

PREFACE

IRINA PAPERNO
(GUEST EDITOR)

In this issue, a group of scholars – who have worked in close cooperation – reexamine the notorious story of the Gercen family drama of 1848-1852. Relying on a wealth of existing information and interpretations, some of which have come to light in recent years, we discuss the implications of the family drama for the making of Gercen's *Byloe i dumy* (*My Past and Thoughts*) and, ultimately, for the creation of the far-reaching cultural tradition associated with Aleksandr Gercen and his memoirs. While the authors do not always agree in their interpretations, they have worked together to produce a collective monograph.

INTRODUCTION: INTIMACY AND HISTORY. THE GERCEN FAMILY DRAMA RECONSIDERED

IRINA PAPERNO

Abstract

In her Introduction to this special issue, Irina Paperno lays the conceptual and empirical foundations for this collective project that reexamines the notorious story of the Herzen family drama of 1848-1852 – its role in the making of Alexander Herzen's memoirs, *My Past and Thoughts* (*Byloe i dumy*), and in the creation of a far-reaching cultural tradition. The Introduction outlines Herzen's efforts to turn intimate life into a historical narrative by way of literary structures, which were underwritten by Hegelian philosophical paradigms. The introduction tells the story of the love affair itself, focusing on the convergence of the intimate and the historical. It also describes how the story of the family drama was written and published, between 1852 and 2001, by Herzen, members of his immediate circle, and distant scholars, some of whom became emotionally involved in the Herzen family drama. Paperno argues that, in the end, the story of the Herzen family drama turned into a paradigmatic text, or institution, of Russian intelligentsia culture: the intimacy-history connection became both publicly observable and reproducible.

Keywords: *Herzen; Family Drama; Herwegh*

Opening Remarks

The image of Aleksandr Ivanovič Gercen (1812-1870) has retained its power to this day. He has been regarded as a revolutionary activist; a significant contributor to European radical literature; the main spokesman for Russia to

the European public in the wake of the 1848 revolution, in which he participated; the sole “uncensored voice” speaking to the Russian public in the years 1853-1863 (through his Free Russian Press operating from Geneva and London); the first theorist of Russian socialism; the first historian of Russian revolutionary thought; but for many he was simply and indisputably a great Russian writer.

In this regard, the assessment of his close friend and fellow revolutionary, Michail Bakunin, is emblematic. In 1863 Bakunin reported to the underground organization *Zemlja i volja* (Land and Freedom) that Gercen was, first and foremost, a man of letters – a writer of genius – who combined all the advantages and disadvantages of his profession. He went on to say that in the future free Russia Gercen would be quite at home as a brilliant writer or even a statesman, but that, with his demoralizing skepticism, he did more harm than good to the revolutionary cause.¹

Gercen can be also considered the creator of Russian cultural institutions. Thus, he developed the idea of a community of intellectuals aspiring to a revolutionary role in history, later commonly called the “*intelligentsia*”. It was in his first address to a Western audience in 1849-1850, the essay ‘*La Russie*’, written as a letter to “G.H.”, or Georg Herwegh, that Gercen notably described an educated minority within the Moscow nobility. Alienated from the Russian society, involved in the culture of Europe, it boils with “passions and energy” and, devoid of other outlets, produces “brilliant individualities, full of eccentricity”. Their position is “truly tragic”. It is from this milieu, Gercen further insisted, that “the whole literary movement” in Russia came forth.²

It would be hard not to see a self-portrait in this passionate description and an attempt to define a socially significant role for himself and the people of his circle. It was, indeed, a circle of friends and family that served as a prototype for Gercen’s vision of a new community. United in a common struggle with oppression – domestic and political – and, at present, living mostly in the shadow of failure, this community was meant to be the germ of the new world.³

As a writer, Gercen created the image of an *intelligent* – an alienated, thinking, struggling individual, markedly ineffective in his private and public endeavors – in love as well as in revolution. Such is the hero of Gercen’s novel *Kto vinovat?* (*Who Is To Blame?*, 1845-1846) and the autobiographical protagonist of his memoirs, *Byloe i dumy* (*My Past and Thoughts*; written in 1852-1868).

In the end, it is as a writer that Gercen reached the future Russia. Indeed, the power of his personal image and his vision of the *intelligentsia* community – a network of people bound by a shared sense of the social and historical significance of their private lives – have been preserved and

perpetuated in his monumental memoirs. This book left a distinctive imprint on Russian letters as well as on Russian lives.

Arguably, a paradigmatic text of intelligentsia culture, *Byloe i dumy* has been used by generations of Russians caught in the historical dramas of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to arrange their own lives and to write them in memoirs and novels. Like Gercen, these Russian intellectuals lived in tightly knit circles of friends and in emotionally disorderly family households; following Gercen, they attached enormous historical significance to their tangled personal intimacies.

Students of Gercen have long believed that the secret of the book's influence lies in a peculiar combination of the personal and the historical, the individual and the communal, the quotidian and the metaphysical, which Gercen achieved through an intricate use of narrative, metaphor, and genre informed by philosophical paradigms, above all, by Hegelian historicism. It has been argued that the power of this book also derives from the reader's belief in the authenticity of Gercen's experience and emotion.

When Gercen started to work on his memoirs, the immediate impetus came from the family drama involving Gercen, his wife, Natal'ja,⁴ and his intimate friend and comrade in democracy, the German political poet Georg Herwegh. Unfolding in the years 1848-1852 – during the European revolution – their triangular relationship was inspired by the idea, shared by many in their generation of Romantic revolutionaries, that “friendship in love” was the highest form of social bond, the telos of historical change, and a prototype of the future (socialist) society.⁵ From the beginning to the end, this relationship was mediated by literary models. This love affair led to Natal'ja's death, to a political scandal in the international radical community, and, ultimately, to Gercen's disillusionment with the revolutionary community, with Western democracy, and with the Hegelian philosophy of history. Some scholars claim that his newly found skepticism amounts to an event in Russian intellectual history.

Natal'ja's death in May 1852 and the continuing scandal that marred his honor, as a nobleman who had declined to fight a duel with his wife's lover and as a revolutionary who had failed to take an enlightened attitude to sexual transgression, threw Gercen into despair and rage. Insisting that this was not purely and simply an individual matter – that the failure of this intimate union represented, in microcosm, the failure of the revolution – he appealed for judgment to his “friends in democracy”, Jules Michelet and Pierre Proudhon, as well as to the authorities on passion, George Sand and Richard Wagner. Gercen's family drama turned into a “European scandal”, with rumors reaching as far as Alexander II and Karl Marx.

In the end, Gercen felt a “frenetic desire” to write his story. As he described it, what was planned as a short “memoir” (that is, a memorandum) on “my case” grew into multi-volume memoirs that told the story of Gercen's

life as an integral part of Russian and pan-European history, from Napoleon to the Revolution of 1848. It took the reader through the story of Gercen's birth in the fateful year of 1812, his childhood and youth as the illegitimate son of a Russian nobleman and a German bourgeoisie and his "moral birth" after the failed Decembrist revolt in 1825 (Part One); his arrest and exile in provincial Russia in 1834-1838 (Part Two); his marriage under the sign of the Romantic cult of love in 1838 (Part Three); his involvement in the warring circles of Moscow intellectuals, the Westerners and the Slavophiles, in the 1840s, and the couple's first marital conflicts (Part Four); and, finally, his participation with the international radical community in the failed revolution in France and Italy and his family drama in 1848-1852 (Part Five). (Parts Six, Seven, and Eight, which deal with Gercen's life, mainly in London, after his wife's death, are almost plotless and increasingly fragmentary.) Gercen was to work on this book for the rest of his life: writing, revising, amending. As he said in jest, it seemed as if he had lived his life for the sake of these memoirs.

At the time of Gercen's death, *Byloe i dumy* was a text replete with insertions, appendixes, retrospective comments, and authorial introductions and commentaries. To this day, the shape of the text of *Byloe i dumy* as well as its genre have remained unclear. Gercen himself usually referred to his work as "notes" ("zapiski"), as if he wished to avoid pinpointing its genre. Literary critics have discerned the presence of Goethe's *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, *Bildungsroman*, family novel, epic, drama, as well as historical and philosophical narrative.⁶ In the 1866 introduction to Part Five, which he had intended to contain the story of his family drama, Gercen coined a definition of his project (which has since been quoted by practically every scholar who has written on Gercen's memoirs): "*Byloe i dumy* – ne istoričeskaja monografija, a otkrazenie istorii v čeloveke, *slučajno* popavšemsja na ee doroge" ("*Byloe i dumy* is not a historical monograph, but a reflection of history in a man who had *accidentally* got in its way"; X, 9). The literary scholar Lidija Ginzburg, who saw Gercen's memoirs as a product of "conscious historicism", aptly rephrased Gercen's formulation in generic terms, describing *Byloe i dumy* as a fusion of autobiography and historiography.⁷ It has been further argued that the book was informed by the pattern of fusing the individual and the historical derived from Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit*.⁸

In intent, as well as in genre and structure, Gercen's project is fraught with paradoxes. For one thing, while Gercen was writing the story of his notorious family drama, he was involved in yet another drama: a love affair with Natal'ja Tučkova-Ogareva,⁹ the wife of his life-long friend and collaborator Nikolaj Ogarev. Carefully hidden from the family, friends, and the public, this second drama did not make it into Gercen's memoirs.

Gercen claimed to have written the whole of his memoirs in order to present the story of his family drama. But when the book reached the reader,

the part about the Herwegh affair remained unpublished. It was too intimate. The intimate chapters of *Byloe i dumy* were first published in 1919 – after a long struggle involving members of the family and of the scholarly community. By that time, details of Gercen's family life were widely known through gossip, rumor, and legend, as well as through works of fiction written by friend and foe.

Furthermore, while the conception of his life and the structure of his book are clearly informed by the philosophy of history and social theory, Gercen's exact position remained uncertain. To this day scholars debate whether Gercen remained a radical committed to his peculiar version of socialism or became a liberal skeptical of any social theory as well as of the rational metaphysics of history.¹⁰ The issue has implications for the interpretation of *Byloe i dumy*. For some critics, Gercen's memoirs (the first five parts) represent a Hegelian fusion of the individual and the historical, which is embodied in the teleological movement of the plot – as in a *Bildungsroman* or as in Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit*. For others, the book manifests a vision of history governed by chance and irony, a vision embodied in generic and narrative uncertainty. Still others try to negotiate between these two extremes.¹¹ The treatment of the family drama in Part Five has been a stumbling block for many.

One thing remains clear: in its writing, emplotting, interpreting, publicizing, and silencing, the family drama informs the image of Gercen as a revolutionary and as a writer, as well as the structure of his paradigm-making memoirs.

It is striking how many people – from members of Gercen's immediate circle to distant scholars – have participated in the production of the Gercen family drama.

In the twentieth century, family documents and biographical narratives started to appear in scholarly publications in Russia – where Gercen's name had been long banned by censorship – prepared by Michail Geršenzon, Michail Lemke, Nikolaj Anciferov, and others. In 1907, Lemke began working on an edition of Gercen's collected works and letters, for which (in 1912) he obtained from the Gercen family a copy of the intimate chapters of *Byloe i dumy*. Delayed by the war and the revolution, the volume containing the full text of Part Five was published in revolutionary Petrograd in 1919. In 1921, another edition that claimed to be the first full publication of *Byloe i dumy* appeared in Berlin, edited by the prominent émigré Fedor Rodičev. In the 1950s, the editors of the Soviet academic edition of Gercen's works made an effort to reconstruct the text, which was known only from divergent and defective copies of Gercen's original manuscript. They published a text that differed from Lemke's as well as Rodičev's in composition, and they called the intimate chapters (placed in Section Two of Part Five) "The Story of the Family Drama". (For years, this text and this title remained standard.) In her

influential interpretative studies from the 1950s-1970s, the literary scholar Lidija Ginzburg made prominent the image of Gercen as a man whose intimate life was both formed and crushed by the wheels of history that had accidentally run him over – an image that had a special resonance in post-Stalinist Russia. It was the British historian and diplomat E.H. Carr who, in 1933, was the first to gain access to documents unknown to Gercen himself: Natal'ja Gercen's letters to Georg Herwegh, which had been jealously guarded by the Herwegh family. These letters revealed that Natal'ja's role in the affair had been quite different from what Gercen had described (on his and her behalf) and what his loyal readers accepted as the true story. (To this day, Natal'ja's letters to Herwegh have been published only in excerpts.)¹² The first scholar to give a coherent account of the Gercen family drama, and one not limited to Gercen's view, Carr too saw the family drama as replete with cultural significance: a "collocation of Romanticism and Revolution".¹³

The story is not yet at an end. Many scholars have made contributions. As late as 1997, after years of preparation and a long delay in publication, the Moscow series *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* made public the long lost original manuscript of the notorious Section Two of Part Five. The Russian scholar I.G. Ptuškina carefully constructed a text that differs from what was hitherto known as the standard version of this section. She also restored Gercen's original title: "Inside" (in English).¹⁴ There is historical irony in the fact that she did not seem to know that this had already been done: by the Bolshevik statesman and historian of revolutionary thought, Lev Kamenev, in an edition of *Byloe i dumy* from 1931-1932. This edition had been withdrawn from circulation in the Soviet Union after the editor was shot as an "enemy of the people" in 1936. In 2002, the British playwright Tom Stoppard, himself an exile, staged Gercen's family drama in the play *Shipwreck*, a part of his dramatic trilogy *The Coast of Utopia*, informed by the complexities of his own position as well as by Gercen scholars' preoccupations with Gercen's identity politics.¹⁵ In this sense, over the years, historians of Russian thought, Russian literature, and the Russian intelligentsia – many of whom were themselves public intellectuals – became involved in the Gercen family drama.

As the authors of this issue will try to show, the Gercen case – the production of this paradigm-making story (which is centered in, but not limited to Gercen's memoirs) from the experience of the family drama – exemplifies the convergence of "intimacy" and "history", achieved through literature, which is peculiar (though not necessarily unique) to the revolutionary ethos of the Russian intelligentsia.¹⁶

To open the project, in the pages that follow, I will tell two stories that provide essential information on the events and documents of the Gercen family drama: first, the story of the love affair itself; second, the story of how it was written and published. They are inextricably intertwined. The story of

the love affair has been told before. Relying on Carr's narrative, as well as on an array of published primary sources,¹⁷ I will relate it anew, in brief, focusing on moments in which its participants tried to make the intimate and the historical converge. The second story has not yet been told. Spanning more than a century, it begins with Gercen's work on his memoirs in the midst of his family and his circle and continues with the efforts of his publishers and interpreters; this story, too, shows an irresistible urge to link "intimacy" and "history". Concluding this introduction, I provide a general overview of interpretations associated with the Gercen family drama. The essays that follow focus on specific aspects of the drama, tracing the process by which the intimate is turned into the historical.

The Love Affair in a Historical Key

At the end of the revolutionary year 1848, the Gercens, who had recently left Russia, found themselves in Paris. There they formed a peculiar intimacy, replete with symbolic and social significance, with a family of political exiles, Georg Herwegh and his wife Emma. Their carefully cultivated union – a utopian commune of sorts – formed an island of "harmony" amidst despair: the revolution that started on February 24, 1848, came to a halt. The men, both painfully disappointed in their political aspirations, saw themselves as brothers in arms and as spiritual "twins" (an image derived from George Sand's novel *La Petite Fadette*, in which two twins, who differ, but complement each other, love the same woman, who tries to bring them to harmony). The women shared in their husbands' despair at the failure of democracy and they too longed for harmony; and the children – young Aleksandr (Saša) and Natal'ja (Tata) Gercen, and Horace and Ada Herwegh – were expected to join their parents in this commune of love. The harmony appears to have gone undisturbed for about six months, up to the summer of 1849. Their hopeful sentiments and far-reaching ideological aspirations are amply documented in letters later exchanged by members of this circle, when they lived apart, longing to restore the lost harmony. As we learn from Herwegh's letter to Gercen (written later, at a moment of crisis in the union), the original plan involved finding "le dernier refuge [...] dans notre intimité, dans notre activité commune, dans ce petit cercle".¹⁸ Gercen echoed: "s'il nous semble que tout croule – attachons-nous, et diable, en avant, sauvons-nous, sauvons les individualités" (XXIII, 233). The two couples hoped that the harmony and beauty established in their relationships could serve "comme modèle au monde", prefiguring the socialist society that would come to be, in spite of the failure of the revolution.¹⁹

For Gercen and his wife, this union promised a sense of community that they saw as an essential condition of living. In Russia in the 1840s, they

had lived in a closely-knit circle ("kružok") of men and women bound together by mutually reinforcing ties of personal intimacy and the ideology of liberation. Gercen, as Natal'ja Tučkova-Ogareva noted later in her memoirs, had always been a center of a circle. Indeed, the first circle went back to his student days. The Gercen scholar Martin Malia comments on the deeper purpose and ultimate significance of this student circle as a form of sociability that represented "at the same time freedom for 'the flowering of the personality' of each of its members, and full equality in fraternity among all of them". Malia concludes that "long before [Gercen] heard of the word, the circle was his first taste of what he later called 'socialism'".²⁰ The discord in ideology and emotions in the circle that formed around Aleksandr and Natal'ja Gercen in the 1840s precipitated the family's departure from Russia in 1847. In Europe, Gercen was separated from Nikolaj Ogarev, who, from adolescence, had been more than a friend and more than an ally. As Gercen put it in the key chapter of *Byloe i dumy* (written in 1853), Ogarev was an object of his "first love" – the love that "forgets sexual difference" (VIII, 83). They were united both by "chemical affinity" and by a shared "revolutionary religion" (VIII, 80).²¹ As for Natal'ja, in the first months of the couple's sojourn in Europe, she formed a passionate attachment to a female friend, Natal'ja Tučkova (whom she called, following George Sand, her *Consuelo*); they parted when the Tučkovs returned to Russia at the onset of the revolution. The union with the Herweghs seemed to recreate the emotional and ideological ambience of the intimate circle in a new situation.

Soon emotional complications arose in the new circle. Beginning in August 1849, unbeknownst to Gercen and Emma, the closeness between Natal'ja and Herwegh had acquired a different character: they had consummated their union in sexual intimacy. In this new situation, Natal'ja struggled to relate the personal and the social – now as coincidence, now as conflict. In the first days of their love, she wrote to Herwegh: "Neither revolutions nor republics are needed: the world will be saved *if it understands us*. Or even if it perishes, I do not care, you will always be for me what you are."²² But Natal'ja still believed that harmony – the two families sharing a joint life in a single household which would serve as a microcosm of the future socialist society – was possible, provided that her husband, Aleksandr, and Herwegh's wife, Emma, knew nothing of her sexual intimacy with Herwegh.

Herwegh's separation and estrangement from his wife, however, introduced a note of discord. Both Aleksandr and Natal'ja Gercen kept pleading with Herwegh to restore the general peace. Gercen used political terminology: to end "the civil war with Emma" (XXIII, 242-243). Hopeful that harmony was within reach, but oblivious to his wife's sexual involvement with Herwegh, Gercen wrote in the words of the famous song of the 1789 revolution, "Ça ira! ça ira!" (XXIII, 242-243). In his letters, he tried to inspire his errant friend to a new life, reproaching him for "un égoïsme cupide, un

amour-propre implacable”, which he explained in social terms as a result of Herwegh’s immersion in the “bourgeois milieu” (XXIII, 230). But tensions, doubts, and suspicions were appeased for the sake of harmony: “harmony in our tight circle” (Gercen to Herwegh); “harmony and happiness which would come to be when our families unite” (Natal’ja’s note in Gercen’s letter to Emma); the harmony that “few people were able to achieve” (Herwegh to Gercen).²³

After June 1849, the members of this small circle, persecuted by the French authorities and beset by financial problems, led a peripatetic existence in France and Switzerland, separating and reassembling in different constellations. Their letters document the complex entanglement of four people held together by mediated emotions and shared beliefs. They shared a trust in the transcendent power and social potential of “friendship in love” – an emotion that could unite more than two people in a harmonious relationship. It was underwritten by literary models drawn from the books that explore both the dangers and the advantages of triangular (and quadrangular) relations: Rousseau (his *Confessions* and *La Nouvelle Héloïse*), Goethe, George Sand (her novels and her memoirs), and Gercen’s own *Kto vinovat?* were on their reading list.

They seem to have found their main model in George Sand, whose novels present emotional utopias in which the explosive potential of triangular desire is conquered in a fulfilling relationship of three (if not four) people who complement each other to form a single inseparable whole. George Sand’s emotional utopias were directly based on the socialist utopianism of Pierre Leroux, whose vision of the social harmony in a collective was an expansion of the private ideal of emotional harmony in a love triangle. The key to harmony is that a triple union overcomes differences (in sex and temperament as well as in social status and wealth). In her contribution to this issue, focusing on Natal’ja’s letters to Herwegh, Kate Holland shows how, inspired by her reading of Sand, Natal’ja confers symbolic and social value on her simultaneous relationship with Herwegh and Gercen, indulging in a fantasy that a communal merging of the two families would embody a way to overcome the social and political differences which the 1848 revolution revealed. Judging by his *Kto vinovat?* (first published in 1845-1846, it appeared in German translation in 1851) and by what he later wrote to Ogarev in the course of the second triangular drama, Gercen, too, was intrigued by the potential of collectivity in love.²⁴

But let us return to the events of the family drama. Recall that other participants in this “friendship in love” did not know of the sexual intimacy between Natal’ja and Herwegh, and that the intended harmony was predicated on their not knowing. In February 1850, pressed by Gercen, Herwegh met Emma after months of separation. During this meeting, he confessed the

secret to Emma, swearing her to secrecy. Natal'ja, deeply troubled by Emma's obvious suffering, begged Herwegh to spare Aleksandr. At this time, the two families were planning their final reunification in Nice. This is how Gercen described the state of political and personal affairs to Herwegh in a letter sent with Emma on February 19, 1850:

La république en France est perdue... La propagande du socialisme se fait – mais cela ce sont des questions de deux générations. La barbarie de la dissolution est au complet, le chaos, la confusion et la corruption générale règnent. A présent la grande question subjective, où aller? Le danger ici est imminent, je ne reste que pour mes affaires avec Rotschild. Je prendrai des renseignements sur Nice... (XXIII, 274).

Shortly thereafter, both the Gercens and the Herweghs were expelled from France. After demanding Gercen's immediate return, the Russian government started a formal procedure "for the permanent exile of the defendant Aleksandr Gercen, deprived of property rights, from the confines of the Russian Empire".²⁵ Disturbing news came from Russia: Ogarev, who had recently united with Natal'ja Tučkova in common-law marriage, had been arrested, allegedly together with Tučkova, though the last part turned out to be false. Gercen had been long trying to recover, through the mediation of the bank of Rothschild, a part of the family estate seized by the Russian government. He felt tormented by the pettiness of his everyday struggle with adversity.

In June 1850, the two families did reunite in Nice, then a part of Italian Piedmont. They finally formed a single household, wherein the Herweghs lived largely at Gercen's expense – still under the sign of the culturally significant intimacy that prefigured the new world to come. But Georg and Emma, for reasons unclear to Gercen, seemed uneasy. Natal'ja had high hopes for the restoration of initial harmony, and more: "And what if Ogarev and Natalie came here – we would form a colony!.. [...] And after that what is the point of destroying the family! Then we would all be one family!"²⁶ She was pregnant. (The child, Ol'ga, was born on November 20, 1850.)²⁷ From her childbed, Natal'ja could hear Herwegh's footsteps on the floor above and she sent him ecstatic notes. The letter from November 29 has brought considerable embarrassment to commentators: "Let men one day fall and worship before our love, dazzled as at the transfiguration of Jesus Christ."²⁸ The Soviet commentator Lanskij takes this as evidence of "pathology" in Natal'ja's feeling. Carr found an explanation for such sentiments in George Sand's theory of the sanctity of free passion; indeed, Natal'ja and her cohorts called George Sand a "female Christ".²⁹

In the first days of 1851, Gercen finally understood the situation. Confronted with the knowledge of the sexual intimacy between Herwegh and Natal'ja, he felt unable (as Natal'ja had predicted) to continue "une existence

commune". In humiliating terms, he asked the Herweghs to leave his house. Later, in *Byloe i dumy*, referring to the evidence of documents from the time, Gercen hinted at the explosive sexual potential of the situation, across gender lines:

Письма его [Гервега] ко мне – *сохранившиеся у меня* – скорее похожи на письма л юбовника, чем на дружескую переписку. Он со слезами упрекает меня в холодности, он умоляет не покидать его, он не может жить без меня, без прежнего полного, безоблачного сочувствия, он проклиная недоразумения и вмешательство "безумной женщины" (т. е. Эммы). Он жаждет начать новую жизнь, жизнь вдали, жизнь с нами, – и снова называет меня отцом, братом, близнецом.

(The letters he [Herwegh] wrote to me – *which I still have* – resemble a lover's letters more than friendly correspondence. With tears, he reproaches me for being cold; he begs me not to leave him – he cannot live without me, without the previous, complete and unclouded, sympathy; he curses misunderstandings and the interference of the "crazy woman" (i.e. Emma). He thirsts for a new life, a life far away, a life with us – and once again calls me his father, brother, and twin.)

Gercen's response, shaped by Puškin's exaltation of barbaric freedom over civilization in his *Cygane* (*The Gypsies*), was couched in social terms:

На все это я говорил ему на разные лады: "Подумай, можешь ли ты начать новую жизнь, можешь ли стряхнуть с себя... порчу, растленную цивилизацию", и раза два напомнил Алеко, которому старый цыган говорит: "Оставь нас, гордый человек, ты для одного себя хочешь свободы!"

Он отвечал на это упреками и слезами, *но не проговорился*. Его письма 1850 и первые разговоры в Нице служат страшным обличительным документом... чего?

(In response to all of this, I told him, in various ways: "Just think, will you be able to start a new life, will you be able to shake off... the damage, the depravity of civilization?" and a couple of times I reminded him of Aleko, to whom the old gypsy man says: "Leave us alone, proud man, you want freedom for yourself alone!")

He responded to this with reproaches and tears, but *he never let it slip out*. His 1850 letters and the first conversations in Nice serve as terrible, implicating evidence... of what?

This "of what?" is of the utmost importance. Indeed, what was Herwegh's crime in Gercen's eyes? He continued:

Чего? – Обмана, коварства, лжи... нет; да это было бы и не ново – а той слабодушной двойственности, в которой я много раз обвинял западного человека.³⁰

(Of what? – Of lying, treachery, deception... no; that would not have been new, anyway. – Of that spineless duplicity, of which I have accused Western man many times.)

Corrupted by civilization, selfish and duplicitous, Herwegh became an embodiment of Western man – the “bourgeois” – as opposed to the freedom-loving Russian “barbarian”. In 1852, describing the affair in his letters to friends and cohorts in democracy, Gercen connected the failure of the revolution betrayed by the duplicitous liberal bourgeoisie and the failure of “l’existence commune” betrayed by Herwegh.³¹

According to Gercen’s account, Emma pleaded with him in vain on behalf of her distraught and allegedly suicidal husband to find a solution that would be in accord with the ideals of freedom in love. One plan called for Herwegh to stay on in the Gercens’ home as a tutor for the children; another proposed that Natal’ja would leave Gercen to unite with Herwegh, while Emma would stay with Gercen and care for his children. But Natal’ja, whose passion for Herwegh did not seem to subside, felt that she could not leave (could not “assassinate”) Aleksandr. As Gercen put it, in the end, Herwegh left “très bourgeoisement, avec bagage, femme, bonne et enfants”.³²

In the months that followed, the four exchanged mutual recriminations as they tried to settle accounts – emotional and financial. (To facilitate the Herweghs’ departure, Gercen took it upon himself to pay off their debts to local merchants; as he later recounted in *Byloe i dumy*, Emma, who already owed Gercen ten thousand francs on a promissory note, used this occasion to her economic advantage.) In their letters, neither Emma nor Herwegh spared Natal’ja. Both reproached her for initiating the affair and then refusing to bring it to fulfillment. Emma went as far as to accuse Natal’ja of “sentimental dilettantism” (her refusal to decide for either one man or another).³³ All four feared bloodshed (by suicide, murder or duel).

Gercen and Natal’ja maintained their marriage (and, for several months, Natal’ja maintained her correspondence with Herwegh); both relationships were painful and strained. In June 1851, while traveling for distraction, Gercen learned from a friend he met in a cafe in Geneva (Nikolaj Sazonov) that – defying Gercen’s demand for secrecy – Herwegh had made their situation public knowledge. Moreover, Gercen learned that his position was a matter of moral judgement in the radical community and that he was blamed for subjecting his wife to “moral coercion” and preventing her from joining her lover, Herwegh.³⁴ In pain and rage, he demanded that Natal’ja state her intentions. In response, she hastened to meet him. *Byloe i dumy*

describes this encounter of the spouses in Turin as “the second wedding”. For the next four months they seemed to have lived peacefully. Then something happened.

By an uncanny coincidence, on November 17, 1851, another misfortune struck the family: Gercen’s mother and the couple’s deaf-mute son, Kolja, drowned in a shipwreck on the way to Nice. *Byloe i dumy* describes these events with piercing pain in the chapter called “Oceano nox”. On December 2, 1851, the revolution came to an end and the Second Empire was proclaimed in France. This double catastrophe reaffirmed Gercen’s belief in the inextricable link between the “private” (“častnoe”, or “ličnoe”) and the “social” (“obščee”). As he wrote to Proudhon on December 26, 1851, “Entre le sinistre personnel et le présent un monde entier a fait naufrage”. Further, speaking of the failed revolution, Gercen lamented the fall of the liberal, civilized, oppositional bourgeoisie: “Elle a tout vendu pour garder son argent...” He continued with meditations on the workings of history, concluding: “Hegel et vous – vous avez fait la moitié de mon éducation philosophique” (XXIV, 216-217). What stands out is Gercen’s search for philosophical paradigms that would help place his public and private experiences in a meaningful frame of reference. Hegel (or modifications of Hegel’s philosophy of history) seems to have provided such a frame.³⁵

The new catastrophe dealt Natal’ja a horrible blow. At the end of December, Natal’ja, once again pregnant, fell dangerously ill. Soon after, Herwegh, who had long been silent, wrote to Gercen challenging him to a duel in a monstrously offensive letter (which Gercen called “donos”, or a denunciation of Natal’ja). As Gercen later wrote in *Byloe i dumy*, Herwegh not only rejoiced in the fact that “fatum” had decided between them by drowning Gercen’s progeny in the sea, but also reported certain shocking details about Natal’ja.³⁶ What Gercen did not relate in his memoirs was the content of this letter: Herwegh reported that Natal’ja had been at one time pregnant with his, Herwegh’s, child; that she had begged him forgiveness for carrying Gercen’s child (presumably, Ol’ga); that she had claimed to have remained “virgin” in her husband’s arms; and, finally, that she had promised to leave Gercen for Herwegh. (As we now know from Natal’ja’s letters to Herwegh, which came to light in 1933, she did indeed write these things to her lover.)

Gercen, a Russian aristocrat – as he called himself, illegitimacy notwithstanding – refused the duel. As a revolutionary, he preferred that Herwegh be tried in a “jury d’honneur” composed of the members of the international democracy. At this point, he too made the affair public, writing about the circumstances to members of the radical community. As he later wrote to one of them, in refusing the duel he also acted as a proponent of women’s liberation:

Mon refus avait encore une autre signification plus étendue; j'ai voulu par ce fait définitivement, solennellement reconnaître en réalité la liberté de la femme. J'ai voulu donner toute la plénitude de l'indépendance à la femme pour se réhabiliter elle-même. (XXIV, 249)

To allow Natal'ja to "rehabilitate herself", Gercen suggested that she write to Herwegh and make her position clear. The letter from Natal'ja to her lover, dated February 18, 1852, in which she firmly states her disillusionment with him and renounces the past itself, is included in *Byloe i dumy*. Gercen believed that this was his wife's final statement on her involvement with Herwegh:

С этой минуты ее презрение перешло в ненависть, и никогда ни одним словом, ни одним намеком *она не простила его* и не пожалела об нем.

(From that minute on, her disdain turned into hatred, and she *never forgave him* or regretted losing him – not with a single word or a single hint.)³⁷

Natal'ja remained dangerously ill (with pleurisy and pneumonia) for months. Fearing that she would not survive childbirth, she asked her closest friend Natal'ja Tučkova-Ogareva to come from Russia and take charge of the children. But this did not happen. On May 2, 1852, after giving birth to a boy, Natal'ja Gercen died. The child, born prematurely, died on the same day.

Gercen never learned that Natal'ja had secretly sent Herwegh a last, bitter farewell and blessing from her deathbed.

After her death, Gercen's immediate task was to form a "court" that would condemn Herwegh's violation of the socialist moral code in the name of the international community of socialists. He addressed an appeal to his brothers in democracy, asking them to be his judges in the name of the solidarity of the peoples and of the autonomy of the individual.³⁸ Writing to an intimate friend, Marija Rejchel', who had known the Gercens for much of their life and had followed them into exile, he explained in detail how his personal tragedy was intertwined with the question of the revolution and of "the new people":

Важность вопроса не теряйте из вида, это вовсе не несчастная трагедия, а вопрос колоссальный – вопрос всей революционной религии, всех последних надежд для меня. Действительно, я сознаю себя *новым* человеком, как выразился Саффи. И вот я делаю опыт наказать злодея без старого суда, без старого поединка – одной силой демократического мнения. *Новые* люди вострепнулись, они поняли важность и отвагу предприятия, но если они не

сумеют провести, не найдут сил раздавить мерзавца, труса, если погибнем мы, а не он, – ну что же тогда? Не будет ли это микроскопическое доказательство, что не только на больших размерах, но и в самых мелких, демократия бесплодна, неспособна, что внутренние, незримые волокна ее так же бессильны, как и ее вестовая труба, как ее воззвание? Понимаете, как у меня теперь все это сплетено в один жизненный вопрос. (July 23, 1852; XXIV, 306)

(Do not lose sight of the importance of the question. This is not an unfortunate tragedy at all, but an enormous issue – the issue of revolutionary religion, of all my last hopes. I really feel like a *new* man, as Saffi said. And now I perform an experiment by trying to punish the villain without the old trial, without the old duel, but rather with the mere force of a democratic opinion. New people roused themselves; they understood the importance and courage of the enterprise but if they will not be able to carry it out and will not find the strength to crush the scoundrel and coward, if we perish – and not he – what then? Will it not serve as microscopic proof that not only on the grand scale, but also on the small one, democracy is futile and incapable, that its interior, invisible fibers are as powerless as its trumpet? You see how all of this is now intertwined for me into one vital question.)

Addressing Proudhon, he claimed that a failure to act in this case on the part of the “society of the future” would be a sign that the revolutionary future was an utopian dream:

Si la société de l’avenir restait en effet muette et impassible devant ce drame terrible, devant un homme dans lequel s’est concentrée double toute la dépravation, toute l’immoralité qu’elle hait, qu’elle poursuit dans le vieux monde, avec l’apparence révolutionnaire, couvrant un abîme... elle ne serait pas viable... elle serait condamnée à mourir à l’état de fœtus, passer sans réalisation aucune, comme une espérance abstraite, comme un rêve utopique. (September 6-7, 1852; XXIV, 326)³⁹

It is worth noting that both letters relegate sexuality to metaphors of failed procreation: “demokratija besplodna”, “la société de l’avenir [...] serait condamnée à l’état de fœtus”. What also comes through in these letters is how important it was for Gercen to convince his “friends in democracy” that he did not fear a duel, but took a historically significant step to replace this “feudal” way to resolve a conflict between a wronged husband and a lover by a new institution. (In response, Proudhon, as well as Michelet, expressed their solidarity with Gercen, but refrained from any action.)

Gercen also wrote to Richard Wagner, addressing him as the theoretician of “the art of the future” and appealing to Wagner’s “aesthetic sense”.

Gercen insisted that Herwegh's crimes were not a result of "autonomous passion" or "tragic collisions with their fatal consequences"; they were of a "profoundly bourgeois" and "vulgar" nature (July 8, 1852; XXIV, 295). (In his reply, Wagner, who was Herwegh's friend, expressed his only desire regarding the affair: not to know about it.)

Finally, through a friend in the democracy, Gercen appealed to George Sand as the embodiment of the revolutionary idea of the woman: "*Elle doit connaître cette histoire, elle qui résume dans sa personne l'idée révolutionnaire de la Femme.*" In this letter, Gercen cast Herwegh in the role of the weak and selfish hero of *Horace*, George Sand's novel set in the wake of the 1830 revolution.⁴⁰ (Most probably, George Sand did not respond.)

Hard as he tried, all of Gercen's efforts came to naught: the court representing the society of the future – an apocalyptic event of sorts – failed to convene. As Gercen scholars agree, at this point he resorted to another plan. On November 5, 1852, Gercen wrote to Marija Rejchel' from his new home in London:

Поздравьте меня [...] у меня явилось френетическое желание написать мемуар, я начал его, по-русски (спишу вам начало), но меня увлекло в такую даль, что я боюсь, – с одной стороны, жаль упустить эти воскреснувшие образы с такой подробностью, что другой раз их не поймаете... Иван Алексеевич, княгиня, Дмитрий Павлович, Александр Алексеевич, Васильевское – и я ребенком в этом странном мире, патриархальном и вольтеровском. – Но так писать – я напишу "*Dichtung und Wahrheit*", а не мемуар о своем деле. (XXIV, 359)

(Congratulate me [...] I have a new frenetic desire to write a memoir. I began writing it in Russian (I will copy the beginning for you) but I was transported into such distant places that I am afraid – on the one hand, I regret to let go of these images resurrected in such detail that I might not be able to capture them again... Ivan Alekseevič, the princess, Dmitrij Pavlovič, Aleksandr Alekseevič, Vasil'evskoe, and I – a child in that strange, patriarchal and Voltairean, world. But if I write this way, I will write *Dichtung und Wahrheit* rather than a memoir about my own affair.)

Gercen here refers to the members of the unconventional family into which he was born: "Ivan Alekseevič" is I.A. Jakovlev, the Russian aristocrat who fathered Gercen out of wedlock with the young German bourgeoisie, Luisa Haag; "princess" is M.A. Chovanskaja, Gercen's paternal aunt, who brought up his future wife, Natal'ja Zachar'ina. (Natal'ja was the illegitimate daughter of the older brother of Gercen's father, Aleksandr Jakovlev; her mother was a serf.)

Concluding the letter, Gercen appealed to the opinion of the community – this time, an intimate circle of Russian friends: “Kak mnenie vaše i našich družej, pisat’ bol’šoj voljum ili odin memuar?” (What is your opinion and that of our friends, should I write a large volume or a single memoir?”; XXIV, 359).

Indeed, a whole network of friends participated in his project: later in November, V.A. Engel’son, who was Gercen’s confidant in his confrontation with Herwegh, wrote to Gercen: “Ja polučil pis’mo ot T [M.-E. Tessié de Motay], kotoryj pišet mne ob vas” (“I received a letter from T [M.-E. Tessié de Motay], who writes about you”): “Il écrit *ses* mémoires. Le pluriel l’a emporté sur le singulier, et je suis, heureux, comme vous pouviez l’être, de cette victoire grammaticale”. Engel’son himself was of a similar opinion.⁴¹

It is necessary to remark on the significance of the word “memoir” (which has escaped the attention of Gercen scholars). What Gercen had in mind, I think, is a specific genre that appeared in France in the years preceding the Revolution: a judicial memoir (*mémoire judiciaire*). Published by both lawyers and litigants, such a “memoir” was a novelty – a document in which first-person narrative and dramatic form replaced the customary legal prose.⁴² Thus, for Gercen and his cohorts, who had just lived through the defeat of another French revolution, to publish “a memoir” (singular) meant to appeal to the power of public opinion and thereby partake of revolutionary culture.⁴³ To write “memoirs” meant something else: the plural referred to a literary genre.

But while his friends rejoiced in his choice, Gercen himself was far from happy. This is how he presented his situation to yet another friend in democracy, Karl Vogt, the medical doctor who was also involved in the debate on the genre:

Toi aussi Brutus – vous me faites aussi du compliment sur le commencement des mémoires, vous et Engels<on> et Edm<ond> Chojecki> et Tessié. Mais, chers amis, pensez un peu qu’il <y> a plus d’amitié dans votre contentement, que de raison. Je ne me fais aucune illusion. Faire des mémoires au lieu d’un mémoire c’est presque abdiquer, c’est être parjure, presque traître – et couvrir par un succès littéraire une déchéance morale. Je me méprise pour cela – pourquoi donc je le fais? – Kastraten sind wir, impotente Wüstlinge, au lieu d’érection, nous nous contentons de paroles lascives.

Note that the sexual resides in metaphors. In the next sentence, Gercen connected the events that took place in his home to the historical events (described in cosmic metaphors):

La triste histoire qui s’est passée autour de mon foyer (qui vous paraisse il y a un comique, que le bon Dieu vous pardonne) représente exacte-

ment, comme l'aberration des étoiles représente en petit l'écliptique – le 24 février de toutes les nations, un bon désir, un élan énergétique – une courte haleine et une halte – quelquefois une mort dans la boue. (November 21, 1851; XXIV, 361)⁴⁴

In the end, his intimate failure (depicted in terms that clearly suggest a failed sexual act) “represented” the failure of the revolution. Furthermore, for Gercen in 1852, turning to *Byloe i dumy* marked a collective and an individual failure: instead of a revolutionary action (the condemnation of Herwegh’s duplicity and betrayal on the part of the radical community), this disappointed husband and disillusioned revolutionary engaged in literary writing.

It is tempting to speculate about the emotional dynamics of Gercen’s situation. His letters written in the months surrounding his wife’s death provide a glimpse into his feelings: again and again, he speaks of a sense of vacuity, emptiness, and profound lack of meaning in his life. In a letter to Proudhon (on March 23, 1852), he complains:

Il y a bien longtemps que je désire me appeler à votre souvenir, mais il y a un tel *vacuum horrendum* dans mon âme, je suis tellement malade et, si non découragé, au moins dégoûté de la vie, que je ne trouvais rien de digne de vous être communiqué. (XXIV, 259)

For Gercen, who always defined himself through speech, having nothing to communicate must have been the worst condition of all. But in the end he does find something to say to his fellow revolutionary. He speaks about “their time” as the epoch in which “history” itself is silent and empty:

Notre temps appartient en effet à ces époques écrasantes, dont l’histoire ne dit rien, dans lesquelles il ne se passe rien, mais pendant lesquelles l’année se compose de 365 jours et le cœur de l’homme fait ses 60 pulsations par minute. Ce sont les époques des souffrances subjectives dont le lyrisme s’évapore sans même pouvoir atteindre une mention sèche et honorable dans une chronique. (XXIV, 259)

These words – Gercen’s reflections on *horror vacui* – touch on the very essence of his emotional disposition and his philosophy of life. (He refers to the famous principle “*natura abhorret vacuum*”, elaborated by authors ranging from Empedocles to Pascal, but seems to apply it to human life and to history.) For Gercen, “subjective suffering” – the suffering devoid of historical meaning – is nothing but a void.

Drafting a letter to Ogarev on April 3, 1852, Gercen tries once again to express his sense of emptiness and meaninglessness. Addressing his oldest

friend, with whom he shared the quest for the liberation from the religious “idealism” of their youth, Gercen speaks of the “horrible story of the last year-and-a-half” as an affliction of “fate”: “sud’ba taščit na kazn’ – v ètom ee jumor, ee ateizm” (“fate drags me to the execution; in this lies its humor and its atheism”). He seems to use the word “atheism” to affirm the lack of higher meaning. (The word “humor” probably nods at the Romantic notion of life as “an empty and silly joke”.) But then he notices that in blaming fate, he still tries to assign religious meaning and teleology to human life. He corrects himself: “Ili, lučše, v ètom obvinenii ee – naša glupost’, naša neispravimaja religioznost’, vera v vseobščij razum, v vysšij porjadok” (“Or, rather, our foolishness, our irreparable religiosity, our faith in the universal reason, in the higher order reveal themselves in blaming fate”; XXIV, 263). This letter remained unfinished and unsent. It might not be an exaggeration to claim that Gercen’s lifelong attempts to replace religious teleology with something else – with history – also remained unfinished.

In the letter to his and Natal’ja’s close friend and confidante, Marija Rejchel’, written on April 5, 1852, while Natal’ja lay dangerously ill, Gercen (who wrote on the Monday of Easter week) rehearses the sensory memories of his Christian childhood: “the sound of the ringing bells”, “the candles”, “mushrooms, rules to follow, the hoarse voice of the cantor, the sleepy deacon...”. He goes so far as to regret the atheistic regime in his household: “[...] čem vse èto zamenit’?.. Nečego budet našim detjam pominat’, sveli my ich žizn’ na prozu piščevarenija da na skuku rassudka” (“[...] what would replace all of this?.. Our children would have nothing to remember; we reduced their lives to the prose of digestion and to the boredom of reason”; XXIV, 265). He then describes vacuity as the meaninglessness of the everyday:

Недавно какой-то англичанин считал свою жизнь перед смертью и свел ее на несколько дней. Например, так... Мне 40 лет, из них 10 бессмысленного детства, 10 проведены во сне, 10 ел, мылся, надевал сапоги... Остается 10 лет. Искл ючить из них тюрьму, ссылку, болезни близких и последние полтора года, то увидите, что больше 5% не да ют. (XXIV, 264)

(Recently some Englishman calculated his life before he died and reduced it to several days. For example, it could have been done this way... I am forty years old; out of those forty, ten were spent in meaningless childhood, ten spent sleeping, ten spent eating, washing, putting on boots... What remains is *ten years*. If we take away prison, exile, the illnesses of family members, and the last year and a half, then you will see that one is not granted more than five percent.)

Writing to Rejchel' again, on June 15, 1852, six weeks after Natal'ja's death, he concludes his report on daily life: "A ved' strašno pusto!" ("What horrible emptiness!"; XXIV, 284).

It seems that Gercen found relief from the horrible feeling of vacuity in the process of writing his life. An atheist, he replaced religion with historicism. In his memoirs all those events that, in his letter to Rejchel', he described as "meaningless" – childhood, imprisonment and exile, and, finally, the last year and a half – were filled with meaning: the historical meaning. In this process, literature served as a mediator. To use the language of his letter to Proudhon, Gercen turned to literature in order to endow his "subjective suffering" with "lyrical expression" and thus to make it the subject of a historical chronicle, albeit in the form of an autobiography.

The Production of the Text: 1. Gercen Writes and Publishes His Story

Though the initial autobiographical impulse came from a need to make a "confession" and tell "the terrifying story of the last years", Gercen began with his earliest memories. He addressed his "confession" to his "brothers in Russia".⁴⁵ Gercen scholars believe that the first four parts, which take the hero from his birth in 1812 through his departure from Russia in 1847, were written more or less in chronological order between 1853 and 1857 (Parts One, Two and Three, in 1852-1853; Part Four, in 1854-1857), to be revised, amended and rearranged in later years. Parts Six, Seven, and Eight were written between 1856 and 1867.⁴⁶ It has proven difficult to determine the time frame for the writing of Part Five, in which the revolution and the family drama are described, but it, too, occupied most of Gercen's remaining life.

The chapters that formed Section One of Part Five – the story of the revolution – seem to have been written in 1855-1857. As for Section Two, according to I.G. Ptuškina (who recently reconstructed Gercen's work on the basis of the newly found original manuscript), Gercen worked on the story of his family drama in 1853, 1855, 1857-1858, 1860, 1863, 1865, and 1867-1868. There was a gap of two years between his first attempts to tell his story in 1853 and another, abortive attempt made in 1855, on the third anniversary of Natal'ja's death. (It should be noted that, in 1852, Gercen described his family drama in letters to friends, from which he culled situations, phrases, metaphors, and character sketches for his memoirs.)⁴⁷ Ptuškina believes that the first version of the whole story was completed in 1857-1858.⁴⁸ This means that Gercen was writing the story of Natal'ja's involvement with Herwegh at the time when another drama was unfolding in his family: his own sexual involvement with Natal'ja Tučkova-Ogareva (which he did not mention in his memoirs).

This second family drama, which, in a way, was an aftermath of the first, deserves a brief digression. Recall that on her deathbed Natal'ja Gercen had bequeathed the care of her children to her intimate friend Natal'ja Tučkova, who in the meantime had married Gercen's closest friend, Ogarev. Unable to leave Russia upon Natal'ja Gercen's death, Natal'ja Tučkova-Ogareva and Nikolaj Ogarev joined Gercen in London in April 1856. During the first three sleepless nights of their reunion, Gercen told them his terrible story "in all its details".⁴⁹ Though it seemed that the arrival of the Ogarevs would restore the long-lost sense of community, Tučkova-Ogareva's attempts to become a second mother to the children were fraught with tension. The children did not accept her; moreover, the situation led to conflict with another member of Gercen's household: Malwida von Meysenbug, a German exile to whom Gercen had entrusted his children's education.

In a few months, Gercen noticed yet another complication. At the end of 1856, he wrote to Ogarev:

Давно хотел я с тобой посоветоваться, мой Друг, и все, жалея разрушить гармонию и тишину твоей жизни и столь же жалея N<atalie>, как тебя, молчал. [...] Я заметил в дружбе N<atalie> ко мне более страстности, нежели я бы хотел. Я люблю ее от всей души, глубоко и горячо – но это вовсе не страсть, для меня она ты же, вы оба – моя семья и, прибавив детей, все что у меня есть. [...] в моей чистой близости с твоей подругой был для меня новый залог нашего трио. [...] она видит во мне Наташу, защитника ее за гробом, твоего друга, брата и мою симпатию. [...] смело, чисто стою я перед тобой, Друг моей юности, – но еще шаг, и новая пропасть откроется под ногами. (XXVI, 62-63)⁵⁰

(I have wanted to ask for your advice for a long time, my Friend, but, regretting to destroy the harmony and tranquility of your life and feeling as much sympathy for N[atalie] as for you, I was silent. [...] I have noticed in N[atalie]'s friendship towards me more passion than I would like. I love her with all my heart, deeply and warmly – but it is not passion at all; for me, she is you – both of you are my family, and, along with the children, you are all I have. [...] In my untainted closeness with your companion I saw a new assurance of our trio. [...] In me, she sees Natasha, she sees Natasha's defender after her death, she sees your friend and brother, and my sympathy. [...] Fearlessly and innocently, I stand before you, Friend of my youth – but one more step, and a new abyss will open up beneath our feet.)

As Ogarev wrote to Gercen two or three years later, he, too, "had believed in a dream to unite the three into one love", and he still believed this to be possible.⁵¹ For Natal'ja Tučkova-Ogareva the choice was to return to Russia alone or "навек *trio*" ("trio forever").⁵² In September 1858, Natal'ja Tuč-

kova-Ogareva and Gercen had a child, Liza, followed, in November 1861, by twins. Both Gercen and Ogarev were actively involved in the upbringing of the children, who bore Ogarev's name and were supposed by all to be Ogarev's. (Only Ogarev, Gercen, and Natal'ja Tučkova-Ogareva knew that Ogarev was sterile.)

But the desired "harmony" was not to be, and this time, it seems, it was the woman who proved unable to sustain the relationship emotionally. As is amply documented in letters, Gercen's relationship with Tučkova-Ogareva was plagued by emotional conflicts and domestic squabbles. The conflicts poisoned the lives of the Gercen children, but did not, however, interfere with the life-long closeness between Gercen and Ogarev. In the early days, when the trio still lived together, Ogarev captured one day in their household in a comedy for an intimate audience, entitled *Bedlam, or A Day of Our Life* (1857-1858).⁵³ But Gercen, in a letter to Ogarev from 1865, called this "second drama" of his life, "tragedy à l'antique" (XXVIII, 93). Remarkably, both Gercen and Ogarev, as well as Gercen scholars, blamed Natal'ja, citing mainly her tendency towards "the hypertrophy of the personal".⁵⁴ But the personal alone was never sufficient for Gercen. Thinking of his second family drama, but writing in the language of social theory and Hegelian dialectics, Gercen noted, on August 16, 1863, in his fragmentary late diary:

Частной жизнь ю не много сделаешь, ее нельзя выдать за норму. Теорию с практикой в деле отрицания примиряет революция. В ней отрицание – не личное, не искл ючительное, не на выбор, не уклонение – а открытое противодействие старому и водворение нового. Старая добродетель объявляется пороком, нелепость ю и пр. Все это невозможно для отдельного лица и для домашнего употребления. (XX, 603)

(One cannot do much by way of personal life, it cannot pass for the norm. Revolution reconciles theory with practice in the matter of negation. In the revolution, the negation is not a personal matter, not a matter of choice, not a deviation, but an open resistance to the old and the affirmation of the new. The old virtue is proclaimed a sin, an absurdity, etc. All of this is impossible for an individual person and for domestic use.)

It seems that Gercen still believed in the possibility of uniting emotional liberation and revolution, but not on the domestic scene.

To return to the writing of the family drama, in 1860, when Gercen returned to his story, making extensive revisions, his relationship with Tučkova-Ogareva was in crisis (they were separated).⁵⁵ In the fall of 1863, when he traveled from England to Nice to visit his wife's grave (ten years after he started

his story), Gercen returned to the manuscript again, adding two post-scripta.⁵⁶ On March 26, 1865, he started another post-scriptum (which remained unfinished). On this day, he returned to the cemetery for the burial of the twins, who died of diphtheria at the age of three during another separation. Another set of revisions to Section Two of Part Five was made in 1867 or 1868. Gercen died, in 1870, without completing the text.⁵⁷

The publication of *Byloe i dumy* seems to have been haphazard. Beginning in 1854, Gercen published fragments from various parts – in achronological order – in journals and the collected volumes of his Free Russian Press, followed by a separate edition in four volumes in 1861-1862 and 1867.⁵⁸ In the introduction to the publication of Part Three in 1857 Gercen noted:

Один парижский рецензент [...] прибавляет шутя, что я повеству ю свою жизнь, как эпическую поэму: начал *in medias res* и потом возвратился к детству. Это эпическое кокетство – совершенная случайность. (VIII, 408)

(One Parisian reviewer [...] adds, jokingly, that I relate my life in the form of an epic poem: I began *in medias res* and then returned to my childhood. This epic coquetry is a complete accident.)⁵⁹

Scholars have suggested that Gercen published the least intimate parts (first, in 1854, Part Two, the story of his arrest and exile) and then released increasingly intimate material.⁶⁰ Gercen's introductory comments to his publications indeed confirm such an interpretation. In the introduction to the first publication – of Part Two, “Тjur’ma i ssylka (1834-1838)” (“Prison and Exile [1834-1838]”), in 1854 – he commented:

Рассказ о “т юрьме и ссылке” составляет втору ю часть записок. В нем всего меньше речи обо мне, он мне показался именно потому занимательнее для публики. (VIII, 403)

(The story of “prison and exile” constitutes the second part of the notes. It discusses me the least, which is exactly why it seemed to me to be more engaging for the public.)

In 1856, upon publication of the next installment, Part One, “Detskaja i universitet (1812-1834)” (“The Nursery and the University [1812-1834]”), the narrative of his childhood and youth:

В этой части мне приходилось больше говорить о себе, нежели в напечатанных, и не только о себе, но и о семейных делах. Это вещь трудная [...] но я не хотел пожертвовать интересом, который

имеет жизнь, искренно рассказанная, — целомудренной лжи и коварному умолчанию ю. (VIII, 399)

In this part, I had to talk more about myself than in the published ones, and not just about myself, but also about family matters. This is a hard thing [...] but I did not want to sacrifice to prudent lies and insidious silence the interest held by a sincerely told life.

With the 1857 publication of Part Three, “Vladimir-na-Kljaz’me (1838-1839)” (“Vladimir-on-Kljaz’ma [1838-1839]”), the story of his love for and marriage to Natal’ja Zachar’ina, Gercen remarked:

Часть, печатаемая теперь, интимнее прежних; именно потому она имеет меньше интереса, меньше фактов; но мне гораздо труднее писать ее... [...] Может быть, кому-нибудь из тех, которым была занимательна внешняя сторона моей жизни, будет занимательна и внутренняя. Ведь мы уже теперь старые знакомые. (VIII, 409)

(The present published part is more intimate than the previous ones, which is why it has less interest and contains fewer facts, but I am finding it much harder to write... [...] Maybe, some of those who found the external part of my life interesting will also find the internal part interesting. After all, we are now old friends.)

Whether or not such an effect was “a complete accident” or Gercen’s intention, these comments not only explicitly marked Gercen’s hesitation in publishing the intimate details of his family life; they must have had the additional effect of heightening the reader’s interest in the intimate. In the end, the process of publication created intimacy between Gercen and his reader.

Different chapters from what eventually became Section One of Part Five appeared in Gercen’s journals *Poljarnaja zvezda* (*Polar Star*) and *Kolokol* (*Bell*) between 1855 and 1862. This first half was devoted to Gercen’s involvement in the 1848-1852 revolution; it concerned the “obščee” (public/common) as opposed to the “častnoe” (private/personal) in his life. Publishing this part in 1859 in *Poljarnaja zvezda*, Gercen entitled it “Zapad. Otdelenie pervoe. Outside (1849-1852)” (“The West. Section One. Outside [1849-1852]”), thereby indicating that the second section devoted to his life in the West was forthcoming.

In *Poljarnaja zvezda* (in 1856 and 1859) and in *Kolokol* (in 1862), Gercen also published short fragments of a more intimate nature, which were later included in Section Two of Part Five. Thus, in 1859 Gercen published the story of the 1851 shipwreck, “Oceano nox”.

When Part Five came out in the separate edition of *Byloe i dumy* (volume IV in 1867), it was limited to one section, which included mainly the

chapters on the revolution (as well as another variant of “*Oceano nox*”). The word “Outside” had disappeared from the subtitle, “Pariž – Italija – Pariž (1847-1852)” (“Paris – Italy – Paris [1847-1852]”).

Gercen seemed to signal to the reader that there was more to the story.⁶¹ The 1867 variant of “*Oceano nox*” consisted of two parts, or fragments. The first part told the story of Gercen’s “rendezvous”, “reconciliation”, and the “second wedding” with Natal’ja in Turin in July 1851 – however, it failed to account for any circumstances that would have necessitated a reconciliation. The second part contained the story of the shipwreck, which was already known to the reader, complete with the following footnote:

Этот отрывок (никогда еще не печатавшийся) принадлежит к той части “Былого и дум”, которая будет издана гораздо позже и для которой я писал все остальные... (X, 271)

(This excerpt [never published previously] belongs to the part of *Byloe i dumy* that will be published much later and for which I wrote everything else...)

The reader’s interest in the unsaid, as well as a sense of the reader’s gradual admittance into intimacy with the author, must have been heightened by such hints. But while Gercen’s intimacy with the reader grew, his intimacy with his own family seemed to falter. Preparing to publish “*Oceano nox*” in 1859, Gercen sent it to his son Aleksandr, adding:

[...] прочти, когда ты будешь нисколько рассеян: над этими страницами я провел месяцы, на них следы слез... мне было почти жаль их печатать. (XXVI, 244)

(Read it when your mind will not be in the least bit scattered: I spent months over these pages; there are traces of tears on them... I was almost sorry to publish them.)

Feeling a need for an intimate audience, Gercen held private readings of his manuscript for carefully chosen friends. As he wrote on July 27, 1860, to his female friend, the writer M.A. Markovič, whom he expected in London:

Мне очень хочется вам прочесть те несколько глав (которые мне стоили несколько лет и которыми я был до нынешнего лета недоволен) – да только мне бы это хотелось или в комнатке у вас – читать с глазу на глаз, или на поле – я сказал бы на берегу морском – только это смешно, – но непременно с глазу на глаз. [...] Я жду вашего искреннего суда, честного, – вы – как женщина –

должны сказать, если это вас шокирует. Я верю в ваше сердце. А для меня эти главы не шутка. Кроме Ог<арева> и С<атина>, я никому не читал всего. (XXVII, 82)

(I very much want to read to you those few chapters [which cost me several years and with which I had been dissatisfied until the past summer] – but I would like to read them in private, either in your room or in a field – I would say on the seashore, if that weren't ridiculous – but certainly eye to eye. [...] I await your sincere, honest judgment; you as a woman should say if all of this is shocking to you. I believe in your heart. These chapters are not a joke to me. Besides Og[arev] and S[atin], I have not read them in their entirety to *anyone*.)

As Markovič never came to London, this encounter did not take place, though others indeed heard Gercen read his story. Gercen failed to mention to Markovič another intimate fact: that he had already read fragments to a woman, Natal'ja Tučkova-Ogareva. Thus, Gercen noted on his manuscript that he read the excerpts to Ogarev and Natal'ja Tučkova-Ogareva in 1856-1860.⁶²

We know little about Gercen's initial plans and hesitations regarding the publication of the chapters on his marital drama. A rare piece of evidence is found in N.A. Mel'gunov's letter to Gercen from October 13, 1856:

Ты спрашиваешь, печатать ли интимную часть “Записок”? Как публика, я сказал бы: “Разумеется, печатать”. Но вопрос о “приличии” можешь ты один решить: почему бы нет? Большая часть твоих читателей или уже знает или догадывается *en gros*, что ты мог бы сообщить теперь *en détail*. Наконец, дело твоего личного такта – найти средину между романтической стыдливостью и цинической откровенностью. А в такте такого рода у тебя недостатка нет.⁶³

(You ask whether to publish the intimate part of your “Notes”? As your audience, I would say: “Of course, publish them”. But you have to decide the problem of “propriety” yourself: why not? The majority of your readers already either know or guess *en gros* what you could communicate *en détail*. Finally, it is a question of your personal tact to find a balance between romantic shyness and cynical openness. And you do have a fine sense of tact.)

When Gercen died on January 21, 1870, the story of his 1848-1852 family drama remained unpublished. So did two other fragments from the memoirs that dealt with Gercen's sexual experience: his affair with P.P. Medvedeva, which was concurrent with his courtship of Natal'ja Zachar'ina, and his casual infidelity with a housemaid in 1843, which Natal'ja did not seem to

have forgiven him, and which, in a way, set the entire family drama in motion. In both cases, the absence was marked in the published text by a line of dots.⁶⁴

In the end, while privileged readers (members of the family and friends) knew the intimate details of Gercen's life, general readers were in many ways prepared by the manner of publication to expect them. The process of publication created intimacy between Gercen and both groups of his readers.

The Production of the Text: 2. Managing the Story after Gercen's Death

After Gercen's death in January 1870, the decision on whether or not to publish the story of the family drama was in the hands of his and Natal'ja Gercen's children.⁶⁵ For years, they hesitated. As the oldest of the two daughters, Natal'ja Aleksandrovna (Natal'ja, or Tata) Gercen, wrote to Marija Rejchel', in October of 1870, "Sooner or later, it will be necessary to publish it, since father wished for it – but for now we postponed this for a while longer. Have you read this volume or not?"⁶⁶ In 1876, when the first posthumous edition of Gercen's collected works was being prepared, Gercen's daughter decided to seek professional advice. She handed a copy of the manuscript of the unpublished part of Part Five to Ivan Turgenev, who hastened to share his excitement (and the manuscript) with the critic Pavel Annenkov:

Я сейчас окончил чтением ту часть "Былого и дум", в которой Герцен рассказывает историю ю своей жены с Гервегом, ее смерть, и т. д. (Мне эту рукопись вручила Тата.) С своей стороны я решительно против печатанья, хотя как читатель не могу об этом не жалеть, ибо все это написано огнем, слезами и кровью – я до сих пор нахожусь в состоянии того особенного нервного трепетанья, которое всегда возбуждают во мне герценовские исповеди.⁶⁷

(Just now, I finished reading the part of *My Past and Thoughts* in which Gercen tells his wife's and Herwegh's story, her death, etc. (Tata gave me this manuscript.) For my part, I am decidedly against publishing it, even though, as a reader, I cannot help regretting this, since all of this is written with fire, tears, and blood. I am still in that state of special nervous trepidation that Gercen's confessions always arouse in me.)

Both Turgenev and Annenkov not only knew the Gercens personally, but had also witnessed the beginning of their intimacy with the Herweghs in Paris in 1848. In a letter to a fellow writer, Michail Saltykov-Ščedrin, Turgenev

wrote: "Tak pisat' umel on odin iz russkich" ("Only he, of all Russians, could write in this way"). This statement (which became famous with later critics) was preceded by an equally unequivocal judgment: "Žal', čto napečatat' èto nevozmožno" ("It is a pity that it is impossible to publish this").⁶⁸ Annenkov agreed with Turgenev's judgment that the story could not be published. Their main reason, it seems, was the fear of retaliation from Georg Herwegh's widow, Emma (Georg Herwegh had died in 1875) – the publication of Natal'ja Gercen's letters to Georg. As Annenkov wrote to Turgenev, "Podumat' tol'ko, čto v rukach m-me Gerweg nachodjatsja ešče pis'ma k ee suprugu bednoj Natal'i Aleks<androvny>" ("Just think, all the letters of poor Natal'ja Aleks[androvna] to Herwegh are still in the hands of M-me Herwegh").⁶⁹ In the end, the first collected works appeared (in 1875-1879 in Geneva) without the intimate sections of Part Five.

One family member supported publication: Natal'ja Tučkova-Ogareva.⁷⁰ The main protagonist of the second family drama (which unfolded in the years when Gercen wrote the story of the first), she kept insisting that Gercen wished that the story be made public. She also claimed that he asked her to read it to his children: "velel mne čitat' ego i Saše i Nataše – Ol'ge nel'zja bylo, potomu čto ona ne ponimala po-russki" ("he asked me to read it to both Saša and Nataša – it was impossible to read it to Ol'ga because she did not understand Russian").⁷¹ Rejecting the children's explanations as mere pretext, Ogareva claimed that the real reason for their objections was that Gercen's children had become "bourgeois".⁷² As for Natal'ja Gercen's letters to Herwegh, "Nataša's letters are gone; who guards the past this much?"⁷³ Fearing that what he wrote would simply disappear with her death, she pressed Gercen's son, Aleksandr, to make her a copy of the original manuscript, which, after much hesitation, was given to her in 1875.⁷⁴ Later in life, Ogareva told her own version of the drama in a private memoir written at the urging of E.S. Nekrasova, who was among the first scholars to collect information about Gercen's life.⁷⁵

In 1907, Gercen's heirs entrusted the historian Michail Lemke with the publication of Gercen's works and letters in Russia.⁷⁶ When it came to Part Five, once again, they hesitated. Gercen's grandson, Nikolaj Aleksandrovič Gercen (the only grandson who knew Russian), wrote to Lemke:

В сущности, пресловутая пятая часть не содержит ничего компрометирующего Н. А. И если мы до сих пор не желаем издавать ее, то делаем это во избежание неприятной полемики с наследниками Гервега.⁷⁷

(In essence, the notorious Part Five does not contain anything compromising N.A. And if we still do not wish to publish it, then we do so in order to avoid an unpleasant polemic with Herwegh's heirs.)

(Emma Herwegh had died in 1904.) To Michail Geršenzon (who competed with Lemke for the opportunity to publish Gercen's intimate papers) Nikolaj Gercen gave the following reason:

Есть много причин, по которым мы не можем сейчас публиковать пятую часть Мемуаров моего деда: прежде всего, мой дядя Моно не хочет, чтобы его жена узнала что-либо об этой истории. Вы, несомненно, сами помните, что дедушка высказывал некоторые сомнения о своем отцовстве по отношению к моей тетке Ольге. Затем вы знаете, что Гервег предстает там в крайне неблагоприятном свете. По этому мы уверены, что его наследники не останутся ни перед чем, чтобы защитить его память.⁷⁸

(There are many reasons why we cannot currently publish Part Five of my grandfather's Memoirs: first of all, my uncle Monod does not want his wife to learn anything about this story. Undoubtedly, you remember that my grandfather had expressed certain doubts about his paternity in relation to my aunt Ol'ga. Then you know that Herwegh appears in an extremely unfavorable light there, which is why we are sure that his heirs will stop at nothing in defending his memory.)

The objections of Ol'ga Gercen's husband, Gabriel Monod (a historian and admirer of Michelet) were mentioned by others.⁷⁹ However, there is no readily available evidence that Gercen doubted his paternity.

Over the years, a number of Russian scholars visited Gercen's daughter Natal'ja Aleksandrovna (Tata) Gercen, who lived in Lausanne, seeking access to the manuscript. Among them were E.A. Ljackij (in 1910) and N.P. Anciferov (in 1911 and 1914).⁸⁰ In 1912, Lemke made a long-planned visit. Over the year he worked with Gercen's manuscripts his relationship with the Gercen family acquired a certain emotional intensity. As he wrote to N.A. Gercen:

Частенько, особенно теперь, когда я весь ушел в вашего отца, смотрю я на вашу карточку и на карточку Николая Александровича, и много дум и много чувств возбуждают эти лица дочери и внука величайшего из русских писателей...⁸¹

(Frequently, especially now, when I have become completely absorbed in your father, I look at your picture and at Nikolaj Aleksandrovič's picture, and these faces of the daughter and grandson of the greatest of Russian writers arouse many thoughts and many feelings.)

During the 1912 visit, their intimacy grew. In the end, Lemke managed to convince the family to release a copy of the manuscript. When he brought it

to Russia, he organized a reading of the story to a selected circle of guests in the home of the philanthropist V.A. Morozova. Gercen's daughter approved this reading – a fundraiser for the edition – on the condition “that it did not become a public affair”.⁸² As Lemke reported, some of the listeners cried; the fundraiser was a success.

Soon it became clear to the family that they could not control knowledge about the drama. A conversation between Anciferov and Natal'ja Aleksandrovna Gercen in 1914 (during his visit to Lausanne) sheds light on at least some of the reasons that led to a change in the family position. This is how Anciferov described it:

Я напомнил ей письмо, которое она писала мне в 1911 году о неизданной части “Былого и дум”, где говорится об уходе ее матери. Нат. Алекс. всплеснула руками: “Вот и Вы говорите об уходе. Неужели в России все так думают? Ведь никакого ухода не было. Моя мать сумела победить свою страсть”. И Нат. Алекс. достала “Былое и думы” и показала мне ее слова: “Я возвращаюсь как корабль в свою гавань, спасенная”. “Ведь она же ездила в Турин встретиться с отцом из дому, из Ниццы, который она никогда не покидала. ‘Возвращаюсь’ она писала в духовном смысле”. Нат. Алекс. сказала мне, что ее потрясло известие, что в России существует такая точка зрения на семейную драму ее родителей. Она решила опубликовать все до последней строчки, чтобы реабилитировать память матери. Говоря это, она сильно волновалась.⁸³

(I reminded her of a letter, which she wrote to me in 1911 about the unpublished part of *My Past and Thoughts* that discusses her mother's leaving them. Nat. Aleks. threw up her hands in surprise: “You, too, talk of her leaving us. Does everyone in Russia think so? Actually, there was no leaving at all. My mother was able to overcome her passion.” Then, Nat. Aleks. took out *My Past and Thoughts* and showed me her words: “I am coming back as a ship comes back to its harbor, saved.” “In fact, she went to Turin to meet my father from home, from Nice, which she never left. She wrote ‘coming back’ in a spiritual sense.” Nat. Aleks. told me that she was shocked by the news that such a point of view on her parents' family drama existed in Russia. She decided to publish everything to the last line in order to rehabilitate her mother's memory. She was very agitated when she spoke about this.)

But many years passed before “everything” was in fact published. World War I brought Lemke's edition to a halt in 1915, after the appearance of the first eight volumes. The rest appeared after the Revolution, when Lemke (who joined the Bolshevik party) successfully negotiated the cooperation of the Soviet authorities. (Much to the Gercen children's distress, he was not able to

reverse the nationalization of proceeds from the sale of the edition).⁸⁴ The story of the family drama was first published in full in 1919, in volume XIII of Lemke's *Polnoe sobranie sočinenij i pisem Gercena*. (Like the edition as a whole, the volume bore the inscription "Izdanie naslednikov avtora" [Edition of the Author's Heirs].) This allowed the editors of the Soviet academic edition (the so-called 30-volume edition) to claim, in 1956, that "the complete edition of *Byloe i dumy* was accomplished for the first time after the Great October Socialist revolution, in our country, in the author's native land".⁸⁵

In the course of his editorial work on Part Five, Lemke encountered the problem of constituting a text, which consisted of fragmentary parts. The editor had at his disposal not Gercen's original manuscript, but a copy. The original, contained in a notebook, was preserved in the Gercen family "kak svjatynja" ("as a sacred text").⁸⁶ This copy, as well as several other existing copies, apparently left room for interpretation. Which fragment opened the story of the family drama? What was the order of chapters? Where did the story come to an end? What belonged to the appendixes and addenda? What were the titles of the separate chapters and of the story as a whole? And, finally, how to connect Section One, on the revolution, and Section Two, on the family drama? These and other questions continued to plague the editors from 1912 to 1997. Over the years, Gercen scholars reached different decisions, making different versions of the text available to the reader.

Lemke made his decisions mainly on the basis of a note Gercen wrote to Ogarev in 1869, shortly before his death, entrusting his closest friend with the final constitution and publication of the chaotic text of his memoir. (Ogarev, who was then suffering from epilepsy and alcoholism, did not fulfill this task.) Based on this note, Lemke combined the chapters on the revolution and the chapters on the family drama into one single text of Part Five, subtitled "Paris – Italy – Paris (1847-1852)".⁸⁷

In 1921, in Berlin, the émigré press Slovo issued another edition of *Byloe i dumy* marked "first complete edition". It prominently featured the story of the family drama. In his introduction, the initiator of this publication and its editor – one of the leaders of the liberal KD party, F.I. Rodičev – lamented "the strange fate of Gercen's writings", from the omission of one part of Part Five ("the part dearest to Gercen, for which he wrote all the rest") to the fact that the Lemke edition came to a halt in 1917. It seems that Rodičev (who left Russia in 1918) was indeed unaware that in 1919 Lemke did publish the complete Part Five.⁸⁸ In any case, he discounted the Soviet editions:

Других изданий, кроме советских, в России не будет... [...] Для душ свободной России печатается настоящее издание. Печатается с уполномочия наследников Герцена.

(There will be no other editions in Russia except the Soviet ones... [...] The present edition is published for the free Russia of the future. It is published with the authorization of Gercen's heirs.)⁸⁹

Rodičev and his "Gercen circle" (Kružok imeni A.I. Gercena) – a stronghold of Russian liberalism – had already clashed with Lemke in the 1910s, competing for the honor of bringing out the first full edition of *Byloe i dumy*, complete with its intimate chapters.⁹⁰ This rivalry was a part of a struggle for the political interpretation of Gercen's heritage: was he the father of Russian socialism or the father of (a soon to be aborted) Russian liberalism? (This struggle is, of course, alive to this day.) Then, in the matters of who would publish the complete *Byloe i dumy*, the Gercen family sided with Lemke. Now, after the Bolshevik revolution, the situation changed. Trying to persuade Gercen's daughter Natal'ja Gercen to authorize the publication of the complete *Byloe i dumy* (and then the rest of Gercen's works) in the West, Rodičev used several arguments: given the complete destruction in Russia, Lemke is unable to continue the publication; if he does publish, the edition will appear, as did the first parts of *Byloe i dumy*, "Bolshevik style" (in new orthography and on bad paper); "Lemke serves the Bolsheviks", and, most importantly, this edition is "necessary" at this particular moment, when, both in Russia and in the West, one hears the opinion that "Votre Père" was a "precursor of the Bolsheviks".⁹¹ While she felt uneasy breaking the commitment she had made to Lemke, on the questions of Gercen's reputation as a "precursor of the Bolsheviks" Gercen's daughter seems to have shared Rodičev's opinion.⁹²

From 1920 on, Rodičev and his family became intimately involved with the Gercen family. In the words of a present-day Russian scholar, "life had arranged it so [žizn' rasporjadilas' tak] that spiritual closeness to Gercen materialized into the special human relationships that Rodičev and his family members formed with Gercen's descendants".⁹³ The correspondence between the Rodičevs and Natal'ja Aleksandrovna Gercen (whom Rodičev addressed in his letters as "Tante Tata") indeed testify to their intimacy. After Rodičev's death in 1933, one of his daughters, Aleksandra Rodičeva, became a companion to Natal'ja Gercen, and stayed with Gercen's daughter until her death in 1936, managing the archive.

For his edition, Rodičev used another copy of the story of the family drama made from Gercen's original manuscript (obtained, like Lemke's copy, from the Gercen family); the Berlin edition featured the story as Section Two of Part Five, subtitled "Semejnaja drama" ("The Family Drama").

A number of separate editions of *Byloe i dumy* that appeared in the Soviet Union after 1919 reproduced the Lemke text. In the 1950-1960s, after years of intense labor on the part of a group of scholars from the Gor'kij

Institute (Institut Mirovoj literatury im. Gor'kogo), a monumental 30-volume "academic" edition of Gercen's work was produced in the Soviet Union, supplanting all other existing editions with carefully reconstructed and thoroughly annotated texts. For this edition, the text of Part Five was constructed anew, appearing (in 1956 in volume X) in yet another, third, variant. The textology, commentary, and introduction were prepared by S.S. Borščevskij, I.G. Ptuškina, and L.P. Lanskij (X, 446). By this time, the copy used by Lemke, as well as Gercen's 1869 note to Ogarev on which Lemke based his reconstructions, had been lost (they are missing to this day); the location of the original was unknown (X, 448). Using three different copies of the missing original notebook in which Gercen wrote the last version of his family drama,⁹⁴ the editors of the 30-volume edition arranged the fragmentary parts somewhat differently than their predecessors.⁹⁵ Like Rodičev, they divided Part Five into two halves, placing the story of the revolution in one section and the story of the family drama in another. In this edition, Section Two assumed a subtitle – chosen by the editors – "Rasskaz o semejnoj drame" ("The Story of the Family Drama").⁹⁶

The numerous subsequent publications of *Byloe i dumy* have followed the text of the 30-volume edition. Edition after edition has used the subtitle "The Story of the Family Drama", so that, for readers and scholars alike, this became a standard, probably irreversible, name for the notorious intimate part of Gercen's memoirs.

For years, Soviet scholars kept searching for the original notebook. This was far from easy: scattered in the course of the Gercen family's peripatetic life, their papers ended up in a number of private and public institutions in Europe as well as America, and Soviet scholars were severely restricted in their contacts with the West. (From 1922 until her death in 1936, Gercen's daughter N.A. Gercen rejected suggestion that she hand the archive over to Soviet Russia.) An active participant in this search was Sergej Makašin, an editor of the series *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, devoted to the publication of archival documents on the history of Russian literature. In 1945, as a Soviet soldier in occupied Prague, Makašin tried (but failed) to gain access to the Gercen files in the émigré archive, the "Russkij zagraničnyj istoričeskij archiv" (in which N.A. Gercen had chosen to deposit a large part of the Gercen papers), seized by the Soviet army. The collections were soon handed over to Soviet institutions, but the manuscript of Part Five was not found in the so-called "Prague collection".⁹⁷ Makašin also pursued another route, trying to establish contact with the Gercen family. In 1950, he sent a telegram to Ol'ga Gercen (Monod) greeting her on behalf of *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* on the occasion of her hundredth birthday. Born in the momentous year 1850, in the midst of the family drama, Gercen's younger daughter still lived in Versailles. It was not easy for the Soviet scholar to explain to Ol'ga's children what he was looking for, but, in 1955, one of them, Germaine Rist

(née Monod), wrote to Makašin that she believed the autograph of Part Five to be in the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam.⁹⁸

It was also difficult for *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* to communicate with the International Institute of Social History (IISG). The institute, established in 1935 with the immediate goal of saving the documents of the international labor and socialist movements, literally smuggled Bakunin's manuscripts out of Austria shortly before the Nazis came to power and purchased the documents smuggled out of Soviet Russia by Mensheviks, Social Revolutionaries, and Trotskyites. (Trockij's papers were stolen in 1936, most likely by Soviet agents, from the Institute's Paris office headed by the prominent émigré Boris Nikolaevsky, and have since disappeared; other missing materials, seized by the Nazis, were discovered in Moscow in 1991.)⁹⁹ In 1956, after a long correspondence between the Soviet archivists, their Amsterdam colleagues, and members of the Gercen family, which had been plagued by mutual misunderstandings,¹⁰⁰ Sergej Makašin was informed that the Institute indeed had the notebook containing the manuscript of the intimate sections of Part Five written in Gercen's hand. The manuscript – "for which we searched the whole world" – was finally found.¹⁰¹ It had been purchased by the Institute and its founding director Nicolaas W. Posthumus in 1937-1938 from Gercen's grandson, Vladimir Aleksandrovič Gercen, through the mediation of Boris Nikolaevsky.

It remains unexplained why it was only in 1970 that *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* received from the International Institute of Social History a microfilm of the original manuscript of Part Five (in exchange for photocopies of documents from the archives of Marx and Engels, which found their way from Germany to Moscow after the war).¹⁰² Nor do we know what went on within Soviet scholarly institutions between 1970 and 1997, when the autograph of the story of the family drama was finally published, in volume 99 of *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, by I.G. Ptuškina, who dubbed it "The Amsterdam Notebook".

I.G. Ptuškina (a researcher employed by the Institut mirovoj literatury im. Gor'kogo) has carried out the enormous task of carefully analyzing Gercen's original manuscript. Working with the photocopies of Gercen's autograph, Ptuškina (who has not had an opportunity to travel abroad for research), corrected about three hundred textual inaccuracies in the text of the 1956 edition (misreadings, omitted sentences, transpositions of word order, forgotten italics, division into paragraphs, etc.) and changed the chapter titles.¹⁰³ Moreover, she suggested a different beginning and ending for the story, reframing the whole text.

Thus, Ptuškina reached the conclusion that Section Two was supposed to start with a fragment entitled "Iz žurnala ženščiny" ("From a Woman's Diary"; contained in a different notebook) – with excerpts from the diary Natal'ja Gercen kept shortly before the family's departure from Russia in

1847, which Gercen edited for publication. At the end of Section Two of Part Five, under the subtitle “Addendum” (“Pribavlenie”), Ptuškina placed several fragments. They included two diary-style notes, “Teddington pered ot’ezd-om” (“Teddington, before departure”, dated August 1863), and “Posle priez-da” (“After arrival”, dated September 21, 1863). Gercen made these notes in his diary (and copied them to his manuscript) on the occasion of his trip to Nice, when he visited Natal’ja’s grave, the house in which the Gercens had lived jointly with the Herweghs, and the house in which Natal’ja had died:

21 сентября 63 был я на могиле. [...] Я пошел с кладбища в оба дома. Дом С ю и дом Дуйса. Оба стояли пустыми. Зачем я вызвал опять этих немых свидетелей à charge.

Вот терраса [...] Диван, покрытый теперь пыль ю и какими-то рамками – диван, на котором она изнемогла и лишилась чувств в страшную ночь объяснений.

Я отворил ставень в спальней дома Дуйса – вот он старо-знакомый вид... Я обернулся – кровать, т юфяки сняты и лежат на полу... словно на днях был вынос... Сколько потухло, исчезло в той комнате. Бедная страдальца – и сколько я сам – беспредельно любя ее – участвовал в ее убийстве!

(On September 21, 1863, I visited the grave. [...] From the cemetery I went to both houses: Sue’s house and Douis’s house. Both were empty. Why had I summoned these mute witnesses of prosecution again?

Here was the terrace [...] The sofa, now covered with dust and some frames – the sofa on which *she* collapsed and fainted on the dreadful night of our decisive conversation.

I opened a shutter in the bedroom at Douis’s house – here was the old and familiar view... I turned around – the sheets and mattresses had been taken off and were lying on the floor... as if the dead body had been recently carried out... So much had died out and vanished in that room. The poor sufferer – and what a part I myself, infinitely loving her, had in her murder!)

The text as we knew it between the 1956 and the 1997 publications ended with these words. However, the notebook that was now at Ptuškina’s disposal contained one more entry:

ЕЩЕ ПОСЕЩЕНИЕ
(25 марта 1865).

(ANOTHER VISIT
[25 March 1865].)

Under this title and date, there is nothing. On this day, Gercen visited Natal'ja's grave again when he came to Nice to bury the bodies of the twins he fathered with Natal'ja Tučkova-Ogareva.¹⁰⁴ The text, as constructed by Ptuškina, ends with this marked absence.

These textological decisions have had consequences for the interpretation of the text. The two fragments that open and conclude Part Five transform the memoir into a diary, as it were.¹⁰⁵ This frame seems to freeze time in an endless present.

There is something else. Obviously, Gercen's story has more than one ending and more than one beginning, or more than one frame. The first chapter (which presents events that preceded the Herwegh affair) ends with the following words:

Было время, я строго и страстно судил человека, разбившего мою жизнь. Было время, когда я искренно желал убить этого человека... С тех пор прошло семь лет; настоящий сын нашего века, я износил желание мести и охладил страстное воззрение долгим непрерывным разбором. В эти семь лет я узнал и свой собственный предел... и пределы многих... и вместо ножа – у меня в руках скальпель, а вместо брани и проклятий – принимаюсь за рассказ из психической патологии.¹⁰⁶

(There was a time when I harshly and passionately judged the person who ruined my life. There was a time when I sincerely wished to kill this person... Seven years have passed since then; as a true son of our century, I had worn out the desire for vengeance and cooled the passion of my view with long and continuous scrutiny. In these seven years, I learned my personal limit, too... and the limits of many... and, instead of a knife, I hold a scalpel in my hands, and, instead of swearing and damning, I embark on a story from psychological pathology.)

What follows is the story of Natal'ja's love affair with Herwegh.

The words "in these seven years" allude, in my opinion, to Gercen's second family drama: his involvement with Natal'ja Tučkova-Ogareva, when he found himself in a position not unlike Herwegh's in his affair with Natal'ja Gercen. Ending with the cryptic note "Another visit", the story of the first drama is framed in coded evocations of the second. It might not be an exaggeration to say that the second – concealed – drama is silently present in the story of the first.¹⁰⁷

Another change concerns the title. Ptuškina concludes that Gercen intended to provide a subtitle for the intimate second half of Part Five: "Inside" (in English), a pendant to the subtitle of the first half, "Outside".¹⁰⁸ This, too, has consequences for the interpretation of Part Five. The "Outside"/"Inside" frame declares the duality between the common and the personal, history and

intimacy, which is the backbone of Gercen's conception of life. This simple composition seems to suggest that the two dimensions of human life can be separated, contained, and ultimately joined into a larger whole. Making them into one emerges as the main topic of the fifth part of Gercen's life story.¹⁰⁹

In 2001, an edition of *Byloe i dumy* that followed the latest reconstruction of Part Five appeared in print, prepared by I.G. Ptuškina. It was issued in Moscow by a post-Soviet publishing house that bears the same name as the publisher of Rodičev's 1921 edition of *Byloe i dumy*: Слово/Slovo (twice, in Cyrillic and Latin script). This edition restores Gercen's title of Section Two, "Inside" (however, it does not restore the subtitle of Section One, "Outside").¹¹⁰ The 2001 edition will probably not be the last in the long series of textual variants. From the vantage point of 2006, one thing seems clear: with all the painstaking work done by generations of Gercen scholars, there is no final text of Gercen's *Byloe i dumy*.

There is one more irony in the publication history of *Byloe i dumy*: forgotten by everybody, there was, preceding the 30-volume academic edition, a publication that restored the subtitle "Inside" to the second part of Part Five (and the subtitle "Outside" to its first part), suggested yet another composition for the story of the family drama, and, for the first time, offered extensive commentaries on the circumstances of and participants in the Gercen family drama. Appearing in 1931 and 1932 (in two separate, almost identical, variants), this *Byloe i dumy* was edited by Lev Borisovič Kamenev, the prominent Bolshevik revolutionary and statesman.¹¹¹

Throughout his tumultuous career, Kamenev combined the role of revolutionary with that of a historian of the revolutionary movement. It is hard to imagine how, with all his occupations and responsibilities, Kamenev found the time for historical and literary scholarship. Indeed, over the years Kamenev fulfilled a number of party and government assignments (which included, after the revolution, membership in the party's Central Committee), engaged in time-consuming personal initiatives (including preparing a list of enemy intellectuals used in the 1922 arrests and deportations, as well as helping arrested writers and scholars). Both before and after the 1917 revolution, he actively participated in factional struggles and the competition for power, and, both before and after the revolution, he frequently found himself under arrest. And yet, while working for the revolution, Kamenev also worked on its history. In 1914, an editor of the underground Bolshevik newspaper *Pravda* and the man designated to head the Bolshevik faction of the Duma (a plan interrupted by his arrest), Kamenev published in *Vestnik Evropy* his first work of scholarship, an article on Gercen and his rivals in the 1848 revolution.¹¹² From Gercen and Černyševskij, he moved to a living subject, Lenin. (In 1922, Lenin entrusted Kamenev with his archive.) By 1927, Kamenev, who, for most of his political life, vacillated between opposition and support for the leader (first Lenin, then Stalin), had lost all of

his party and government posts. In the 1930s, his sphere of influence was strictly limited to literature: in 1932, he was made the director of the publishing house Academia; in 1934, the director of the Institute of Russian Literature and of the Institut mirovoj literatury im. Gor'kogo. Having failed as a revolutionary leader, Kamenev again became a student of Gercen. In 1934, Kamenev was arrested, along with other members of the party's highest echelons; he was executed in 1936.¹¹³

At the time of its appearance, Kamenev's *Byloe i dumy* was warmly and prominently welcomed. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* published lavish praise by the Gercen scholar Ž. Ėl'sberg (aka Jakov Ėl'sberg), at the time, Kamenev's secretary and close associate in Academia.¹¹⁴ Then, as well as later, he was also an informant for Stalin's security service, and he is now believed to have been responsible for the arrests of a number of literary scholars, historians, and writers.¹¹⁵ When Kamenev was executed, after a notorious public trial, the books for which he served as the editor, including Gercen's *Byloe i dumy*, disappeared from the public domain.¹¹⁶ (Kamenev's current and former wife, two sons, brother, and sister-in-law disappeared as well.) Ironically, Gercen's works were, once again, banned in Russia, now not on account of the author, but on that of the editor – a member of the following generation of revolutionary activists, who, living in that “future free Russia” envisioned by Bakunin, combined statesmanship with the historiography of the revolutionary movement and its literature.¹¹⁷

Kamenev was officially rehabilitated in 1988. The Public Library in St. Petersburg (renamed the Russian National Library) returned a copy of Kamenev's *Byloe i dumy* from its special department (Specchran) to the general holdings in 1990.¹¹⁸ Western libraries hold copies – obtained in the Soviet Union – in which Kamenev's name is scratched out with a razor blade (in some, the introduction is cut out).¹¹⁹ This edition has yet to be brought to the attention of Gercen scholars in Russia: since 1936, not a single scholar or editor of *Byloe i dumy* either mentioned or used the rich material contained in this edition.

Over the years, there have been problems not only with the text and editions, but also with the story itself. After 1919, when Lemke first published the intimate parts of *Byloe i dumy*, generations of readers took Gercen's version of the events as simply true. Roughly speaking, Herwegh appeared as a treacherous and duplicitous friend and lover, who, in the very act of intimate betrayal, also betrayed the revolutionary cause. With obvious pain, grief, and scorn, Gercen pictured himself as a wronged friend, deceived husband, and failed revolutionary, who was ready to accept responsibility for participation in the failure of the democratic revolution and in his wife's “murder” – provided he atoned for his blindness, optimism, and passion by bearing witness to and serving as a historian of both intimacy and revolution, documenting

the “outside” as well as the “inside”. What Gercen desired most was to create an image of his wronged wife Natal’ja. *Byloe i dumy* presented Natal’ja Gercen as a symbol of frail, erring, and vulnerable humanity. Seduced and betrayed, she was a victim who rehabilitated herself by repudiating the errors of her aberrant heart. Gercen’s book was to stand as a monument to her memory.

Much of this rested on Gercen’s conviction that Natal’ja’s repudiation of her passion and her judgment of Herwegh’s worth were absolute and final. There was documentary proof: the letter that the fatally ill Natal’ja wrote to Herwegh on February 18, 1852, cited in *Byloe i dumy* along with Gercen’s certification: “From that minute on, her disdain turned into hatred, and she *never forgave him* or regretted losing him – not with a single word or a single hint.”

But was it true? For years, Gercen’s family and friends worried about Natal’ja’s letters to Herwegh, which remained in the hands of the Herwegh family. Both in Gercen’s lifetime and after his death, attempts were made to retrieve these letters.¹²⁰ In 1870, months after Gercen’s death, Malwida von Meysenbug wrote to Herwegh (apparently through the mediation of her close friend Richard Wagner) asking on behalf of the Gercen children for the return of Natal’ja’s letters in exchange for Herwegh’s letters to Gercen. In his carefully worded reply, Herwegh, mixing two different cultural codes, reproached “Fräulein Meysenbug” for “entering the Russian service” and for “occupying herself with *Dichtungen ohne Wahrheit*”. He described her request as an effort “to crown the edifice of the romantic hero [by asking] for the surrender of the letters of the romantic heroine”, and dismissed it as a social impropriety that was beyond his comprehension. Changing the register from literature to family life, he explained his refusal: “I too have a wife and children to whom I owe it not to abandon this good weapon against possible future calumny; and these letters and other writings shall be preserved from generation to generation. That the Gercen children, whose wish I cannot therefore fulfill, need fear no misuse of them by me is guaranteed by the attitude which I have preserved in the face of the most provocative, most scandalous, most crying brutality.” (He is referring to the deliberate marring of his reputation by Gercen and members of his circle.) He concluded by saying that “in any case, children have no business with their mother’s love-letters”.¹²¹

Apparently, the Gercen children did not believe their mother’s lover. But when, in 1919 in Petrograd and in 1921 in Berlin, Part Five was finally published in full (albeit only in Russian), Herwegh’s children remained silent.

It was not until the 1930s that Natal’ja Gercen’s letters to Herwegh came to light. This happened when the writing of Gercen’s life passed from fellow Russian intellectuals, who identified with Gercen and took his family

drama to heart, to an outsider – the young British diplomat and novice historian, E.H. Carr. (Carr, of course, would become a distinguished historian, journalist, and statesman, the author of monumental histories of the Bolshevik revolution and the controversial *What Is History?*.) In the late 1920s, Carr was a disenchanted liberal who became fascinated with the passionate and irrational Russians. In 1925, posted to Riga as Second Secretary to the British Legation, he killed time by taking lessons in Russian from a “somewhat unreliable Russian priest”.¹²² Reading Dostoevskij, he was taken with the idea of history as a product of the disordered imagination; a rational liberal, he “stepped into a parallel universe”.¹²³ When Carr stumbled across Lemke’s edition of Gercen’s collected works in a second-hand bookstore in Riga, he decided to write on “that brilliant generation of the forties, which had left Russia [...] and which [...] found scattered and unhonored graves in French or Swiss or English soil”.¹²⁴ His book, written in 1931-1933, while he continued his career in the British Foreign Office, was called *The Romantic Exiles*. The book seems to have been deeply personal. Carr’s biographer tells us that “later, when his own marital problems came close to driving him to despair, Carr would talk about these concerns under the semi-transparent veil of the discussion of the lives and loves of *The Romantic Exiles*”.¹²⁵

In his works, Carr seems to have derived inspiration and material from personal contacts. When the meetings of the League of Nations brought him to Geneva, he went to see Gercen’s daughter Natal’ja (Tata) in Lausanne. As his diary shows, his first visit, on September 6, 1931, was immediately followed by another. In their many conversations, “she imparted a great deal from her memory”.¹²⁶ With the audacity of an outsider, in 1932 Carr also contacted the rival family. The son of Georg and Emma Herwegh, Marcel Herwegh (born after the Gercen affair), whom Carr found in Paris, “determined to keep them out of any Russian hands”, proved eager to turn over the Gercen-Herwegh letters to the British author, and, after Carr’s perusal, to the British Museum.¹²⁷ In the Preface to *The Romantic Exiles*, Carr extends gracious thanks to “Mademoiselle Natalie Herzen” and to “Monsieur Marcel Herwegh” (and apologizes to the former for calling her in the book “by her pet name of Tata”). Explaining his intentions, and those of Marcel Herwegh, to his readers, Carr argues: “The chapters of Herzen’s memoirs which tell the story of the rupture [between the two families] were given to the world by the Soviet State Publishing House in 1919; and from this moment it was inevitable that the copious papers in the possession of the Herwegh family should sooner or later be used to redress the balance and to correct the serious omissions and inaccuracies of the Herzen version.” According to Carr’s biographer, Jonathan Haslam, he sought and received Natal’ja Gercen’s opinion before sending the manuscript of *The Romantic Exiles* to his publisher, V. Gollancz, in January 1933.¹²⁸

We hear about Natal'ja Gercen's reaction from the diary of a Russian Gercen scholar, Nikolaj Anciferov:

Мне стало известно, что и Нат. Алекс. получила книгу Карр и, узнав правду, закрыла ее. Не стала читать дальше: "Лучше б я умерла, не зная этой ужасной книги".

(I learned that Nat. Aleks, too, received Carr's book, and, having learned the truth, closed it. She decided not to read any further: "I would have rather died without knowing this terrible book".)¹²⁹

We do not know whether or not "Tata" read as far as her mother's farewell note to Herwegh (written, in French, on April 26, 1852, several days before her death). Carr cited it in English translation:

[...] – "a sign of life" – and to what purpose? Always to *justify you* by covering myself with reproaches, by accusing myself. Be at ease, though you have desire enough and means enough to succeed in that without my help – be at ease; if ever I speak before anyone who is able to understand (otherwise I shall not speak, otherwise it would be the greatest profanation of what is most sacred to me), it will not be to *justify myself*.

Have you hurt me? You ought to know that better than I – I only know that my blessing will follow you everywhere, always.

To say more – would be superfluous.

Carr commented: "Herzen was not told of this letter. That too would have been superfluous. He would not have been 'able to understand'."¹³⁰ What Carr did not seem to understand was that, in this deathbed letter, Natal'ja was preparing to speak to a higher authority than an earthly companion.

The Soviet scholar P.I. Lanskij, who cited this letter in his survey of Natal'ja's correspondence with Herwegh published in *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* in 1958 (with Ja.Ė. Ėl'sberg's preface), gave a slightly different reading of this text. In his text (cited in Russian translation), Natal'ja blames Herwegh for justifying *himself* by covering her, Natal'ja, with reproaches and accusations.¹³¹ Remarkably, the volume from the chronology of Gercen's life for the years 1851-1858, prepared, among others, by L.P. Lanskij and I.G. Ptuškina and published in 1976, while noting the minute events of Natal'ja Gercen's last days, did not mention Natal'ja's last letter to Herwegh.¹³² It appears that Natal'ja's feelings for Herwegh continued to be a highly sensitive matter for Gercen scholars.

As we have seen, generations of historians of Russian thought and literature became involved in the Gercen family drama. Among them were the

prominent members of the pre-revolutionary leftist intelligentsia Michail Lemke and Nikolaj Anciferov, the rebellious Bolshevik Lev Kamenev, the NKVD informer Jakov Èl'sberg, the British diplomat and historian E.H. Carr, and the pillar of the post-Stalinist intelligentsia community Lidija Ginzburg. (There were, of course, many others, whose lives were not exposed to the public.) Remarkably, for some scholars, involvement with the Gercen drama became intensely intimate.

To demonstrate this particular thread in the intimacy-and-history nexus, I will give one striking example: it concerns the historian of the city and scholar of literature Nikolaj Anciferov. In 1911, on his honeymoon in Paris, Anciferov contacted Gercen's daughter Natal'ja and asked her for permission to publish the omitted sections of Part Five. For many years, Anciferov worked jointly with his wife on a book on love in Gercen's life, *Ljubov' v žizni Gercena*. It was largely based on the presumption that Natal'ja remained faithful to Gercen. In his desire to exonerate Natal'ja, the Gercen scholar went even further than Gercen himself, who, after 1851, knew that Natal'ja's infatuation was sexually consummated. *Byloe i dumy* makes veiled, but easily readable, allusions to this fact. In 1933, Anciferov read E.H. Carr's book and (as he put it in his diary) "uznal o svjazi ženy Gercena s Gervegom, o ee strasti, ne pogašennoj do konca ee dnei, do konca utaennoj" ("learned about Gercen's wife's affair with Herwegh, about her passion, which had not been extinguished until the end of her days, and remained secret until the end"). He supposedly suffered a stroke and died. This is a legend. In fact, while he was deeply shaken by Carr's revelations, Anciferov reworked his book on Gercen and love in the light of this new knowledge.¹³³ The source of this legend has been found in one of Anciferov's letters, which relates his conversation, in 1942, with another of F.I. Rodičev's daughters, Sofija Bernackaja, née Rodičeva (who remained in Russia):

Заходил к Софье Федоровне, которой давал читать свою новую работу о любви Герцена. Она на нее произвела большое впечатление, но ее поразило, что я мог поверить измене Наталии Александровны. Она сообщила мне, что вся семья Герцена и ее отец Федор Измайлович убеждены, что переписка, опубликованная Карром, подложная. Она говорит, что один из сыновей Гервега хотел все письма вернуть семье Герцена, но другой – спекулянт, в интересах реабилитации отца – пустился на дурное дело. [...] Софья Федоровна считает, что кровотечение сделалось у ее отца после встречи с Карром из-за волнения. [...] Каково это было слышать мне.¹³⁴

(I paid a visit to Sof'ja Fedorovna, whom I gave to read my new work about Gercen's love. It made a big impression on her but she was astonished that I could believe Natal'ja Aleksandrovna's infidelity. She

told me that Gercen's entire family as well as her father, Fedor Izmajlovič, were convinced that the correspondence published by Carr was counterfeit. She says that one of Herwegh's sons wanted to give all the letters back to Gercen's family but another son, who was a profiteer, committed the misdeed in the interest of rehabilitating his father. [...] Sof'ja Fedorovna thinks that her father's bleeding occurred after the meeting with Carr because of anxiety. [...] Imagine what it was like for me to listen to that.

Rodičev indeed died in 1933, the year Carr's *Romantic Exiles* appeared in print, but this, too, is a legend.¹³⁵ These legends are indicative of the power that the Gercen family drama exercised over the minds and emotions of Russian intellectuals: some have even seemed to relive the Gercen family drama in their own lives.

To return to Anciferov, to the end of his life, he was involved with Gercen's life and texts. His work on *Ljubov' v žizni Gercena* was interrupted by his arrest in 1929. His wife and mother died while he was in prison. In 1933, released from his sentence of hard labor on the Belomorkanal, he worked on the chronicle of Gercen's life *Letopis' žizni i tvorčestva A.I. Gercena* planned for Kamenev's Academia. In 1937, Anciferov was arrested again (to be released in 1939). After World War II, he prepared for publication (in *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*) the documents from the Gercen archive seized in Prague. Anciferov's book on Gercen's love and his chronicle of Gercen's life remained unfinished and unpublished. What was published, in 1992, long after his death, was the story of Anciferov's own life, entitled *Iz dum o bylom* (*From the Thoughts About the Past*), written mainly in 1945-1954, after he lost his wife and children in the terror and war. This book inscribes the historian's life, from his adolescence at the time of the 1905 revolution to the arrests, prison, and exile under the Soviet regime, into the narrative pattern provided by Gercen. As Anciferov's publisher notes, in the titles of parts and chapters, in the division of his life into stages, in the structure of the text itself, and in the plot moves, there are clear traces of the projection of Gercen's life onto Anciferov's own.¹³⁶ I would add that Gercen also provided Anciferov with the paradigm that endowed the drama of another life, also lived in the shadow of revolution, with a semblance of meaning by turning intimacy into history. Like Gercen, Anciferov saw himself as a man who had accidentally got in history's way.

On the preceding pages I have outlined the story of the Gercen family drama, from the tragic love affair, informed by a sense of the historical significance of intimacy and shaped by literary models, to the production of the main text that brought this love affair into the public domain, making it literature, Gercen's *Byloe i dumy*. Struggling to manage his emotions and to control his

wife's memory, Gercen processed his experience by writing and publishing his memoirs. Composing and publishing in a zigzag fashion, with various textual episodes prompted by his memories of the past and by ongoing events in his life, he tried to give his devastating experience a narrative coherence. After the author's death, immediate participants in the real-life drama as well as distant scholars, prompted by various personal and political circumstances, struggled to influence the story by providing or withholding evidence and interpretations. Over the years, many people became intensely involved in what – to less historically conscious minds – might have seemed a family matter. As we have seen, for immediate participants and distant readers alike, this love affair had far-reaching social and personal implications. In the end, the story of the Gercen family drama turned into a paradigmatic text, or institution, of Russian intelligentsia culture: the intimacy-history connection became not only publicly observable, but also reproducible.¹³⁷

Addendum

There were moments in which Gercen doubted the wisdom of trusting history as the cure for his depression, his *horror vacui*. Thus, in 1854 and then again in 1857, Gercen published a story entitled “Povreždennyj” (“The Damaged One”; he indicated that it was written “near Nice” in “Winter 1851”). It also appeared in German in 1858, translated by Malwida von Meysenbug. The story clearly alludes to Gercen's experiences of the double drama of the failed revolution and ruined family. It starts as a first person narrative:

В одну очень тяжелую эпоху моей жизни, после бурь и утрат и перед еще большими бурями и утратами, встретил я одно странное лицо, которого слова и суждения мне сделались больше понятны спустя некоторое время. (VII, 363)

(At one very difficult time in my life, after storms and losses and before even greater storms and losses, I met one very strange person, whose words and opinions became clearer to me only after some time had passed.)

The narrator tells a story that features a hero, Evgenij, who became mentally “damaged” by betrayal in love. A Russian nobleman, Evgenij fell in love with a housemaid, but she impulsively and inexplicably betrayed him with a servant, who robbed the “dreamer” of two thousand rubles. Evgenij's mental illness found expression in an obsessive belief that the planet earth itself and all of its inhabitants were afflicted with a terrible disease, “endemic” in Europe: history. (The term “history” seems to imply both historical development and a sense of being the subject of historical development.) This disease

is fatal: “Istorija sgubit čeloveka [...]” (“History will ruin mankind”; VII, 371). Speaking to the afflicted hero, the narrator voices, perhaps mockingly, a word of hope:

[...] а ведь как л юди-то надуют философию истории и учение о совершенствовании, когда они вылечатся от хронической болезни *historia morbus* и начнут жить мирными стадами? (VII, 377)

(And what if people will play a trick with the philosophy of history and the teaching about progress when they cure themselves of the ailment of *historia morbus* and will start to live in peaceful herds?)

(The phrase “*historia morbus*” is, of course, a pun.) The story ends by moving from the Hegelian philosophy of history to the woman: the reader is exhorted to sympathy for the treacherous maid.

This bizarre story invites symbolic and, perhaps, psychological reading as an emblem of Gercen’s own situation as the subject of his family drama. The melancholy narrator and his mentally damaged companion who talk about the disease of history in a small town near Nice seem to represent the author himself, caught between two equally dangerous mental illnesses: the depressive *horror vacui* and the manic *historia morbus*.

* * *

As a post-scriptum, I will offer a vignette. In the winter 1876-1877, in Villa Rubinacci in Sorrento, Malwida von Meysenbug formed a brief idyllic union with three “boys” (as Wagner called them), Friedrich Nietzsche and his young friends, Paul Rée and Albert Brenner. In this “secular monastery”, they read Herodotus, Thucydides, Voltaire, Jacob Burckhardt, and Gercen’s *Memoiren* to each other. On January 21, 1877, the seventh anniversary of Gercen’s death, they drank in silence to his memory. Meysenbug described these vigils in her affectionate letters to her “Pflegetochter”, Ol’ga Gercen (now married to the historian Gabriel Monod). Nietzsche, she wrote, “marveled at your papa’s life”.¹³⁸ In conclusion, I invite the reader to meditate upon this image: the author of ‘Uses and Abuses of History for Life’ – a caustic critic of the Hegelian historicist sense, indeed, a writer who invited his reader to meditate upon the idea that “the ahistorical and the historical are necessary in equal measure for the health of an individual, of a people and of a culture” – in the midst of an intimate circle reading one of the most powerful testimonies to the uses and abuses of history for life, Aleksandr Gercen’s *Byloe i dumy*.¹³⁹

Concluding Remarks: What Does the Story Mean?

In conclusion, I will try to give a general overview of the meanings attached to the Gercen family drama.

First, it should be noted that the story has been known mostly from Gercen's version. Gercen took it upon himself to tell his wife's side of the story. There are also Natal'ja's letters to Herwegh, which were written in the course of the affair. Gercen encouraged Natal'ja to write her own "confession", but at the time of her death, it remained unwritten. On the whole, Natal'ja's view of the drama remains largely a matter of speculation.¹⁴⁰ Of course, Gercen – the great writer – remains this story's main hero and its main interpreter. Still, before turning to Gercen's overpowering view, I will briefly comment on perspectives of two other participants who offered their own interpretations.

In a memoir written in 1894 (which has recently come to light), Natal'ja Tučkova-Ogareva interpreted the affair primarily in terms of its underlying sexual dynamics. According to her, after several difficult pregnancies and miscarriages, doctors prohibited sexual contact between Gercen and his wife:

Доктора не задумались произнести над ними свой приговор: "развод". Оба легко подчинились этому требованию; она – потому что не простила ему, он – потому что чувствовал себя еще свободнее. В таком отношении друг к другу мы находим их в 1848 году.¹⁴¹

(Doctors did not hesitate to pronounce their verdict over them: "divorce". Both succumbed easily to this demand: she did it because she never forgave him, and he – because he felt that he had even more freedom. This is the relationship we find them in in 1848.)

The sin that Natal'ja did not forgive was Gercen's sexual encounter with the housemaid in 1843, which Tučkova-Ogareva described somewhat differently than Gercen did in Part Four of his *Byloe i dumy*.¹⁴² The word "razvod" (divorce) indicated the end of sexual relationship between husband and wife. Thus, Tučkova-Ogareva explained Natal'ja Gercen's involvement with Herwegh as the result of her unfulfilled sexual drive and excused the affair as a woman's right to enjoy sexual equality in marriage. Of course, as she wrote this, the heroine of the second family drama could not help thinking of her own situation. Perhaps this story tells us more about the second drama than about the first. Still, for at least one contemporary, the Gercen family drama exemplified the tragedy of female sexual desire in a male-dominated world.

Little is known about how Georg and Emma Herwegh viewed their own roles in this drama. In 1894 (the same year that Natal'ja Tučkova-Oga-

reva wrote her private memoir of the affair), Emma Herwegh told her side of the story to Frank Wedekind, who related it in his diary, published in 1986 under the title *Die Tagebücher. Ein erotisches Leben*. Described in his “erotic diary” by a writer who enjoys the reputation of being the first to identify in literature society’s obsession with sexuality, this version presents the Herwegh-Gercen affair as a story of unbridled sexuality: Gercen and his wife “were said to have had sexual intercourse with each other even as children”; in 1849-1850, Natal’ja “proved capable of retaining the affections of her husband and her lover”, which Gercen “calmly watched” until a friend of Gercen’s “tackled him at dinner regarding his wife’s behavior”; in Nice, Gercen and Herwegh discussed whether they should “swap wives”, and while Gercen “does not seem to have started an affair with Herwegh’s wife”, he used to “throw parties for his friends in the local brothel, for which his wife adored him”.¹⁴³ This is, of course, a story from another age and another milieu.

Most of those who took it upon themselves to explain this affair (beginning with Gercen himself) ignored sexuality, focusing on socio-cultural explanations.¹⁴⁴

A prominent Russian intellectual and personal friend of the Gercen family, Pavel Annenkov, in his memoir *Zamečatel'noe desjatiletie (1838-1848)* (*A Remarkable Decade [1838-1848]*), offered an elaborate and carefully articulated interpretation of the Gercen affair in terms of cultural and social history. It deserves to be presented in some detail. As a literary critic and memoirist, Annenkov left a strong imprint on the historiography of the Russian intelligentsia. First published in 1880 (that is, after *Byloe i dumy* made its appearance in the West), his *Zamečatel'noe desjatiletie* told the stories of the same Moscow circles that Gercen chronicled in his memoirs. Echoing Gercen, Annenkov reinforced the idea that the Russian intelligentsia community was a social formation rooted in the friendly circles of “the Moscow idealists”.¹⁴⁵

Annenkov explained Natal’ja’s love for Herwegh as something more rational than passionate. Happy with her husband, her family, and her Moscow friends, she suffered from a lack of “poetry” and “Romanticism” in her life:

Но куда бы ни обращала она свои глаза – ничего похожего на порядочный романтизм нигде не оказывалось налицо вокруг нее. Задачей ее жизни сделалось, таким образом, обретение романтизма в том виде, как он существовал в ее фантазии. (302)

(But wherever she turned her gaze, she saw nothing around her that resembled decent romanticism. The goal of her life, then, became the discovery of romanticism as it existed in her imagination.)

The outcome of this pursuit of imaginary and belated Romanticism, her fatal affair with Herwegh, was the confrontation between a Russian “dreamer” who was raised on European literature with a Western man who hid the vanity and egoism of an ordinary lady-killer behind the literary mask of Wagner’s Lohengrin (304).

As for Gercen, Annenkov presented his situation as a “revolt” against not only conventional morality, but also the ideals of moral self-abnegation and self-restraint in realizing “personal physical and intellectual impulses” that reigned in the circle of “Moscow idealists”, which operated as a “monastic order” of sorts (300). Annenkov charged Ogarev with “inoculating” both of his friends, Gercen and his wife, with the notion that every person had a right to dispose of himself (or herself), unconstrained by either the “official morality” or the “private morality” of a “friendly circle” (300). Mixing medical metaphors (“inoculated/*privil*”) with sociological arguments, Annenkov pointed out the “aristocratic” roots of this new attitude: the freedom of physical (read: sexual) self-fulfillment open to those who enjoyed complete material and intellectual independence (300). Carefully choosing his words, Annenkov continued the story of Gercen’s “sin”. Influenced by “enduring tenderness for his childhood companion”, Gercen too found this attitude congenial (300). But his personality was fraught with contradictions. After he left the circle, Gercen attempted to “secularize” his life (that is, to abandon the ideals of self-denial and moral discipline), but he retained the role of “stern teacher and moral preacher” even as he “lived on the public market” (301). In Paris – with “the intrusion of political and social passions” – Gercen lost all capacity for “mental self-regulation” (301). Under Gercen’s and Ogarev’s influence, the impressionable Natal’ja Gercen was completely transformed. In the West, her quest for the “ambrosia of sublime emotions” – unrestrained by orderly routines of daily life (“byt”) and by the circle’s strict sectarian order – led to her infatuation. But at the first taste from that magic cup of Romantic feeling, she was consumed by “deepest revulsion and burning repentance”, which caused her untimely death (303). After his wife’s death, having recovered his intellectual power, Gercen

[...] отдал на суд будущих русских л юдей, в известных своих “Записках”, как самого себя, так и типы деятелей, ведших за собой политические фаланги того времени. (305)

([...] turned over both himself and the types of activists who led the political phalanxes of that time to be judged by the Russian people of the future.)

Produced by a member of the same milieu – which Annenkov (unlike Gercen) actually called the “*intelligentsia*” – this remarkable account presents

the Gercen drama from several perspectives. For the wife, it is a story of seduction by literature and death by repentance; for the husband, a story of the corruption of an undisciplined mind and body by social and political passions (which he passed on to his wife as a secondary infection of sorts) and rehabilitation by memoir writing. But, most importantly, for both husband and wife, this story exemplified the danger of living outside both the conventional social order and the circle's peculiar private order. In the end, in Annenkov's influential account, the Gercen drama bespoke the importance of the future Russian intelligentsia community as a regulator of the social and sexual passions unleashed by literature and revolution.¹⁴⁶

Let us now turn to Gercen himself. As we have seen, for Gercen, the experience signified, first and foremost, a failure of everything he expected to find in the revolution and in socialism, then and there, in France in 1848-1852. As I tried to show, he came out of the affair with a profound sense of failure and betrayal, but, both in letters from the time and in his later memoirs, he did not express this feeling in personal terms. True, in *Byloe i dumy*, describing the decisive conversation in which he finally learnt everything, Gercen confessed to his jealousy and rage, as well as guilt that, with his "enlightened attitude" ("razvitie") and "humanism", he could still torture "the miserable woman" with his jealousy. Writing after her death, he did not seem to blame Natal'ja for anything. His own unresolved emotions, moreover, was not the heart of the story.

For Gercen – as well as for the members of his milieu – the family drama signified, first and foremost, not the sexual and personal, but the social and historical, mediated by literature. In their feelings and actions, the participants in the Gercen family drama were inspired by the revolutionary ideal of a self-regulating radical community, which involved a vision of emotional harmony in an intimate circle, symbolic of social harmony in society at large. This ideal – an integral part of the revolutionary ethos of the Romantic generations – drew its power from both social theory and literature.

Both before and after the Gercens, experiments with love relations were a matter of social theories embodied in family novels, and they were put into practice by families and communities. (Suffice it to recall Fourier, Pierre Leroux, and George Sand, discussed in Kate Holland's contribution to this issue.) For both Aleksandr and Natal'ja Gercen, from its idyllic beginning to the tragic end, their family drama was dependent on literary mediation: their experience was organized by plots and tropes borrowed from literature. (In his contribution to this issue, Ilya Kliger shows how this was done.)

After the affair came to an end, Gercen, having failed to mobilize the revolutionary community, turned to literature: from *un mémoire judiciaire* he moved to the memoirs, informed by the *Bildungsroman* and by Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Through his memoirs, Gercen succeeded in reaching, if

not the immediate community, then, the community of the future: the community of readers.

But what mattered most to Gercen was not literature. By way of literature, intimacy was converted into history: the history of the failed 1848 revolution, underwritten by socialist Romanticism, the proto-socialist adultery novel, and Romantic and Post-Romantic philosophy.

Ultimately, more than the 1848 revolution (and more than the family drama of 1848-1852) was at stake. As Ulrich Schmid aptly puts it, the experience revealed “Weltgeschichte als Familiendrama”.¹⁴⁷ One could also reverse the order: “Familiendrama als Weltgeschichte”. In his essay in this issue, Schmid argues that, in *Byloe i dumy*, Gercen made family drama into “an archetypal figuration of conflict, individual and historical, if not metaphysical, which can be adapted to various situations”. Indeed, in the first five parts of his memoirs, Gercen described his entire life, from 1812 to 1852, as a family drama that reflected the turbulent events of Russian and European history. In this task, literature joined forces with philosophy, and clearly, Gercen’s philosophical background is Hegelian.

Elsewhere I have argued that, in its first five parts, Gercen’s *Byloe i dumy* consciously follows the structure of Hegel’s *Phenomenology of Spirit*, inspired, in its turn, by the pattern of the *Bildungsroman*, whose hero passes through stages of self-development propelled by conflicts and contradictions. In his journey, he is at one with the historical journey of the self-developing world. Retracing the steps of *Geist*, the “hero” of *Phenomenology*, Gercen’s autobiographical hero makes his uneasy progress in the unhappy world both as an individual and as the spirit of history incarnate, passing through revolution and war, but, unlike Hegel’s *Phenomenology of Spirit*, Gercen’s *Byloe i dumy* depicts *Bildung* without the happy ending.¹⁴⁸

Ulrich Schmid disagrees: in his contribution to this issue, Schmid argues that Part Five represents a radical departure from the pattern of *Phenomenology* and from Hegel’s teleological conception of history. In his essay, Ilya Kliger offers yet another reading of the Hegelian underpinnings of *Byloe i dumy* and traces the book’s attempts to turn intimacy into literature. Lina Steiner discusses the workings of the *Bildungsroman* in Gercen’s memoirs. Kate Holland focuses on the role of the French sentimental social novel, and George Sand, in the narratives of the affair. Thomas Campbell revisits the scholarly controversies over the interpretation of Gercen and his memoirs and catches their echoes in the restaging of the family drama in Tom Stoppard’s *Coast of Utopia* in 2002. It may be that, when the reader reaches the end of this issue, the Gercen family drama and the notorious Part Five of Gercen’s memoirs will remain as much a stumbling block as ever in the discussion of *Byloe i dumy* and its genre, of Gercen’s philosophy of history, and of his legacy.

And yet we hope that collectively we have succeeded in taking the reader, by several routes, through Gercen's paradigm-making attempts to turn intimate life into a historical narrative by way of literary structures underwritten by philosophy, and that we have pointed to some far-reaching implications of Gercen's project.

Of course, there are yet other stories: the life of Natal'ja Gercen deserves to be told for its own sake; so does the story of the heroine of the second, silenced drama, Natal'ja Tučkova-Ogareva. Rumors and legends created by contemporaries (including several works of fiction about the Gercens and Herwegh) make separate stories.¹⁴⁹ Finally, there is the yet untold story of the Herwegh family. The contributors to this collective project hope to return to these topics in the future with the help of other scholars. We invite the readers of this issue to join us in this enterprise.

NOTES

The author is indebted to Laura Engelstein for inspiring dialogue, critical reading, and specific suggestions. Expert research and editorial assistance was provided by Jane Shamaeva and Anastasia Kayiatos. Jacqueline Friedlander has served as the copy editor for the whole collection of papers.

¹ I am paraphrasing Ju.M. Steklov, *Michail Aleksandrovič Bakunin, ego žizn' i dejatel'nost'*, Vol. 2, Moskva-Leningrad, 1927, 107.

² Here and further, unless otherwise indicated, Gercen's works are cited from: A.I. Gercen, *Sobranie sočinenij v tridcati tomach*, Moskva, 1954-1965. Italics in citations always indicate Gercen's emphasis, unless otherwise indicated. Translations of Russian quotes are by Jane Shamaeva. Gercen's 'La Russie' is cited here from its French variant published in Proudhon's newspaper *La Voix du Peuple* in November-December 1849, addressed to "G.H." (VI, 178-179); also published in German, as a letter addressed to "Georg Herwegh" and signed "Barbar", in Gercen's *Vom anderen Ufer* (1850).

³ I follow Judith Zimmerman, who interpreted this passage as one of the first definitions of the intelligentsia and provided a thorough analysis of Gercen's idea of the community of intellectuals. See Judith E. Zimmerman, *Mid-passage: Alexander Herzen and European Revolution, 1847-1852*, Pittsburgh, 1989, 151-152, 162-164, and chapter 8, "The Revolutionary Community". In her study, Zimmerman placed the family drama in the context of Gercen's

- political life, connecting it to his life-long efforts to create the “revolutionary community”. See also her ‘Natalie Herzen and the Early Intelligentsia’, *Russian Review*, 41, 3, July, 1982, 249-272. An early attempt to connect the love life in the Gercen circle and the idea of the intelligentsia was made by the prominent Russian liberal P. Miljukov in ‘Ljubov’ u “idealistov tridcatykh godov”’, a part of his *Iz istorii russkoj intelligencii*, Sankt-Peterburg, 1902.
- 4 Gercen’s wife, Natal’ja Aleksandrovna Gercen, née Zachar’ina (1817-1852), often used the French variant of her name, Natalie.
- 5 I modified the formula from William M. Reddy, ‘Sentimentalism and its Erasure: The Role of Emotions in the Era of the French Revolution’, *The Journal of Modern History*, 72, March, 2000, 204.
- 6 For brief surveys of and critical comments on diverse opinions on the genre of *Byloe i dumy*, see S. Gurvič-Liščiner, *Tvorčestvo Gercena v razvitii russkogo realizma serediny XIX veka*, Moskva, 1994, 131-137 and 162-163, and N.V. Dulova, *Poëtika “Bylogo i dum” A.I. Gercena*, Irkutsk, 1998, 5-8. For discussion of Goethe’s *Dichtung und Wahrheit* and *Byloe i dumy*, see E. Dryzhakova, ‘Herzen’s Past and Thoughts: *Dichtung und Wahrheit*’, in: Derek Offord (Ed.), *The Golden Age of Russian Literature and Thought*, Hampshire and London, 1992; and Sof’ja Gurvič-Liščiner, *Tvorčestvo Aleksandra Gercena i nemeckaja literatura*, Frankfurt am Main, 2001. In their contributions to this issue, Ilya Kliger and Lina Steiner reexamine the presence of the *Bildungsroman* in *Byloe i dumy*.
- 7 Lidija Ginzburg’s work on *Byloe i dumy* is classic. See Lidija Ginzburg, *O psichologičeskoj proze*, Leningrad, 1977, 242-268. The formula “a fusion of autobiography and historiography” was reinforced by Ginzburg’s English translator, Judson Rosengrant; see *O psichologičeskoj proze*, 251 and Lydia Ginzburg, *On Psychological Prose* (Trans. Judson Rosengrant), Princeton, 1991, 203.
- 8 Irina Paperno, ‘Sovetskij opyt, avtobiografičeskoe pis’mo i istoričeskoe soznanie: Ginzburg, Gercen, Gegel’, *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, 68, 2004, 107-110. This study also shows how *Byloe i dumy* was used as a paradigm by succeeding generations of Russian intellectuals, especially in the Soviet period.
- 9 Natal’ja Alekseevna Tučkova-Ogareva (1829-1913) was also known to the Gercen family as Natalie.
- 10 In his contribution to this issue, Thomas Campbell discusses the current state of these debates, which go back to the early twentieth century.
- 11 In their essays in this issue, Ulrich Schmid and Ilya Kliger address the controversial issue of the Hegelian underpinnings of *Byloe i dumy*.
- 12 ‘Pis’mo Natal’i Aleksandrovny Gercen k Gervegam’, obzor L.P. Lanskogo, *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 64, 1958, 259-318. In this publication Natal’ja Gercen’s letters, which were written in French (with occasional Russian, which Herwegh was learning), are cited, in excerpts, in Russian translation. Carr in *The Romantic Exiles* offers extensive quotes from these letters in English

translation. The originals are in the British Library, Herzen-Herwegh papers, Add. 47664-47668.

- 13 E.H. Carr, *The Romantic Exiles: A Nineteenth-Century Portrait Gallery*, London and New York, 1933, 27 (the book later appeared in several other, identical, editions).

- 14 “Byloe i dumy”. Avtograf rasskaza o semejnoy drame’. Stat’ja, publikacija i primečaniya I.G. Ptuškinoy, *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 99-1, 1997, 55-148.

- 15 In his essay in this issue, Thomas Campbell discusses Stoppard’s play and its context in detail.

- 16 I use the word “intimacy” in its common linguistic usage, to refer to the personal, to the inward, to shared familiarity, and to sexual relations. In the sociological sense the word “intimacy” has been used to denote the core of the “private sphere” as the domain of feelings, thoughts, bodily sensations, and the small details of domestic life. As social theorists have shown, these experiences are subject to the laws of social life and open to the political, but they derive meaning from the privacy of their existence – from being experienced in the intimacy of one’s inner life and one’s home. The first theorists of intimacy are, of course, Hannah Arendt, in *The Human Condition* (1958) and Jürgen Habermas, in *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit* (1962). When we speak of “history” in this issue, we follow our subject, Gercen, as well as students of “historical consciousness”, to refer to a historically specific experience: a sense of being a part of a chain of historical events and a subject of an account of such events and experiences. In the end, the phrase “intimacy and history” refers to a paradoxical act by which inner experience and the sheltered private domain become the subject of historical reflection and the historical record, and hence a part of the public domain. The pioneering research on “intimacy and history” has been done by John Randolph, who describes how the historiography of the Russian intelligentsia was constructed from the documents of the intimate lives of early Russian intellectuals – the all-important Bakunin family. See his “‘That Historical Family’: The Bakunin Archive and the Intimate Theater of History in Imperial Russia, 1780-1925”, *The Russian Review*, 63, 4, October, 2004, 574-593; ‘On the Biography of the Bakunin Family Archive’, in: A. Burton (Ed.), *Archive Stories: Experience, Identity, History* (forthcoming), as well as Randolph’s forthcoming book, *The House in the Garden: The Bakunin Family and the Romance of Russian Idealism*. My own work has been inspired and facilitated by John Randolph’s subtle conceptualization of the intimacy and history connection.

- 17 I have benefited from the invaluable reference source, *Letopis’ žizni i tvorčestva A.I. Gercena*, Vols. 1-5, Moskva, 1974-1990 (prepared by G.G. Elizavetina, S.D. Gurvič-Liščiner, L.P. Lanskiy, A.M. Malachova, I.G. Ptuškina, V.A. Putincev, and others).

- 18 A.I. Gercen, *Polnoe sobranie sočinenij i pisem* (Ed. M.K. Lemke), Petrograd, 1915-1925, XIV, 41, January, 1850. Further references to this edition are given as “Lemke”.

- 19 Lemke, XIV, 41.

- 20 Martin Malia, *Alexander Herzen and the Birth of Russian Socialism (1812-1855)*, Cambridge, Mass., 1961, 68. Judith Zimmerman cites Malia in discussing the “emotional and ideological ambience” of the Gercen-Herwegh circle (Zimmerman, *Midpassage*, 162).
- 21 The phrase “chemical affinity” is borrowed from Goethe’s novel of affinity and adultery, *Die Wahlverwandtschaften*, discussed by Lina Steiner in her essay in this issue.
- 22 Cited in Carr, *Romantic Exiles*, 61-62; and in ‘Pis’ma Natal’i Aleksandrovny Gercen k Gervegam’, 265-266. Dated September 2, 1849; emphasis is Natal’ja’s. I adjusted Carr’s translation.
- 23 Quotes from (in the order of appearance): Gercen, XXIII, 227-228 (December 31, 1849); Gercen, XXIII, 197 (October 10, 1849); Lemke, XIV, 41 (January 1850).
- 24 For a discussion of the social implications of the idea of the triple union and a brief treatment of Gercen’s position, see Irina Paperno, *Chernyshevsky and the Age of Realism: A Study in the Semiotics of Behavior*, Stanford, 1988, 113-147 and passim.
- 25 See *Letopis’*, 1, 587; Lemke, VI, 147:

Подсудимого Герцена, лишив всех прав состояния, признать за вечного изгнанника из пределов Российского государства.

- 26 Natal’ja’s letter to Herwegh, written jointly with Gercen, from the summer of 1850. Cited from ‘Pis’ma Natal’i Aleksandrovny Gercen k Gervegam’, 292.
- 27 Gercen scholars chose to believe that the child was Gercen’s.
- 28 Cited from Carr, *Romantic Exiles*, 85; see also ‘Pis’ma Natal’i Aleksandrovny Gercen k Gervegam’, 298.
- 29 On George Sand’s influence, see Carr, *Romantic Exiles*, 65 and passim.
- 30 The whole quote is from Gercen, X, 256, and *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 99-1, 108. Here and throughout, references to *Byloe i dumy* are given from the 30-volume edition as well as – for Section Two, Part Five – from the latest reconstruction of this text: “Byloe i dumy”. *Avtograf rasskaza o semejnoi drame*, *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 99-1, 55-148.
- 31 See, among others, letter to Ernst Haug of March 16, 1852 (XXIV, 247), letter to Richard Wagner of July 1852 (XXIV, 295), and letter to Marija Rejchel’ of June 30, 1852 (XXIV, 291); in the letter to Rejchel’ Gercen proudly called himself a “barbarian”.
- 32 Gercen’s letter to Haug of March 16, 1852; see Gercen, XXIV, 247.
- 33 Carr, *Romantic Exiles*, 94.
- 34 Gercen described this episode in *Byloe i dumy* (X, 269; *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 99-1, 117). For documentary evidence, see Gercen’s letter to Natal’ja of June 28, 1851, written in a Geneva cafe, in which he related his encounter with the Russian political émigré N.I. Sazonov, who “knew everything” (XXIV, 192-293). See also N.I. Sazonov’s letter to Gercen of February 3,

-
- 35 In this issue, Ulrich Schmid discusses Gercen's use of both Hegel and Proudhon.
- 36 For Gercen's selective description of this letter's content in *Byloe i dumy*, see X, 284 and *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 99-1, 126. This letter, which Gercen had destroyed, has been also known from a draft contained in Herwegh's notebook, discovered and described by Carr, *Romantic Exiles*, 107-110. In this notebook (Emma's gift to Herwegh on New Year's day 1849), Natal'ja addressed her first vows of love to Herwegh in August 1849. Described in Carr, *Romantic Exiles*, 61-62; original: British Library, Add. 47668, Vol. V.
- 37 From *Byloe i dumy*, X, 290-291; *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 99-1, 130. Carr commented that this letter "reflects in every line the inspiration of Gercen's masterful pen" (*Romantic Exiles*, 111). Indeed, the two known copies of Natal'ja's letter to Herwegh show Gercen's editorial changes. See XXIV, 231-233 and commentaries on p. 480; see also Lemke, XIV, 94-95.
- 38 Gercen's address "aux frères de la démocratie" was circulated in the radical community (see VII, 386-387). For this and other documents pertaining to Gercen's appeal, see also Lemke, VII, 65-71. Zimmerman analyzed this episode in her *Midpassage*, 194-209. See also Edward Acton, *Alexander Herzen and the Role of the Intellectual Revolutionary*, Cambridge, 1979, 93-95.
- 39 Gercen addressed a similar letter to Michelet (July 25, 1852; XXIV, 307-314).
- 40 From Gercen's letter to the German political émigré G. Müller-Strübing (who was George Sand's lover at that time) of October 18, 1852 (XXIV, 350).
- 41 V.A. Engel'son to Gercen on November 16, 1852, 'Pis'ma V.A. Engel'sona Gercenu', publikacija I.G. Ptuškinov, *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 99-2, 1997, 637.
- 42 The historian Roger Chartier, from whom I have borrowed this information, sees such *mémoires judiciaires* as landmarks in the constitution of the public and private opinion in pre-Revolutionary France. See Roger Chartier, *The Cultural Origins of the French Revolution* (Trans. Lydia G. Cochrane), Durham, 1991, 34-35 and 196-197.
- 43 Such a "memoir" was written and printed by Gercen's friend and fellow revolutionary Ernst Haug (who became implicated in the affair because he served as Gercen's emissary in the matter of the duel), but Gercen persuaded Haug to stop the distribution. Gercen discussed the story of the Haug memoir in *My Past and Thoughts* (X, 309-310); see also his letter to Marija Rejchel' of July 8, 1852 (XXIV, 294).
- 44 The standard Russian translation (XXIV, 364) tones down the sexual metaphors. Judith Zimmerman cited this letter in accurate English translation (*Midpassage*, 208-209).
- 45 See the earliest introduction to *Byloe i dumy* (from November 2, 1852), "Brat'jam na Rusi" (VIII, 397-398), which remained unpublished in Gercen's lifetime.

- 46 I follow the dating in the commentaries to the 30-volume edition (VIII, 438).
 47 See also Lidija Ginzburg, *"Byloe i dumy" Gercena*, Moskva, 1957, 366-367.
 48 For Gercen's use of his letters from 1852 in his memoirs, see Ptuškina's
 invaluable introductory article "'Byloe i dumy". Avtograf rasskaza o semejnoj
 49 drame', 57-58.
 50 *Ibid.*, 57-60. Ptuškina's reconstruction contradicts some earlier datings. Thus,
 Lidija Ginzburg claimed that the first version of Parts One through Five,
 including the story of the family drama, had been completed between 1852
 and 1855 (*"Byloe i dumy" Gercena*, 366-367; *O psihologičeskoj proze*, 250).
 49 N.A. Tučkova-Ogareva, *Vospominanija*, Moskva, 1959, 100.
 50 The editors of the 30-volume edition date this letter approximately: the end of
 1856. Carr believes that this letter was written in response to Ogarev's
 reproach that Gercen had not told him earlier (*Romantic Exiles*, 194), but I see
 no evidence for this conclusion. In his contribution to this issue, Ulrich
 Schmid cites this letter in full and discusses its implications.
 51 "[Ja] poveril mečte soedinit' trech v odnu ljubov', da ja i teper' verju v voz-
 možnost' ètogo" (from Ogarev's letter to Gercen, approximately dated Fall
 1859. 'Archiv N.P. Ogareva', in M. Geršenzon, Ed., *Russkie propilei*, IV,
 Moskva, 1917, 211).
 52 N.A. Tučkova-Ogareva's letter to Ogarev from 1858. 'Pis'ma N.A. Tučkovo-
 Ogarevoj', *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 99-2, 1997, 74.
 53 'Bedlam ili Den' iz našej žizni (èskiz dlja komedii)' (published by M. Ger-
 šenzon in *Russkie propilei*, 194-200; English translation in Carr, *Romantic*
Exiles, 375-383).
 54 "Gipertrofija ličnogo" (cited from V. Polonskij, "Semejnaja drama Gercena-
 Ogarevykh", *Archiv N.A. i N.P. Ogarevykh*, ed. M. Geršenzon, Moskva-Le-
 ningrad, 1930, 14; see also S.D. Liščiner's comment in *Literaturnoe na-*
sedstvo, 99-2, 154-155).
 55 Ptuškina in "'Byloe i dumy". Avtograf rasskaza o semejnoj drame', 62-63.
 Ptuškina noted the coincidence of the 1860 revisions with the second family
 drama, but not the coincidence of the initial writing with the beginning of the
 second drama, which is discussed by Ulrich Schmid in his contribution to this
 issue.
 56 *Ibid.*, 67-69.
 57 *Ibid.*, 70-72.
 58 Detailed information on the publication can be found in commentaries to vols.
 VIII-XI of the 30-volume edition; for critical discussion of the writing and
 publication history, see Ginzburg, *"Byloe i dumy" Gercena*, 372-373; V.A.
 Putincev, *Gercen-pisatel'*, Moskva, 1963, 208-221, and L.B. Kamenev in his
 introductory article to A.I. Gercen, *Byloe i dumy* (Ed. L.B. Kamenev), Vols.
 1-3, Moskva-Leningrad, 1932, I, XXXI-CVII.
 59 Published in the French periodical *La Presse* on October 13, 1856, this piece
 reviewed the German translation of Gercen's memoirs. For information on
 German, French, and English translations, including Gercen's own, see com-
 mentaries (VIII, 481; X, 502-509).

- 60 Noted by Kamenev (Ed.), *Byloe i dumy* I, XXXVIII-XLII, and Ginzburg,
 61 “*Byloe i dumy*” *Gercena*, 372.
 In his contribution to this issue, Ulrich Schmid makes this argument as well,
 62 citing other evidence.
 Ptuškina describes notations on the original manuscript (the “Amsterdam
 notebook”) in her “Byloe i dumy”. Avtograf rasskaza o semejnoi drame’, 62.
 Judging by notations on one of the copies of the manuscript, he also read or
 gave the manuscript to his friend N.M. Satin in 1860 and to his son Aleksandr
 in 1862 (see X, 449).
 63 ‘Pis’ma N.A. Mel’gunova – Gercenu’, *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 62, 1955,
 326-327. Gercen’s letter to which Mel’gunov responds is lost.
 64 In the standard posthumous editions, the episode with Medvedeva (named
 only with the initial “P”) appears in Chapter XXI of Part III; the episode with
 the housemaid, in a long footnote to the first fragment (subtitled “Grübelel”)
 of Chapter XXVIII of Part Four. See Ginzburg, “*Byloe i dumy*” *Gercena*,
 373, for a complete list of unpublished fragments.
 65 Gercen was survived by three of the children he had with Natal’ja Alek-
 sandrovna Gercen: Aleksandr Aleksandrovič (Saša) Gercen (1839-1906), Nat-
 al’ja Aleksandrovna (Natal’ja, or Tata) Gercen (1846-1936), and Ol’ga Alek-
 sandrovna Gercen (after her marriage, Ol’ga Monod; 1850-1953). Gercen’s
 daughter with Natal’ja Tučkova-Ogareva, Elizaveta Ogareva (after 1869, Eli-
 zaveta Gercen), who was born in 1858, committed suicide as a result of an
 unhappy love in 1875.
 66 Cited by Ptuškina in “Byloe i dumy”. Avtograf rasskaza o semejnoi drame’,
 77. Actually, Rejchel’, who was Gercen’s confidante in the affair, read Part
 Five only in 1904:

Это потряса ющая история, и сколько бы мне ни было из нее
 знакомо, она вновь потрясла меня. Я этого мнения, что печатать
 ее еще рано [...].

(Rejchel’s letter to E.S. Nekrasova of October 17, 1904, published in
Literaturnoe nasledstvo, 99-2, 634)

- 67 I.S. Turgenev to P.V. Annenkov, January 19, 1876 (from Paris), I.S. Turge-
 nev, *Polnoe sobranie sočinenij i pisem*, Moskva-Leningrad, 1961- (*Pis’ma*,
 XI, 203).
 68 I.S. Turgenev to M.E. Saltykov, January 19, 1876 (*Pis’ma*, XI, 205).
 69 *Pis’ma*, XI, 564.
 70 See letters of Tučkova-Ogareva to P.V. Annenkov from 1875, published in
Literaturnoe nasledstvo, 63, 519-521; to T. Astrakova from 1886, *Litera-*
turnoe nasledstvo, 99-2, 150; to E.S. Nekrasova from the 1890s, *Literaturnoe*
nasledstvo, 99-2, 239, 247. See Ptuškina’s comments in *Literaturnoe nasled-*
stvo, 99-1, 77-78, 79.
 71 Cited from *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 99-2, 239.

72 “Oni popali v buržuaznyj krug i tem ochladili k sebe mnogich družej Gercena” (cited from *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 99-2, 247).

73 “— čego že ždut meščanskije deti? [...] Èto tol’ko predlog, i pisem Nataši net uže; kto berežet tak prošloe?” (from Tučkova-Ogareva’s letter to E.S. Nekrasova from 1904; *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 99-2, 239). In her letter to Annenkov in 1875, when Annenkov informed her of Herwegh’s death, Tučkova-Ogareva wrote: “Uvidim, čto sdelajut žena i deti s pis’mami Natal’i” (*Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 63, 519).

74 Noted by Ptuškina (*Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 99-1, 77).

75 Ogareva told her story in the 1890s, in the 1890s, in the 1890s, in the memoir entitled ‘Vospominanija o žizni N.A. Gercen’, written for Nekrasova in 1894 and, to date, unpublished (see *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 99-2, 232-279, for L.P. Lanskiĭ’s survey of these documents).

76 The first edition of Gercen’s collected works appeared in Russia in 1905 (the so-called Pavlenkov edition); heavily censored, it did not contain even Section One of Part Five.

77 Cited in V.I. Kulešov, ‘Perepiska M.K. Lemke, s naslednikami Gercena’, *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 63, 1956, 840.

78 Cited in S.V. Žitomirskaja, ‘Sud’ba archiva Gercena i Ogareva’, *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 96, 1985, 608.

79 See Rejchel’s letter to E.S. Nekrasova of October 17, 1904 (*Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 99-2, 634).

80 See Žitomirskaja, ‘Sud’ba archiva Gercena i Ogareva’, 608.

81 April 27, 1912; cited in Kulešov, ‘Perepiska M.K. Lemke, s naslednikami Gercena’, 832.

82 “[...] čtoby èto ne nosilo publičnogo charaktera” (cited in Žitomirskaja, ‘Sud’ba archiva Gercena i Ogareva’, 609; see also M.K. Vandalkovskaja, *M.K. Lemke – istorik russkogo revoljucionnogo dviženija*, Moskva, 1972, 79).

83 Cited in Žitomirskaja, ‘Sud’ba archiva Gercena i Ogareva’, 609. Lemke tried to correct this mistake in his commentary to the 1919 edition, listing those who made it (Lemke, XIV, 90), but he did not succeed. Thus, in recent years, Kulešov has again claimed that Natal’ja left Gercen for Herwegh (see Kulešov, *Istorija russkoj literatury. Učebnoe posobie*, Moskva, 1997, 364).

84 On the nationalization of the funds belonging to the Gercen family, who financed the edition, see Kulešov, ‘Perepiska M.K. Lemke s naslednikami Gercena’, 837-838 and Žitomirskaja, ‘Sud’ba archiva Gercena i Ogareva’, 614.

Полное издание “Былого и дум” впервые было осуществлено после Великой Октябрьской социалистической революции в нашей стране, на родине писателя. (VIII, 440)

86 Lemke’s phrase.

87 See VIII, 440 and X, 447 for comments on this decision.

- 88 In his letters to Gercen's daughter, Natal'ja Aleksandrovna Gercen, Rodičev, who kept insisting that her commitment to Lemke was no longer valid, suggested that Lemke did not, could not, and should not continue his edition. At least once, in a letter from July 24, 1920, he did state: "Beglecy iz Peterburga rasskazyvajut, čto neizdannoe tam napečatano" ("Refugees from St. Petersburg tell that the unpublished has been published there"; Rodičeva Papers, Columbia University, New York, Box 7).
- 89 A.I. Gercen, *Byloe i dumy. Pervoe polnoe izdanie s portretami i faksimile*, 1921, 5-6. The place of publication does not figure on the title page. The name of the publishing house, "Слово", is embedded in a vignette as the base for the statue of the Bronze Horseman, suggesting Petersburg. The edition actually appeared in Berlin.
- 90 See Kulešov, 'Perepiska M.K. Lemke, s naslednikami Gercena', 832, and Žitomirskaja, 'Sud'ba archiva Gercena i Ogareva', 606, 614; Vandalkovskaja, *M. K. Lemke*, 78.
- 91 See, among others, F.I. Rodičev's letters to N.A. Gercen of November 14, 1919 and April 22, 1920 (Rodičeva Papers, Box 7).
- 92 This is evident from N.A. Gercen's letters to F.I. Rodičev, especially the one from November 28, 1919 (Rodičeva Papers, Box 9).
- 93 Elena Narskaja, 'Gercen i russkaja ěmigracija' (summary of the paper presented at "X Bannye čtenija", Moscow, 2002 in *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, 45, 2002).
- 94 The copies were found in "Russkij zagraničnyj istoričeskij archiv", captured during World War II in Prague (the so-called "Prague collection").
- 95 For detailed information on the composition of Lemke's, Rodičev's, and the academic edition's texts, see X, 448-449.
- 96 Commentaries to VIII, 441 specified "pod redakcionnym nazvanijem <Rasskaz o semejnoj drame>", but readers and scholars alike seemed to have paid little attention. That this was not Gercen's title was first emphatically stressed by I.G. Ptuškina; see her article 'Novoe o pjatoj časti "Bylogo i dum" Gercena', in: A.P. Nikolaev (Ed.), *Gercen – pisatel', myslitel', borec*, Moskva, 1985, 70, and her introductory article to "'Byloe i dumy". Avtograf rasskaza o semejnoj drame', 56.
- 97 *Ibid.*, 620.
- 98 Žitomirskaja, 'Sud'ba archiva Gercena i Ogareva', 621.
- 99 See a brief essay on the history of IISG at www.iisg.nl/iisg/history.html. The disappearance of documents from the Paris branch of IISG, seized first by the Nazis and then by the Soviets, and the post-1991 attempts at restitution have been described by Patricia Grimsted in 'Russia's "Trophy" Archives – An Update on Restitution Issues' (a paper presented on September 24, 2001 in IISG), www.iisg.nl/archives_in_russia/ (see pp. 9-10).
- 100 These misunderstandings have been described by the archivist S.V. Žitomirskaja, 'Sud'ba archiva Gercena i Ogareva', 621-622.

101 “[...] kotoruju my uporno iščem po vsemu svetu” (from Makašin’s letter to
Gercen’s granddaughter Germaine Rist; Žitomirskaja, ‘Sud’ba archiva Gercena i Ogareva’, 621.

102 Žitomirskaja, ‘Sud’ba archiva Gercena i Ogareva’, 622.

103 As I.G. Ptuškina notes, after the edition was prepared for publication, S.V. Žitomirskaja, who received, late in her life, an opportunity to travel to Amsterdam, became the first Soviet scholar to see the original (see Ptuškina’s introductory article to “‘Byloe i dumy’. Avtograf rasskaza o semejnoi drame’, 56). In 2003, I examined this notebook in IISG: it is fully accessible to the public.

104 Gercen insisted on moving the bodies of the twins, originally buried in Paris, to his family vault in Nice. It was Ptuškina who suggested the significance of this date (“‘Byloe i dumy’. Avtograf rasskaza o semejnoi drame’, 144-145).

105 Noted by Ptuškina, *Ibid.*, 68.

106 Gercen, X, 239; *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 99-1, 96.

107 For a different reading of the relationships between the two family dramas, see Ulrich Schmid’s essay in this issue.

108 See Ptuškina in “‘Byloe i dumy’. Avtograf rasskaza o semejnoi drame’, 63-66.

109 For analysis of the relationship between the two parts, “Inside” and “Outside”, see Ilya Kliger’s essay in this issue.

110 The commentaries direct the reader’s attention to the new title of Section Two of Part Five:

В процессе подготовки этого текста И. Г. Птушкиной было установлено заглавие этого раздела – “Inside” (в академическом издании и в последующих он публиковался под редакционным названием “Рассказ о семейной драме” [...]). (A.I. Gercen, *Byloe i dumy*, Moskva, 2001, I, 877)

111 A.I. Gercen, *Byloe i dumy* (Ed. L.B. Kamenev), 3 Vols., 1st Ed., Moskva-Leningrad, 1931-1932; 2nd Ed., Moskva-Leningrad, 1932. On the family drama, see the section of Kamenev’s extensive introductory article, subtitled ‘Političeskaja drama i semejnaja tragedija’ (2nd Ed., I, LIV-LXII). For reconstruction of the subtitle “Inside”, see pp. LVII-LVIII. Kamenev’s textological decisions, which differ from Lemke’s, have been made obsolete by Ptuškina’s reconstructions.

112 ‘Samyj ostroumnyj protivnik Gercena’, *Vestnik Evropy*, 1914, No 4, 118-160; reprinted as ‘Gercen i nemeckie demokraty posle 1848’ in Kamenev’s first book, *Ob A.I. Gercene i N.G. Černyševskom*, Petrograd, 1916.

113 For Kamenev’s biography, I have used information from K.A. Zaleskij, *Imperija Stalina. Biografičeskij énciklopedičeskij slovar’*, Moskva, 2000; and A.P. Šikman, *Dejатели otečestvennoj istorii. Biografičeskij spravočnik*, Moskva, 1997. On Kamenev’s literary scholarship, see V.V. Krylov, ‘Final’nyj akkord literaturnogo tvorčestva L.B. Kameneva’, in: *Mir istočnikovedenija*,

- Moskva, 1994, 181-185, and V.V. Krylov, E.V. Kičatova, *Izdatel'stvo "Akademija". Ljudi i knigi*, Moskva, 2004, 63-114.
- 114 Ž. Ėl'sberg, 'Novye izdaniia klassikov obščestvennoj mysli', *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 7, 1933. This review mentions the "Inside"- "Outside" title on p. 466. In his introduction to his edition of *Byloe i dumy*, Kamenev warmly recommended Ž. Ėl'sberg's book *A.I. Gercen i Byloe i dumy*, Moskva, 1930, as a pioneering study of this memoir.
- 115 Ample documentation on Ėl'sberg as an informant can be now found on today's Internet. If we believe the following reported conversation, this fact was known to Kamenev:

C. A. Макашин рассказывал, что когда редактором "Лит. наследства" был Зиновьев Г.Е., то он, Макашин, молодой научный работник как-то пришел к нему домой по делу. В биб-ке, у пылающего камина сидел Л. Б. Каменев. Разговорились. "У вас там (в редакции) околачивается Эльсберг", – сказал Каменев – "Будьте с ним осторожнее, он к нам приставлен от ГПУ". В 39-м г. Макашина посадил Эльсберг!"

(From memoiristic "notes" by the writer V.S. Vasilevskij, *Literaturnaja gazeta*, 37, 5892, September 11-17, 2002)

- 116 See A.V. Bljum, *Zapreščennye knigi russkich pisatelej i literaturovedov. 1917-1991. Indeks sovetskoj cenzury s kommentarijami*. Sankt-Peterburg, 2003, Nos. 131-132.
- 117 I am referring to Bakunin's 1863 discussion of Gercen's role in the future free Russia, described at the beginning of this essay.
- 118 For this information I am indebted to Kate Holland.
- 119 I have been privileged to use Martin Malia's personal copy of the Kamenev edition. Malia used and recommended this edition in the bibliographic essay of his widely known *Alexander Herzen and the Birth of Russian Socialism*.
- 120 On Gercen's first attempts to make Herwegh return Natal'ja's letters, see *Letopis'*, 5, 317.
- 121 Carr, *Romantic Exiles*, 369-370. Gercen's children did concern themselves with their mother's love letters. Thus, in 1919-1920, with N.A. Gercen's blessing, F.I. Rodičev tried to purchase the letters from Herwegh's son, Marcel Herwegh. He also sought to obtain the watercolor with her pet goat ("l'acquarelle à la chèvre" or, in Tata Gercen's words, "le portrait de ma chèvre blanche"), which her mother, Natal'ja Gercen, presented to Herwegh as a New Year's gift in 1851. This gift is famously described in *Byloe i dumy* as the cause of Gercen's sudden insight into the true nature of his wife's intimacy with Herwegh (see Lina Steiner's essay in this volume for discussion of this episode in *Byloe i dumy*). The (unsuccessful) attempts to recover the letters and the watercolor are described in F.I. Rodičev's letters to N.A. Gercen of December 15, 1919 and January 2, 1920, and N.A. Gercen's letters

to F.I. Rodičev of December 18, 1919, February 7, 1920, and February 13, 1920 (Rodičeva Papers, Boxes 7 and 9).

From Carr's diary as cited in Jonathan Haslam, *The Vices of Integrity: E.H. Carr, 1892-1982*, London and New York, 1999, 37.

Jonathan Haslam, 'E.H. Carr's Search for Meaning', in: Michael Cox (Ed.), *E.H. Carr: A Critical Appraisal*, New York, 2000, 24.

Carr, *Romantic Exiles*, 363. The story of his accidental discovery of Gercen seems to originate with Carr himself.

Haslam, *The Vices of Integrity*, 51. Haslam thanks Sheila Fitzpatrick for this information.

After Haslam, *The Vices of Integrity*, 52.

See E.H. Carr, 'Some Unpublished Letters of Alexander Herzen', *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, III, 1952, 80-81. Marcel Herwegh requested that these documents should not be made available until the hundredth anniversary of Natal'ja Gercen's death on May 2, 1952. In 1956, with the permission of Gercen's grandson, Eduard Monod, the British Library made photocopies of these documents available to *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*; working from these photocopies, L.P. Lanskij prepared his 1958 survey (in: Michael Cox, Ed., *E.H. Carr*, the son is misidentified as "Max Herwegh, eldest son of the poet"; p. 345).

Haslam, *The Vices of Integrity*, 52.

Cited in Žitomirskaja, 'Sud'ba archiva Gercena i Ogareva', 609, from an archival source.

Carr, *Romantic Exiles*, 115.

Cf. Lanskij's text:

Признак жизни – а зачем? по-прежнему, чтобы *оправдываться* [te justifier], осыпая меня упреками, обвиняя меня... Будь спокоен, хотя у тебя слишком много желаний и средств, чтобы не иметь в этом удачи без моего участия, – будь спокоен: если я когда-нибудь открою рот перед кем-либо, кто мог бы меня понять*, – это будет сделано не для того, чтобы *оправдываться* [me justify].

[...] Причинял ли ты мне зло?.. Ты должен знать это лучше, чем я... Я знаю только, что мои благословения будут следовать за тобою всюду, всегда - - -

Добавлять к этому что-либо... было бы излишне - - - - -

*Иначе я бы этого не сделала – иначе это было бы величайшим осквернением того, что остается самым святым для меня.
(*Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 64, 313-314)

I have supplied the French phrases and adjusted punctuation from the original manuscript, which I have seen in the British Museum. The letter, written in pencil on two pieces of semi-transparent paper, is barely legible (Herzen-

Herwegh papers, Add. 47666, Vol. III, ff. 195-196). As Lanskij notes (*Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 64, 318, note 67), the Herwegh family archives also have a copy of this letter, carefully arranged on a piece of paper with a lace border and identified as the last letter of Natal'ja Gercen to Georg Herwegh, written on April 26, 1852, with the date on the postal stamp, Nice, May 2, 1852.

For Natal'ja's last days, see *Letopis'*, 2, 81-83.

See A.I. Dobkin's introduction to N.P. Anciferov, *Iz dum o bylom. Vospominanija*, Moskva, 1992, 4 and 10, note 4.

Letter from N.P. Anciferov to T.B. Lozinskaja of May 22, 1942. The archival source was discovered and cited by A.I. Dobkin in his introduction to Anciferov, *Iz dum o bylom*, 10-11, note 4; the Rodičevs were identified by S.V. Žitomirskaja.

From the diary of Rodičev's last days, it is clear that Rodičev indeed saw Carr at N.A. Gercen's home on the day before an attack of heavy bleeding (February 12, 1933), but it makes no mention of any revelations about Gercen's wife. Moreover, it is clear that this day was traumatic for Rodičev for another reason: it was the first anniversary of the death of his own beloved wife (*Zapisnaja knižka F.I. Rodičeva. 1920-1933*; Rodičeva Papers, Box 30).

From A.I. Dobkin's introduction to Anciferov's *Iz dum o bylom*; for biographical information, see 411-417.

This is how Maurice Merleau-Ponty defined the concept of institution for his philosophy of consciousness and metaphysics of history intended as a revision of Hegelianism: "what we understand by the concept of institution are those events in experience which endow it with durable dimensions, in relation to which a whole series of other experiences will acquire meaning, will form an intelligible series or a history [...]" ('Institution in Personal and Public History', in: Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *Themes from the Lectures at the Collège de France 1952-1960*, Trans. John O'Neill, Evanston, Ill., 1970, 40).

After S.P. Giždeu's introduction to 'Pis'ma Mal'vidy Mejzenbug', *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 99-2, 650-652.

Malwida von Meysenbug and Olga Gercen read Nietzsche's essay 'Vom Nutzen und Nachteil der Historie für das Leben' (1874) when it first appeared in print. Nietzsche first read Gercen's memoirs in 1872. The formula I cite is Nietzsche's.

In this issue, Ilya Kliger and Kate Holland attempt to reconstruct Natal'ja's view.

'Pis'ma N.A. Tučkovoj-Ogarevoj E.S. Nekrasovoj', obzor L.P. Lanskogo, *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 99-2, 1997, 244.

For Gercen's version, see Chapter XXVIII in Part Four of *Byloe i dumy*. For Tučkova's version, see her still unpublished memoir 'Vospominanija o žizni N.A. Gercen' (written at the instigation of E.S. Nekrasova for the historian's use), as cited in 'Pis'ma N.A. Tučkovoj-Ogarevoj', 247.

Frank Wedekind, *Die Tagebücher. Ein erotisches Leben* (Hrsg. Gerhard Hay), Frankfurt am Main, 1986, 286-294 (January 1894). I used the language of the

English translation, Frank Wedekind, *Diary of an Erotic Life* (Trans. W.E. Yuill), Oxford, 1990, 216-218. This diary is mentioned in the recent biography of Emma Herwegh: B. Rettenmund, J. Voirol, *Emma Herwegh: Die grösste und beste Heldin der Liebe*, Zürich, 2000, 134-142.

In his 1933 book, Carr commented that Natal'ja's behavior was driven by sexual frustration in her marriage to Gercen and the sexual fulfillment she seemed to have found in her union with Herwegh (*The Romantic Exiles*, 78); still, Carr explained the affair mainly in terms of its cultural dynamics.

P.V. Annenkov, *Literaturnye vospominanija*, Moskva, 1989, 297-307 (chapter XXXIII); page numbers in the text refer to this edition. Commentators to this edition mistakenly believed that, when he had written his memoirs, Annenkov had not been familiar with the story of the family drama as told in the unpublished parts of *Byloe i dumy* (p. 595) (see I.S. Turgenev, *Polnoe sobranie sočinenij i pisem, Pis'ma*, XI, 206-207 and 564, for evidence that he had read them in 1876).

Tučkova-Ogareva, in her 1894 memoir on Natal'ja Gercen, commented on Annenkov's story:

Я никогда не читала, что писал о ней Анненков. Это, конечно, пошлый вздор. Когда я <1847> встретила с Натали, она жаждала любви [...] конечно, тому способствовало разочарование в Александре; потом она находила, что он неспособен на такую страстную привязанность, о какой ей мечталось; он слишком был поглощен общими интересами.

(I have never read what Annenkov wrote about her. This is, of course, vulgar nonsense. When I met Natalie, she craved love. [...] Of course, her disappointment in Aleksandr added to this. Then, she found him incapable of the passionate attachment she dreamt of; he was excessively absorbed by common interests; 'Pis'ma N.A. Tučkovoj-Ogarevoj', 241)

See Ulrich Schmid, "Weltgeschichte als Familiendrama: A.I. Herzens *Byloe i dumy*", chapter 13 of his: *Ichentwürfe: Russische Autobiographien zwischen Avvakum und Gercen*, Zürich, 2003.

Readings of Hegel's *Phenomenology* as a *Bildungsroman* were offered by the philosophers Josiah Royce and Jean Hyppolite and the literary critic M.H. Abrams. In his essay in this issue, Ilya Kliger describes and extends this conception further. For my comment, see Irina Paperno, 'Sovetskij opyt', 107-109.

At least two works of fiction deal with the Gercen drama: the dramatic tragedy *Die neue Welt. Ein Trauerspiel in fünf Aufzügen. Mit einem Vorspiel: Goethe's Ankunft in Walhalla*, written by the German revolutionary activist Arnold Ruge and published (in spite of Gercen's protests) in Leipzig by F.U. Brockhaus in 1856, and the story (*povest'*) by Natalija Utina (the widow of

the Russian political émigré N.I. Utin), *Žizn' za žizn'*, published under the name N.A. Tal' in *Vestnik Evropy*, 4 and 5, 1885 (hostile to Aleksandr Gercen and sympathetic to Natal'ja Gercen, it dealt with both of Gercen's family dramas).