleonic legend. Cedro is just an ordinary soldier who was easily influenced by the grandeur of the French Emperor as were many others. What Żeromski does in Ashes is to present Napoleon's magic and the effect it had on his subordinates, while at the same time, resisting it as an author by implying that there might be a bitter disappointment in store for the Poles.

The two times that Napoleon radiates unusual power and strength he seems at the same time to be devoid of any real human qualities. Żeromski emphasizes this by the use of adjectives. For example, "twarz blada" ("the pale face"), "... jakby wykuta z niewiadomego metalu" ("as if carved in an unknown metal"), "zimna, obojętnie ponura jak złom głazu" ("cold and sullenly indifferent, like a slab of stone"), "granitowe oblicze" ("the granite face"), "oczy czyhają jak lwy w zasadzie" ("eyes watch like lions in ambush"), "ciemne, wojenne" ("the dark, martial [eyes]")", "nieme i głuche" ("the mute and deaf eyes"), "kamienny wzrok" ("with stony eyes"), "oczy straszliwe" ("the dreadful eyes"). In spite of his position,
that of and Emperor faced constantly with difficult problems and deprived of the luxury of normal, warm human feelings, the Napoleon painted by Žeromski has something forbidding, inhuman, and almost cruel about him. It is this quality of the Frenchman Žeromski wanted to stress, a quality which could be equally applicable to men and nations alike.

Žeromski's method in depiction of Napoleon is similar to that of Tolstoj: intentional concentration of powerful adjectives, verbs, and nouns. But how different is the result! The result is diametrically opposed to that of Tolstoj. In Žeromski's hands Napoleon emerges as an awesome and strong person to be feared and respected. Tolstoj deliberately ignores these qualities of the French emperor and caricatures him by emphasizing his pedestrian side. Thus both writers try to express their feelings toward Napoleon by the use of artistic devices they consider suited best to their aim.

The scene of Cedro's meeting with Napoleon near Madrid calls to mind a similar scene at Austerlitz where Prince Andrej meets Napoleon. There are obvious similarities: both characters are wounded, the meetings take place far from their homelands, and they both meet their idol. The difference between the two meetings lies in the meaning they had for both men. To Cedro it was proof that his sacrifice in the battlefield was not in vain. Soit --one word from the lips
of Napoleon was sufficient: it gives hope and assurance to Cedro, and it continues his faith in Napoleon. In the case of Prince Andrej, the meeting serves as a sobering experience for him: he recognizes the vanity of grandeur, and his hero, at whose feet he is literally lying, appears to him as

[...] stol' malen'kim, ničtožnym čelovekom v sravnenii s tem, čto proisxodilo teper' meždu ego dušoj i etim vysokim, beskonečnym nebom s beguščimi po nem oblakami.

[...] such a small, insignificant creature compared with what was passing now between himself and that lofty infinite sky with the clouds flying over it.33

Thus the effect of the meeting on both men is from the philosophical standpoint quite different.

A rather interesting and significant fact is Żeromski's treatment of the French Royalists, who appear briefly in volume III, in the chapter called "A Fortification." Żeromski does not exhibit any hatred or even a dislike toward the allies of the Austrians but in a gentlemanly way acknowledges their heroism. This brief passage also proves that Żeromski did not glorify the Napoleonic legend. If he had been pro-Napoleonic, his depiction of the French royalists fighting against Polish troops on the side of the Austrians would not have been so sympathetic. He was neither pro-Napoleonic nor pro-royalist but simply pro-Polish.

A Belgian scholar, Claude Backvis, in his article on Żeromski34 accuses him of idealization of sołdateska (arrogant
and overbearing military) and Napoleonism.\textsuperscript{35} The most serious accusation, however, is leveled at the Polish generation who participated "in catastrophic and hopeless Napoleonic adventure" and in doing so "squandered recklessly" [...] "the riches" of the Stanisław August epoch. I would like to point out that the current of historical and political events welded the fate of Poland to France. Poles had very little choice if we ignore the possibility of a passive attitude. But in that case the Poles would have become nameless cannon fodder in the armies of the partitioners. By throwing their lot in with the Napoleon, they preserved their honor. As says Trepka to old Cedro:

\begin{quote}
—— Trzeba było ratować. Honor plemienny za jaką bądź cenę musiał się obudzić. Wolałbym, żeby zamiast uprowadzenia Krzysztofa ucięto mi tę rękę, tę nogę, ale musiałem, przyjacielu, podmawiać, żeby szedł.
\end{quote}

It was necessary to try to save. National honor had to be awoken at any price. I would have preferred that instead of Krzysztof going away my hand or my leg would have been cut off, but I had to encourage him to leave, my friend.\textsuperscript{36}

And a little further:

\begin{quote}
—Musiało co lepsze ocknąć się i rzucić w krwawą kąpiel.
\end{quote}

The better elements had to wake and plunge into the gory bath.\textsuperscript{37}

Probably the best and most concise rebuttal to Backvis is that of Wyka who says:
The writer was reproached by foreign scholars; this reproach is based on a mistake and on an inadequate knowledge of how the Napoleonic legend actually looked in the context of contemporary Poland.

Thus Żeromski's treatment of the Napoleonic legend in general and Napoleon in particular can be best summarized by quoting from an article of Julian Krzyżanowski:

"... in the gallery of works praising Napoleon, Ashes is a sort of jarring note. Żeromski has a great respect for Napoleon, but he is far from having an idolizing view of him. Żeromski is not among Napoleon's admirers or supporters; a person ascribing such a place to the author of Sulkowski does not testify to his correct orientation in the world created by his imagination.

Tolstoj and Żeromski treat Napoleon differently. Tolstoj does it with hostility mainly because he is Russia's enemy and also because of author's philosophical considerations on history and war. Thus he deflates and ridicules Napoleon with all the artistic means at his disposal. Żeromski does not glorify Napoleon but treats him, in contrast to Tolstoj,
fairly and objectively. He has reservations about Napoleon which he does not hesitate to point out, but at the same time Żeromski also calls the reader's attention to the positive achievements of Napoleon. Both authors treat Frenchmen other than Napoleon in a not unfriendly manner.
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CHAPTER V

TOLSTOJ, ŻEROMSKI, AND THE FOREIGNERS

Tolstoj and the Poles

In War and Peace Poles appear episodically in isolated incidents. Nevertheless, their treatment by the author of the novel is of great interest considering his almost constant biased attitude towards them and other foreigners. It is also interesting to compare Żeromski's treatment of foreign nationals in Ashes with that of Tolstoj's.

It seems to me that by and large Lednicki is correct when he speaks of "The presence of chauvinistic, nationalistic elements" in War and Peace, meaning by that Tolstoj's intense dislike for everything foreign and especially west European. Tolstoj divides the world in War and Peace into "the Russian and the non-Russian." Quite justifiably, Lednicki calls this a double standard. The concrete examples from the novel substantiate these allegations. Polish episodes may be divided into the following three groups:

1. Unjustified and ironic by their nature.
2. Those dealing with the Polish pro-Napoleonic sympathies.
3. Episodes treated without prejudice.
The first group consists of Tolstoj's remarks about Poles (frequently via some main character) in a rather unfriendly way without any artistic or ideological justification. For example, at Olmutz Prince Andrej is visited by Boris Drubeckoj, and at one point they come face to face with Prince Czartoryski, a Pole:

They [...] met [...] a short man in civilian clothes [...] This short man [...] stared at Prince Andrew with cool intensity, walking straight toward him and evidently expecting him to bow or to step out of his way. Prince Andrew did neither: a look of animosity appeared on his face and the other turned away and went down the side of the corridor.

"Who was that?" asked Boris.

"He is one of the most remarkable, but the most unpleasant of men—the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Prince Adam Czartoryski.... It is such men as he who decide the fate of nations," added Bolkonski with a sigh he could not suppress, as they passed out of the palace.5

A similar incident occurs in Tilsit when Nikolaj Rostov, on a visit to Boris Drubeckoj, where there appears another Pole, Count Žyliński:
Boris žil s drugim ad"jutantom, pol'skim grafom Žilinskijm. Žilinskij, vospitannyj v Pariže poljak, byl bogat, strastno ljubil francuzov, [...]

Boris lodged with another adjutant, the Polish Count Zhilinski, a Pole brought up in Paris, was rich, and passionately fond of the French, [...]

Žilinskij, vidimo, ne radostno prinjal eto novoe russkoe lico v svoj kružok i nicego ne skazal Rostovu.

Zhilinski evidently did not receive this new Russian person very willingly into his circle and did not speak to Rostov.'

Both these incidents are arbitrarily inserted into the novel. Their only purpose seems to be to communicate the author's dislike for the two Polish noblemen (they are unpleasant and discourteous) and in this manner influence the reader.

Into the same category of unsympathetic portrayal of Poles falls also Tolstoj's ridicule of pronunciation of Polish names. It is a rather shallow but probably effective way of making fun of the Poles through Russian pronunciation of their names: "except for Kutuzov, there is not a single Russian in command of a column. The commanders are: Herr General Wimpfen, le comte de Langeron, le prince de Lichtenstein, le prince de Hohenlohe, and Prishprshiprsh, or some such Polish name."8

The second group is of a more sophisticated nature. Episodes described in this group deal with the sympathies of the Polish population for Napoleon and also with the
Napoleonic legend among the Polish troops fighting on the French Emperor's side. And so we observe "utončennyx pol'skix dam" ("refined Polish ladies") at the ball given in honor of tsar Alexander. But after Napoleon's entry into Vil'no

[...] tolpy naroda s vostorgom vstrečali i provozali ego. Vo vseg oknax ulic, po kotorym on proezžal, byli vystavljeny kovry, znamena, venzelja ego, i pol'skie damy, privatstvuja ego, maxali emu platkami.

[...] crowds of people had rapturously greeted and followed him. From all the windows of the streets through which he rode, rugs, flags, and his monogram were displayed, and the Polish ladies, welcoming him, waved their handkerchiefs to him.10

The implication here is clear: to show the pro-Napoleonic sympathies of the Poles, and their unreliability toward Russia. The best known episode, however, is the one dealing with the drowning of some Polish cavalrymen during the crossing of the Wilia before the eyes of Napoleon. This episode is also the most distorted of all. According to Tolstoj's version the Polish colonel lost forty of his men by drowning during the river crossing. The reason for this was his recklessness, a direct result of his devotion to Napoleon: instead of seeking the ordered ford, he and his men jump blindly into the river with tragic results. Napoleon, though displeased, orders eventually the hot-headed colonel enrolled in the Legion d'honneur. Tolstoj, however, adds his own comment: Quos vult perdere - dementat.11 This is quite obviously, an
Ironic and, to be sure, unjust remark. Tolstoj took this episode from Count's de Segur's *Histoire de Napoleon et de la Grande Armée*. He, however, made a very important and significant change in it: according to Tolstoj the action of the Polish colonel was voluntary, while Segur stresses that Napoleon gave an order for such a crossing. Needless to say, the original brave deed of the Polish ulans looks in Tolstoj's version like a foolish act.

Thus we observe Tolstoj's subtle way of dealing with problems which he recognized as important and which also irritated him. What is strange is that, while Tolstoj was trying to fathom the laws of history, he never attempted to understand the causes of Polish actions. A most likely explanation for such an approach is that Tolstoj at the time of *War and Peace* was a Russian nationalist par excellence, and this led him to chauvinistic hostility toward other nationalities. Lednicki terms it xenophobia which manifests itself in Tolstoj's attitude to the high command and to the officers of the Russian army who are of foreign origin, primarily those close to Kutuzov, who for Tolstoj was an epitome of Russianness. The national bias of Tolstoj manifests itself also in other ways: for example, it is quite normal for Nikolaj Rostov to swoon over Alexander and to wish to die for him every time he sees the young tsar, while the same kind of devotion on the side of the Polish colonel for his idol is depicted in a ridiculous light. This example illustrates again Tolstoj's
above mentioned division of the world in War and Peace into Russian and non-Russian, to which he applies different standards. In short, Quod licet Iovi non licet bovi.

The last group of Polish episodes in War and Peace is less numerous but must be mentioned for the sake of fairness. Here belong references to such personages as Polish Prince Poniatowski, commander of the Polish forces, and also Count Wilarski, who formally introduces Pierre to freemasonry; Tolstoj refers to them quite objectively and without any sarcasm or irony.

Lednicki's opinion on Tolstoj's treatment of Polonica in War and Peace is not shared by all Polish scholars, especially those living in present day Poland, such as Bazyli Białokozowicz. In his book Leo Tolstoj's Connections with Poland (Warszawa, 1966) in the chapter "Polonica in War and Peace" Białokozowicz tries to minimize Lednicki's accusations. For example, because Poles are represented episodically, their characteristics are sketchy. Tolstoj's dislike of Poles and foreigners are explained as a sentiment of an invaded nation defending itself. Polish life, says Białokozowicz, is depicted as part of a Russian complex and not separately, causing thereby such contrasts. Here Białokozowicz seems to miss the most important point: it was Tolstoj's purpose to contrast Poles with Russians in order to achieve this black and white effect. Białokozowicz agrees
that the Napoleonic legend did exist and that Tolstoj did not try to inquire into its genesis, only in 1906 revising his position in his story What for? In regard to Tolstoj himself, Białokozowicz absolves him as a speaker of an official political line. But this seems only to make matters worse: if a private citizen (Tolstoj) had such unkind thoughts about Poles, what could one expect from the government, which was decidedly anti-Polish? Białokozowicz makes some weak attempts to show "warm pro-Polish accents," such as Nikolaj Rostóv's help to a needy Polish family. He conveniently omits "Denisov's remark: "Ekaja durackaja vaša poroda Rostovskaja" ("Ah, what a mad breed you Rostovs are") which takes all Tolstoj's goodness toward Poles out of this passage. One should keep in mind that Białokozowicz cannot express himself as freely as could Lednicki in the United States.

To summarize Tolstoj's treatment of Poles in his novel, one has to stress the obvious and unjustified bias of the author of War and Peace on a personal and national level. He does not differentiate his treatment of Poles along class lines. To Tolstoj, Poles are foreigners and allies of the enemy, of Napoleon, and have to be treated as such. In order to achieve the desired effect, Tolstoj uses the devices appropriate for the purpose: subtle irony and at times sarcasm.
Most action in *Ashes* which takes place in Poland occurs in the Austrian dominated part. It is therefore not surprising that references to Austrians, both civilians and soldiers, are the most frequent. Mentioned next, but on a much smaller scale are the Prussians. Almost non-existent in the novel are the Russians. They are mentioned specifically only once:

Właśnie mieli je [Sandomierz] zająć Kozacy, przeprawiający się na łodziach zza Wisły.

It [Sandomierz] was just to be occupied by the Cossacks who were coming in boats across the Vistula.22

This absence of Russians in *Ashes* can be ascribed to two reasons: first, the Polish legions during their campaigns abroad did not clash with Russians. It was only during the 1812 war that Polish and Russian troops met face to face. No action in the novel takes place in the Russian-occupied part of Poland. The second reason for the absence of the Russian element is that Żeromski's novel was based on issues largely indifferent to "the Russian problem." Żeromski refrained from any direct references. Żeromski did not shun the subject of Russo-Polish relations either before or after *Ashes*. Such works as *Ravens Will Tear Us to Pieces* (1894), *Sysyphian Labors* (1898) and *The Faithful River* (1912) speak for themselves.
Żeromski's treatment of Austrians and Prussians differs considerably from that of Tolstoj in respect to Poles in particular and foreigners in general. The dislike for foreigners present in War and Peace is absent in Ashes. This might appear even stronger if we consider the relationship of both authors to foreign elements involved. To the Russians, Poles were not the main enemy and yet Tolstoj treated them unsympathetically and unkindly. To the Poles, Austrians and Prussians were the partitioners of their homeland, but Żeromski's treatment of them is fair, not irrational or prejudicial. For example, the picture of the Austrian commissioner Hibl comes out better than that of Rafał's uncle Nardzewski. Hibl is quiet, polite, and exhibits tremendous self-control in the face of the Polish nobleman's Sarmatian behavior. He does not let himself be intimidated by the defiant and provocative attitude of Nardzewski toward the Austrian authorities Hibl represents. Hibl is only one civilian representative in Ashes of the Austrian regime. The other Austrians we see are military: soldiers and officers. They appear in situations of two different kinds: (1) as members of the Austrian army fighting against Napoleon in Italy and Poland, and (2) as supporters of the Austrian regime in Poland during the intervals of peace.

Wherever we see Austrians as fighting men, the impression of them projected by Żeromski is objective and not detrimental.
In Mantua, near Raszyn, at the redoubt at Glinki, in Sandomierz, they are depicted as a sizeable opponent, at times even superior in military knowledge to the inexperienced Polish troops. There is not a trace of the author's malevolence toward them. On the contrary, there is a feeling of common soldier's hard lot which Polish and Austrian troops both share. This is well demonstrated by an incident which occurred after a clash between Poles and Austrians. A wounded Austrian soldier has his wound dressed by a Pole.

Says he to the prisoner:

żebym tak nie był miękkiego serca, tobym cię wziął i tu na tym miejscu dorżnął. Wiesz teraz.

Were it not for my soft heart, then I would finish you off on the spot. Now you know.24

But this is not the sentiment of only one Polish soldier:

Szli ostro, z ciekawością, z przyjaźnią i pewnym specjalnym uszanowaniem obserwując swych jeńców.

They were riding briskly and watching their prisoners with interest, friendliness, and rather special respect.25

One of these rare cases when Żeromski depicts a foreigner with obvious dislike takes place after the capitulation of the French at Mantova when Polish soldiers are extradited to the Austrians. We see in this scene an Austrian field marshal, who explains the secret clause of the French-Austrian agreement to the enraged Poles:
In the distance, a general's retinue emerged from a street, and still farther on surrounded by a splendid staff rode on a magnificent horse General Baron Kray de Krayova. [...] The Field Marshal looked around with an expression of contemptuous disdain, squinted his eyes, and said in a careless manner:

"Everything that happens now, is happening on the basis of the additional secret clause of the July 28 capitulation. There is nothing illegal. Those who fled from the banners of His Emperial and Royal Highness shall be handed over one by one to the regiments and battalions to which they belong.

[...] I vouch for everybody's life," drawled the Field Marshal.26

Another discordant note in Żeromski's treatment of the Austrian military in war is the murder of Nardzewski. But even this unjustified atrocity is described matter-of-factly, without emotional overtones.

Austrians in Poland in peacetime are presented in a less favorable light than the fighting troops. For example, there is a detachment of Austrians administering corporal punishment to Michcik, a "rebellious" peasant. Żeromski, however, stresses over and over again that it was a Polish
landowner's Chłupka complaint which brought the Austrians to the village. The other equally unpleasant appearance of Austrian authorities in the novel is during the hanging of a young man for an attempted escape to "the Poles" (i.e., to the Polish troops in the Napoleonic army, which at that time was already in Silesia). At the beginning of the chapter dealing with this event, there were three men to be hanged for the similar "crime," but through successful interventions two of them had their sentences commuted to military service, and only one, "a stranger," was hanged. Thus the event which initially had a very ominous air about it, is in its final conclusion considerably watered down. Żeromski communicates it to the reader through the mood of the crowd watching the execution:

Ów człowiek [the executioner] zbliżył się do skazańców i pierwszemu z brzega rozwiązał ręce. Potem go ujął za ramię i sprowadził z pomostu.

Tłum westchnął.

[...] Oprawca wrócił zwolna po schodach.

[...] Drugiemu skazańcowi z kolei rozwiązał ręce i sprowadził go ze schodów.

Lud głośniej, radościej zaszemrał: [...] 

Wszystkie głowy drgnęły i z ust do ust leciała błogosławiona wieść:

- Chwała bądź Bogu!
- Pan z nami [...] 
- Do wojska oddali!
- Na wieczny czas!
- W kamasze ich!
- Darowali życie.
- Darowali życie, darowali życie.

This man the executioner approached the condemned men and untied the hands of the nearest one. Then he took him by the arm and led him from the platform.
The crowd sighed.

[...] The hangman slowly ascended the steps. He untied the hands of the next one and led him down the steps.

The people murmured louder, more cheerfully: ...

All the heads jerked and from mouth to mouth passed the blessed news:
"Glory be to God!"
"The Lord is with us" ...
"They handed them over to the army!"
"For all times!"
"Off to the boot camp with them!"
"Their life is spared."
"Their life is spared, their life is spared." 27

In another representation of Austrians, this time dealing with a young lieutenant in charge of border guards, Żeromski permits himself a certain amount of light irony: the Polish host gets the Austrian officer drunk and this enables the Poles to expedite the flight of Olbromski and Cedro across the river to the Polish troops in Silesia. Also among the Polish peasants there were humorous stories about Miemce (a mispronounced Polish name for Germans). One sees, for example, how a Polish peasant outwitted a German (Austrian) forester, who caught him stealing wood. It was on the level of the peasantry that the Austrians were repeatedly referred to as Germans, most probably on the basis of language. Żeromski himself distinguishes in the novel between the various nationalities in the Austrian army.

Besides the representation of Austrian characters, no matter how sketchily, Żeromski also engages in discussions about the realities of Poles under Austrians, the character
qualities of both peoples, etc. Here also the term "Germans" is frequently used to mean Austrians. Very significant in this respect is the discussion between Trepka and young Cedro. Trepka, who defends the isolation of the Polish nobility and its disregard of the foreign, outside world is opposed by Cedro, whose ideas are much more modern, perceptive, and subtle as one could judge at first glance. He attempts to obtain the title of a count from the Austrian government for reasons which are twofold:

"I" said Cedro through clenched teeth, "am neither begging nor acting out of my own will. Father's order is sacred for me. But it is my opinion that we must learn to know the world, understand the European way of life. We should go to the Germans. Namely to them, to their homes, observe their life, get to know their strength. How else can we ward off their blows? We've got to establish contacts in order to use them."

Thus the young post-partition generation shows a great understanding of the problems facing Poland and at the same time also has concrete ideas about how to counter the threatening danger.
As I have pointed out, Austrians are referred to as "Germans." This is not a mix-up of terms but is done deliberately. It becomes especially obvious when Krzysztof talks about the "Slavic soul" and the "German soul" as two quite different spiritual entities.

In Ashes there are fewer references to Prussians than to Austrians. They appear for the first time as preservers of "law and order" on the streets of Warsaw chasing the boisterous and brawling youth. Soon after this night time incident a different kind of Prussian appears in Ashes: the intellectual. Master of the Chair in the masonic lodge The Golden Lantern is a Prussian major de With. The masonic lodge itself, to which Prince Gintułt and Rafal belong, is part Prussian, part Polish. German and Polish is spoken there. So, at first, Żeromski leads us into an illusion that Prussians, especially on the intellectual level, are accepted by the Poles, that there are no differences of interests. But slowly Żeromski begins to show the other face of the Prussians. After Rafal's initiation to the lodge, the masons drink to the health of the Prussian king Friedrich Wilhelm, and other German dignitaries. And during the siege of Gdańsk, the Master of the Chair is killed fighting on the side of the Prussians against the Poles. Rafal mentions this to Prince Gintułt to show that he realizes the hypocrisy of the so-called masonic brotherhood members, who in the critical and
decisive moments adhere to the old, conventional order of the world, ignoring their sacred oaths.

Rafał's adventure with Helena de With can be interpreted as his psychological revenge on the Prussian masonic brother. This, however, is not very obvious since Helena was his old sweetheart and their romantic escapade gives an impression of merely a continuation of an interrupted love affair. It is the opinion of this writer that Żeromski very subtly combined both: he re-instated the old line of development (love of Rafał and Helena) and introduced a new one (Rafał's dislike for Prussians).

Equally interesting in Żeromski's treatment of Prussians is General Dąbrowski's proclamation to "Hollanders, Germans, and people of whatsoever religion or nationality living on Polish soil ...."29 They are guaranteed freedom of religion and protection by the government as long as they remain loyal to Poland. Poles in turn are reminded of these moral rights of the aliens. In this manner Żeromski wanted to indicate the fair and just treatment of Polish foreign-born citizens by the Polish military authorities.

The Prussian military is shown briefly in a few clashes with the Polish troops advancing north toward Gdańsk. It is probably because of the hit-and-run type of warfare in which Poles and Prussians were involved, that the Prussians are shown inferior to Polish troops, who almost always come out
victorious. Historically speaking, Prussians were able to show their valor better when fighting in large units and not in small detachments where the situation demanded individual decisions under battle conditions.

Żeromski makes one more reference to Germans, or to be precise, to Saxon troops who fought at Raszyn on the Polish side against the Austrians. A great indignation arose among the Polish troops as the news of the Saxons' crossing over to the Austrian side became known. A bitter "German and German will always be brothers" resounded angrily in the Polish camp. The author refers here to the linguistic and spiritual or cultural unity of German-speaking peoples.

The only direct reference to Russians in Ashes is after evacuation of Sandomierz by the Austrians. But there is an indirect but quite obvious allusion to the Poles and all the occupying powers, primarily Russians. It is not by accident that a great many chapters in Żeromski's novel are devoted to the Spanish war. Over and over again Żeromski puts before us the heroic example of the Spaniards. They are fighting against enormous odds and remain unbeaten. Their army of 100,000 men has been beaten by the French, but Spain itself remains unconquered. Having lost their independence, the Spanish people fight united against the invaders. They are old hands at that game: they defeated the Moors after seven centuries .... The parallel to Poles and Poland is obvious.
They compare rather unfavorably with the Iberians. Poles are not lacking in bravery. They lack the most important ingredient of success of any freedom fight: national unity. We see disunity among Polish social classes (aristocracy, nobility, peasants) and within the classes themselves. Especially apparent is the strong individualism of nobility where each member has different ideas on how to save the country. This is the parallel to Poland and the occupying powers. At the same time one could read into the Spanish-Polish allegory an idea that Polish defeats in the recent Russo-Polish history (the Kościuszko uprising and the uprisings of 1830-31 and 1863-64) are not the final decisions of history on their fate as long as they continue their resistance and continue it united. The fate of the Poles was in their own hands.

Żeromski treats Austrians and Prussians in an objective, balanced, and impassionate manner. We can see in him no dislike for foreigners, and this is even more remarkable when we realize that those foreigners were enemies of Poland. Tolstoj's bias against foreigners in general and to the Poles in particular is best explained by his great emotional involvement in the events of the 1812 campaign, an involvement which made him lose the artistic restraint so visible in Żeromski.
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CHAPTER VI

REMARKS ON STRUCTURE AND COMPOSITION OF BOTH NOVELS

Characterization

In War and Peace as well as in Ashes, characters can be grouped into two clearly discernible categories: one made up of historical figures and one made up of fictitious figures. To the first group belong in War and Peace such characters as Napoleon, Alexander, Russian and French generals, as well as statesmen like Speranskij and Arakčeev; in Ashes Napoleon, Poniatowski, Dąbrowski, Sokolnicki, and Zajączek. The group of fictitious characters may in turn be divided into main heroes and secondary characters. To the first subgroup one would include Prince Andrej, Pierre, Nataša, Princess Mar'ja and Nikolaj Rostov from War and Peace, and Rafał Olbromski, Krzysztof Cedro, and Prince Gintułt from Ashes. The group of secondary characters is the largest in both novels. Here belong such figures (from War and Peace) as old Prince Bolkonskij, old Rostovs, Drubeckojs, Doloxov, Petja Rostov, and many others, while from Ashes we would include the old Olbromskis and their daughter, old Cedro and his daughter, Trepka, Helena, Princess Elżbieta, Michcik, and others.
In this chapter I shall deal only with the fictitious characters, dismissing the historical group with the remark that those characters do not develop throughout the novel but remain stationary. They also lack psychological depth and spiritual dimensions. There are, however, two exceptions: Kutuzov in *War and Peace* and Dąbrowski in *Ashes*. Although both men belong in the category made up of historical characters (and by my classification should be "static" and without psychological depth because of their unique role in both novels), they are presented differently. Kutuzov, Napoleon's counterpart and to a certain extent Alexander's, develops in importance in the novel: from a commander of the Russian expeditionary forces to Austria in 1805, to Commander-in-chief of the whole Russian army in 1812. (One should mention here that Alexander did not want to appoint Kutuzov to this high position but did so in order not to antagonize popular opinion.) Kutuzov's psychological side is shown in such small, kind deeds as a friendly word to a priest's wife, who greets him at Carevo-Zajmišče, a few lumps of sugar for a little girl at Fili. One sees it also in kind, fatherly relationship with his troops. Dąbrowski, on the other hand, is shown by Żeromski in different situations, but with the same result. We see him talking with Prince Gintult in Verona, a man of vision with tremendous will power but at the same time one fully aware of his thankless task and the long,
difficult road ahead for the Polish legions before his vision for which the legions were created can be realized. We see him at a military council of Polish generals in Modlin. There, even though Dąbrowski is not the highest in rank or position, he towers above his immediate environment intellectually; with his wisdom and experience, he solves an almost stalemated situation over the issue of what the Polish troops were to do after their evacuation from Warsaw.

In War and Peace the hero is introduced most frequently in a group scene. For example, both Prince Andrej and Pierre are introduced during Anna Šerer's soiree; during the name day party at the Rostovs, we meet Nataša and the members of the young set. The biographical as well as the physical description of a character is somewhat limited, so that these details penetrate into the narrative gradually. By this limited description the author gives his characters the opportunity to "grow" without limiting them to any one kind of rigid image. The hero's appearance is a visual impression. His external make-up reflects the psychological traits of the character.

V èto vremja v gostinnuju vošlo novoe lico. Novoe lico èto byl molodoj knjaz' Andrej Bolkonskij, muž malen'koj knjagini. Knjaz' Bolkonskij byl nebol'šogo rosta, ves'ma krasivýj molodoj čelovek s opredelennymi i suximi čertami. Vse v ego figure, načinaja ot ustalogo, sukušačego vzgljada do tixogo mernogo šaga, predstavljalo samuju rezku protivopoloznost' s ego malen'koju, oživen- noju ženoj. Emu, vidimo, vse byvšie v gostinoj
Just then another visitor entered the drawing room: Prince Andrew Bolkonski, the little princess' husband. He was a very handsome young man, of medium height, with firm, clear-cut features. Everything about him, from his weary, bored expression to his quiet, measured step, offered a most striking contrast to his lively little wife. It was evident that he not only knew everybody in the drawing room, but had found them to be so tiresome that it wearied him to look at or listen to them. And among all these faces that he found so tedious, none seemed to bore him so much as that of his pretty wife. He turned away from her with a grimace that distorted his handsome face, kissed Anna Pavlovna's hand, and screwing up his eyes scanned the whole company.

By creating a visual picture of a character, the author helps us remember the character's appearance. A character introduced in a group scene becomes an object of observation by other subjects and at the same time a source of their impressions, mood, or feelings. Along with this, Tolstoj purposely gives us a description of the secondary characters in order to emphasize the difference between the two. Tolstoj gives his main characters a high moral concept of honor and compels them to act in accordance with that concept. It is by their deeds that heroes show their high spiritual values. This nobility of spirit is the uniting link between the characters, their common language. One of the determining
criteria of a character's moral quality is the presence or absence of such intellectual attributes as the ability to think or reflect. Negative characters usually have none of these and are shown as being insignificant, spiritually shallow, or worthless. In this way Tolstoj via Pierre divides characters into positive and negative. Clothing plays an important part in this psychological unmasking. Usually Tolstoj describes it while dealing with members of high society as if to cover up their spiritual nakedness. For example, Élen is always exquisitely attired and bejewelled. She presents quite a contrast to Nataša, whose dress is hardly mentioned, for she can hold her own without beautiful dresses. Tolstoj's use of unattractive and ludicrous character traits brings about a debasing rather than a humorous effect. This device, however, has a different effect on different characters. Thus, an identical or similar detail ascribed to one character has a debasing impact on another, and thereby creates an elevating effect in the first character. For example, tolstaja spina of Napoleon strips him of the pompous image, while the identical expression used with the respect to Kutuzov enhances his human appearance. Thus Tolstoj creates a new yardstick for the evaluation of his characters: those who by the application of the above-mentioned standards, appear ludicrous or unsympathetic and are bad and evil; and those who pass such a "test" affirmatively and are positive characters.
As mentioned at the beginning, characters are introduced with limited detail, a device which gives them an opportunity to grow and develop. The development of characters is the result of stimuli provided by other characters, usually negative ones. It often appears as obstacles in the lives of positive characters, obstacles which they must overcome. For example, Pierre marries Elen through the cunning of her father. He tries to extricate himself from this extremely unsatisfactory arrangement, but the ultimate solution is actually brought about by Elen's death. At these times, however, we see that the author "helps" characters by skillfully manipulating some event in the novel and thereby arranging the needed "outside help." A good example of such a situation is the thwarting of Anatol's scheme by Nataša's friends.

Details play a very important part in Tolstoj's description of characters. They are introduced sparingly but the most significant and the most obvious traits are repeated frequently. For example, we have Liza's short upper lip recurring quite often. It even appears in the angel monument at her grave and in her son Nikolen'ka. Princess Mar'ja's luminous eyes and Žjuli Kuragina's red neck are likewise used quite frequently.

It is often said that the main heroes of War and Peace have autobiographical bases and were drawn from Tolstoj's immediate family and environment. There is enough material
to substantiate it. We shall mention the more important claims:

1. Natása - Tolstoj's sister-in-law Tanja Bers, later Kuz'minskaja;

2. Nikolaj Rostov - Nikolaj Tolstoj, the author's father;

3. The old Rostovs - Tolstoj's paternal grandparents;

4. Old Bolkonskij - the author's maternal grandfather N. S. Volkonskij;

5. Princess Mar'ja - Mar'ja N. Volkonskaja.

Needless to say, all these characters were not carbon copies of their living prototypes but underwent some character changes in the hands of Tolstoj. The prototype of Prince Andrej and Pierre is Tolstoj himself. It would have probably been difficult or impossible to find such complex characters in the author's milieu. For this reason Tolstoj turned to himself. The individual lives of the two characters do not resemble perfectly the life of the author, but they do have many traits in common shared by the three men. For one thing they are aristocrats and intellectuals seeking truth and the meaning of life. They pass through various crises and disappointments and are deeply concerned with the problems of their country and the family. At the same time they possess many qualities which differentiate each of them sharply. Prince Andrej is a dreamer turned skeptic, quite elitist in his thinking. He is brave and even heroic. In
his relations with the other people, he is usually reserved. Pierre, on the other hand, is naive and enthusiastic, taking up different causes. He loves people, is sincere, and remains basically simple. Qualities differentiating both men were present in Tolstoj himself. There is yet another emanation of Tolstoj: Nikolaj Rostov. He represents the manorial aspect of the author with the aristocratic note of psychological conservatism, as seen in the preservation of the status quo as stated by Nikolaj in the epilogue:

[...] no sostav' vy tajnoe obščestvo, načni vy protivodejstvovat' pravitel'stvu, kakoe by ono ni bylo, ja znajuj, čto moj dolg povinovat'sja emu. I veli mne sejčas Arakčeev itti na vas s ěskadronom i rubit' - ni na sekundu ne zadumajus' i pojdu.

[...] but if you formed a secret society and began working against the government—be it what may—I know it is my duty to obey the government. And if Arakčeev ordered me to lead a squadron against you and cut you down, I should not hesitate an instant, but should do it.4

N. Torčkova in her essay About the prototypes of Prince Andrej5 puts forward an interesting idea, namely that the Russian historian A. I. Mixajlovskij-Danilevskij served as a prototype for Prince Andrej. She bases her opinion on L. Brant's biography of Mixajlovskij-Danilevskij, which Tolstoj used while working on the novel. However, the facts quoted by Torčkova in support of her theory, such as that Mixajlovskij-Danilevskij had the same position as Prince Andrej at Kutuzov's staff, the similarity of physical features and education, although fairly plausible are not very convincing.
The artistic rationale behind Tolstoj's idea to use himself as the prototype for Prince Andrej and Pierre because of the dichotomous nature of their characters is to me more acceptable.

Non-fictitious, historical figures are only briefly sketched in Ashes. Żeromski does it, however, in such a way that the reader gets a clear idea of a particular character and can fill in the missing parts himself. (Direct characterization of fictitious characters is usually very clear and concise. Żeromski does supplement it by the gradual and slow addition of details.) Main characters are introduced somewhat differently than with Tolstoj. They do not always appear in group scenes, but are sometimes alone, as for example, Rafał during a hunt. They may also appear in the presence of up to two characters, as is done with Prince Gintułt when we see him together with the Olbromski brothers. Similar to Tolstoj, Żeromski presents his main characters (and some secondary ones, too) with "room to grow" physically and emotionally. Growth and development of characters is most visible in Rafał and Cedro. Here we are aware of growth in two dimensions: physical (from young boys to manhood) and spiritual (carefree schoolboys become concerned patriots). In the case of Prince Gintułt, this growth is absent, for we meet him as an already accomplished man who participated in the events preceding the Napoleonic epoch. Nevertheless, we
witness in him a spiritual-intellectual change from an epi­
curean magnate in Grudno to a truth-seeking aristocrat and
finally to a freedom fighting patriot. The secondary char­
acters, though usually very convincingly presented, remain
static. The only exceptions in this respect are women:
Helena, Princess Elżbieta and Rafał's sister Zofia. But the
changes in them in comparison with the changes in Rafał and
Krzysztof are relatively insignificant.

In his external characterization of main characters,
Żeromski's description is vague. For example, in the whole
first chapter, where the author introduces Rafał, in all
forty pages all we find out about the hero is that he "is
standing" (p. 8), "walking" (p. 9), "listening" (p. 9), "rem­
iniscing" (p. 10), and "coming to" (p. 13); only on page 14
are we informed that Rafał is "a young man." It continues
throughout the whole chapter in a similar manner. In the
next chapter, where Rafał is participating in a kulig, Żerom­
ski devotes more space to the description of Rafał's horse
Baśka than to the young protagonist. The same can be said
about the external characterization of young Cedro. Only
Prince Gintułt is described in a comparatively detailed way,
as seen through Rafał's eyes. Żeromski pays very little at­
tention to clothing (except in the case of women), quite a
contrast to Tolstoj. In representing an inner or spiritual
view of his principal characters, Żeromski uses an indirect
method. It is from a character's thoughts and feelings that
we get a glimpse of his inner self.

An important device in conveying the psychological state of his heroes is through their facial expressions in various situations. One of them is laughter; the other is the most eloquent medium of all, human eyes. Laughter in *Ashes* expresses a whole range of human feelings, from the carefree laughter of young people at *kulig* to a laughter of hate (a feeling Rafal has toward young Princess Gintult at the beginning of their acquaintance) and envy (in Zofia Olbromska), to a laughter of insanity (in Saragossa) and to "peculiar kind of internal laughter" of Cedro's at the sight of the badly mutilated corpse of his comrade-in-arms. Human eyes as a device of conveying the feelings of a character are best discerned in the two scenes where Napoleon appears. In the first scene the look in Cedro's eyes is "sleepy, indifferent," reflecting his psychological state, which resulted from his serious wound. But at the sight of Napoleon, the look in Cedro's eyes becomes so powerful it makes itself felt on Napoleon. It also expresses love of country, a love so strong that Napoleon involuntarily thinks back to his native Corsica. Napoleon's eyes, those "dark, martial," "mute and deaf" eyes that cast "a stony look," were affected by the feeling of the young Pole, a feeling of such intensity that it was communicated by his eyes. In the second scene at Orsza a different feeling of young Cedro is conveyed by his "staring eyes," "eyes turned to stone," namely that of
"soldiery loyalty" and "undying faith." Again Napoleon reacts to it: his "terrible, indifferent" eyes seem to reflect a gleam transformed into a "half-sad smile."

The dichotomy of characters according to good and evil, so typical of Tolstoj, is not so obvious in Żeromski. In Ashes we see instead a different division of characters. This division of characters depends on the author's treatment of them, which in turn stems from his attitude toward them. In one category are the figures who speak the author's ideas, feelings, and his innermost thoughts. Consequently, they are the least objectively treated. Here belong all three main characters plus Captain Wyganowski, including also such secondary characters as Trepka and Sułkowski. The other category includes figures with whom Żeromski was most objective and impartial and to whom he was the least committed emotionally (old Olbromski, for example). Usually these characters come out better, seeming more expressive and more alive. They appear in the novel two or three times, having the effect of complementing each other.

A special subcategory among the characters in Ashes are women. The author's treatment of this group differs considerably from his treatment of men. In the case of women, Żeromski devotes a great deal more attention to their physical appearance and their beauty than to that of the men. He also describes their attire in great detail. But the aspect of
love, which is their main function in the novel, is not analyzed by the author. Żeromski does not show the gradual development of that feeling. His heroes and heroines fall in love at first sight and remain in that state from then on. All the reader sees are the sensual heights of their experiences. Thus the spiritual side of women remains undeveloped at the expense of the emotional side. In this respect Żeromski differs greatly from Tolstoj, who devotes a great deal of attention to the spiritual side of women and the development of their love experiences.

I have indicated some biographical bases for the prototypes of major figures in War and Peace. In Ashes only one character can be traced to some biographical connection, and that is Helena. Kasztelanowicz suggests that her prototype was Helenka Pancerówna, a young girl in whom Żeromski had more than a passing interest, and his "pupil" Lucja Zaborowska. But all three heroes are in one way or another connected with the personality of the author in the same way that Prince Andrej, Pierre, and Nikolaj are connected with Tolstoj. They also have traits differentiating them from each other. Like Żeromski, Rafał is a dreamer full of erotic passion, romantic, sentimental, and melancholy. His is very sensitive, for example, to nature or works of art. At the same time he is not an analytical intellectual, nor does he have social problems close at heart as did his brother Piotr;
he must be made aware of problems. He is simple, primitive, and at times brutal. Cedro seems like an old positivist hero: good and noble with a strong sense of duty and concerned with public and national problems. Here the similarity between him and the author ends. Cedro has an absolute devotion to Napoleon regardless of the consequences. Initially soft and sensitive (e.g., his behavior at the death of the Silesian fisherman), once exposed to the realities of war he becomes insensitive. His feelings are quite different from Wyganowski's concerning the ethical problems stemming from the Poles' involvement with Napoleon simply because he does not understand them. Prince Gintułt is the most complex character of all. He is the opposite of Rafał and Krzysztof in many respects, but bears the strongest of Żeromski's characteristics—the profound feeling of pain and the concern for the question *unde sit malum* in order to prevent evil, which causes pain. Thus he is philosophically connected with the author. A man to Żeromski was a place of contest between good and evil. Historically speaking, Gintułt is an anachronistic figure, a remnant from Kościuszko and the Four Year Sejm period. His contemporaries were Piotr Olbromski and Sułkowski, a very intelligent and aristocratic person. Another character, who in a way is also the author's spokesman, is captain Wyganowski. He is a historical figure whom Żeromski found during his research work on *Ashes* and used in his novel,
for he closely reflects the author's feelings about the war and the ethical questions connected with it. This extremely tragic figure brings to the fore the dilemma which was facing Polish troops fighting on the side of Napoleon.

In the characterization of these figures, both writers employ some techniques that are similar and some that are different. The minimal initial description of heroes and the treatment of historical and fictitious characters are very similar in both authors. But probably the thing most common to both writers is the fact that the main characters of both novels are to a large extent emanations of their authors. To the differing characterization methods belong such things as introduction of heroes, role of clothing in their characterization, use of detail, and presence of autobiographical element in Tolstoj heroes, something which is in direct contrast to the heroes of the author of Ashes.

Comparing the technique of characterization of the two writers together, one can only conclude that Tolstoj's influence in that respect on Żeromski was negligible.

Battle Scenes in War and Peace and Ashes

Battle scenes in both novels may be viewed from two points: 1) philosophical (how they reflect the position of the respective writer on the war), and 2) technical (how both authors actually describe them). War and Peace and Ashes
both depict several major battles: Schöngraben, Austerlitz, and Borodino (War and Peace); Mantua, Saragossa, Raszyn, and Sandomierz (Ashes). There are also a number of minor clashes in each novel. I shall concentrate mainly on Borodino and Raszyn, since the two battles contain numerous parallel traits, but occasionally I shall also refer to other battles.

Borodino and Raszyn both are the turning points of the respective novels: after Borodino the Russians surrender Moscow, just as Polish troops evacuate Warsaw after Raszyn. The two battles have the most complete presentation in the two books: 1) decision for the battle ([...] Napoleon dal, a Kutuzov prinjal eto sraženie. [...] Napoleon offered and Kutuzov accepted that battle.9) - War and Peace; in Ashes the opinion of General Fiszer approved by Prince Poniatowski decides the place of the battle: "A tu, mości książę, miejsce jest dobre. [...] Gdyby tak na mnie, to stanąłbym w tym miejscu i bitbym się aż do śmierci." (And here, Your Highness, is a good spot. [...] If it were up to me, I would make a stand here and fight until death),10 2) building of fortifications at Borodino and Falenty, 3) a day-long battle in each case, and finally 4) their results.

Since the war consists of a series of battles, the description of battle scenes is conditioned by the writers' attitude to war. Both authors have a negative disposition toward war. This is the reason why they do not lend romantic glorification to battle scenes but rather point out and stress
their darker side and destructiveness. Tolstoj and Żeromski alike condemn a war which has for its purpose territorial expansion and enslavement of other nations, but at the same time both of them accept it provided that a war is imperative for national survival and the preservation of freedom. However, even in the case of "justifiable wars," the two writers indicate the senseless waste of human lives and the enormity of human suffering caused by them. It suffices to mention the death of Petja Rostov during a guerilla attack toward the end of the war, and the distress of the inhabitants of Falenty Wielkie:

[...] Petja tjaželo upal na mokruju zemlju. [...] Denisov [...] pod"exal k Pete, slez s lošadi i drožašćimi rukami povernul k sebe zapackanoe krovjju i grjaz'ju, uže poblednevšee lico Peti. [...] i kazaki s udivljeniem ogljanulis' na zvuki, pokožie na sobačij laj, so kotorym Denisov bystro otvernelsja, podešel k pletnju i sxvatilsja za nego.

[...] Petya fell heavily to the wet ground. [...] Denisov [...] rode up to Petya, dismounted, and with trembling hands turned toward himself the bloodstained, mud-bespattered face which has already gone white. [...] And the Cossacks looked around in surprise at the sound, like the yelp of a dog, with which Denisov turned away, walked to the wattle fence, and seized hold of it.

Or in Ashes:

Kiedy ich zawiadomił [...] że baby i dzieci mają co duchu uciekać ze wsi, rozległ się straszny popłoch jęk, płacz, zawodzenie. [...] Wszystko [...] skamlało jednym głosem: -Zmiżuj się! [...] When he had informed them [...] that the women and the children were to leave the village instantly,
frightful tumult, cries, and wailing broke out. [...] All these whined in one voice: "Have pity on us!"12

The gloomy mood obtained by the authors' choice of words describing dead Petja (the image of blood and dirt) in *War and Peace*, and the forcible evacuation of the inhabitants of Palenty Wielkie conveys to us the writer's sentiment toward any kind of war.

Tolstoj and Żeromski show the battle scenes through a prism of consciousness of the main heroes, their spiritual experiences and reactions to the events witnessed. For example, Nikolaj Rostov at Schöngraben experiences his first fear under fire, and Prince Gintułt participates in the defense of Mantua and at the same time relives in his sould the horror of the battle for the city. Prince Andrej, because of his lofty aspirations, is able to act heroically and leads the fleeing mob into an attack at Austerlitz. When wounded, however, there is a change in his attitude and the realization that glory is vain, all of which is reflected in his view of the lofty sky. Cedro and Wyganowski both react differently to the cruelties of war at Saragossa: Cedro becomes a hardened warrior while Wyganowski cannot compromise his ethical principles. Borodino horrifies inoffensive Pierre, who leaves the battlefield thinking to himself: "Net, teper' oni ostavjat èto, teper' oni užasnutsja togo, čto oni sdelali." ("Now they will stop it, now they will be horrified at what
they have done!"} Raszyn exerts similar influence on a less sensitive Rafał:

Włókł w sobie śmiertelne cierpienie, dźwigał w zamkniętych oczach widok całego tego pola, miał w ramionach ruchome kupy ciał na grobli.

He was dragging a load of mortal pain, carrying in his eyes the sight of that entire field; he had in his arms those squirming heaps of bodies on the dam.14

And finally the siege and destruction of Sandomierz bring Rafał and Prince Gintultz into direct collision with their own (Polish) military, a collision which is fundamentally of esthetic origin. They try to prevent the destruction of the ancient church of St. Jacob in Sandomierz, whose destruction, however, is necessary for the defense of the city.

Tolstoj, a retired officer, was in a far better position to describe battle scenes than the civilian Żeromski, for Tolstoj could (and did) draw on his martial experiences from the Caucasus and Sebastopol, where he was able to observe the battles and the reaction of their participants first hand. Żeromski, however, had to rely almost exclusively on experiences of others reflected in memoirs, letters, and various literary and historical sources.

Tolstoj's tone in describing battle scenes is quieter, more peaceful than Żeromski's. He does not use the naturalistic technique to convey his view. Frequently he resorts to historical and philosophical arguments akin to publicistic and polemical writings. This in turn leads to a
boring or even jarring effect. Żeromski differs in this respect from Tolstoj. There is a deeper intensity of feelings and experiences in Żeromski. By depicting the cruelty of battle scenes in a naturalistic way, Żeromski achieves the same result as Tolstoj or perhaps even more in presenting his point. The difference between the two writers is that Żeromski influences the reader via the artistic arrangement and treatment of events, while Tolstoj quite frequently slips into lengthy philosophical arguments. Such scenes as the death of the five year old child in Mantua, the destruction of art treasures in Sandomierz, the suffering of the civilian population in Saragossa speak more eloquently than ten Tolstojan philosophical treatises on the immorality and the destructive nature of war. Żeromski, in this respect, goes even further than Tolstoj. While Tolstoj argues against war mainly on the basis of its immorality, killings, and destruction of property, Żeromski points out the damage war does to human nature, a far more devastating effect than any material damage it can inflict. For example, while depicting the events of the Spanish campaign, he shows the awakening of man's animalistic erotic instincts, something which is the direct result of the demoralizing effect of the war. Thus Żeromski's battle scenes worthy of Goya's brush are far more powerful than Tolstoj's philosophical words.
It is interesting to compare the two battles of Borodino and Raszyn a little further. Both are observed through the eyes of one of the main heroes in the respective novels: Pierre and Rafal. Pierre is an educated observer and non-combatant; Rafal, a vigorous participant. The goodness and inoffensiveness of Pierre can hardly be compared to the indocile, unsubdued nature of Rafal. Thus there are fundamental differences between the two men, but the picture of battles we get through them is similar; at the beginning both heroes are relatively happy (Pierre watches the beginning of the battle as some monumental spectacle - and - "P' eru zaxotelos' byt' tam, gde byli èti dymy, èti blestja-
šcie štyki, èto dviženie, èti zvuki." ("Pierre wished to be there with that smoke, those shining bayonets, that movement, and those sounds").15 Rafal at the sight of the first salvos of artillery: [...] Roześmiał się wesoło. Zawołał prawie z rozkoszą: Aha! Nareszcie!" ("[...] gave a merry laugh. He cried out almost with delight: 'Aha! At last!'").16 As the battles progress, their heat "infects" the two men:

(Pierre) he was entirely absorbed in watching this fire which burned even more brightly and which he felt was flaming up in the same way in his own soul.17

And in Ashes:
At sight of the enemy the soldiers of Godebski's battalion seized their arms and rushed forward. Swept by a mad frenzy, Raphael went with them.

But at the end gloom and depression embrace both heroes after this harvest of death:

The one thing he now desired with his whole soul was to get away quickly from the terrible sensations amid which he had lived that day [...]19

The night was well advanced when Raphael emerged from the fighting ranks [...] He was dragging a load of mortal pain, carrying in his eyes the sight of that entire field; he had in his arms those squirming heaps of bodies on the dam.20

Because of the relative lack of mobility of Pierre at the beginning, we see only a general panoramic view of the battlefield and the Raevskij redoubt, where Pierre arrives on his horse. After he leaves the redoubt, Tolstoj himself provides the additional information about the battle on the Russian and French sides in order to provide the reader with
a complete picture of the battlefield. Rafał on the other hand, is highly mobile: as General Sokolnicki's aide-de-camp he rides all over the field, a device which affords him an opportunity to see various sectors of the battlefield and different stages of the battle; he watches the retreat of the Polish cavalry, the Austrian attack on Falenty Wielkie, the battle for the dam, and the eventual retreat.

Żeromski's narrative is fast-flowing and contrasts sharply with unhurried Tolstoj's. In Żeromski there is more of a dynamic feeling, in Tolstoj an epic restraint. What Tolstoj lacks in feeling he makes up for in the psychological depth of his characters and inner monologues.

We may make the following observation about the battle scenes as depicted by the two novelists: their description is influenced by the writers' ideology. Both authors have a negative attitude toward war but convey it by different techniques: Żeromski through his naturalistic descriptions, Tolstoj mostly via his philosophical polemics. Battle scenes are always reflected through the heroes' experiences. The pace in Tolstoj's descriptions is slower, and Tolstoj himself is more psychological. Żeromski exhibits more subjective feeling and fast pace.

Language

Esli by ja byl car', ja by izdal zakon, čto pisatel', kotoryj upotrebit slovo, značenija kotorogo on ne možet ob"jasnit', lišaetsja
If I were a tsar, I would issue an order that a writer, using a word whose meaning he will not be able to explain, will lose his right to write and will receive 100 lashes. 21

So wrote Tolstoj jokingly in his letter to Straxov on September 5, 1878. But each joke contains a certain amount of truth, and in this one we see how serious was the author of War and Peace about the language used in an artistic work. No wonder that Leonid Andreev described his impression of Tolstoj's language in the following way:

Can anything be higher than the mighty language of Tolstoj? Turgenev wrote in a sugary language, making his style sleek and polishing sentences artificially. People praise Turgenev's language and point to it as a model... For goodness sake! After all, can one compare it to Tolstoj's language? Like a giant moving clods of earth Tolstoj piles word upon word, throwing the most difficult phrases like balls. 22

If one takes a closer look at Tolstoj's language in War and Peace, one will agree with Andreev. The impression Tolstoj's phrases, locutions, and language in general make on the reader is the one Andreev talks about. What was then so typically Tolstojan about the language of War and Peace?
Numerous extant drafts of *War and Peace* testify not only to the constant growth of the author's ideas and the novel itself, but also to his incessant work on the language, which perhaps is the most important aspect of any work of fiction. Strange as it may seem, in spite of his concern for the linguistic side of the work, Tolstoj paid far less attention to the grammar and syntax than one would have expected. But this disregard for formal correctness was a typically Tolstojan characteristic. It added to the beauty and strength of the writer's language. An amusing but at the same time devastating analysis of Tolstoj's style and language was made by his friend Družinin:

Každyj vaš nedostatok imeet svoju čast' sily i krasyoty,-počti každoe vaše dostojinstvo imeet v sebe zernyški nedostatka. Slog vaš sovershenno podxodit k ètomu zaključeniju, vy sil'no bezgramotny, inogda bezgramotnost'ju novovvoditelja i sil'nogo poèta, peredelyva-
juščego jazyk na svoj lad i navsegda, inogda bezgramotnost'ju oficera, pišuščego k tovarišçu i sidjaščego v kakom-nibud' blindaže. [...] u vas slog putãetšja, i javljajutsja adskie oboroty reči. [...] dlja sistemy že razumnogo popravlenija mogu skazat' glavnoe tol'ko: izbegajte dlinnyx periodov. Drobite ix na dva i tri, ne žalezte toček. S časticami reči postupajte bez ceremonii, slova čto, kotoryj, i èto marajte desjatkami.

Each of your shortcomings is partly strong and partly beautiful, -almost each of your merits has in it a grain of demerit. Your style fits this conclusion perfectly; you are very ungrammatical--at times like an innovator and a powerful poet reshaping the language in his own way and for good,- at times like an officer sitting in some dug-out. [...] You confuse your style, and hellish locutions appear. [...] To
suggest a wise improvement, I can only advise the following: avoid lengthy sentences. Break them up into two and three. Do not spare periods. Treat speech particles unceremoniously, words like what, which, and this scribble by the dozens.\textsuperscript{23}

Tolstoj accepted Družinin's criticism on his Youth (1857) somewhat grudgingly: "Družinin xvalit Junost' no ne sliškom." ("Družinin praises Youth but not much.")\textsuperscript{24} Tolstoj must have continued in his old style, for in 1882 Turgenev, after having read his Confession (1880-1882), remarked to A. A. Tolstaja: "[...] slogo poxož teper' na neproxodimoe boloto." ("[...] now his style resembles an impassable swamp.")\textsuperscript{25} Tolstoj's language peculiarity referred to by Družinin in his letter (and by Turgenev) was probably the result of his lack of understanding of Tolstoj's syntax. A detailed analysis of it would reveal great skill and special grace in his "interminable sentences." There is another reason for a certain amount of the military coloring in some passages of War and Peace. While writing War and Peace Tolstoj used several memoirs of military men of the period such as A. P. Ermolov, A. I. Mixajlovskij-Danilevskij, and Denis Davydov. At time he changed the language of his sources very little. The reason for it was not so much the unwillingness or inability to rework the given material completely as it was the desire to preserve the linguistic and cultural flavor of the epoch.
described by retaining the source material intact. To do this, one also sees different characters representing the older generation in the novels, as for example old Prince Bolkonskij, who use many archaisms typical of their period. ("Kak vas nemcy s Bonapartom srazhat'sja po vašej novoj nauke, strategiej nazyvaemoj, naučili." - "How the Germans have taught you to fight Buonaparte by this new science you call 'strategy.'")

This desire of the author to give a truthful image of the contemporary Russian language of the period led primarily to syntactical curiosities, such as the long, extended paragraphs pointed out by Družinin. Some newspaper reviewers called Tolstoj's language "Jazyk dokaramzinskogo perioda" ("The language of pre-Karamzinian period"). There is, however, a disagreement among scholars on Tolstoj's long passages, especially in his historical and philosophical digressions. Čičerin, for example, thinks them to be necessary for the all embracing, analytical thinking of Tolstoj.

Besides the passages dealing with history and philosophy and those "borrowed" from memoirs, there is a vast body of colloquial linguistic material in which grammatical discrepancies bordering on mistakes occur:

Podležašče bez skazuemogo, pridatočnoe predloženie bez glavnogo, opredelenie bez opredeljaemogo slova-vse èti i drugie, im podobnye otklonenija ot pravil'nogo grammatičeskogo postroenija reci, byli običny v razgovornom jazyke Tolstogo.

A subject without a predicate, a subordinate clause without a main clause, a
definition without word defined - all
these and other similar deviations from
correct, grammatical speech structure
were quite normal in Tolstoj's colloquial
style.29

It is here that we find numerous folk proverbs and sayings.
For example: "Bez snasti i vša ne ubeš'" ("Without a tackle
you cannot even kill a louse"),30 "Vstavljat' palki v kolesa"
("To throw a monkey wrench in the works"),31 "Gde sud tam i
nepravda" ("Where there is court, there is injustice").32

N. N. Gusev mentions that Tolstoj diligently studied Dahl's
dictionary in 1879, but it is obvious that he must have re­
ferred to it during his writing of War and Peace, since all
three proverbs quoted before are from Dahl's dictionary.

Drawing mainly on living Russian, Tolstoj frequently intro­
duced his own neologisms such as "on poddumal" in place of
possible "vydumal." Both verbs have the same meaning ("he
invented, fabricated"). In coining this word Tolstoj prob­
ably used the pattern of the verb "poddelat'" ("to imi­
tate").33 This verb is in one of the rough drafts and was
not included in the finished version of the novel. In order
to call the reader's attention to certain situations or in­
dividual words, the author uses a play of words ("[...]
začitel'nyj, ničego ne značaščij vzgljad Miloradoviča" -
"[...] impressive but meaningless gaze of Miloradovič")34 or
simply capitalizes them, as for example, stressing the losses
of both parties at Borodino, the word "half" is capitalized
twice: "[...] russkie, [...], poterjali POLOVINU svoego
vojska" ("the Russians [...] had lost one HALF of their army") and a little further: "vrag, kotoryj poterjav POLOVINU vojska [...]" ("an enemy who, after losing HALF of his men [...]"). 35

While dealing with Tolstoj's Russian, one must mention peculiarities of his language technique such as the principle of repetition 36 and the use of such parts of speech as adjectives, nouns, and verbs. The two are to a certain degree connected, since there are repetitions of individual words or their synonyms, but Tolstoj also repeats whole sentences, clauses, and phrases. The repetition of words is a means of emphasizing a particular detail, such as, for example, the "luminous" eyes of Princess Mar'ja. The repetition of a word in a sentence can produce a rhythmical effect. In such cases synonyms or closely related words are also used to avoid monotony in a passage. The parts of speech repeated most frequently are adjectives, nouns, and verbs. The most common pattern of repetition is triparticity, but there are cases where words are repeated only twice or as many as five or six times. 37, 38 The repetition of identical or semantically close words or word combinations, besides providing a feeling of rhythm (which can be easily perceived by following the signs of punctuation and, connected with it, pauses spaced at fairly regular intervals), serves also other
purposes: it strengthens the expression, unifies the image, and depicts it from as many sides as possible. It occurs in direct and indirect speech.\textsuperscript{39} In order to illustrate these phenomena I have to quote a rather lengthy paragraph dealing with the review of troops near Olmütz.

From early morning the smart clean troops were on the move, forming up on the field before the fortress. Now thousands of feet and bayonets moved and halted at the officers' command, turned with banners flying, formed up at intervals, and wheeled round other similar masses of infantry in different uniforms; now was heard the rhythmic beat of hoofs and the jingling of showy cavalry in the blue, red, and green braided uniforms, with smartly dressed bandsmen in front mounted on black, roan, or gray horses; then again, spreading out with the brazen clatter of the polished shining cannon that
quivered on the gun carriages and with the smell of linstocks came the artillery which crawled between the infantry and cavalry and took up its appointed position. Not only the generals in full parade uniforms, with their thin or thick waists drawn in to the utmost, their red necks squeezed into their stiff collars, and wearing scarves and all their decorations, not only the elegant, pomaded officers, but every soldier with his freshly washed and shaven face and his weapons clean and polished to the utmost, and every horse groomed till its coat shone like satin and every hair of its wetted mane lay smooth-felt that no small matter was happening, but an important and solemn affair.

Another language used in *War and Peace*, but not nearly as important as Russian, is French. Vinogradov called *War and Peace* a bilingual novel, but Christian minimizes the number of French words by putting it at two percent. The press reviewers did not like the presence of French in the novel, and Botkin was unhappy about it. Probably for these reasons in the 1873 edition the French passages disappeared almost completely together with many philosophical essays on history and war. Eventually both were reintroduced in later editions.

Why did Tolstoj put so much French in *War and Peace*? What is its function? The answer to these questions is not simple, and in answering them one has to take into account several factors. 1) The historical reality. Russian nobility at that time spoke French at their social gatherings and also at home. The influence of French culture was quite strong. Thus, in order not to jeopardize the historicity of his novel,
Tolstoj had to include the usage of the French language.

2) The presence of Frenchmen. There are in the novel real Frenchmen who at least now and then must speak French. (At times they speak Russian.)

3) Artistic considerations of the author. Čičerin and Gudzij are wrong in interpreting characters in the novel as good or bad by basing their judgment on a character's usage or non-usage of the French language. Not only do negative characters like Anna Serer or Anatol or Ippolit Kuragins use French, but also such positive characters as Pierre, Prince Andrej, Kutuzov and many others. Thus Tolstoj does use French with a very subtle effect, contrasting it to Russian not so much in terms of negative characters as such, but in terms of negative implications in what is being said. Usually contemporary Soviet critics try to prove that the Russians who use French (i.e., the nobility) in *War and Peace* are alien to the truly Russian milieu (The people). If such a dichotomy were strictly carried out, such positive characters as Prince Andrej, Pierre, and even Nataśa would end up in the anti-"people" camp.

Besides the French language there is German, which is used rather infrequently by a few characters. The German language is the language of the official documents and the remarks of Austrian generals about the events of 1805. It emphasizes the impression that the Russian army is in a foreign land and that allies think, understand events, and
feel entirely differently from the Russians. It increases
the impression of the lack of internal coordination in the
Russian army brought about by German generals.

Żeromski was very much interested in language. He was
a linguist, though self-taught, to be sure. His readings
in this area included An Outline of the Polish Language
by his teacher Antoni Gustaw Bem and also a translation from
German On the Knowledge of Language by an unknown author.
He also read a number of items of related material. Like
Tolstoj, the author of Ashes had a special and sustained
interest in dictionaries of his native language, and the
well-known Linde's dictionary was his constant companion.
As a student of the Polish idiom, he was aware of the influ-
ences of other languages on Polish and was also very inter-
ested in various Polish dialects, which he considered a re-
freshing factor in its literary form. Archaisms to him were
the words which had been cast away and forgotten but if rein-
troduced into Polish could replace barbarisms present in the
language. Żeromski considered neologisms at times a neces-
sity but never coined any himself. Instead he formed com-
posite words such as "cudogłos" ("wonder-voice"), "słowa-
całunki" ("words-kisses") and others. Through his phenom-
enal memory, unusual talent, and artistic intuition, Żeromski
refreshed and enriched the literary Polish language.

Żeromski worked hard on the linguistic side of the
novel. A few extant rough drafts (as is the case of Tolstoj)
testify to that. By studying the rough drafts and various editions of Ashes, one can trace the process of crystallization of artistic expression with respect to the choice of vocabulary, semantics, and syntax. To illustrate Żeromski's work I shall quote a passage which Pigoń reproduced in his article and which shows various stages of the author's artistic seeking of the best form. I have simplified Pigoń's elaborate system of signs indicating words which have been crossed off by ( ), and those which have been added by ( ).

Krwawy puklerz słońca zapadał się prędko za wydżetą, (wyniosłagu) i wzbuzzoną pręgę (daleko). (Tam daleko, tam nieskończoność, tam za oczami - to także ocean.) Olbrzymie granatowe lechy poradzone (falami) (+kolczastymi ścianami) stały się na całej długości, (ciagnęły wszerz). Znikła z nich barwa ciesząca oczy (i) a pozostawał już mrok nocy. Zamirało w niej barwa ciesząca oczy (i) a pozostawał już mrok nocy. Stamtąd gdzie tonęło słońce. (szedł po morzu) (płonęło jego krwawe) zorze, szedł po wierzchu morza bialawy półbkysk o metalicznej, ponurej, zimnej barwie cyny. Fale (pędzące) (wypływające) stamtąd nie miały w sobie cieniów i barw złamanych. Były jednolite i ciągłe jak (posępny) (jałowy) metal. (Piany burzyły się na nich) (sycząły w fali) (+piany złę, juchą gniewu) (+slinami spomiedzy kłów wody) (+mlaszczące). Narzucały się w sobie, jedne w drugie wchodziły (i pozerały się wzajem bez końca) (wzgórze i pagórki) (skiby i brózdy) wodne.

The translation of the passage above is given here.

The bloody buckler of the sun was sinking fast behind a swollen, (high) and rough streak (far). (There is far, there is endless, there is out of sight - and there is also the ocean). Huge navy blue fields ploughed (by waves) (jagged walls) stretched to full length, (extended in width). The color which
gladdened the eyes disappeared from them (and) but there remained with the waves only darkness of the night. From over there where the sun was sinking, the whitish half-shine of the metallic, gloomy, cold color of tin (walked over the sea) (+ (and aglow were its bloody)+) stars, walked over (m) the top of the sea. The waves (rushing) (rising) from there did not have in them shadows and broken colors. They were even and heavy like a (dismal) metal. (The froth billowed at them) (hissed in the waves) (+ (evil froth, evil gore)+) (with saliva from between the water's fangs) (slurping). They threw themselves at each other, penetrating each other (and devouring each other endlessly) (+ (hills and hillocks) watery (+ (ridges and furrows))).

The example quoted by Pigoń is based on the very first edition of Ashes (Pigoń considers three editions of the novel as being the basis of the canonical text: 1902-1903 serial publication in Tygodnik Ilustrowany (The Illustrated Weekly), and two book editions, 1904 and 1906). The nature of changes in this passage indicates the author's striving for exactness of expression, which one sees, for example, in the third sentence where he crosses out "by waves" and adds in its place "by jagged walls." Another trend in Żeromski's reworking of the text is an enrichment of the imagery. For example, in the fifth sentence the author adds to the image of stars in making them "bloody" and "aglow." Thus the precision of image and its richness and uniqueness were of great concern to the author of Ashes. His concern for the artistic side of the novel is manifested further by the numerous changes made after the first publication. One sees
this in the following presentation where the variants of the two versions of the paragraph quoted before are listed side by side. First, however, we give the complete text of the second version.

Krwawy puklerz słońca zapadał prędko za wzdługą i wyniosłą przęgę. Tam daleko, tam nieskończoność, tam za oczyma - to także ocean... Olbrzymie grani-towe lechy, poradlone szarymi skibami, słały się na całej długości, ciągnęły się wszerz. Znikała szybko barwa ciesząca oczy i pozostawał z falami jednolity zwiatun nocy. Stamtąd, gdzie tonęło słońce i płonęły jeszcze jego krwawe zorze, szedł po wierzchu zebrania wód białawy pośród ometalicznej, bez lśniąca, zimnej i odpychającej barwie cyny. Fale, wynurzające się stamtąd, nie miały już cieniów i barw w sobie złamanych. Były ciężkie i jednostajne, niby z jałowego metalu. Nurzały się w sobie coraz szybciej te skiby i bruzdy wodne, jedną w drugą wchodziły i pożerały się wzajem, bez końca.

* The buckler of the sun was sinking fast behind a bulged and high streak. There is far, there is endless, there is out of sight - and there is also the ocean. Huge navy blue fields ploughed by grey ridges, stretched to full length, extended in width. The color which gladdened the eyes was disappearing fast and there remained with the waves uniform harbinger of night. From over there where the sun was sinking and were still aglow its bloody stars, the whitish half-shine of the metallic, lusterless, cold, and forbidding color of tin walked over the expanse of water. The waves emerging from there did not have in them shadows and broken colors. They were heavy and even, as if from a barren metal. These watery ridges and furrows dove at each other faster and faster, penetrated and devoured each other endlessly.  

(Because of a lack of space the listing of the two versions is given on the next page.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example Number</th>
<th>Sample of the Variants</th>
<th>1902 version</th>
<th>canonical version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>zapadał się</td>
<td>sinking (reflexive)</td>
<td>zapadał</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>wydęta</td>
<td>swollen</td>
<td>wzdęta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>wzburzona</td>
<td>rough</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>oczami</td>
<td>eyes (Prep. case, archaic)</td>
<td>oczyma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>kolczastem ścianami</td>
<td>(by) jagged walls</td>
<td>szarymi skibami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>znikła</td>
<td>disappeared (pf. asp.)</td>
<td>znikła</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>z nich</td>
<td>from them</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>jeno</td>
<td>only</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>mrok nocy</td>
<td>darkness of the night</td>
<td>jednolity zwiastum uniform harbinger nocy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>jeszcze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>morza</td>
<td>the sea (Gen. case)</td>
<td>zebrania wód</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>ponurej</td>
<td>gloomy</td>
<td>bez lśniения</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>odpuchającej</td>
<td>forzidding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>wypływające</td>
<td>rising</td>
<td>wynurzające się</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>już</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>jednolite i ciężkie</td>
<td>even and heavy</td>
<td>ciężkie i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>jednostajne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>jak</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>niby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Syczały w fali</td>
<td>Missed in the waves</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>piany zže, jucha</td>
<td>evil froth, evil gore</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gniewu ślinami</td>
<td>with saliva from be-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spośmiedzy kłów wody</td>
<td>tween the water's fangs</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>narzucali się</td>
<td>threw themselves</td>
<td>nurzały się</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>coraz szybciej, faster and faster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>te [skiby i brózdy these [watery wodne]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beside the grammatical and semantic changes there are also changes in syntax, i.e., involving the word order and structure of sentences. Some sentences as in the example nr. 20 are completely omitted.

To characterize Żeromski's language concisely, yet effectively, one has to borrow such terminology by Adamczewski as: 1) the complete feeling, lack of gradation but immediate fortissimo in expression; 2) extremism of expression. Here are some examples: Ad 1.) "Rafał ze wściekłością cisnął strzelbę w zarośla, a sam runął na ziemię dusząc się od łkania" ("Raphael fell into a rage, cast his gun into the thickets, threw himself on the ground, and choked with sobs."). Blood always "kipi" ("boils"), "wrze" ("seethes"); a question "wytryskuje w umysle" ("bursts out in the mind"). Ad 2.) These examples illustrate extremism of expression where a description of an object or experience is very strong:

Serce szalonymi ciosy, serce-młot bije raz wraz w głębie miękких, klekocących fal! Płuca zrywają się, siepią i mocują w nadmiernym trudzie.

The heart pounding with frenzied blows, the hammer-like-heart pounds again and again in the depth of soft, chattering waves. The lungs start up, show fight, and struggle in an excessive labor.

Or:

Helena rękoma objąży kolana wpatrywa się w bure, gorące chmury, które pędem wylatywały z kamiennych dolin w szalejące lasy, i śpiewała pieśń złożoną z dziwnych słów.
Her arms about her knees, Helen looked into the hot, yellow-gray clouds as they rushed out of the stony rifts to enter the frenzied forest, and sang a song made of strange words.51

Żeromski used Polish in a correct way (grammatically and syntactically). Miriam-Przesmycki in his review of Ashes52 says that Żeromski "ujarzmil smoka SŁOWA, który słucha wszystkich jego rozkazów." ("has enslaved the WORD dragon, who obeys all his orders.") And yet just as Tolstoj, Żeromski too has "undigested" passages taken sometimes almost verbatim from the historical sources he was using. Usually these passages deal with the reporting of historical events, as, for example, the Polish campaign in Prussian-occupied Poland where the artistic description is replaced by a dry chronicle style. The narrative of Ojrzyński or siege of Mantua are also based on memoirs of the actual participants, but they are retouched linguistically and thus have lost somewhat the detailed and at times boring flavor of the reporting style. The reason for Żeromski's adherence to exactness of historical detail was the influence of naturalism. But this cult of details could only bring about boring results and, except for being a historical document of the period in question, had no artistic value. There is still another reason for this slipshod treatment of historical material which Żeromski himself admits. A reason which was unfortunately beyond the author's control and for which he can hardly be blamed. In 1904 Żeromski in his letter to Miriam says:
I had to finish my work sketchily not as I wanted to. The final passages I wrote after a hemorrhage, lying on my back, immobilized. Therefore these passages have the value of tubercular spittle.

Żeromski uses widely varying dialecticisms in order to re-create the characters as realistically and true-to-life as possible. Żeromski's description of the hut where wounded Rafał has been brought in is one example of use of dialecticisms:

It seemed as though this lowly hut had been dropped on a wind-swept waste where, rushing from the four corners of earth, snow-storms, blizzards, squalls, and tempests meet.

Another is the scene of Gajkoś carrying wounded Cedro:

"They've killed him!" he howls to all the squadron. "They've killed our gentleman! Here's your damned victory for you! Here's victory for you! Hell blast it all...."

Also the whole story of Mocarny is told in the Górale dialect.

To this group may also be included composita of żeromski and the literarily reshaped dialecticisms forming new
words. Żeromski used them frequently in lyrical nature descriptions. We see, for example, "łąka-kochanka" ("the love-mate meadow"), "paprotki zielonowłose" ("Green-haired marsh ferns"), "granitowa skalina Tatry" ("the granite rocks of Tatry"), "księżyc-wietek" ("the crescent moon"), "najniklejsza pajęczyna" ("the frailest cobweb"), "podmuch-moc" ("the wind-crash"), "powiew-wódz" ("the wind-breath leader"), "olbrzym-swierk" ("the giant fir"), "sekretne rozpadliny dusz" ("secret crannies of souls"), "złoto-biała jego głowa" ("its golden-white head"), "śnić-myśleć" ("to dream-to think").

It is quite obvious that not all composita of Żeromski can be rendered effectively in English. This technique was used by a British poet Gerald Manley Hopkins (1844-1889).

Żeromski also uses very frequently old Polish forms of address of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, such as: "mości książę," "mości kapitanie," "waćpan," "waszmość," "asan." They are impossible to translate into English. Clearly typical of the period described in the novel they enhance its historicity and linguistic realism.

Similar to Tolstoj's is Żeromski's technique of repetition and the accumulation of various parts of speech, especially adjectives. This technique is usually applied in descriptions of nature or spiritual experiences of heroes. Sometimes it is present in dialogues. The device of repetition brings about a rhythmical effect. This rhythm in turn
welds the sentence into one whole syntactical unit which has a common tone of feeling. It corresponds to elation of feeling. An example of such a rhythmical passage in Ashes is the prayer of Sokolnicki before the battle of Raszyn:

(I)  
Ale, o Boże mój upokórz serce...
Daj mi w tym dniu rozkaz poczęty w mądrości,
żebym jego szańcem zasłonił bracią.
Daj mi radę w najgorszej chwili.
Daj mi mądrość ostatniej godziny,
kiedy popłoch pozęta żołnierzy jak zgrałę dzieci.
Odwróć ode mnie śmierć...
Zmiłuj się, Panie!

(II)  
Któryś mię wywiodł
spod Offenbach i Bergen,
spod gradu kul pod Hohenlinden,
spod paszcz u Salzburga,
spomiędzy bagnetów nad Innem, nad Aachem,
ktożyś mię ratował
pod Stolpą, pod Heyburz, w dziele frydlandzkim...
Ty, coś mię krzepiż w przejściu alpejskim,
kiedy odeszli wszyscy okrom Fiszerka,
kiedy tysiąc wiernych żołnierzy szło bez butów,
da tymięce na polę bośo,
połowę legii nie miała koszul, a
da tymięce były bez ubrania.

(III)  
Dales mi łaskę walki na tych żagonach...
Zachowaj ramię me, wspomóż serce!
Ale, o Wszechmogący, jeśli Twa wola...
Daj mi śmierć Żółkiewskiego...
Który wyżysz duszę moją w tej minucie aż do samego dna...

(I)  
"But, O Heavenly Father, humble my heart....
"Give me this day the word of command begotten of wisdom,
with whose bulwark I may shield my brethren.
Give me Thy counsel in the moment of direst need.
Give me courage in the final hour when panic scatters soldiers as it might scatter children.

"Save me from death...
Have mercy on me, O Father!

(II)  
"Thou who didst bring me safe
from Offenbach and Bergen,
from beneath the hail-storm of fire at Hohenlinden,
from before the mouths of cannon at Salzburg, from the midst of bayonets on the Inn, at Aachen...

Who didst shield me
at Stolp, at Hayburz, at Friedland...
"O Father, who didst strengthen me in my crossing of the Alps,
when I alone was staunch and resolute,
when all, save Fiszer have left me,
when a thousand of my loyal soldiers marched without boots,
two thousand were half barefoot,
when half the legion was without shirts and two thousand were without clothing....

(III)
"Thou givest me the grace of battle on these fields....
"Protect my arm, strengthen my heart!...."
But, O Allmighty, if it is Thy will....
Give me the death of Żółkiewski....
Thou, who sees my soul at this very minute all the way through...."

This passage consists of three parts: 1) **invocatio** - an invocation; a request for help at the beginning of the prayer; 2) **laudatio** - a praise full of gratitude for help rendered in the past; 3) **supplicatio** - a final petition for help, connected with **invocatio**. The anaphora present in each part through syntactic parallelism provides the above parts of Sokolnicki's prayer with effective poetic rhythm.

An example of the accumulation of adjectives is the following:

Schylał się ku kwiatom jeszcze w wilgoci pogrążonym. Wszystkie były świeże, soczyste, szczęśliwe...Szukał na nich sładów krwi sercem zatwardniałym, okrątbnym, pełnym zbojeckiego męstwa, patrzył znieczulonymi oczyma.

He bent toward the ground, toward the flowers still steeped in dew. All were fresh,
moist, happy.... He sought traces of blood upon them with a hardened, unfeeling heart, heart full of brigand courage; he looked with insensitive eyes.

Zeromski does not use a foreign language in his novel as Tolstoj does French. There are a few odd French and German words scattered all in the novel, but they do not merit any special treatment.

The language of both novels covers a wide range of expressions, from stark realism to tender lyricism. Concern for language manifests itself in both writers by their variety of expression. One finds language of historical sources, colloquial language (as used by the nobility and the vulgus), and poetic language. One also sees continuous changes in the different drafts of the novels which testify to the authors' concern for language. There are some distinct differences between the language of the two writers. Zeromski is more formal and more elegant than Tolstoj, who initially gives the reader a certain impression of grammatical and syntactical clumsiness, but ultimately he is very effective. Zeromski's language is more rhythmical than Tolstoj's. Some of his passages could be, with slight adaptations, rewritten as poetry. Tolstoj uses foreign languages, especially French, for a rather complex and diverse purpose. This feature is completely absent in the author of Ashes. Both are concerned linguists, for Zeromski had firm views on the role of dialects in literary Polish and Tolstoj did a great deal of work on
Russian, especially the peasant idiom. Both writers thoughtfully fashioned the linguistic aspect of their novels in order to obtain the best possible result.

**Endings**

What interests us in this subchapter is how the two novels end. This would seem to imply only a narrative interest in both works, which no doubt is of great importance. But besides the importance of the narration there is also the importance of the characters in *War and Peace* and *Ashes*. What happens to all those actors that appear in the last act of these great plays? How do they compare with the characters we originally met at the beginning of each novel some fifteen years earlier? And finally there is a technical question involved. Why have the novels ended the way they did? What were the reasons behind the endings?

The fictional part of *War and Peace* ends with the first epilogue. The author pinpoints the date exactly: December 5, 1820, the name day of Nikolaj Rostov. (Tolstoj indicated the beginning of his novel almost as precisely: June, 1805.) I have stated that it is the fictional part of the novel that ends in the first epilogue. The philosophical part goes on for another forty-six pages in the second epilogue which is full of rassuždenija (discussions) and opredelenija (definitions) of a philosophical nature. We are concerned here only
with the narrative part. The narration stops in the first epilogue, but we feel there are all the necessary ingredients present to continue it if the author had decided to do so. (We will mention this in more detail during the discussion of the technical aspect of the ending.) The epilogue is the summary of the lives of the remaining main characters. It shows suddenly how they have changed physically and spiritually from the time we first met them. This suddenness is caused by Tolstoj's opening sentence of the epilogue: *Prošlo sem' let posle 12-go goda.* (Seven years had passed since 1812). The amount of time that had elapsed is equivalent to the elapsed time in his first fifteen books: 1805-1812. Some of the main characters have died, including Prince Andrej, but most of them have undergone considerable changes: Nikolaj Rostov has evolved from a frightened young hussar at Schöngraben, naively silly in his admiration and devotion to tsar Alexander I, into a mature but still intellectually limited family man in his thirties. Former Princess Mar'ja (now Countess by virtue of her marriage to Nikolaj) also moved up to the ranks of main characters. Only Nataša and Pierre are the original main characters. Pierre takes on himself the part of late Prince Andrej. He talks about the despotism of Arakčeev with Nikolaj, but it was Prince Andrej who had a taste of it during his brief audience with the Minister of War in 1809. It is not only in this respect that Pierre assumes Prince Andrej's function in the
novel. Young Nikolen'ka, Prince Andrej's son, feels a spiritual attraction toward Pierre and looks up to him for guidance and approval as he probably would have done to his own father. Pierre is still a good-natured and good-hearted man as he was in the opening scenes of the novel. Intellectually he seems to have found what he was seeking and is not in the same state of constant spiritual turmoil as before. He is more settled.

Nataša [...] popolnela i poširela [...] ([...] had grown stouter and broader [...]61 (as probably did all the other characters) and from a gay and mischievous young girl had grown into a typical mother-hen. The new status and the new duties have left very little of the old Nataša. Her brother Nikolaj became a staunch supporter of the regime and the reactionary policies of Arakceev. He is unable to think and reason for himself and admits it:

Dokazat' ja tebe ne mogu. Ty govoriš', čto u nas vse skverno i čto budet perevorot; ja etogo ne vižu; [...] kakoe by ono pravitel'stvo ni bylo, ja znaju čto moj dolg povinovat'sja emu.

I can't prove it to you. You say that everything here is rotten and that an overthrow is coming: I don't see it....--be it what may--I know it is my duty to obey the government.62

Countess Mar'ja has changed least of all. Her angelic goodness and understanding smooth many rough spots in her marriage with Nikolaj. Thus, the first epilogue is the summary of the fates of the main characters and problems with which they were involved at that particular "cut-off" date. But the novel does not end with the summary of the fates of the main characters. It signals the role of the children. The fifteen-
year-old Nikolen'ka is beginning to look like his father both physically and intellectually. And there is also Pierre's three-year-old daughter Nataša who already at this early age is beginning to show the qualities we remember in her mother: gaity, mischievousness, and femininity.

"You can see the woman in her already," she Countess Mar'ja said in French, pointing to little Nataša.63

Therefore the two young children may certainly be considered the harbingers of the beginning of the new and yet eternally same cycle of life. This brings us to the technical aspect of the ending of War and Peace.

At the beginning we were introduced to some young heroes; we witness their development and maturing all the way through the novel only to see the cycle starting all over again. It is from this continuity of the great flow of life that we perceive the novel as a personal experience: constantly flowing and never ending. The image of the old oak tree bare at first and soon after in leaf conveys dramatically the continuity of the life cycle in nature. It is because of this unconventional character of the novel that War and Peace does not have a conventional or absolute ending.

Ashes ends with the last two chapters: "Home" and "The Word of Honor." Roughly they correspond to the first epilogue
of Tolstoj's novel: the narrative picks up after a break of three years when the two main characters Rafał and Krzysztof appear once again. As in War and Peace we know exactly the time and place of the last act: the middle of August, 1812, near Orsza. The narrative in Ashes does not come to a really convenient stopping point as in War and Peace. It is arbitrarily (and rather jarringly) cut off by the author on the eve of the great historical events of 1812 and the years which followed. In order to properly understand the reasons behind the timing of both endings, one must recollect the original motivations which prompted both authors to write their respective novels. In the case of Tolstoj it was the desire to present the events of 1805-1812 in what was (according to Tolstoj) objective historical light. This eventually became an anti-Napoleonic and pro-Russian work. Żeromski, on the other hand, wanted to produce a novel based on the historical past, which would boost the nation's morale and help it face the future with more confidence. Therefore with the presentation of the successful conclusion of the 1812 war, Tolstoj was free to end his novel at any time he considered reasonable. He decided on seven more years which were added in the epilogue. One feels a sense of hurry in the way Tolstoj opens the epilogue, and how he rapidly relates the events of seven years which have passed since 1812. It seems as if Tolstoj realized how long he had been at the novel and decided it was high time to end it.
Żeromski, on the other hand, had to end it at Orsza at the beginning of the Napoleonic campaign against Russia. It was, historically speaking, a very opportune moment for the Poles: Austria and Prussia defeated and now in the Napoleonic camp participating in the campaign against the last undefeated partitioner of Poland, Russia. Had he continued the novel, Żeromski would have had to show Napoleon's defeat and with it the crash of all the Polish hopes and dreams connected with him. The ending of Ashes is in perfect agreement with the original purpose of the novel, just as the ending of War and Peace is in perfect agreement with the aims of Tolstoj.

Since the nature of Ashes's ending is different, the details in it are also different. Rafal and Krzysztof are now mature young men but without the atmosphere of accomplishment which we see in Nikolaj Rostov and Pierre. Because the time elapsed from our last meeting with them is relatively short (three years), the changes in them are almost unnoticeable. Basically, they are still soldiers very much involved in politics and with the feeling of "unfinished business," Cedro more than Rafal, to be sure. There are only two of the main heroes left, for Prince Gintult, just like Prince Andrej in War and Peace, died in old Olbromski's home of wounds sustained during the siege of Sandomierz. In spite of his death, nobody assumes his role, that of a thinker and seeker, as does Pierre in War and Peace with respect to Prince Andrej. In Ashes there is also no continuity of the life cycle, which
is hinted at in War and Peace by the presence of children—Nikolen'ka and the little Nataša. Rafał and Krzysztof are still the continuants of the life cycle of their parents. Żeromski later wrote other works in which this continuity, with respect to Olbromski and Cedro, exists: the play Turon (1923) shows their death during the upheavals of 1846; Rafał's son Hubert dies in Faithful River (1912) during the uprising of 1863.

The presence of the figure of Napoleon in the very last chapter must be mentioned and commented upon. Żeromski's attitude to and evaluation of Napoleon with respect to Poland was realistic. Nevertheless, in the final chapter he presents Napoleon in a sympathetic light as seen by a faithful and trusting, though inexperienced and naive, Cedro. And perhaps in this ending is an additional message to the Poles: to rely completely on an ally, no matter how powerful, may prove disastrous. The safest ally is one's own strength.

In summary we may point out the following characteristics of the endings of the two novels. The stories are concluded after a considerable break in time (seven years in the case of War and Peace and three years in the case of Ashes.) The endings are also clearly dated in both cases, but the choice of time is determined by the authors' aims in writing their novels, and as such they are to a great degree dependent on past historical events. The continuity of the life cycle is clearly implied in Tolstoj's novel. It is not present in
Ashes, although it exists in two of the later works of Żeromski. Both authors also had personal factors which might have influenced the quality of the endings of their works: Tolstoj rushed to end War and Peace, which was beginning to drag on too long, and Żeromski rushed also for he was sick with tuberculosis.

Each subchapter was followed by a brief summary of the subject matter discussed in it. As the result of it, we can now conclude the following: most of the similarities between the two writers occur in their handling of battle scenes, in their treatment of the language, and in the conclusions of their respective novels. Most of the dissimilarities between Tolstoj and Żeromski exist in the area of characterization.

However, very frequently the similarities are only general (on the issues or the subject matter) and the differences become apparent in the actual treatment or approach. For example, both writers condemn war, but they express their disapproval of it in different ways; Tolstoj's and Żeromski's care for the idiom of their works produces the same extremely effective results, but both novelists achieve them in a rather dissimilar manner; the endings of War and Peace and Ashes have a comparable time element, but the authors' reasons for it and its implications vary considerably.
The problem of characterization in both novels shows a lack of similarity, except for the dichotomy of characters into historical and fictitious. For example, the manner of introduction of characters, their biographical connections to the author, the role and usage of detail, characters as emanations of the author— all these are different in both works.
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CHAPTER VII

MAN AND HIS WORLD IN WAR AND PEACE AND ASHES

Families

At times War and Peace is referred to as a family chronicle. Tolstoj in his article Some Words about War and Peace\(^1\) denies the chronical character of his novel:

Что такое Война и Мир? Это не роман, еще менее поэма, еще менее историческая хроника.

What is War and Peace? It is not a novel, even less is it a poem, and still less and historical chronicle.\(^2\)

And quite rightly so. A chronicle of any kind, historical or familial, is a record of events without an attempt to fathom their philosophical essence, a characteristic so typical of War and Peace. Still, the three families of Bolkonskijs, Rostovs, and Bezuxovs constitute a vital ingredient of the novel and must be examined. They may be viewed as typical representatives of the Russian upper classes in the early nineteenth century: Bolkonskijs are the representatives of the aristocracy. The old Prince belongs to the generation of Catherine II, while his son Andrej, though very much retaining the aristocratic characteristics of his father, is more progressive in his thinking and attitudes. The Rostovs represent the Russian nobility of the early nineteenth
century. Both father and son are rather average intellectually and therefore quite inferior to the Bolkonskijs. As far as the views of old count Rostov and his son are concerned, there is not a polarization but rather a hardening of them. The Bezuxovs are represented throughout the novel by Pierre, for the old count dies in the opening chapters of the book, leaving his illegitimate son as the sole male heir. Pierre's character is influenced neither by his aristocratic status nor by his socially doubtful origin. It is the result of his moral development originating in his own soul.

Quite frequently the question is asked as to who is the main hero of War and Peace, and equally frequently the answer is given that this novel has no one main hero but rather several main characters. Since the main characters come from the three representative families and as such represent narod (the people) as it will be demonstrated, it would be reasonable to agree that the people are the hero. I would prefer to say that in War and Peace we have a collective hero. This collective hero (the people) is inevitably identified by contemporary Soviet critics with prostoj narod (the vulgus, the simple people, peasantry) crediting it with winning the war and being superior to the nobility. Some concessions are given to the main characters by ascribing to them narodnost' (national character, national roots), the quality of the narod, but by and large the masses of the ordinary peasants are considered to be this elusive "hero." In true Tolstojan manner
one must attempt to find the truth. Let us examine and compare these "supposed heroes." It is true that War and Peace is inhabited by a huge number of characters, many of them nameless, and they are of the prostoj narod type. The soldiers and the peasants appearing on the pages of the novel during war and peace are the common people. To be sure, their contribution to the war, however great and important, is of the passive nature. They, the prostoj narod, do not lead but are led by the aristocracy and the nobility. The success of the war was the result of the leadership provided by the upper classes and the carrying out of their plans and orders by the prostoj narod. The closer the rapport between the two strata, the better were the results. But the part of the prostoj narod in the novel hardly qualifies them for the "main hero" status. It is necessary to emphasize that we consider the upper classes part of the narod, and within this concept we also include the lower classes (predominantly peasants) whom we call the prostoj narod. On the philosophical-ideological level, as well as on the structural level, the hero of the novel is narod, and more specifically its upper strata, the aristocracy and the nobility. The role of the prostoj narod is, however, secondary. Contemporary Russian critics go to great lengths trying to prove the national character and Russian roots of the main heroes in an attempt to identify them with the prostoj narod. The factor which determines the
difference (or similarity) is in this case the level of intellect of the particular group of people. Traditions, social status, and wealth are also important. In the case of the three families and the common people, this difference is insurmountable and ever-present. The issues the members of the three families face, ponder over, and deal with and solve are incomprehensible to the common people, Platon Karataev included.

The roots and the national character of the three families are unquestionably Russian. It is shown by Tolstoj on many different occasions: Nikolaj feels love and admiration for the tsar as any peasant does to car'-batjuška (the tsar-father); Nataša dances Russian folk dances instinctively without ever being instructed in them; Prince Andrej is genuinely concerned about peasants, in his aristocratic way, to be sure; Princess Mar'ja is involved with bož'i ljudi ("God's folk"); and Pierre too is concerned about the welfare of his peasants. Thus it is not the common people but the three families of Bezuxovs, Bolkonskijs, and Rostovs that comprise this collective hero of War and Peace. They are in fact the representatives of the narod. The reason for Tolstoj's choice to make members of the nobility representatives of the Russian people was two-fold: 1) The real leaders of the Russian people in the time in question were still to be found only among the higher classes (Speranskij was an exception rather than the
rule). The role of the common people was not of any great importance until after the Napoleonic campaign when the troops returned home from Western Europe. The first results were visible in December 1825. And even then the Decembrists were mainly noblemen. Therefore Tolstoj's presentation of the leading echelon of Russian society of that time was historically true. 2) The equally important reason was Tolstoj's Weltanschauung during the writing of War and Peace. In spite of Soviet critics' wishful thinking the fact remains he was at the time still a dvorjanskij pisatel' (writer of the nobility) and as such stressed the role of the nobility in shaping Russia's future. One might speculate whether the "germs" of his conversion were already at work, judging from his occasionally sympathetic treatment of peasants. To say this with certainty, however, is impossible.

The three families, Gintults, Cedros and Olbromskis form in Ashes the main body of characters similar to that in War and Peace. One, however, cannot draw a very close parallel between the individual families in both novels. The Gintults are aristocrats equal to the Bolkonskij family; they even have the same title, that of princes. The Cedros in their status (counts) and wealth call to mind the Bezuxovs, and the Olbromskis resemble the Rostovs. But this is where the similarity ends. The members of the Polish families in Ashes do not bear even general characteristics resembling the families in War and Peace. For example, as a type Prince Gintult is closer
to Pierre than to Prince Andrej; Cedro is very much different from Pierre; and only Rafał has relatively more traits in common with Nikolaj Rostov. (For a more detailed discussion of this aspect see subchapter on p. 212). For this reason we might say that the families in both novels represent similar social classes in Russia and Poland and that from them originate the main dramatis personae. There exist similarities between several characters from the above mentioned families in both novels, but they cross the boundaries which I have originally created by equating Gintults with Bolkonskijs, Cedros with Bezuxovs, and Olbromskis with Rostovs. For example, old Olbromski resembles closely old Prince Bolkonskij in his personality and despotic treatment of children and members of the household. Old Cedro with his joviality and good nature brings to mind old Count Rostov. Thus there are the same ingredients (characteristics) but "mixed" in different manners, --distributed differently among the three families. The presence of parallelism in the character traits of personages of the two novels could indicate a certain degree of influence by Tolstoj on Żeromski.

These three families in each of the novels command our attention, but the role of the older generation in Ashes, represented by the Cedros and Olbromskis is of far lesser importance than that of old Prince Bolkonskij and old Count Rostov. They appear only episodically leaving the stage mostly to the younger generation of both families. Like Tolstoj, Żeromski
also concentrated primarily on the members of the upper classes to supply the main characters of the novel. But as in War and Peace the question of the main hero in Ashes must be answered by saying the hero is collective—it is the people. Besides the nobility represented by the three families, also represented is the class of peasants, sometimes in uniform, sometimes out of uniform. This class is clearly present and far more active and important than their counterpart in Tolstoj's novel. (For a more detailed discussion of peasants in both novels see subchapter on p. 198.) Thus this term of a collective hero (the people) has a much fuller meaning in Ashes than in War and Peace, both structurally and philosophically.

What is interesting about Tolstoj and Żeromski is the fact that both writers single out as representatives of their respective societies of the period the landed gentry and aristocracy and not the courtiers, governmental officials, or high ranking military men. It is obvious that both writers considered the landed gentry and aristocracy, in spite of the cultural influences of Western Europe on these classes, the closest to the real national substance, the people.

The reason for Żeromski's different treatment of peasants lies in the fact that Poland had more progressive legislation in the peasant-landlord sector than Russia. This was initiated in the Constitution of May 3, 1791. Kościuszko
carried out further improvement in the situation of Polish peasants.

Similarities between the families in both novels exist, but they are of a rather complex nature. There exist deep and substantial differences. The similarities are the social status and position in their respective societies. The differences stem from the different social and political problems facing the families in both novels.

Deaths

Deaths in the novels *War and Peace* and *Ashes* occur as a part of the process of life. The causes are either natural (as with old Count Bezuxov, Princess Liza, old Prince Bolkonskij, old Count Rostov, and Piotr Olbromski) or as a result of outside influences (as with Prince Andrej, Anatol' Kuragin, Elen, Vereščagin, Karataev, Petja, Helena, Wyganowski, Prince Gintužt, the little boy in Mantua, the nun in Saragossa, and many others). And, of course, there are a number of deaths on the battlefield depicted in both works. While Żeromski describes the battles and deaths occurring in them in naturalistic detail, Tolstoj avoids it (in the very same situations) by constantly shifting his attention from one point in the scene to another. The description of the dead soldiers is quiet, lacking the gory, naturalistic details of Żeromski. Here are two examples. First Żeromski:
Now, after letting out floods of coagulated blood, they were sleeping, pale and haggard, a frightful ecstasy in their drawn brows, in their open mouths, from which the cry of vengeance still seemed to come.... From the nostrils of the crushed nose of one of them so much blood had flown that a shell had formed of it on his lips and beard, for all the world like mask hanging from the thoughtful forehead, the tear-flooded eyes. Another's head was torn by a grenade, and his lips were twisted by such pain that the sight of them forced a groan from the bottom of the heart.

Tolstoj, description of Raevskij redoubt:

Pierre again went up onto the knoll where he had spent over an hour, and of that family circle which had received him as a member he did not find a single one. There were many dead whom he did not know, but some he recognized. The young officer still sat in the same way, bent double, in a pool of blood at the edge of the earth wall. The red-faced man was still twitching, but they did not carry him away.

From these different descriptions of the dead soldiers one can arrive at the treatment of death by both authors.

Tolstoj's characters die quietly, stoically. When a shell
hits their ranks, the dead and wounded are removed while the troops philosophically, with a weird humor, continue holding their positions. The horror of death seems to recede before such an attitude. Żeromski, on the other hand, seems to be obsessed with the naturalistic, macabre description of death and the dead.

Żeromski's inclination to naturalistic treatment of the text can be explained in terms of the Polish naturalism which grew in the last fifteen years of the nineteenth century. It was the time of Żeromski's literary growth. Although he was influenced by naturalism in the early stage, Żeromski was not a consistent naturalist. He was able to combine sharp naturalistic overtones with deep lyricism. Naturalism in Żeromski is especially visible in his obsession with details and dark, macabre motives. The first led to boring results, i.e., Żeromski's incorporation of some historical materials in Ashes for the sake of historical authenticity. We see it in the depictions of the fighting in Pomerania and also partially in Spain. They are taken verbatim from the sources Żeromski used. His stress on cruelty and horror in war was the result of naturalism's negative attitude to war. The presence of naturalistic elements in Ashes and their lesser appearance in Tolstoj's novel is the result of the difference of time between them, some thirty-five years. The influence of naturalism on Tolstoj manifests itself at the later time, for example in Power of Darkness written in 1886, the heyday
of naturalism. One interesting detail the defenders in both novels have in common is that both dress festively: Russian peasants put on clean, white shirts before the battle of Borodino; Spaniards have their heads bound with red kerchiefs in holiday fashion. Both are aware of their imminent death and prepare themselves for it.

There are two deaths which are treated more thoroughly and fully by the two authors and thus merit more attention: the death of Prince Andrej in War and Peace, and the death of Piotr Olbromski in Ashes.

Prince Andrej has a premonition of death, on the eve of the Borodino battle before he actually becomes seriously wounded, Tolstoj compares his mental state to that at Austerlitz, where he was also gravely wounded. His whole life flashes before him and the possibility of death becomes suddenly acutely real to him. When he actually faces it in the form of "a smoking black ball," he realizes how much he does love life and how much he does want to live. It is this proximity of death later in the operating tent that puts things in a sharp focus for him which he knew existed but was never fully aware of, as, for example, the religious attitude to life of his sister Princess Mar'ja. A few days before his actual death Prince Andrej has a very real vision of death entering his room, but he is no longer afraid of it as before. Suddenly he realizes that love is the basis of existence and that he is a part of universal love. And because love is God,
then by his dying he would be reunited with God and returned to the original source of love.

The death of Prince Andrej, when it finally came, had also an effect on his immediate environment. Besides the personal feeling of grief because of their loss, Princess Mar'ja and Nataša were also both aware that the last act of life's mystery, their beloved and brother's death, occurred in their presence. Thus death, an awesome mystery, affects not only the person directly involved but also the people who are emotionally connected with death's victim.

Piotr Olbromski did not have premonitions of death as did Prince Andrej. But there was an oppressive mood of suffering, which is conveyed by the seriously ill Piotr. We almost feel that his end is only a matter of time. One could probably argue from the medical point of view that his death was a direct result of the emotional upheaval he experienced after the argument with his friend Prince Gintult. But this is not important. What is important is the author's timing of Piotr's death: he dies after he has at least partially and symbolically achieved his life's ambition to free his peasants. Through his intervention Prince Gintult frees only one, Michcik. The scene of Piotr's death contains a great deal of concentrated tragic awe, especially in moments preceding his death during the argument of two former friends and comrades-in-arms, now divided by their aspirations and ideology.
Rafal, in his search of Piotr's belongings, comes across what appears to be a very intimate diary. What is of great interest to us is that in it Piotr expresses the same attitude toward and idea about love as does Prince Andrej.

Quotation from Ashes:

"Tyś wezwał chłopa z szeregu, który w popłochu uciekał, żeby się twarzą w twarz przeciwko idącej śmierci obrócić. Tyś włożył w jego piersi mięsto nadludzkie, na jego ręku udziwiałeś mię z ziemi.  
"Tyś to uczyniś, który jest Bóg, czyli Miłość. [...]  
"Niechaj się raz jeszcze rozraduje w miłości jednej, pospóźniej z Tobą, niech wyznam na Twoim krzywdę mą i niechaj zazna serce moje wiecznego spokoju na Twoim sercu, któryś jest Bóg, czyli Miłość...."

"Thou didst call from the ranks a peasant who was fleeing in dismay and bid him turn and face onrushing death. Thou didst put into his breast superhuman valor, upon his hands Thou didst lift me from the ground.  
"Thou didst this, who art God, or Love. [...]  
"That I may once more rejoice in a single love, the love which is Thine, that I may tell my grief upon Thy bosom, and that my heart may know eternal peace upon Thy heart, Thou who art God, of Love...."

Quotation from War and Peace:

"Ljubov'? Cto takoe ljubov'?" dumal on.  
"Ljubov' mešaet smerti. Ljubov' est' žizn'. Vse, vse, cto ja ponimaju, ja ponimaju tol'ko potomu, čto ljublju. Vse est', vse suščestvuet tol'ko potomu, čto ja ljublju. Vse svjazano odnoju eju. Ljubov' est' Bog, i umeret', znachit' mne, čaštice ljubvi, vernutsja k obščemu i večnomum istočniku." Mysli eti pokazalis' emu utešitel'ny.

"Love? What is love?" he thought.  
"Love hinders death. Love is life. All, everything that I understand, I understand only because I love. Everything is, everything exists, only because I love. Everything is united by it
alone. Love is God, and to die means that I, a particle of love, shall return to the general and eternal source.\textsuperscript{8}

Through this identical reasoning both men did overcome fear. To Piotr it was the fear of loneliness, helplessness, and death. To Prince Andrej it was the fear of leaving this world, which he loved so much.

The description of Piotr immediately after his passing is a very pathetic one: the dead man gazes over the fields and pond as if saying his last good-bye. Piotr's death influenced his former soldier Michcik more than it did his brother Rafał. Michcik had an emotional attachment to his former officer and at the same time realized precariousness of his situation as a peasant after his liberal master's death. Rafał was more concerned with the inheritance than anything else. The only emotion that the death of his brother evoked in him was that of fear of loneliness. After all, he had nowhere to go.

Tolstoj and Żeromski both differ in their description and treatment of death. Żeromski shows considerable influence of naturalism with its detailed description, while Tolstoj avoids them and provides a more balanced picture. Both writers treat death as an awe-inspiring mystery, the fear of which can be overcome by the notion that God is love, love is everything, and therefore death is reunification with God.
Peasants

Peasants and their problems are treated differently by both writers. Tolstoj ignores almost completely the difficult situation of peasants as a social class or shows it in a very mild manner, as, for example, the Bogučarovo incident. His article Some Words About "War and Peace" testifies to how determined Tolstoj was in his distortion of historical truth where he says:

Ja znaju, v čem sostoit tot xarakter vremeni, kotorogo ne na孝odjat v moem romane, --eto užasy krepostnogo prava [...] i etot xarakter togo vremeni, kotoryj živet v našem predstavlenii, --ja ne sčitaju vernym i ne želal vyravit'.

I know what "characteristics of the period" are that people do not find in my novel-the horrors of serfdom [...] but I do not think that these characteristics of the period as they exist in our imagination are correct, and I did not wish to reproduce them.9

It is obvious from this quote that Tolstoj arbitrarily decided which "characteristics of the period" were true and which were not. The historical evidence, however, is different. The eminent Russian historian Tarle states that:

[...] v 1812 g. proisxodil rjad krest'-.janskix volnenij protiv pomescikov, i volnenij mestami ser'eznyx, --eto my znaem dokumental'no.

In 1812 a series of peasant disorders took place against the landowners. These disorders were serious in places - this we know from documents.10

It is also a historical fact that when Napoleon's repeated attempts to obtain peace with Alexander failed, he was
seriously considering other acts against Russia, and a decree about freeing Russian serfs was one of them. Thus there must have been sufficient proof for the success of such venture for Napoleon to consider it. And this contradicts Tolstoj's opinion. Tolstoj shows only one small and insignificant incident of peasant unrest, which is quickly put down by Nikolaj Rostov practically single-handed. This scene is contradictory to Tolstoj's opinion, for it shows a flare-up of the young nobleman's anger, a nobleman who is a representative character. Such qualities of nobility at large could (and did) lead to more serious problems with the peasants.

Peasants appear in *War and Peace* episodically and generally without conflicts with the nobility. They are present in the soldier masses or, as Prince Andrej refers to them in the pond bathing scene, as "cannon fodder." Still this huge and apparently ineffective mass provides the two main heroes of the novel with moral strength at the time of their spiritual crises: Prince Andrej declines a position on Kutuzov's staff and wants to stay with the men of his regiment instead; Pierre, after his long search for truth and purpose in life, finds it in the prisoner of war camp with the help of a simple peasant, Platon Karataev. What did Karataev, the uneducated peasant, have to offer to a sophisticated aristocrat? Tolstoj provides the answer by describing him as

[...] nepostiznym, kruglym i vechnym olcetvoreniem duxa prostoty i pravdy [...]
an unfathomable, rounded, eternal personification of the spirit of simplicity and truth.\textsuperscript{12}

Thus Karataev is an embodiment of the spirit of simplicity and truth, humility and love. The love of Karataev is cosmic: it is for everything and everybody, and not for individual objects or people. Pierre was very much aware that time was the answer to his search, so simple and yet so effective:

\begin{quote}
[Pierre] чувствовал, что прежде разрушенный мир теперь с новою красотой, на каких-то новьих и незыблемых основах, двигался в его душе.
\end{quote}

Pierre felt that the world that had been shattered was once more stirring in his soul with a new beauty and on new and unshakable foundations.\textsuperscript{13}

In \textit{War and Peace} as well as in \textit{Ashes}, the peasant masses are in military uniform. But how different is their function? While in Tolstoj's novel they are fighting for the freedom of their country against the foreign invader, the Polish soldier fights also for a new and more just social system, a system reflected symbolically on their badges with the slogan: "Free men are brothers." The peasants in \textit{Ashes} are represented more frankly and without the distortion present in \textit{War and Peace}. While Tolstoj treats the peasants and their problems from the moral and philosophical point of view, \v{z}eromski views them as a social problem. He depicts them truthfully by showing the full range of ignorance and backwardness; but at the same time he shows the abuse of the peasants by the
nobility, which is one of the most important causes of the peasants' plight. It also has detrimental effect on Polish society as the whole. The unjust treatment of peasants by the landowners divides the Polish society into two hostile camps. Żeromski's characters Prince Gintułt and Piotr Olbromski discuss the unenviable situation of peasants just like Prince Andrej and Pierre do. But Żeromski in his novel does more. He, as Julian Krzyżanowski says, builds bridges which span the abyss of class strife. It is the brotherhood of arms in the spirit of the slogan "Free men are brothers." On both sides we have a proper understanding of social justice: Piotr, a former officer from before the partitions, dreams of freeing all his peasants. He begs Prince Gintułt for the freedom of one of the peasants who fought under him and saved his life. Also Rafał has a subconscious compassion for the peasants: while recuperating in a peasant hut from the wounds inflicted by a wolf, Rafał hears the tragic story of Dyląg and begins to cry. Michcik and Gajkoś are the two peasants in Ashes who value their freedom and attach great importance to human dignity. They do not hesitate to stand up for it. And so when flogged by the Austrian soldiers at the request of a Polish landlord for inciting unrest among the rest of the peasants, Michcik continuously stresses his status as a free man who served under the Polish leader Kościuszko. His stuttering served a dual purpose:
Zeromski was able to disguise the name of an anti-Russian Polish insurgent leader and at the same time added pathos to the flogging scene:

— Pod Na... pod Na... służyłem... psiekrwie... Miemcel!... Szanuj mię psie! Żołnierza! W bitwach, w bitwach-em beł, psiekrwie! W ośni! Pod Kozubowem...[...]

— Szanuj mię, psie, człowieka wolnego!

"Under Na— under Na— I served, you dogs.— Germans!— Respect me, dog! A soldier! I've been in battles, in battles, you dogs! Eight of them! At Kozubov...[...]

"Respect me, dog, a free man!"15

Kościuszko's name is not mentioned explicitly, but I interpret Na... as Naczelnik (leader) as the title given to Kościuszko at the time.

Gajkoś, an old sergeant, believes almost religiously in the national and social justice of the cause he is fighting for:

Tacy, co już padli w krwawym boju twarzą na ziemię, a teraz w obcych ziemach bez krzyża-pamięci i bez imienia leżą. Aboby to mogło tak być, żeby w tym żadnej sprawiedliwości nie było? Po obcych piachach one trupy rozwleczone na darmo? Abo my to nie przyśli do swych strzech, w te lasy, gdzie ino trza? Z końca świata my przysili, bo słowem wodzowym przysiągł. Obejdziemy ziemie het --precz, porządek zrobmy i dopiero do ziemie, ale już wtedy ostatni raz na dobre. Tak starzy powiadalni...

Men who by this time have fallen face downward in bloody battle and are now lying in foreign countries without a cross — without rememberance and name. For could it all have come to pass as if there was no justice in it? Could those dead have been scattered over foreign sands for naught? And didn't we come back to our homesteads, to these woods, wherever we were needed? We came from the end of
the world, for he had given us his commander's word on it. We'll go once more into the far ends of earth, set it all to rights, and then back to our own parts once more -- only then for the last time, for good. That's what our elders used to say....

Both peasants retain their loyalty to their superiors, who are of noble origin: Michcik saves Piotr and later in Sandomierz also Prince Gintułt; Gajkoś rescues Cedro in Spain from certain death. They hold no grudge against them, proving in this way the nobility of their spirit.

The different treatment of peasants by the two writers may be traced to their ideology. Tolstoj was an aristocrat and at that time represented a very conservative point of view, while Żeromski, conscious of the role the peasants had to play in the struggle for Poland's freedom could be effective, had a more realistic and sympathetic attitude toward peasants and their problems. Both writers tried to present the rationale of their nations as they themselves saw it. Thus the view is obviously subjective.

**Women**

While the male characters for most part dominate the center of the stage of both novels, the role of women in *War and Peace* and *Ashes* is also of great importance, and cannot be ignored.

Nataša, Princess Mar'ja, and Elen are the three women who rank equally in importance with the men. Nataša is the
one most involved with other characters. From her teens into maturity, she had a whole series of involvements with various male characters: Boris Drubeckoj, Denisov, Prince Andrej, Anatol' Kuragin, and Pierre. Some of them were of a fleeting and non-serious nature, as for example, Boris or Denisov, while the others left a very deep imprint on her sensitive nature, as Prince Andrej and the brief but dangerous encounter with Anatol', the "affair" with Pierre eventually ended in marriage. Nataša also influenced strongly the character with whom she was involved. This is especially true of Prince Andrej, who becomes a quite different and new man, and Pierre. Pierre always liked Nataša but never openly admitted it until his return to Moscow after the French retreat, when he confided in Princess Mar'ja. When Prince Andrej told Pierre of his love for Nataša and the happiness it brought to him, Pierre calls Nataša "such a treasure," "a rare girl," terms which indicate the feeling he had for her. In Nataša's presence he always blushed and felt ill-at-ease because of the feeling of love for her which he could not express, but felt very deeply.

But Nataša did not just affect her immediate male counterparts. Through her vivaciousness and personal magnetism she radiated joy and happiness in the environment she happened to be: at her uncle's after the hunt, the Christmas festivities in Otradnoe, looking after the wounded
Prince Andrej, or consoling her heartbroken mother after the death of Petja. Nataša was Tolstoj's darling and perhaps her prototype, Tanja Behrs, the author's sister-in-law, also had a certain influence on him. This is what Tolstoj's son I.L. Tolstoj said about her:

"Bolee plenitel'noj ženščiny, čem tetja Tanja, ja ne znal. Ona nikogda ne byla krasiva v obyknovennom smysle etogo slova. U nee byl sliškom bol'soj rot, nemnogo sliškom ubegajuščij podbordon dok i ele-ele zametnaja nepravilnost' glaz, no vse eto tol'ko sil'nee podčerkivalo ee neobyknovennuju ženstvennost' i privlekatel'nost'.

[...] Pozdnee, uže vzroslym čelovekom, ja často zadaval sebe vopros: byl li papa vljublen v tetju Tanju? I ja dumaju teper', čto da.

[...] Čitaja "Vojnu i Mir" ja ee vižu i s sestrami, i na oxote, i ja slyšu ee penie pod djadjuškinu gitaru, da eto ona --tetja Tanja, i ona delaet vse, kak delala by tetja Tanja. I ja sprašivaju sebja: mog li xudožnik sozdat' takoj divnyj ženskij obraz, ne ljubja ego? Konečno net, --takuju mečtu ne ljubit' nevozmožno, i v ètom vsja razgadka".

I didn't know a more captivating woman than aunt Tanja. She was not beautiful in the usual sense of the word. She had a rather large mouth, also a noticeable double chin and some barely noticeable irregular eyes, but all this emphasized only more her unusual femininity and charm.

[...] Later, as a grown man I frequently asked myself the question: was Father in love with aunt Tanja? Now I think, he was.

[...] While reading War and Peace I see her with her sisters, at the hunt, and I hear singing to the accompaniment of Uncle's guitar; yet it is she -- aunt Tanja, and she does everything as aunt Tanja would be doing. I am asking myself: could an artist create such a wonderful picture of a woman, not being in love with her? Certainly not, one had to be in love with such a dream, and this is the whole solution. 17

Princess Mar'ja is very much like the author's maternal grandmother: plain, married late, and had those "luminous eyes"
the author referred to so frequently in the novel. She is in direct contrast to Nataša. Princess Mar'ja is preoccupied with the spiritual and religious matters which so very much influence her outlook on life and her relationships with other people including her despotic father and husband Nikolaj. She tried to influence her brother by giving him an icon before his departure for the army. Prince Andrej remembers his sister and her philosophy in the operating hut:

"Sostradinie, ljubov' k brat'jam, k ljubjaščim, ljubov' k nenavidjaščim nas, ljubov' k vragam, da, ta ljubov', kotoroju propovedoval Bog na zemle, kotoroj menja učila knjažna Mar'ja i kotoroj ja ne ponimal: vot otčego mne žalko bylo žyzni, vot ono to, čto ešče ostavalos' mne, eželi by ja byl živ. No teper' uže pozdno. Ja znaju ęto!

"Compassion, love of our brothers, for those who love us and for those who hate us, love of our enemies; yes, that love which God preached on earth and which Princess Mary taught me and I didn't understand— that is what made me sorry to part with life, that is what remained for me had I lived. But now it is too late. I know it!"18

While Nataša is an embodiment of femininity and love of life, Princess Mar'ja is endowed with some rather rare qualities for women of that time even in an aristocratic environment: she is well educated and has serious intellectual interests (in her letters to Žjuli Kuragina she is sentimental). Her spiritual qualities reflect her religious philosophy: she is quiet, not impulsive, unselfish, gentle, and obedient. In the first tears of her married life, she kept a diary in which she recorded various events from children's lives.
Tolstoj gives us some hints of the origins of Princess Mar'ja's religious preoccupations. The main reason seems to be her unattractiveness, a source of humiliating experiences such as meeting her suitor Anatol' with the pretty French girl Bourienne. Equally important was the despotism of her father, a cause of many painful and unhappy moments for Princess Mar'ja. This is how the Christian ideal of love and selflessness took root in her character.

Elen is actually a secondary character, but because of her unusual and rather unique qualities, so in contrast to the other two women, one should include her in this discussion. A statuesque beauty, she tops Nataša and Princess Mar'ja with her physical attributes. In other qualities, however, she falls far behind them. Her beauty is an empty facade which hides such ugly characteristics as her sensuality and cunning. Her excessive sensuality extends even into the relationship with her brother Anatol'. In the early drafts Tolstoj hinted at the incestuous nature of that relationship:

Anatol' takže ne vyxodil iz doma, no byl ne viden i ne slyšen i celye dni provodil u sestry i daže pozdnno do poloviny noči zasiživalsja u nee.
--Éto neprilíčno, Anatol', --skazala mat', vojdja v spal'nju docěri.

Anatol' deržal obnažennuju, beluju i polnju ručku sestry, kogda vošla mat'. On, krasnyj, s tem zverskim, kravivym vyraženiem kotoroe ljubili v nem ženščiny, ogljanulsja na mat' i ne vypustil ruku sestry, kotoruju on laskal.
--Vot eščè! sestra! Čto? --skazal on. --Nu idite, idite, u nas delo. Idite ž, mam'en'ka.
Prekrasnye glaza knjažny Hélène toržestvenno i sčastlivo smotreli to na mat', to na brata.
Anatol' too did not leave the house, he was neither heard of, nor seen, and spent whole days at his sister's. He even stayed half the night in her room.

"This is indecent, Anatol'", said mother entering her daughter's bedroom.

Anatol' was holding the sister's bare white and plump hand when mother entered. He, ruddy-faced with this handsome bestial expression which women loved in him, looked at mother but did not release sister's hand which he was holding.

"What? Sister, indeed" said he. "Well, go, go, we have something to talk about. Go then, mother darling."

Princess Hélène's beautiful eyes looked triumphantly and happily now on mother, now on brother.

This passage was, however, not included in the final version of the novel. Her marriage to Pierre was a direct result of the mutual cunning and plotting by her father, Prince Vassilij, and other members of the Kuragin family, including Elen. After the marriage Elen continues her hedonistic and now adulterous kind of love by taking a series of lovers: Doloxov, Boris Drubeckoj, a magnate, and a foreign prince. Eventually it leads to her death from an overdose of drugs intended "to produce a certain effect."

We could establish a moral hierarchy of these three women in the form of a triangle: Princess Mar'ja at the top, the most saintly type; Nataša on the right, representing the good aspects of life; and Elen on the left, as the pursuit of the evil in life.

In Ashes there are two main female characters: Helena and Prince Gintužt's sister, Princess Elżbieta. Their role in the novel is different from that of Tolstoj's women. Both
young women are involved only with one male character, Rafał. Helena is Rafał's first love, and their relationship is innocent and beautiful. Then comes a break: Rafał is banished by his father and loses contact with his beloved. While "in exile" he meets a new girl, Princess Elżbieta, the sister of his benefactor. They are greatly attracted to each other, but the expression of feeling on the part of the Princess is suppressed and not admitted. A break comes also in this relationship with Rafał's departure for school in Kraków.

The hero meets both girls again later in the novel but under different circumstances. Both are married now, but when Rafał appears on the scene, Żeromski unobtrusively removes their spouses in order not to hinder the action with unnecessary conflicts.

He meets Helena first, who is now the wife of a dignitary of a masonic lodge of which Rafał is a member. Their reunion culminates in a romantic escapade with a tragic ending. Some time later, on the way to join Polish troops in Silezia, Rafał meets former Princess Elżbieta, now Mrs. Ołowska. It is only then, after many years, that she admits her love for him and in a final brief romantic interlude yields to him.

From this very brief outline of both women's involvement with Rafał, we may deduct the following: the main and only motivation of their actions was their love for Rafał. It remained strong even after long periods of separation when
all hope of meeting him had disappeared. Thus their love for Rafal was translated into complete and ultimate loyalty to him who was their first love, and therefore, their, strictly speaking, adulterous acts should not be judged too harshly. They were not affairs à la Èlen from War and Peace but were acts of love started a long time before and not then permitted to come to full bloom for reasons beyond their control. Thus when the opportunity arose, all obstacles, which were to them insignificant, were swept away with the passion typical of true and not casual lovers.

Helena and Elżbieta both resemble Nataša in War and Peace, for whom love was the sustaining force of life. Neither Helena nor Elżbieta exhibit any physical or spiritual quality of Princess Mar'ja. And they certainly cannot be compared to the sensuous adulteress Èlen.

On the basis of the above presentation it is seen that women in War and Peace and Ashes are shown as noble figures with equally noble aspirations. They are not depicted by either Tolstoj or Żeromski as "an instrument of pleasure" as it is stated by Grzegorz Timofiejew:

Miłość cielesna najsilniejszy swój wyraz znajduje w "Wojnie i pokoju" [...] Sens przeżywanego uczucia -- zachwyt i rozkosz. Kobieta jest tylko narzędziem doznawanego upojenia. [...] Słupa miłość -- bezmyślny zachwyt żywego kochania -- jest tu jakimś wszechogarniającym tajemnym żywiołem, tak pierwotnym, jak pierwotna i wieczna jest rozkosz. Poza takie hedonistyczne rozumienie Żeromski właśnie nie wykracza. Kobieta jego to miłosnica -- narzędzie rozkoszy, [...] pierwotną i silna w swom erotyzmie (Helena z "Popiołów") [...]
Carnal love finds its strongest expression in *War and Peace*. The sense of the experienced feeling is ecstasy and pleasure. A woman is only an instrument of the inebriation experienced. Blind love -- wanton exaltation of animate love -- is here some all-embracing mysterious element, as primeval and eternal as pleasure. But Żeromski does not transcend such hedonistic intellection. His woman is a lover -- an instrument of pleasure, [...] primeval and strong in her eroticism (Helena from "Ashes") [...].

This statement is sweeping, dogmatic, and erroneous. Tolstoj's treatment of the major (or minor) female characters does not even remotely resemble Timofiejew's statement. Even the treatment of Elen, the only immoral woman in the whole of *War and Peace*, does not substantiate the Polish critic's assertion. On the contrary, from Tolstoj's treatment of her, we feel that the author wholly disapproves of her and her behavior. Also, in the scandalous affair of Natasa with Anatol' Kuragin, which cost her so many heartbreaks, Tolstoj condemns the view of which he is accused by Timofiejew: considering women only as an instrument of pleasure. Princess Mar'ja speaks for herself.

The same accusation is leveled against Żeromski. The author of *Ashes* is said to have a "hedonistic understanding of love" and his women in the first phase of their relationship with Rafał exercise restraint, and the actual surrender comes only in the second phase when they are sure of their love and there is no longer a need to resist it. After all, what is love if not a mutual giving and receiving in
the fullest sense. This extends quite obviously into the domain of physical love.

One might argue the moral aspect of the two affairs (both women were married), but Timofijejew does not concern himself with that, perhaps because it would involve an unpopular subject: religion. If Żeromski's women were really only "instruments of pleasure," as Timofijejew leads us to believe, then why did the author "save" Krzysztof's sister from the notorious seducer Rafał? Usually seducers are strong personalities and "instruments of pleasure" are weak. This can hardly be said about Helena and Elżbieta, both of whom are strong individuals not easily influenced. The suicidal death of dishonored Helena shows the full depth of her moral strength.

In short, Timofijejew seems to view the relationship of men and women in both novels very superficially and generally, completely ignoring its spiritual aspects.

Prince Andrej, Pierre, and Nikolaj as Opposed to Prince Gintult, Krzysztof, and Rafał

The novels under discussion have three main male characters each: War and Peace - Prince Andrej, Pierre Bezuxov, and Nikolaj Rostov; Ashes - Prince Gintult, Krzysztof Cedro, and Rafał Olbromski. Some similarities among the male characters of both novels have been pointed out previously in Chapter VI,
Leaving Prince Andrej aside for awhile, we shall start our comparison with Pierre. His social counterpart is Krzysztof, but this is where the similarity ends. Pierre's equivalent from the viewpoint of intellect and spiritual qualities is Prince Gintult. An active and energetic idealist and friend of humanity, he tries to find the origins of things and like Pierre is subject to various moods and feelings. He lives a life of an epicurean and a hedonist, but when this proves insufficient and unsatisfactory, he turns for his answers to mysticism and Freemasonry. Like Pierre he is a reformer but not of such a radical nature. In this respect he has more in common with Prince Andrej. He treats peasants with scorn, although he is not insensitive to their situation. He has considerable past military experience and even during the time described in the novel participates in military campaigns. Pierre lacks this quality. Early in life Pierre gave up military ambition, so that his military experience does not extend much beyond that of a curious eyewitness to the battle of Borodino. Thus the military aspect is another trait common to Prince Andrej and Prince Gintult. Pierre's experiences in French captivity, however, match those of Prince Gintult during the siege of Mantua. Both men witness a tremendous range of human suffering caused by war. Pierre also
experiences the feeling of love for a woman and of a woman, an experience clearly lacking in Prince Gintult. Pierre is dissatisfied with himself and his life and is seeking the meaning of life, while Prince Gintult feels and experiences pain and tries to find the source of this pain. Unde sit malum? is the constant question asked by him. In his conversation with Sułkowski in Paris, he comes to the conclusion that evil is within every man:

[Gintult] "After long thought and much solitary deliberation I came to the conclusion that all power has its faults, every system its good sides, and that revolutions, even the most justifiable, are nothing more than a change, and a very costly one, of a certain type of faults and abuses for faults and abuses of another kind, of another form. Why [...] the death of one man at the hands of a mob for the reason that he had been a bad superior, a tyrant, an extortioner, a defrauder, is wrong a hundred times greater than his tyranny, extortion, or fraud. And a wrong which is greater than the wrong which preceded it, good cannot come. Why fight? It behooves us, perhaps, to start a
relentless war; not upon people, however, but upon tyranny, upon extortion, upon fraud, themselves."

[Sużkowski] "Splendid! Only how to do it without touching people, these very extortioners and tyrants?"

[Gintušt] "It is a very near enemy. All that we have to do is to look for it within ourselves."22

This is Tolstoj’s idea of non-resistance to evil but on a moral, ideological plane. After his Freemasonic experience Pierre accepts in the end Karataev’s fatalistic attitude to life and experiences spiritual resurrection. Thus Pierre and Prince Gintušt have very important common traits.

Moving to Nikolaj Rostov we notice that he has a great deal in common with Rafał. Tolstoj in his rough draft gives the following sketch on Nikolaj’s character:

**Imuščestven[noe].** Roskošno živet po otcu, no rasčetliv.
**Obšč(estvennoe).** Takt, veselost’, vsegdašnjaja ljubeznost’, vse talanty ponemnožku.
**Poetičeskoе.** Vse ponimaet i čustvuet ponemnogu.
**Umstven[noе].** Ograničen, otlično govorit pošlo.
**Strastnoе.** Takt, veselost’, vsegdašnjaja ljubeznost’, vse talanty ponemnožku.
**Ljubovnoе.** Nikogo ne ljubit krepko, malen’kaja intrigа, malen’kaja družba.


**Property.** Lives luxuriously like his father, but is practical.
**Society.** Has tact, gaiety, customary courtesy, a little of all talents.
**Poetry.** Understands and feels a little of everything.
**Intellect.** Limited, speaks excellent trivialities.
**Fashionably passionate.**
**Love.** Does not love deeply anybody, small intrigue, small friendship.

[...] Has success in society. Begs to go to war. Does what all the others do. Has success with Arkadij’s wife.23
Like Rafal, he has no particular aims in life; he just follows others. He is practical in his dealings with life. Neither his heart nor his mind have any extraordinary qualities. He has no ability to reflect or to think. In fact, he is very average. He does have elemental, violent instincts, which come to the surface during the Bogučarovo incident. But while Rafal as a type is very loosely connected with the historical epoch (he could have lived in any period), Nikolaj is very closely connected with it by his conservative political, typical of that period, views, which in part is the result of his intellectual abilities. He has a dislike for the higher spiritual life which in War and Peace is the yardstick of the moral worth of the characters. This is probably the subconscious reason for his dislike of Prince Andrej. His motto is "not to discuss but to obey." He accepts the existing order and does not wish to change it at all. This philosophy of accepting things as they are extends to his private life and to his marriage:

Kak v Til'zite Rostov ne pozvolil sebe usomnitsja v tom, xorošo li to, čto priznano vsemi xorošim, točno tak že i teper', posle korotkoj, no iskrennoj bor'by meždu popytkoj ustroit' svoju žizn' po svoemu razumu i smirennym podčineniem obstojatel'stvam, on vybral poslednee i predostavil sebja toj vlasti, kotoraja ego (on ėto čuvstvoval) nepreodolimo vlekla kuda-to.

As in Tilsit Rostov had not allowed himself to doubt that what everybody considered right was right, so now, after a short but sincere struggle between his effort to arrange his life
by his own sense of justice, and in obedient submission to circumstances, he chose the latter and yielded to the power he felt irresistibly carrying he knew not where.24

Like Rafał, Nikolaj is a good and brave officer. Young Rostov shares also some characteristics with Krzysztof. He is of a relatively noble stature in relation to other people: he tries to help Denisov, saves the Polish family, and rescues Princess Mar'ja; but somehow all those acts come out rather pale and average.

Just as Cedro feels almost complete obedience toward Napoleon, Nikolaj exhibits very similar but much stronger feelings toward Alexander. He experiences emotional rapture at the mere presence of the tsar and is ready to die for him. In fact he would have died from sheer excitement had Alexander as much as spoken a word to him. Cedro's emotions are not as intense, but they are in the same category. They do have a rational base, to be sure, while Rostov's raptures are based strictly on inflated imagination.

The young Rostov shares with Krzysztof a strong feeling of duty and an insensitivity to the moral issues of war. But he is very much concerned about getting killed:

"Nu, popadis' teper' kto by ni byl", dumal Rostov vdavlivaja špory Gračiku, i, peregonjaja drugix, vypustil ego vo ves' kar'er. Vperedu uže viden byl neprijatel'. Vdrug, kak širokim venikom, stegnulo čto-to po eskadronu. Rostov podnjal sabju, gotovjas' rubit', no v ěto vremja vperedu skakavšij soldat Nikitenko otdelil'sja ot nego, i Rostov počuvstvoval, kak vo sne, čto prodolžaet nestis' s neestestvennoju bystrotoj
vpered i vmeste s tem ostaetsja na meste. 
[...]
"Cto že èeto? ja ne podvigajus'? - Ja
upal, ja ubit..." v odno mnogovenie sprosil
i otvetil Rostov.

"Let anyone come my way now," thought Rostov,
driving his spurs into Rook and letting him go
at a full gallop so that he outstripped the
others. Ahead, the enemy was already visible.
Suddenly something like a birch broom seemed to
sweep over the squadron. Rostov raised his saber,
ready to strike, but at that instant the trooper
Nikitenko, who was galloping ahead, shot away
from him, and Rostov felt as in a dream that he
continued to be carried forward with unnatural
speed but yet stayed on the same spot. [...]
"How is it I am not moving? I have fallen,
I am killed!" Rostov asked and answered at the
same instant.25

Krzysztof finds himself in a very similar but more seri-
ous situation during a clash with the enemy in Spain. But
Krzysztof's behavior is quite opposite to that of Nikolaj.
He experiences happiness and a feeling of power as he ap-
proaches the Spaniards, and when severely wounded his concern
is only for his favorite sabre:

—Bij, zabij! — krzykn^l Krzysztof, uszczes-
liviony, že idzie na czele. Czuł w dłoni pałasz,
pałasz swój złoty, ukochany, potężny, mocniejszy
od błysku tysiąca zdradzieckich karabinów. Leciał
coraz dla siebie wspaniały, ogromniejszy, niez-
mierny, jak anioł gromy ciskający. [...] Že szczęś-
czia, z uczyć mocy --tchu aż brak...[...] Ogni
kolistе buzują się wszędzie, bijąc fontannami
czerwonych iskier. Mocny Boże! Gdzie pałasz!
gdzie pałasz? Spada jasny pałasz z bezwładnej ręki
w ciepły dół... Zwiotczałe poszeptują wargi:
—Pałasz mój, złoty mój pałasz...

"At them, kill them!" Cedro was shouting, happy
that he was at the head. His hand was on his sword,
his golden sword, beloved, powerful, mightier than
the treacherous glint of a thousand carbines. He
flew on and, flying thus, saw himself in increasing
glamor, in increasing splendor and might, in increasing boundlessness, like a thunderhurling angel of wrath.

[...] He is breathless with happiness, with overpowering emotion. [...] Whirling fires flame everywhere, gushing in fountains of crimson sparks. Dear Lord! Where is his sword? His sword! The flaming sword falls from a nerveless hand into a soft, warm pit.... The nerveless lips repeat a faint whisper: "My sword, my golden sword...."26

Krzysztof used to be a very sensitive man (it suffices to recollect his behavior in the dead Silesian fisherman's hut), but the war made him hard and ruthless. In normal peacetime conditions his old self returns. He has a deep concern for social issues, something Nikolaj Rostov lacks completely. Young Cedro is psychologically the least complicated but in some respects he resembles Pierre. Like Pierre, he is of a noble nature, is easily inflamed by lofty ideas or thoughts, and is ready for sacrifices. He listens more to his heart than reason, but on the whole heart and reason are well balanced in him. We see it in his discussion with Trepka.

By virtue of his character Prince Andrej seems to stand alone with only a few connecting lines leading from him to Prince Gintułt. He stands well above Rafał and Krzysztof. A strong-willed character who can control his emotions, he is intellectually gifted and inclined toward self-analysis. He does have moments when he desires power and glory (his Toulon), but after the Austerlitz experience he recognizes the vanity of it all. The symbol of vysokoe nebo (the lofty sky) signifies change in his attitude to lofty moral ideals. Perhaps
few traits of his character liken him to Krzysztof. He too has a deep sense of duty on a somewhat higher level and is capable of sacrifice and selfless acts.

Rafał, as it was pointed out, has quite a few traits in common with Nikolaj Rostov. But he does have some characteristics he shares with no character of War and Peace. It is his powerful, almost elemental passion and sensuality. This makes him a rather uneven character. Irzykowski puts it very concisely and to the point:

... Rafał z Popiołów, który w zewnetrznym życiu jest zwykłym rebajłem, dobrym do wojny i do amorów -- ponadto odczuwa, kocha, marzy tak, jakby był genialnym poetą... 

... Rafał from Ashes is in real life an ordinary swashbuckler good for love and war and further more feels, loves, and dreams as if he were a poet of genius. 27

The Freemasons

Both authors introduce Freemasonry in their respective novels. Their reasons for introducing the element of Freemasonry are similar though not identical. First, it is an attempt at the authentic reproduction of the national scene. The masonic lodges were organized in Russia about 1760. They were the sole form of illegal organizations, and attempts were made to use them for political and educational purposes. This is, for example, true of N. I. Novikov (1744–1818), who helped public enlightenment with donations from the philanthropic
Masons to which he belonged. Freemasonry attracted all the free-thinking and dissatisfied members of the nobility. By introducing the element of Freemasonry, Tolstoj adds an important historical element to his novel as well as cleverly showing the continuity of Pierre's intellectual search. Pierre becomes a member of a masonic lodge through an accidental meeting with a prominent mason, Bazdeev, at Toržok post station. The ideas and aims of the order as explained by Bazdeev appeal very much to Pierre, who was in a rather depressed state of mind. (He has dueled with Doloxov and was separated from his wife). He reached out eagerly for this new hope, which he felt might provide him with answers to his questions about life:

For a long while after he [...] had gone, Pierre did not go to bed or order horses but paced up and down the room, pondering over his vicious past, and with a rapturous sense of beginning anew pictured to himself the blissful, irreproachable, virtuous future that seemed to him so easy. It seemed to him that he had been vicious only because he had somehow forgotten how good it is to be virtuous. Not a trace of his former doubts remained in his soul. He firmly believed in the possibility
of the brotherhood of men united in the aim of supporting one another in the path of virtue, and that is how Freemasonry presented itself to him.²⁹

Pierre acted according to instructions given to him by Bazdeev, got in contact with the necessary people in Petersburg, and after an elaborate ceremony full of mystery, became a mason. To Pierre, who was seeking solutions to problems of life which were bothering him, membership in the masonic lodge was an event of great importance. He became a very active mason, supporting the lodge financially and performing numerous organizational duties. Eventually, however, Pierre becomes dissatisfied with the members of the lodge after slowly becoming aware of the hypocrisy and insincerity of most of them. When his efforts to remedy the situation were not approved, Pierre severs almost completely his connections with the lodge. He kept in contact with the ideas of Freemasonry through Bazdeev, whom he held in high esteem. Thus Pierre's membership in the masonic lodge was but one of several phases he went through in his search for truth, purpose of life, and happiness. The Karataev experience was yet to come. No other character in War and Peace belongs to a masonic lodge, but during the talk with Prince Andrej at the ferry, Pierre makes an impassionate plea for Prince Andrej to join the masons. Tolstoj himself disapproved of the masonic movement. He thought all masons were fools.³⁰
Żeromski has three main characters in his novel who join the masonic lodge: Prince Gintult, Rafał, and Helena. The leading and most serious masons among the three characters is Prince Gintult. Disappointed with his present life, he eventually becomes involved in Freemasonry, hoping to find answers to questions tormenting him. Rafał's membership is not motivated by any high ideas but rather by the influence of his employer Prince Gintult. It is also another adventure in his colorful life. Mysterious rituals did not evoke in Rafał any contemplation of the purpose of the lodge and Freemasonry in general. But somehow his masonic oath taken upon the admission to the lodge sinks into his soul. As if resurrected by Prince Gintult's cry: "To me, children of the widow!", and this prompts Rafał to an absurd and heroic deed in trying to prevent the destruction of St. Jacob's cathedral. The masonic oath overrules in subconscious his military duty (obedience to the commanding officer), an indication that perhaps Rafał's involvement with the masonic lodge is not so shallow after all. From the point of view of its function in the novel, the masonic interlude serves as a device for reuniting Rafał with Helena. To support this notion I would like to point out that in order to make it possible for Helena and Rafał to meet during a masonic ceremony, Żeromski "bent" the historic fact to suit his purpose. According to Grodzicki\(^{31}\) loża profanki (the lodge of the profane one) as
the term did not exist, only loża uczennicy (the lodge of the pupil), which did not have an independent status. Besides, during the time of the action of the novel, even loża uczennicy did not exist. It was created during The Duchy of Warsaw time, i.e., after Napoleon's entry into Warsaw in 1806. The first masonic lodges for women came into existence after the Duchy of Warsaw. Also Rafał's mood, which permeates the whole chapter, points to the importance the author must have attached to the functional aspect of the Rafał-Helena reunion.

Żeromski does not elaborate on the role of Freemasonry in Poland as one of the underground movements in the political life of the country. The use of the German language and also the presence of Prussians in the lodge, as, for example, Major de With, could indicate the loyalty certain Polish circles had toward Prussians. By introducing Freemasonry alongside the "gilded youth," Żeromski completes the picture of contemporary Warsaw, giving in this manner historical authenticity to his novel.

While in War and Peace Pierre's experiences with the brotherhood represent one of the links in the chain of his spiritual searchings, in Ashes the purpose of the two chapters on Freemasonry is to fill a compositional gap in the interrupted Rafał-Helena relationship. The ideological importance of the movement to the characters is not at all developed.
In concluding our discussion on the topics of this chapter, we can make the following observations: most of the similarity has to do with families. Each novel has a similar number and type of representative families. They come from the aristocracy and the landed gentry and constitute an important factor in the novels. It is the upper classes who play the leading role in the life of the respective nations in the time of war and in the time of peace. The remaining topics are treated differently. The differences seem to run along the lines of ideology, the literary influences to which a writer was subjected, and the structural and philosophical considerations. It is therefore because of these reasons that Žeromski gives a detailed description of death (a naturalistic trait), while Tolstoj busies himself more with its philosophical ramifications. Ideologically influenced is the treatment of peasants which in Tolstoj is done from the conservative and aristocratic point of view, while in Žeromski it is more progressive and at times democratic. The role of women in War and Peace is greater, for each main male character is affected by them. In Ashes this is true only for one character (Rafał). The treatment of women differs also along psychological lines: in this respect Tolstoj presents a much more complete picture, while Žeromski concentrates on the depiction of the intensity of their feelings. And finally the topic of Freemasonry has the philosophical function in War
War and Peace of showing the stage of a character's development (Pierre), while in *Ashes* it has an added structural function: to connect an interrupted line of action by bringing two characters together (Rafał and Helena). Common to both writers in their treatment of this topic is their slightly ironic and condescending tone toward the Freemasonry.
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CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSIONS

In my introduction I have indicated the existence of similarities and dissimilarities in the two novels. Now, on the basis of the evidence presented, I shall attempt to draw certain conclusions. These conclusions will show the literary relationship between the two writers and will help project them against the general background of Russo-Polish literary relations.

In evaluating the findings of my study I shall follow the guidelines set forth at the beginning of Chapter I, which divided the subject matter into the following three groups:

a) thematically similar and with similar treatment of it,

b) similar in theme but differing in its treatment,

c) topics absent in one novel but present in another.

I shall now arrange the topics according to this classification in the order in which they were discussed. Their names will correspond roughly to the titles of the sub-chapters. The manner of this concluding discussion will be of the "shorthand type": only keyword references will be made.
to the topics already discussed and an attempt will be made to find their common denominator.

Group a: battle scenes, language, endings, families, the Freemasons;

Group b: war, Napoleon, foreigners, deaths, peasants, women, main male characters;

Group c: history, nature, titles, characterization.

It is in the first group that the influence of Tolstoj can be seen. For example, the presentation of the battle of Raszyn in Ashes resembles quite faithfully the battle of Borodino in War and Peace. Also their structural function in the respective novels is very similar. The conclusion of Żeromski's novel bears a great similarity with respect to structure to the conclusion of Tolstoj's novel. One can quite easily recognize and equate several similar characteristics in the subject of families. The same can be said about the topic of Freemasonry, which in Ashes receives an added structural function. The subject of the language was of equal importance to both writers and in handling of the idiom we see a great concern for it. (The question of Tolstoj's influence on Żeromski in this particular area is, however, very doubtful.)

The second group, which is the largest, shows a varying nature of treatment of the subject matter by both the authors, which is ideological, philosophical and literary.
By this I mean that each writer's ideology, philosophy, or literary considerations (such as influence by a particular literary trend, their own considerations as to the role and treatment of separate topics). To the first subgroup I would include the treatment of Napoleon, foreigners, and peasants. The second subgroup contains the topics of war and death, treated philosophically by Tolstoi and literarily by Žeromski. The last subgroup includes women and the main male characters. The differences in the literary treatment of them is determined by their roles in the novels. There are, however, some descriptive similarities present in some scenes, as for example, wounded Cedro and wounded Prince Andrej; the cavalry charge of Rostov and Cedro, the feelings of Rafał and Pierre at the sight of the fires (the burning of the village in the case of Rafał, the fire of Moscow in the case of Pierre). The main male characters of both novels can only be roughly equated with each other, for they share almost always characteristics of more than just one character in the other novel, as depicted graphically on the following page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prince Andrej</td>
<td>Intellectually gifted aristocrats; thinkers inclined toward self-analysis; not radical but rational reformers; (treat peasants justly but with scorn) both have extensive military experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre</td>
<td>Noblemen with noble natures, easily inflamed with lofty ideas, ready for sacrifices (more heart than reason)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolaj</td>
<td>Noblemen with average mind and heart; no aim in life, just followers of others; dislike or indifference to higher spiritual life; no concern for social issues; good and brave officers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The last (and the smallest) group includes topics not common to either novel. Thus Tolstoj's philosophical essays on history have found no sympathetic ear in żeromski, who in turn devoted a number of chapters to the topic of love with the unique participation of nature, something not found in Tolstoj's novel. In this respect żeromski was a true innovator, just as he was innovating in his rejection of battle romanticism. Somewhat apart stand the problems of titles and characterization. Whereas the title of Tolstoj's novel has a veiled philosophical implication, in żeromski's work it is clearly symbolic. The differences in characterization technique belong to literary differences.

It is possible that the example of Tolstoj's great epic prompted żeromski to write a larger work that he had not done before but probably wanted to do. Here was a model which he could "consult." This might have emboldened him to experiment with some of the elements Tolstoj used in the structure of his novel and also to utilize some of the details. Thus the first group of topics can be termed a creative borrowing group. żeromski took from War and Peace only those elements which he considered important for his novel and which were also common to the contemporary Polish scene.

It becomes obvious from the reading of the two novels that there was no slavish imitation of the Russian. żeromski completely reworked the treatment of a number of topics
according to his own ideological, philosophical, and structural ideas. The second group testifies to that. Thus, the element of the creative borrowing, though present thematically, is completely overshadowed by the truly Żeromskian treatment. This proves his independence as a writer and an artist from Tolstoj's novel. Further proof is provided by the last group where topics and methods used by Żeromski in treating them bear no resemblance to War and Peace whatsoever.

If one is to agree with the statement of Marian Jakóbiec that "Polish-Russian and Russian-Polish literary connections were durable and uninterrupted," then one must add that they were weak, reflecting the political climate, which for most of the time was unfavorable. It is an undeniable fact that the state of Russian studies in Poland, which reflects the literary connections of the two countries on the scholarly plane, were even as late as twelve years ago very poor by comparison with other countries. This is the direct result of difficulties the Polish-Russian cultural relationship faced over a period of more than three centuries, difficulties of a political, historical, and psychological nature. What is rather disheartening is that these difficulties penetrated, on both sides, to be sure, the intellectuals and litterateurs, the circles which should have been immune from any chauvinistic prejudices. It suffices to mention names of such "affected" people as Dostoevsky or Conrad. Whatever the reasons
for this idiosyncrasy, from the intellectual standpoint it is paradoxical. There were, however, honest and strenuous attempts made on both sides to remedy the unbearable situation. As one example in the last century, one can mention Herzen, a more recent one being Waclaw Lednicki on the Polish side.

How do Tolstoj and Żeromski fit this gloomy picture? Tolstoj, as seen from his treatment of Poles in War and Peace, was in the beginning closer to the sentiments of the majority of his countrymen. But later, probably due to his conversion, he admitted his erroneous and unjust attitude toward Poles and their aspirations and tried to make up for it. These changing attitudes of Tolstoj toward Poles and Poland in his works are explored in depth by Waclaw Lednicki in his book Tolstoy Between War and Peace.4

Żeromski, on the other hand, was able to raise himself above the anti-Russian views of his contemporaries in spite of the political climate between the two nations and did appreciate Russian literary achievements. He was full of admiration for Tolstoj and other Russian writers but disliked Dostoevskij's anti-Polish obsessions.

The issue of the influence of Tolstoj's War and Peace on Żeromski's Ashes is really of no great importance, since literary influences are at the very basis of cultural relations. And nobody can dispute André Gide who said: "Influence creates nothing, it only sets in motion the creative thought."5
NOTES
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