

# The Struggle Between the Realist and Modernist Trends in the Theater World of Russia in the Early 20th Century

Magda A. Dzhichonaya<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Social and Humanitarian Disciplines, Moscow State University of Food Production, Moscow, Russia

\*Corresponding author. E-mail: magdalena-27@mail.ru

## ABSTRACT

The article dealt with the problems of the disengagement of forces of artists when there was a struggle between realism and modernism, especially in theatre. Both realists and symbolists had their achievements. K. Stanislavsky and V. Nemirovich-Danchenko were true innovators of theatrical art in Russia at the beginning of the century. Moscow Art Theatre created by them became a director's theatre. The article emphasizes that in the reform activity of K. Stanislavsky and V. Nemirovich-Danchenko a big role belonged to A. Chekhov and M. Gorky. The creative searches of such directors as V. Komissarzhevskaya and Vs. Meyerhold were analyzed. The findings of directors, actors, theatre critics positively influenced theatrical art in the 1920s.

**Keywords:** Realism, Modernism, Silver Age, Director's theatre, Struggle of realism and symbolism, K. Stanislavsky, V. Nemirovich-Danchenko, Vera Komissarzhevskaya and Vs. Meyerhold.

## 1. INTRODUCTION: THE STRUGGLE OF REALISM AND MODERNISM IN THE THEATRE OF THE EARLY 20TH CENTURY

Like in all spheres of art in the early 20th century, there was a disengagement of forces in the theatrical world, and there was a struggle between realism and modernism. Theatre as the most democratic form of art was largely discussed at that time. The issues of theatre that were a matter of concern to many were addressed in monographs and articles by theatre critics published in those years, e.g. *Around the Theatre* (1894) by D. Korovikov, *About the Theatre* (1912) by V. Meyerhold, *Actor's Work and the Stanislavsky Method* (1915) by F. Komissarzhevsky, brother of the famous actress V.F. Komissarzhevskaya, the collection *Theatre. The Book of the New Theatre* (1908), which contained articles by V. Bryusov, A. Bely, and F. Sologub, *The Denial of the Theatre* (1914) by Yu. Aykhenvald, and *Long Live the Theatre!* by the critic S. Glagol.

V. Bryusov's article *Unnecessary Truth* (published in the *Mir Iskusstva* (World of Art)

magazine, 1902) is considered the first manifesto of symbolism in the theatre. It asserted the idea that realistic theatre has become an anachronism, has outlived itself. The slogan: "Death to everyday life!", which was thrown to the realistic theatre in the early 1900s by V. Bryusov, A. Blok, A. Bely, K. Balmont, was directed, in particular, against the Moscow Art Theatre, against Stanislavsky and Nemirovich-Danchenko. A little later, futurists also 'entered the theatre', in St. Petersburg (1913) the following works were staged: V. Mayakovsky's tragedy *Vladimir Mayakovsky*, the opera by A. Kruchyonykh *Victory Over the Sun*. Also, there have been published many works by K. Stanislavsky, V. Nemirovich-Danchenko, M. Ermolova, and A. Yuzhin-Sumbatov, devoted to the problems of theatre development.

The theatre at the beginning of the century was strongly influenced by V. Bryusov's aesthetic concept. Given this fact, it can be reported concerning symbolism and realism in the direction of K.S. Stanislavsky, V.E. Meyerhold, F.F. Komissarzhevsky. During the years 1902-1908, the creative paths of the reformers of the theatre and the most prominent symbolist of V. Meyerhold

repeatedly crossed. Their mutual influences, with all the positive and negative that they created, enriched the theatrical art with new qualities and determined its further development. It should also be noted that another prominent symbolist, poet, philosopher, and scientist, Vyacheslav Ivanov, made a great contribution to theatre studies.

According to V.E. Meyerhold, Ivanov was the initiator of the new theatre, one of the creators of the new theatrical era. His manifestos largely shaped theatrical ideology, enriched theatrical thought, and established traditions of philosophizing about the theatre. [1] V. Ivanov was closely associated with V.E. Meyerhold, V.F. Komissarzhevskaya, actors and directors of the Moscow Art Theatre, the Maly Theatre.

It is impossible not to mention the activity of the Studio-Theatre, also known as the Studio on Povarskaya Street, which was established by K. Stanislavsky as a theatrical laboratory. V. Meyerhold, whom Stanislavsky invited to work at the Studio, soon became its director. Most likely, it was his desire for the new, for search and experiment that attracted K. Stanislavsky. The same search for the experiment would also be the reason for V. Meyerhold to leave the Moscow Art Theatre. However, the views of the two directors were completely opposite: V. Meyerhold valued search for the sake of search, while K. Stanislavsky experimented, seeking to maximize the capacity of realistic drama. Symbolist plays by M. Maeterlinck (*The Death of Tintagiles*, *The Blind*) and G. Hauptmann (*Schluck und Jau*) attracted V. Meyerhold's interest but could not be accepted by K. Stanislavsky. He did use dramatic convention as a technique of stage art, but it never became an end in itself for him or replaced reality. In other words, K. Stanislavsky never antithesized it to realism. For V. Meyerhold, however, it was different: he considered dramatic convention to be an opportunity to depict a person and their life on stage. When K. Stanislavsky tried to retreat from his principles (for example, being carried away by L. Andreev's drama *The Life of Man*), he was in for a disappointment and failure.

V. Meyerhold fully shared V. Bryusov's idea about the 'modern' (i.e. symbolist) theatre, that "... it is impossible to recreate theatre on the same foundation. What should be done is either to continue constructing the building of the Antoine-Stanislavsky theatre or start with the new foundation. Theatre must abandon its century-old traditions developed over the time from

Shakespeare to Ibsen. Not to complicate the stage technique, but to simplify it; not to modify the fake, but to provide the real, albeit conditional, and to realize that symbolism is the only principle of all arts – such is the way to the 'new' in theatre". These and similar principles guided V. Meyerhold in his directing activity both at the Studio-Theatre and the Komissarzhevskaya Theatre.

## **2. THE MOSCOW ART THEATRE IS THE ORIGINATOR OF MODERN ART — V. MEYERHOLD'S 'REBELLION'**

Since the 1890s, there appeared new marked trends in the theatrical environment and an extensive search for new means of expression was carried out. The first experiments in the interpretation of the theory and practice of symbolism in theatre took place at the time of the Russian Revolution of 1905. It should be mentioned that V. Bryusov's article *Realism and Convention on Stage* (from the collection *Theatre. The Book of the New Theatre*) became a statement of symbolism in stage art. Speaking against naturalism, the author brought it (naturalism) together with realism (or even put them on a par). He was right ironically remarking that "only those unwilling to listen and understand still insist that art should 'reproduce' or 'reflect' reality".

Apparently, art, and theatre in particular, is not a mirror. V. Bryusov's article, in fact, discussed the denial of realism as a method. The question of the universal, philosophical aspect of the theatre art was not even raised. It was the concept of symbolism, the 'secret sign' known only to the privy that was made absolute. The criticism V. Bryusov expressed in his article, was mostly levelled at the Moscow Art Theatre. That, however, was an attack from without; the one from within was associated with V. Meyerhold's 'rebellion'. What V. Meyerhold's activity was connected with was transferring the aesthetics of symbolism into the theatre practice. He enthusiastically sought to establish the lofty social mission of theatre. However, his search resulted in the creation of a programme related to symbolism. The misunderstanding that arose between him and K. Stanislavsky resulted in a breakdown, in V. Meyerhold's leaving the Moscow Art Theatre and establishing his own one – the New Drama Partnership (1902). V. Meyerhold attempted dealing with the issues that worried him relying on the ideas of symbolism. Meanwhile, he repeatedly

stated that he considered symbolism antithetical to naturalism.

The foundation of the Moscow Public Art Theatre (1898) radically changed not only the aesthetic but also the organizational system of the Russian theatre. The theatre was among the first to feel the need to update and made it into a new business.

There have been changes in the function of the traditional figure of the director for the theatre. "He took a central, leading position, assuming responsibility not only for the artistic integrity of the performance but also for the aesthetic, ethical, organizational existence of the theatre as a whole. With the emergence of the Moscow Art Theatre, the Russian theatre becomes a director's theatre. This is what gave rise to a variety of directions and searches, theatrical concepts, and acting schools. This is what brought the theatre to the vanguard of the arts, turning it into a kind of barometer of cultural and social life, because it was in the theatre that the interests of all kinds of art: literature and painting, music and architecture, acting and poetry, merged, intertwined, were tied into a tight knot, revealing its universal, synthetic nature". [2]

K. Stanislavsky and V. Nemirovich-Danchenko were true innovators of theatrical art in Russia at the beginning of the century. The Moscow Art Theatre sought to fulfil its aesthetic, ethical, ideological tasks, following three conditions: the actor remained the main figure, the theatre found its playwrights and, last but not least, implemented the reform without departing, but, on the contrary, relying on the best traditions of Russian realistic art.

"The audience was not entertained, but immersed in the atmosphere of life that was going on on stage, forced to suffer and rejoice with the characters, empathize with them, as if to participate in the very action of the play. The emotional tension of the audience had to be its best". [2]

The Moscow Art Theatre (or MAT) has become a herald of new, modern art. Here are the words of Stanislavsky himself about the essence of the theatrical reform carried out by him: "We protested against the false pathos of recitation and acting, and the bad conventions of staging, scenery, and against the premiere, which spoiled the ensemble, and against the insignificant repertoire of the theatres of that time." [3] Stanislavsky's name is associated with the leading line in the development of aesthetics of scenic realism. As an actor and director, he, together with the Moscow Art Theatre

troupe, created what was later called the Stanislavsky system. When asked what it was, he replied, "Life itself". [4] In the formation of this system, a large role belongs to A. Chekhov and M. Gorky, whose plays in the first period of the theatre's activity defined it as a theatre of modern drama. The friendly ties of the Moscow Art Theatre with A. Chekhov and M. Gorky undoubtedly helped the theatre in its creative self-determination, in the formation of the personalities of those actors whose playing enriched the Russian stage: O.L. Knipper-Chekhov, I.M. Moskvina, M.P. Lilina, M.F. Andreeva, A.R. Artyom, V.E. Meyerhold, V.I. Katchalov, L.M. Leonidov and others. K.S. Stanislavsky later remarked, referring to the depth of Chekhov's thought, his concept of a playwright: "Those who try to play a role in the plays of A.P. Chekhov are mistaken. In his plays it is necessary to be, to live, to exist, walking along the main spiritual artery deeply embedded inside". [5]

### **3. A. CHEKHOV'S PLAYS ON THE STAGE OF THE MOSCOW ART THEATRE**

The pages of *The Yearbook of the Imperial Theatres* revealed competition between various theatrical movements, trends, and schools that invaded all fields of art. In general, it was a struggle between tradition and innovation, between the 'old' classical Russian theatre (e.g. the Maly Theatre and the Mikhailovsky Theatre) and new, often symbolist, theatres and those building on the achievements of symbolism (e.g. the Meyerhold theatre, various theatre studios and the 'public' Moscow Art Theatre). *The Yearbook of the Imperial Theatres* discussed repertoire issues, presented correspondence between famous theatrical professionals and composers (e.g. between A.P. Lensky and A.S. Arensky), addressed the tasks of the Imperial Moscow theatre, and invited critics to share their impressions of theatre seasons in St. Petersburg and Moscow. Of great interest are A.N. Ostrovsky's reminiscences and the issues of staging his plays in relation to the so-called 'old drama'. Additionally, *The Yearbook of the Imperial Theatres* published chronicles of foreign literature on theatre art, books and articles on the Russian theatre of the Silver Age.

The analysis of *The Yearbook of the Imperial Theatres* proves that the fighting trends of Russian theatre life had a particular focus on Russian drama theatre in its classical form, which applied to both traditions and repertoire. Thus, great attention was

paid to N. Gogol and A. Ostrovsky (The 1897-1898 Yearbook of the Imperial Theatres). During the 1897-1898 season, 239 performances were staged, including N. Gogol's *Marriage* (at the Alexandrinsky Theatre and the Mikhailovsky Theatre) and the updated stage production of *The Government Inspector* (with new sets and costumes), which had first been staged in October 1907. The Mikhailovsky Theatre did renewed productions of *The Imaginary Invalid* by Molière (September 1) and *Tartuffe* (September 9). As for contemporary authors, the Alexandrinsky Theatre staged A. Chekhov's drama *Ivanov*. The Russian audience was also interested in Henrik Ibsen; so, his play *The Pillars of Society* was staged at the Mikhailovsky Theatre. Benefit performances also attracted the audience's attention (e.g. one-act play *Fear Has Magnifying Eyes* by Nikolai Krinitsky). It is essential to highlight the farewell performance of A. Nilsky at the Alexandrinsky Theatre, when *The Death of Ivan the Terrible* by Aleksey Tolstoy was staged. Along with the plays by Russian playwrights, the Mikhailovsky Theatre staged plays by G. Hauptmann, for instance, *College Crampton*. What is important, *The Yearbook of the Imperial Theatres* published not only summaries of the plays, but also casting information and characters' personalities with comments by critics.

Russian society was brought up on A. Chekhov's plays staged in the Moscow Art Theatre, and only the presence of the Moscow Art Theatre made it possible for A. Chekhov to become the lord of Russian intelligentsia's souls at the beginning of the century. Due to the essential and burning problems posed by the writer, the audience did not remain bystanders but was involved in the dramatic fates of the characters, seeing in them a reflection of the fate of the whole country, its worries, and anxieties. The playwright, the heroes, the actors taught the audience to be irreconcilable with vulgarity and philistinism, they did not flirt with the audience, and sometimes they even were harsh in discovering some bitter truths, and this awakened the public conscience. "In the work on Chekhov's plays, the general ideological and aesthetic foundations of the art of the early Art Theatre were formed, its new directorial method was formed, the principles of acting, decorative design, etc. were composed." [6] Thus, A.P. Chekhov's dramaturgy determined the creative searches of the Moscow Art Theatre.

Stanislavsky did not immediately accept A. Chekhov's dramaturgy, because the 'everyday life' that his heroes allegedly lived seemed as humdrum

routine for the stage, or in his words "non-scenic, monotonous, and boring". In the future, creative contacts became more fruitful, and Stanislavsky became interested in Chekhov, especially in the process of working on the piece *The Seagull*. Supposedly, it was not an accident, since Chekhov's plays were built on the laws of realistic dramaturgy, equally close to both the writer and the director. The Moscow Art Theatre's followers (or Mkhatohtsy) gradually concluded that behind the seeming ordinariness and everyday life in Chekhov's plays there is always a true drama of human destinies.

"... the struggle of the Moscow Art Theatre for a new stage realism was dictated not by the personal tastes of its creators, not, moreover, by foreign borrowings: the MAT was a deeply Russian phenomenon, historically natural." [8] Soft, lyrical, but internally uncompromising, 'hard' A. Chekhov predetermined the horizons of development of Russian and world dramaturgy of the 20th century. The hidden psychological drama, the peculiar 'helplessness' of drama, the equality of the actors, the inner meaning of the scenes that do not lie on the surface ('undercurrent') – that's what determined the originality of Chekhov's plays, inspired the Moscow Art Theatre, helped them discover new laws of scenic art.

Chekhov's plays defined the style of the Moscow Art Theatre, gave the spirit of modernity to what was later called 'mood'. The peculiarity of the Chekhov theatre is that it is, as they say, a 'mood theatre'. Nevertheless, creative conflicts were inevitable. Considering the history of productions of *The Seagull*, *Uncle Vanya*, *The Cherry Orchard*, it is possible to identify the reasons for Chekhov's disagreement with the interpretation of his plays by the Moscow Art Theatre.

The motto of the MAT was the 'unconditional and honest' truth of life. And this could not but lead to the fact that it was necessary to destroy the theatrical routine, to get away from the false pathos, the 'stiltedness' of the characters. A. Chekhov brought the theatre as close to life as possible. However, the departure from 'idealization' and 'glorification' did not mean the triumph of petty everyday life. On the contrary, the MAT students correctly understood Chekhov's idea that the poetry of art should be able to extract from the prose of life, and in it, in life, there is always an 'invigorating beginning'.

A. Chekhov's role in the theatrical art of the 1900s was clearly recognized by Russian figures of culture, Sergei Diaghilev in particular. Below is a fragment of his letter to A. Chekhov.

November 24, 1901. St. Petersburg

Dear Anton Pavlovich,

One of the employees of *Mir Iskusstva*, L. Shestov (the author of the work *The Good in the Teachings of Nietzsche and Tolstoy* and the new major work *Dostoevsky and Nietzsche* which will be published in my journal next year), would like to devote an article to the review of your creative work. In a letter I have received from him today, he writes to me the following, "You probably remember our conversation about Chekhov. While in Kiev, I reread some of his works, and being in Moscow, I attended *The Seagull* and *Uncle Vanya*, which only added to my insight that Chekhov's work constitutes an unusually fascinating and rigorous material for a critical article. However, writing about him not having any, even approximate, indications of when and where his works were produced is utterly impossible. To guess means to risk falling into a grave, albeit formal, error. Wouldn't you be so kind as to write to Chekhov?". Fulfilling his wish, I kindly ask you to tell me where he can find the material he needs, which has not yet been published by Adolf Marks and is scattered in various places. Moreover, it would be of much help if you could indicate the time when the works you judge to be your major and most significant ones were produced, and thereby contribute to his study of the complex and extensive material that he treats with such deep and genuine interest.

Yours sincerely, Sergei Diaghilev [7]

Following A. Chekhov's plays, M. Gorky's dramas entered the repertoire of the Moscow Art Theatre: *The Philistines* and *The Lower Depths*. Tolstoy's plays *The Living Corpse* and *The Power of Darkness* were also staged.

#### **4. CREATIVE SEARCHES OF V. MEYERHOLD AND V. KOMISSARZHEVSKAYA**

To understand more profoundly the true innovation of A.P. Chekhov, his dramaturgy, let us refer to the theory and practice of symbolism and how they were reflected in the theatre of the early 20th century. The transfer of the aesthetics of symbolism into the practice of the theatre is

connected with the work of V.E. Meyerhold, who was called the 'young colleague' of K.S. Stanislavsky. V. Meyerhold called his theatre 'conditional' because in the plays there was no movement of the plot, even internal, psychological. With all the undoubtedly innovative things that the Meyerhold Theatre carried, it cannot be said that it encroached on the foundations of the theatre, replacing the action with a subjective lyrical beginning. In Chekhov's plays, as already noted, there was certainly an action, although there was often an internal movement (an 'underwater' current), and the achievements of the symbolists were creatively used, but the audience noticed there life and living people, not stylized 'masks', not conventional figures.

The face of theatrical Russia of those years was also defined by young, new theatres, just founded by the search for creative thought of directors and actors. Among them, there was the Drama Theatre of V.F. Komissarzhevskaya, which opened in St. Petersburg, in the premises of the Passage on September 15, 1904. It opened with the premiere of *Uriel Acosta* by K. Gutzkow. Komissarzhevskaya identified V.E. Meyerhold as the main director of her theatre, who later became an outstanding supporter of conditional aesthetic theatre. The second performance, that has brought fame and glory to the theatre, was G. Ibsen's *Doll's House*. The role of Nora was brilliantly played by V.F. Komissarzhevskaya herself. She remained faithful to the image of this character all her life.

The creative search of playwrights, actors, and directors of the Drama Theatre V.F. Komissarzhevskaya was caused by the desire to find other forms of scenic expressiveness, different from the traditional ones, which would allow escaping from the literal, primitive reading of the drama, to comprehend its philosophical depth and generality, combining for this the richest traditions of Russian realistic theatre and the new that was born by the art of symbolism.

The desire for everything new, the creative search itself drew Komissarzhevskaya's attention to Meyerhold, who was breaking the traditions of naturalistic theatre and trying to fill old theatrical forms with new content. One of Meyerhold's findings was the introduction of music into drama theatre. And not only as one of the elements of stage art. He radically rethought the functions of music in the play. Symbolism, stylization, grotesque attracted him because they made it possible to sharpen the problems of the play and, as

a whole, synthesize the work, the style of an entire epoch.

The Komissarzhevskaya-Meyerhold Theatre emerged as a pattern of time. Both the actress and the director felt the need to tell about the tragedy of Russian society in a new way. They turned to symbolism as an art of heightened spiritual tension, which would lead them into the world of ‘cosmic’ problems.

Following Blok’s *Street Circus* (Balaganchik), Meyerhold staged L. Andreev’s *A Man’s Life*, and Blok had been struck by this play. It is possible to discuss whether *A Man’s Life* is a symbolist drama or whether here the uncertainty of images-symbols is deliberately (and tendentiously) replaced by coarseness and clarity of allegories. It is possible to discuss similarly, however, about who is L. Andreev: is he a realist? a symbolist? an existentialist? a neorealist?

It should be noted that those artists who were somehow connected with symbolism were still not satisfied with the detachment of the ‘conditional’, ‘motionless’ theatre, as it did not correspond to the very nature of stage action (namely, action as a synonym for action, dynamics). Komissarzhevskaya moved away from the symbolist theatre and its poetics. Stanislavsky, appreciating Meyerhold’s talent and his innovative deeds, also could not accompany him. The overthrow of existing alliances was inevitable. A return to the age-old traditions of realism in the theatre was unavoidable too. However, the new theatres of Russia at the turn of the century did a lot to enrich the performing arts. Their findings were not lost in vain and made them feel already in the 20s.

## **5. CRITICS OF THE EARLY 20TH CENTURY ON THE ACTIVITIES OF K.S. STANISLAVSKY**

An article by Nikolai Popov, a K.S. Stanislavsky’s contemporary, is clearly of interest. It was published in *The Yearbook of the Imperial Theatres* (1909, Issue 2) and was entitled *Stanislavsky: His Significance for Modern Theatre* (Experience, Characteristics). The author devotes his research to the activities of the MAT and Stanislavsky as the main director. Of course, “big things are seen from a distance”, but a lot of things in Popov’s article are estimated correctly, and time only confirms this.

The terms ‘Stanislavsky’ and ‘Art Theatre’ have become synonymous; speaking about the meaning of ‘Art Theatre’ for Russian art, you have to always mean that you are talking about Stanislavsky. This, however, should not detract from the significance for the ‘Art Theatre’ of its other inspirer, V. I. Nemirovich-Danchenko.

The ‘Art Theatre’ itself is just as unthinkable without V. I. Nemirovich-Danchenko as without K. S. Stanislavsky. This theatre, perhaps, even owes its existence to Nemirovich-Danchenko. Him, being a playwright, a teacher of dramatic art, and a natural theatre administrator, managed to find in Stanislavsky what he lacked — an exceptional directorial talent.

V. I. Nemirovich-Danchenko, who has publicly called himself “an amateur in the field of directing” more than once recently, with his literary taste, gut, and administrative tact is a necessary complement to the directorial talent of K. S. Stanislavsky and, if we continue to just talk about the personality of Stanislavsky alone, it will be solely in the sense of his characteristic, only incidentally the ‘Art Theatre’ in general.

As mentioned above, Stanislavsky’s work began long before the foundation of the ‘Art Theatre’, where he transitioned with a whole troupe of his long-time employees.

Merging with Nemirovich-Danchenko was of great importance for the development of Stanislavsky’s talent: it gave him literary completeness and helped him find a proper use for himself.

Stanislavsky’s community has legends about the extraordinary torments to which he subjects his troupe for hundreds of rehearsals for each play.

The Russian stage actor is used to playing in the big theatrical affairs of maximum from 8-10 rehearsals and is deeply indignant when he finds out that the production of *The Seagull* cost the troupe 26 rehearsals in the ‘Art Theatre’. The actors say that this is a luxury no one needs, that only well-fed people can work like this.

It would be more correct, leaving aside any professional points of view, the possibility or impossibility for other theatres to work the way Moscow ‘artists’ work under the direction of Stanislavsky — it would be more correct to look at the very results of this work and draw conclusions from the comparison of the most heterogeneous facts.

The gift of conveying one's personal feeling, the ability to infect the viewer with this feeling is a gift that sometimes, in Komissarzhevskaya's case, for example, makes up the whole charm of such acting talents, this very gift is often absent from many even very talented actors. Sometimes they do not notice this and grumble at the unresponsiveness of the public and criticism. When the same actors begin to set themselves the task of transmitting a characteristic feature of someone else's psyche, the mental state of their character, then there are also technical expressive means for this, about the existence of which, or rather, about the possibility of using which the supporters of 'gut' do not want to know anything.

A natural director, Stanislavsky, at the same time, could never give up the desire to act as an actor and this gave him a great advantage as the head of an entire amateur art circle since his employees always pictured this example of his work on himself as an actor. A great virtuoso in character and comic roles, he at the same time saw in young actors a weakness for tragic roles. He had no direct data for this. In these roles, he had a desire to follow the example of the actors of 'gut', and several failures still did not cool his aspirations to give himself to a direct feeling, which always did not fit the feelings of his characters. [9]

## 6. CONCLUSION

The struggle between the realistic and modernist tendencies in the theatre art of the early 20th century reflected the interaction of different trends of the Silver Age, division of forces, attraction and repulsion, theatre reforms, focus on traditions and the new that defined the art style of the 20th century. The artists of the Silver Age understood the movement of Eternity as a pulsating approach of the spirit to the surface of life, when the Eternal enters the temporal and resides there. As can be seen from the creative dialogue of realists and modernists, the geographical, astral (cosmic), mystical, spherical, mythological, historical, and religious spaces contributed to the creation of the world model.

## AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

This paper is completed by Magda A. Dzhichonaya independently.

## REFERENCES

- [1] S.V. Stakhorsky. Vyacheslav Ivanov and the Russian theatrical culture of the early 20th century. M, 1991. P. 3.
- [2] Russian Drama Theatre of the late 19th - early 20th centuries. Moscow, 1997. Pp.183, 186-189.
- [3] K. Stanislavsky. My Life in Art. Moscow, 1980. P. 196.
- [4] Russian art culture of the late 19th - early 20th century (1895-1907). Book 1. M, 1968. P. 66.
- [5] Stanislavsky K.S. Collected works in 8 volumes. M. 1954. V. 1. P. 222.
- [6] Stroeveva M.N. Theatrical heritage. K.S. Stanislavsky. Moscow, 1955. P. 614.
- [7] Sergei Diaghilev and Russian art. In 2 volumes. Vol. 2. Compiled by I.S. Zilberstein, V.A. Samkov. Moscow, 1982. 576 p.
- [8] Russian art culture of the late 19th -early 20th century (189J-1907). Book 1. Moscow, Nauka., 1968. P. 66.
- [9] N. Popov. Stanislavsky: his significance for the modern theatre. Yearbook of Imperial Theatres, 1909, Issue 2. Pp. 71-73; 82-83.