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INTRODUCTION

Evgenij Zamjatin's fear that "... Russian literature has but one future--her past" has, to some extent, been realized.¹ Not only do frequent reprintings of Nineteenth century Russian "Classics" attest to the continued popularity of the literature of the past, but the works of many Soviet writers who entered the field of literature after Stalin's death in 1953 exhibit close ties to the old masters.

After the generally drab, uninteresting literary period of the late Thirties to the mid-Fifties, many young writers began to forsake such Socialist Realist themes as building Socialism, creating the new Soviet man and constructing the industrial foundations of the young State. They began, instead, to write about the individual as a private entity and to look at the emotional rather than social aspects of existence, with personal and immediate concerns taking precedence over public, long-range considerations. This they did in the language and context of contemporary Soviet life, so that something fresh was found in their writings. Their methods, however, remained basically those of the past, so that their literature seemed to be developing along paths which were close to the models of the last century, while much contemporaneous Western literature seemed aimed at breaking with the past. Thus Jurij Nagibin, Vladimir Tendrjakov, Vasilij Aksenov and Jurij Kazakov--whose works have been said to be written in an "'un-Soviet' spirit of detachment"--have been compared to Čexov.²

positions reminiscent of Turgenev, too, are often found among the works of these writers, especially in such stories as Kazakov's "Blue and Green" and "Autumn in an Oak Forest." The former, which recalls the bitter-sweet memories of a lost first love, and the latter, with its close attention to natural surroundings and lack of resolution, bring to mind both Turgenev and Čexov.

By far the most sensational and well-known of the new writers, of course, is Aleksandr Solženicyn, who because of both his subject-matter and style, has been compared to Dostoevskij, Tolstoj, Leskov and Čexov—among others. The fame that attended the publication of his first work, One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovič, in most instances had little or nothing to do with literature but was due to what were thought to be the political and social implications of the publication in the Soviet journal Novyj mir of a work whose setting is a Stalinist labor camp. As more works by Solženicyn became available—clandestinely as well as openly—some facts about the author's life began to reach his readers in the many nations of the world where his short stories, novellas, sketches and plays are read by millions. The following brief biographical account is offered in view of the autobiographical nature of much of Solženicyn's writing:

---


6. Max Hayward, p. 205. "Paradoxically," writes Mr. Hayward, "the first Soviet prose work which can be profitably discussed exclusively in terms of its aesthetic accomplishment is one which was published in Moscow for avowedly political reasons and received abroad mainly as a political sensation." Numerous similar remarks concerning One Day's reception abound.

7. The principal sources of information regarding Solženicyn's life are Time, "The Writer as Russia's Conscience" (Sept. 27, 1968, 22-27; "Courageous Defender" (Nov. 21, 1969), 34; "Solzhenitsyn: A
Aleksandr Isaevich Solzhenicyn was born on December 11, 1918 in the resort town of Kislovodsk but was brought at an early age to Rostov where he grew up and received his education. His family, which was of Cossack origin, belonged to the intelligentsia, and his father died when the future writer was quite young, leaving the boy to be reared by his mother, a schoolteacher.

In 1941 Solzhenicyn graduated from Rostov University where he took his degree in mathematics and physics. For the two years prior to his graduation he had also been taking correspondence courses from the Department of Philology at the Moscow Institute of History, Philosophy and Literature, but these studies were interrupted by the war.

Solzhenicyn entered the army upon completion of his studies at Rostov University and received training as an artillery officer. The war soon separated him from his wife Natalija Alekseevna (nee Rešetovskaja), to whom he had not long been married, and in 1945 the twice-decorated Captain Solzhenicyn found himself serving in Eastern Prussia. In conversations with a friend Solzhenicyn had criticized Stalin—to whom he referred by derogatory and critical epithets—for his failures as a commander-in-chief. These opinions and expressions were rashly continued in correspondence between the two men, and in February 1945 Solzhenicyn was arrested and sentenced to eight years in prison. He served his time in various prison camps, including the Mavrino "sharashka" which he used as the setting for his novel First Circle. 8

---

8 Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn, The First Circle, trans. Thomas P. Whitney (Bantam: New York, 1968), p. ix ("Translator's Note"): "The word 'sharashka' as it occurs in this story derives from a Soviet slang expression meaning 'a sinister enterprise based on bluff or deceit.' By 1949, the time of the novel, it meant, particularly, a special scientific or technical institute staffed with prisoners . . . "

---
February 1953 he was sent to Djambul Province, and after three years of exile in Kazakhstan he was completely rehabilitated. His wife had meanwhile divorced him at his insistence and remarried, bearing her new husband two children, but she divorced her second husband and rejoined Solženicyn during his exile. The problems of the wife of a prisoner are of great significance in the novel First Circle. A woman could escape ostracism and official persecution by divorcing her convicted husband, and one of the prisoners of First Circle and his wife discuss this matter during a rare visit that is permitted them.

In 1956 Solženicyn went to Rjazan' where he taught physics in high school and began to write his remarkable series of works, some of which are said to have been composed in his head during his imprisonment and retained in his memory until he had the opportunity to commit them to paper. His experiences as a cancer patient during his prison term and again in the mid-Fifties undoubtedly provided him with much of the material for his "novella (povest') in two parts," as Solženicyn himself terms Cancer Ward.

In 1962 Solženicyn submitted his novella One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovič to Novyj mir and set off an explosive chain of events whose literary, political and personal repercussions have not yet ceased to be felt. In an anecdote that is certainly destined to become as famous in literary annals as the story of BelinskiJ's enthusiastic response to DostoevskiJ's Poor People, Aleksandr Tvardovskij, then Editor-in-Chief of Novyj mir, recalls his reaction to One Day:

(Tvardovskij, tired after a full day at the office, was reading some manuscripts in bed and had read about ten lines of Solženicyn's work.) Suddenly I felt that I couldn't read it like this. I had to do something appropriate to the occasion. So I got up. I put on my best black suit, a white shirt with a starched collar, a tie, and my good shoes. Then I sat at my desk and read a new classic.

Thereafter, Tvardovskij remained a loyal champion of Solženicyn, which undoubtedly contributed to his being forced to resign as editor of

---

9Time, "The Writer as Russia's Conscience" (September 27, 1968), 25.
Novyj mir on February 14, 1970. Nikita Khrushchev, in order to promote his own campaign of de-Stalinization in the early Sixties, approved the publication of One Day with its vivid portrayal of the misery of a Stalinist labor camp, and the story appeared in the November 1962 issue of Novyj mir. This issue of the journal and the subsequent edition of the story in book form disappeared into the hands of eager readers as soon as (if not before) the work reached the booksellers' stalls.10

In the ensuing euphoria, Solženicyn was even nominated for a Lenin prize, but by April 1964 a chill had returned to the world of Soviet arts and letters, and the award was denied him mainly on the grounds of an excessive influence of Tolstoj's passive humanism on his works.11

In 1963 Solženicyn managed to get three works into print, all in Novyj mir—"An Incident at Krečetovka Station" and "Matrena's Homestead" in the January issue and "For the Good of the Cause" in the July issue. Not until January 1966 did Novyj mir publish "Zaxar the Pouch," the last work by Solženicyn to appear in the Soviet Union. The first part of Cancer Ward was accepted for publication and several of its chapters had already been set in type when Konstantin Fedin, First Administrative Secretary of the Union of Soviet Writers, prevented its appearance and ordered the type dismantled, prompting letters of protest from two of Solženicyn's staunchest supporters, Venjamin Kaverin and Aleksandr Tvardovskij.12

10 The hard-to-get Soviet book-form edition of One Day was published in Moscow by the Sovetsklj pisatelj publishing house in 1963. In a yet unpublished article entitled "Dissent With No Rhyme: The Etudes of Aleksandr Solženitsyn," Prof. Richard Sheldon has a note which reads in part: "When the November 1962 Novyj mir edition of 95,000 copies was immediately sold out, a second printing of several thousand copies was run off. A paper-back edition of the story was printed in January, 1963--700,000 copies, rather than the frequently reported 100,000."


12 These letters appeared in the journal Survey, July and October 1968.
Solženicyn has written open letters protesting the ban on publication of his works and has recently engaged a Swiss lawyer, Fritz Heeb, to try to prevent unauthorized editions of his works abroad. He has already been forced to defend himself against accusations that he has authorized the appearance in the West of such works as Cancer Ward and First Circle. These attacks took place at a meeting of the Union of Soviet Writers on September 22, 1967 during which Solženicyn repudiated one of his own works, the play Feast of the Conquerors, apparently a very bitter work written in the Fifties. At the same meeting a call for the expulsion of Solženicyn from the Writers' Union was first voiced by K. Jašen and supported by A. Šaripov. More than two years passed, however, before Solženicyn's local Union branch voted to expel him on November 4, 1969. The parent organization announced his formal expulsion on November 12, 1969. By contrast, honors continue to be heaped upon Solženicyn abroad. When he was named the recipient of the 1970 Nobel Prize for literature there was at first some hope that he would be able to travel to Stockholm to receive the award. The Soviet press hinted that he would not be permitted to return home if he went to Sweden. Solženicyn did not attend the ceremonies, but his absence was noted in the speeches of most of the other recipients so that he emerged, paradoxically, as the most publicized laureate of the ceremonies, although he has not yet actually received the prize.

Of the works which Solženicyn is known to have written, the following have not yet been published anywhere: the play Pир побе́дите́лей, the screenplay Зна́йут исти́ну танки and the documentary novel Аркіпе́лаг ГУЛАГ, which reportedly follows Gleb Neržin—one of the central figures

---

13 The publication of Solženicyn's latest work, Август четырнадцатого (August 1914), which was published too recently to be considered in this dissertation, represents a departure from his usual practice. As indicated in an "Afterword" to August 1914, the author considered publication of this work in the Soviet Union an impossibility, and therefore he sought a foreign publisher and authorized the appearance of his book through the agency of the YMCA Press of Paris in 1971.
of First Circle—from the comparative comfort of the Mavrino Šaraška through some of the lower circles of Stalin's infernal camps. GULAG is a Soviet acronym standing for Chief Administration of Corrective Labor Camps.  

Two poems attributed to Solženicyn appeared in the emigre journal Grani, and in December 1969 the Hamburg weekly Die Zeit published excerpts from an epic poem, Prussian Nights, purportedly by Solženicyn. The latter work has not appeared anywhere in Russian.

The issue has been raised many times that, in the West, interest in Soviet writing tends to be political rather than literary and that judgements of it tend to reflect this attitude. As Irving Howe and Victor Erlich point out, it is difficult—if not impossible—to react to such a work as One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovič as a purely literary phenomenon. Nevertheless, continues Professor Erlich, "... I submit that to measure the performance of Soviet writers by any other standards than the 'Western' ones would be a sign of condescension rather than of understanding." The point that literary judgements should shun political bias is well taken. The aim of this study is to provide a literary analysis of Solženicyn's works; commentary upon intellectual and moral themes will be necessary corollaries of this primary emphasis because of the nature of Solženicyn's writing;

---


15Grani, No. 64 (June 1967), 150-152.


political considerations will be ignored so long as they do not comprise the warp and woof of the material.

A few commentators have now begun to establish a body of scholarship devoted to the study of the esthetic features of Solženicyn's works. By building on the work that has already been accomplished and in the hope of adding to it, I propose to examine Solženicyn's prose fiction in the approximate order in which it was published, identifying stylistic elements, showing their effectiveness within the works in which they occur and pointing out both the consistency and variety of stylistic elements employed from work to work. The investigation will be devoted mainly to an examination of phraseology. Solženicyn's vocabulary, his combination of words into phrases and his use of various levels of diction—his "phraseology"—appear to be important elements in his method of characterization, which will be another major topic of this dissertation. The means by which Solženicyn makes his characters known are intimately associated with his phraseology. They are characterized—their personalities, social origins, educational background, fears, hopes and desires are made known—by the individualized speech mannerisms that each employs, as well as by the carefully chosen terms in which other characters and narrators speak or think of them.

For the purposes of this investigation, literary style is construed primarily as a matter of selection; from among a vast number of possibilities, the writer must constantly make choices in the realm of literary representation until he has created a finished work. Some choices, such as the language (French, German, English, Russian, etc.) in which the work is written and the influences that the forms and requirements of that language may have upon one's perception and interpretation of the universe, are usually beyond the control of the writer. Other choices, such as subject matter, setting and character are more susceptible to the author's direction, but, once made, they may then reduce the freedom of subsequent choices. Thus the writer who chooses to
portray the life of an ordinary fisherman will find himself under different restrictions from the author writing about the origins of the ethical system of the ruling class in a modern industrial society. Still other choices seem the freest of all, e.g., vocabulary, phrasing and the invention of metaphors, but even here there are both general and individual limitations of linguistic resources, knowledge and imagination.

Within a given literature, the choices in expression dictated by the characteristics of the language are naturally the most widespread throughout the works of all authors who use that tongue at roughly the same stage of its development. Thus all writers of, let us say, contemporary France will display a great similarity in their terms of expression--more similarity than dissimilarity, undoubtedly--simply because they are all employing the French language as it is constituted today. These homogenized features are important in that they form the matrix which makes comprehension possible among literate people who share that language. For detecting or describing the style of a particular writer, however, these general features are of the least interest or use because they do not individualize. The freest choices will undoubtedly display the most individuality.

Richard Ohmann suggests that style reflects the way in which the artist perceives and interprets the universe and is consequently an epistemological system. Professor Ohmann believes that style, since it reflects the total perceptual being of the artist, lies deep within all aspects of a work, and he adduces from somewhat earlier theorists

---

19 In discussing this aspect of choice in his article "Prolegomena to the Analysis of Prose Style," Richard Ohmann writes on p. 10: "A James Joyce or a Gertrude Stein may reshuffle linguistic forms in an attempt to draw aside the curtain that English places between us and the world of psychic and physical phenomena, but most conventional writers permit English to govern their epistemologies, as do all who merely speak the language." In Style in Prose Fiction, ed. Harold C. Martin (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1959).

such as John Middleton Murry and W. K. Wimsatt support from statements that express a similar notion. This view suggests that everything is a question of style and thus rejects clear distinctions between form and content, between manner and theme, for style reflects the writer's epistemology, which transcends all these distinctions. But in examine­
ing the style of an author, one cannot comment on everything, for--
with any writer worth the effort--this would take an eternity if, in­deed, it could be done at all. However, one can select from the au­thor's works what seems to be most important, most characteristic and most expressive in his interpretation of the universe. This approach is undoubtedly very susceptible to the subjectivity of the investiga­tor, but if he is fairly open-minded and reasonably perceptive some­thing meaningful should result from his efforts.

An author's style, then, is the totality that he creates by mak­ing a huge number of choices; an element of his style is one of those choices (such as the selection of a particular lexical item to produce a specific effect, such as to cause the reader to feel happy or sad or pleased or indignant about an event or character) or a complex of them (such as the combination of a number of lexical items in a phrase, a sentence, a paragraph, with the same aims as those mentioned above) or a kind of choice which recurs frequently (not only in means of expres­sion or purpose of representation, but recurrences of mood, theme and setting) or, on the contrary, a choice that is rare in an author's works and is therefore particularly expressive, e.g., the personal qualities of Bazarov as distinct from the personal qualities of most of Turgenev's other Russian heroes.

Although this approach seems to offer little in the way of clarifying the definition of style in general, it does appear to pro­vide the kind of freedom necessary to allow the interpretation, unfet­tered by any cumbersome preconceptions, of the respective styles of in­dividual authors. If style is everything, then such elements as setting and structure must, in general, be parts of it, but they may not be significant elements in the style of a particular author or an individ­
ual work; they may be merely neutral and not particularly expressive. If, however, such elements are noteworthy for their effect—whether throughout all the works of a given author or even in a single work—then, of course, an examination of style must properly take them into consideration.

Solženicyn's prose fiction will be examined according to the concept of style as outlined above. No works will be neglected, but major attention will be devoted to *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*, "An Incident at Krečetovka Station," "Matrena's Homestead," *Cancer Ward* and *First Circle*, for I believe these works best exemplify both the fundamental consistency and the considerable range of Solženicyn's style. The action in all the aforementioned works takes place in limited physical settings and restricted time spans, yet the settings differ in character from one another despite certain similarities, and even in those works whose events take place in just one day time is expanded through various devices, providing ample information for interpreting the significance of the main action of the work. Solženicyn has exhibited a great talent for depicting simple, earthy "instinctive" characters like Ivan Denisovič, Matrena and Spiridon, the janitor in *First Circle*, but he has also successfully portrayed complex, intellectual and introspective figures such as Oleg Kostoglotov of *Cancer Ward* and Lev Rubin, Gleb Neržin and Dmitrij Sologdin of *First Circle*. His knowledge of all the levels of the Russian language provides him with the nuances which he uses extremely effectively in presenting the words and thoughts of his remarkable variety of characters. Precision of expression throughout the narrative is another result of this linguistic mastery.

I shall attempt to point out stylistic qualities which are found rather generally throughout the corpus of Solženicyn's work--a remarkable facility in the use of unusual vocabulary and diction (rare words, dialect forms, neologisms), an inclination toward subtle manipulation of narrational point of view, the use of leit-motifs, restricted settings and time spans as well as those that occur more rarely, such
as the use of allegory ("Buddha's Smile") in *First Circle*.

Solženicyn's debt to other writers--particularly those with whom he especially invites comparison, such as Tolstoj, Turgenev, Dostoevskij and Leskov--will be commented upon whenever it is appropriate to do so. No attempt will be made at a thorough examination of every detail that may possibly have some relationship to the works of other authors, however; Solženicyn's fiction as it exists in itself is the focus of attention of this work. I hope to show that Solženicyn has employed a number of familiar stylistic elements--some of them, such as skaz, nesobstvenno-prjamaja rec' and point of view, in an innovative fashion--in ways that are significant in the development of Russian literature.
CHAPTER I

One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovič

Although Aleksandr Solženicyn's popularity now depends to a great extent on the sensationalism that attends every event in his life, ultimately his reputation will undoubtedly rest upon his extensive and profound knowledge of the Russian language and his great stylistic versatility. His use of peasant dialect, soldier's slang and prison argot in One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovič was so masterful that it apparently cozened otherwise perceptive readers into assuming that this provincial schoolteacher and ex-convict was a primitive with a knack for writing in precisely the same style in which he thought and spoke. Even Aleksandr Tvardovskij, in his apologia for the work's "most painful" subject-matter and shocking (by Russian standards) language, appears to have been beguiled by Solženicyn's total mastery of his means of expression and complete control of his narrative medium. "The form of One Day," writes Tvardovskij, "is vivid and original in its every-day ordinariness and unpretentiousness; it is least of all concerned with itself and therefore is filled with an inner dignity and strength." The tone of this sentence generally and the use of the words "every-day

3 Ibid., p. 9. Tvardovskij warns that ". . . the use . . . of certain words and expressions from that environment will evoke the objections of a particularly fastidious taste."
4 Ibid.
ordinariness" and "unpretentiousness" specifically give the impres­sion that the author of One Day is an untutored but gifted story­teller, although Tvardovskij should have known at the time he wrote "In Place of a Foreword" that Solženicyn was an educated and self­aware intellectual. Numerous early comments on One Day and its au­thor reflect such false impressions.

Given what is known about Solženicyn's life, it might be as­sumed that his lexicon springs from first-hand sources—standard lit­erary vocabulary and usage from his university career, soldiers' slang and thieves' cant from his military and camp experiences, peasant speech from the time he served as a convict among people of all class­es and as a teacher in the provinces, and profanity mined from the rich vein of obscenities that traverses all these strata. Undoubtedly all these elements had their influence, but by far the greatest single source of Solženicyn's rich vocabulary is Vladimir Ivanovič Dal''s Tolkovyj slovar' russkogo jazyka. Commander Boris Burkovskij—identified as the model for Captain Bujnovskij of One Day--reminisced, "I remember him [Solženicyn] lying in his bunk, reading a copy of the Dal' dictionary and writing something into a big notebook." In an interesting article, E. Siljaev points out that aside from a few neologisms and Soviet acronyms Solženicyn's stock of words can be found in Dal', although the meanings of some words have apparently changed in the camp environment. Thus the word šnon, for example, no longer means "idler" (baklušnik, šatun, šlënda), Mr. Siljaev observes, but has come to refer to the search, or "frisk", to which the prisoners must submit whenever they leave or enter the camp compound.

Not only do Ivan Denisovič Šuxov, the central figure of One Day,
and the narrator use words from strata below that of the literary lan-
guage (posobit'—to help, p. 80; stjapnut'—to steal or "swipe", p. 131; 
vnjat' meaning merely "to understand," p. 33), but they employ sub-
standard morphological forms as well, e.g., ne trog' te for ne trogajte 
A vast number of examples can be found in the text of One Day.

Solženicyn's phrasing, the manner in which he combines words, 

displays the virtuosity with which he uses language accessible to even
the least educated Russian. In explaining why Šuxov confessed to
false charges of spying for the Germans, the narrator employs typically
folkstyle inversions. The passage that follows is, in addition, ex-
pressed in a laconic and bitterly humorous tone that is frequently
found in One Day:

Račet byl ü Šuxova prostoj: ne podpišeš'—búšlat derešjannyj,
podpišeš'—xot' živeš' ešće malost'. Podpisal. (p. 52.)

(Šuxov's reckoning was simple; if you don't sign, you get a
wooden pea-jacket /the prisoners' sardonic metaphor for a coffin/
sign, and you can still live a bit. He signed.)

In One Day by far the most frequent device denoting folk speech
is the inversion of noun and adjective in circumstances under which
such locutions do not conform to literary usage. Examples abound on
nearly every page:

Namordnik doroznýj, trjapočka, za dorogu vsja otmokla ot
dyxanija. . . (p. 35.) (His face-warmer for the road—a rag,
it was—had got all wet from his breathing on the way. . .)

I nadžiratel' lagernýj ešli navstreču popadetaja—tože ništo
. . . (And if the camp warder happened to bump into them, that
was nothing, either. . .) (p. 44.)

7Aleksandr Solženicyn, "Odin den' Ivana Denisoviča," Sočineni-
ja (Frankfurt/Main: Possev-Verlag, 1968), pp. 5-133. In this chapter,
all further references to One Day are from this edition.

8D. E. Rozental', Praktičeskaja stilistika russkogo jazyka
(Moscow: Vyssaja škola, 1965), p. 203: "Inversija opredeljniija, často
vstrečajuščasja v fol'klore, možet pridavat' reči karakter narodnogo
povestovanija, naprimer: Vysiel mešač NOČ'JU TEMNOJ, odinoko, gladit
iz černogo oblika na POLJA PUSTINNIJE, na DEREVNI DAL'NITE, na DEREVNI
BLIŽNIE (Never. /ov, A. S./)" In quotations in the text concerning in-
version, the numbers superscript indicate, for the significant portion
Xrip takoj bolnoj vsegda u nego pered gudkom. (p. 71.)

(It always gave a sickly wheeze like that before the whistle.)

Inversion is used with numerals even when no notion of approximation is intended: Ivan Denisovič has precisely two daughters, but we are told he has "doma dočki dve vzroslyx" ("two grown daughters at home") (p. 48.) Note the alliteration in the original phrase. Ordinarily this word order would mean that he had "about two grown daughters at home," but in the context of the story at this point the semantic implications of the inversion are obviously different. Ivan has just been talking with an active, clever teen-aged prisoner named Gopcik, and the narrator observes that the older man feels a paternal affection for the boy. This establishes a train of thought which leads to information that Ivan's own son died in infancy, so "dočki" is out of its neutral order to emphasize that, while Ivan had children at home, they were daughters, not sons. The significant part of the passage reads:

Ètogo Gopcika, pluta, ljubit Ivan Denisyč (sobstvennyj ego syn pomrer malen'kim, doma dočki dve vzroslyx). (pp. 48-49.)

(Ivan Denisyč loves this rascal Gopcik; his own son died when he was little; he has two grown daughters at home.)

These very same quotations also illustrate still other stylistic devices, e.g., the use of the word namordnik (muzzle) with a new meaning which exhibits the same sardonicism found in the expression "wooden pea-jacket," the somewhat unusual use of an appositive--trjapočka--in controlling the gender of the verb, and the inversions in some cases that go beyond the mere interchange of noun and adjective. Solženicyn is placing toward the beginning of his phrases the semantically more important words, insofar as it is possible to do so without violating Russian idiom. In addition to the greater impact these words have due to their appearance early in their respective utterances, interest is then heightened through suspense, since other clarifying words are frequently found toward the end of the phrase. Thus, in the example from p. 44, only when the reader reaches the fourth word does he discover that the "nadziratel'," or "warder," is the subject in an "if" clause, while with
neutral word order the conditional nature of the utterance would have
been apparent even before the subject was named. Also, this order in-
dicates that nadziratel' is the first notion that the speaking subject
has in mind.

A not uncommon feature of folk speech is the use of various
types of similarities of sound—rhyme, chime, assonance, consonance—
in every-day expression, and SolŽenicyn does not overlook this effect
in One Day. When Šuxov must check the wall he is building without a
level, the narrator exclaims, "Ex, glaz—vaterpas!" (p. 83.) ("Ah, the
eye's as good as a level!") The camp doctor is described as being
"gonkij takoj da zvonkij" (p. 19) ("so hoppity and cloppity"—to make
an unsuccessful attempt at catching the original's neat welding of
sense and sound), while a few words are added to a common expression in
describing the ease with which the camp's Baptists seem to withstand
their imprisonment, and a jingle is created: "S nix lagerja, kak a
gusja voda." (p. 35.) ("Camps flowed off them like water from a duck
[literally "goose"]/") Solženicyn paraphrases an old saying (Kto kogo
ljubit, tot togo i golubit—One caresses whomever one loves) and creates
the ascerbic observation, "Kto kogo možet, tot togo i gložet." (p. 56.)
("You gnaw at whomever you can.")

Parallels of familiar unrhymed sayings are found also. "Teplyj
zjablogo razve kogda pojmet?" (p. 20.) ("When will a warm man ever un-
derstand a freezing one?") is obviously based on the commonly used
phrase snytij golodnogo ne razumeej (a sated man does not understand a
hungry one). There is an aphoristic ring, too, in such expressions as
"I moroz ljut, no brigadir ljutej," (p. 47) ("The frost is harsh, but
the gang-boss is harsher.") and "Brigadir—sila, no konvoj—sila posi-
l'nej." (p. 82) ("The gang-boss is a power, but the escort [armed guards
who accompany the prisoners] is a power a bit more powerful.") Every-
day adages are used unchanged, also—"Bitoj sobake tol'ko plet' pokazi." (p. 47.) ("A chastened cur need only be shown the lash.") "Zapaslivyj
lučše bogatogo." (p. 64.) ("Better prudent than rich.") . . . v
čužix rukax vsegda red'ka tolšče. . .") (p. 118.) (". . . a radish
always looks fatter in another's hands . . .")
One finds "dolgo 11, korotko 11" (p. 49.) ("whether for a long time or a short time")—a phrase that is found in the fairy-tale tradition as well as in common usage—and an allusion to a well-known fable is found in "Zajač'ja radost": mol, ljaguški ešče i nas bojatsja." (p. 95.) ("It was a hare's joy they felt, as if to say, 'Well, at least the frogs are still afraid of us.'"

Diminutives—often referring to rather unexpected items—are frequently met throughout the text; trjapocka (a bit of rag), karmančik (little pocket), xlebušek (bit of bread), zapazuška (the little space in the bosom of one's shirt), and desjatočka (a "little" ten-year stretch) are just a few. Such diminu-

Curiously, although this fable appears to be familiar to most Russians, its author seems to be unknown and I have found its text (probably simplified) only in Natalie Duddington's A First Russian Reader (New York: Henry Holt and Company, n.d.), p. 27:

"Zajcy i ljaguški (Basnja)"

"Soslis' raz zajcy i stali žalovat'sja na svoju gor'kjuž žizn'.
"I ot ljudej i ot xisčnyx ptic i zverej pogibaem. Už lučše raz umeret', čem v straxe žit' i mučit'sja. Davajte, bratcy, utopimsja!"

"I pošli zajcy v ozero topit'sja. Podxodjat k beregu. Uslyxali zajcev ljaguški, poprygali v vodu. Odin zajac i govorit: "stoj, bratcy. Podoždem topit'sja: ljaguskam, vidno, žit' ešče xuže našega--oni i nas bojatsja!"

("The Hares and the Frogs" ((A Fable))

((The hares gathered once and began to complain about their bitter life. "We perish due to people and also birds and beasts of prey. It is better to die once than to live in fear and torment. Let us drown ourselves, brothers!"

((And the hares set out to the lake to drown themselves. They approached the shore. The frogs heard the hares and jumped into the water. One hare said, "Stop, brothers. Let's wait before we drown ourselves. The frogs, apparently, live even worse than we do. They are afraid of us!"))

Vladimir Dal' in his Tolkovyj slovar' velikorusskogo jazyka has under the entry zajac' "(hare) the following phrase:

Zajac' ot' lisicy, a ljaguška ot' zajca běžit'.

((The hare runs from the fox, and the frog from the hare.)
tives usually indicate an affectionate attitude toward the thing named, but this would hardly be the case for the last item on the list above; the tone of "desjatočka" is obviously ironic.

The most extraordinary aspect of Solženicyn's language—to a Russian, at least—is the use of words that had never before been printed in Cyrillic characters in a literary work, at least in the Soviet period. True, as commonplace as such words as "shit," "prick," and "fuck" now are in English, French and other Western literatures, their Russian equivalents in One Day are, for the most part, still partially disguised by strategic spelling alterations ("fuj" for "xuj"—"prick") and modest triplets of dots ("raz'..." for "raz'‘ebenn-nyj"—"all fucked up"), but the camouflage does little to mask Solženicyn's depiction of the coarse and obscene atmosphere that is inevitable when an exclusively male population is oppressed and brutalized.

Not a word is used gratuitously or without justification; considering the origins and experiences of these men (and the resources of the Russian language) it is impossible to suppose that they would not think, speak and act just as they have been portrayed by Solženicyn.10

Vinokur's article is interesting and perceptive, but is perhaps most remarkable for its courage. With very little hedging, he advocates great freedom to depict in literature any aspect of contemporary Soviet life, he praises Solženicyn for his use of ostranenie (a device usually associated with the theories of the suspect Formalists), and he evokes favorably the names of such barely mentionable writers as Babel' and Zoščenko.

---

10T. G. Vinokur, "O jazyke i stile povesti A. I. Solženicyna 'Odin den' Ivana Denisoviča,'" Voprosy kul'tury reči, No. 6 (Moscow, 1965), 16-32. Writing about the objections of some readers to Solženicyn's use of prison jargon, Vinokur defends the use of such words. The following passage could as well stand as a defense of the profanity (and Vinokur finds it appropriate, also) in One Day:

"The complete absence of such words would infect the story with one of those petty untruths which, in the final analysis, create a great untruth which radically undermines artistic trust in a literary work. Is it possible to depict a prison camp without using camp expressions, especially when it is a camp inmate who is narrating?" (pp. 25-26. My translation. LCM)
Stylistically, perhaps the most striking aspect of One Day is Solženitny's handling of point of view. Although the story is ostensibly narrated by an omniscient observer, two distinct narrative voices are discernible. One is a narrator whose consciousness and awareness correspond to those of Ivan Denisović; the other is an omniscient observer who has direct access to the minds of all the characters and to events that occur when Ivan Denisović is not present. For convenience's sake, the former will henceforward be referred to as the "narrator" (indeed, that has been the unstated qualification with which the word "narrator" has been used even thus far in this chapter), while the latter will be designated as the "author" or "authorial voice." The narrator, although he does not actually appear even as a minor character in the novella and thus cannot be said to be a first-person narrator, occasionally uses first-person forms. His language is racy and crude, as is Ivan Denisović's, in contrast to the authorial voice, which employs a more nearly standard literary diction. As Leonid Rzhevsky points out in one of his several articles on Solženitny's works, the linguistic mannerisms of the narrator, while distinct from those of the authorial voice, correspond exactly to those of Ivan Denisović. The following passage, in which Ivan is explaining his antipathy toward religion, exemplifies Suxov's speech:

"Net, ty vse že poslušaj." Suxov na lokte podnjalsa. "V Po­lomne, prixode našem, bogače popa net čeloveka. Vot, sakažem, zovut kryšu kryt', tak s ljudjej po tridcat' p'jat' rublej v den' berem, a s popa--sto. I xot' by krjakanul. On, pop polomenskij, trem babam v tri goroda alimenty platit, a s četveroj s'em'ej živet. I arxierej oblastnoj u nego na krjučke, lapu žirnuju naš pop arxiereju daet. I vaex drugix popov, skol'ko ix prisylali, vyživaet, ni s kem delit'sja ne xočet..." (p. 129.)

("No, you listen, anyway." Suxov raised himself on his elbow. "In Polomna, our parish, no one is richer than the priest. Let's say you're hired to roof a house. Well, you charge regular people thirty-five rubles a day, but the priest you charge a hundred. And

---

not a peep out of him. The priest in Polomna, he's paying alimony to his three old ladies in three different towns, and now he's living with his fourth family. And he's got the local bishop on his hook; our priest gives him his fat paw. And he squeezes out all the other priests, no matter how many they send out; he doesn't want to share with anyone . . .")

The most obvious features of Ivan's speech in this excerpt are the noun-modifier inversions (v prixode našem, pop polomenskij, arxierej oblastnoj, lapu žirnuju) and colloquialisms (xot' by krjaknul, babam, na krjučke, lapu žirnuju daet). These features are shared by the narrator, many of whose expressions of obvious similarity have already been cited.

Often the only way the reader knows that Ivan is not speaking or thinking aloud is through a third-person reference to him:

V Temgenëve kamennyx domov ne znali, izby lz dereva. I škola tože rublenaja, iz zakaznika les privozili v šest' saženej. A v lagere ponadobilos' na kamenšhika--i Šuxov, požalujsta, kamenšhik. Kto dva dela rukami znaet, tot ešče i desjat' podxvatit. (p. 76.)

(In Temgenëve Ivan Denisovic's home town brick houses were unknown; the huts were made of wood. The school was of hewn logs, too; logs over forty feet long were brought from the forest preserve. But in the camp they'd needed a brick-layer, so Šuxov, if you please, was a brick-layer. Whoever knows two crafts with his hands can pick up ten more, too.)

The manner of expression here--informal, conversational, with an aphoristic concluding sentence--is Ivan Denisovic's own, but the internal evidence of the third-person reference to Šuxov indicates that this paragraph is presented by the narrator.

While Ivan Denisovic's direct utterances can be kept distinct from the narrator's speech by the use of quotation marks and syntactic features, no such conventional means exist to differentiate between the narrator and the authorial voice. Nevertheless a difference is evident. Generally, the further the narrative is removed from Ivan Denisovic's thoughts, actions or direct knowledge, the more the language tends toward standard literary Russian, away from the narrator's typical mode of expression. When Ivan attempts to be excused from work on the grounds of illness, the narrator describes the scene at the orderly's desk:

Šuxov snjal šapku, kak pered načal'stvom, i, po lagernoj privyčke lezt' glazami kuda ne sleduet, ne mog ne zametit', što Nikolaj pisal rovnymi-rovnymi stročkami i každu stročku, otstupja ot kraju,
Suxov, of course, understood right away that this wasn't work, but something on the side. But it was none of his business.)

The colorful expression "lezt' glazami" (literally "to crawl with one's eyes"), the somewhat informal repeated epithet "rovnymi-rovnymi" ("even-even") and the colloquial "po levoj" ("on the side"; more literally "on the left") all make this passage typical of the narrator's usual style, which in turn is not distinguishable from Ivan's.

This scene, although described by the narrator, is interpreted strictly within the confines of Ivan Denisović's limited experience, as is shown by the significance that the peasant gives to the activity of the intellectual medical orderly, Nikolaj Vdovuškin. Employing the Tolstojan device of ostranenie ("estrangement"; describing an event from a naive and/or unusual point of observation), Solženicyn indicates that Suxov takes note of the fact that the orderly is engaged in some activity that is probably forbidden. It is obvious that Ivan does not know exactly what Vdovuškin is doing, and the narrator does not give any indication that he could identify the activity either; he seems restricted to the same limits of knowledge as Ivan. To the reader who is more sophisticated than Ivan Denisović in such matters, it is, of course, evident from the description of the peculiar writing conventions employed that Vdovuškin is composing verse. Through ostranenie the reader comes to know more than the character in the work knows.

For those readers who may have been as mystified as Ivan by Vdovuškin's activity, there is an explanation given later in a tone which is much more formal than that employed by the narrator; this is the authorial voice:

* * * (Here and elsewhere, * * * indicates that . . . appears in the original) A Vdovuškin pisal svoe. On, vpravdu, zanimal'sja rabotoj "levoj," no dlja Suxova nepostizhmoj. On perepsiyval vnoe dlinnoe stixotvorenie, kotoroe včera otdelal, a segodnja obeščal
pokazat' Stepanu Grigor'eviču, tomu samomu, poborniku trudoterapii. (p. 19.)

(* * * And Vdovuškin was doing his writing. He actually was engaged in some work "on the side," but something incomprehensible to Šuxov. He was copying out a new long poem that he had polished the day before and had promised to show today to Stepan Grigor'evič, the same one who was the propugnator of occupational therapy.)

Šuxov is specifically excluded from participation in or knowledge of the events described in this passage, and the language is quite literary. Indeed, the term pobornik is sarcastically grandiloquent and would scarcely be part of Ivan Denisovič's vocabulary. In the passage from page 19 the expression levoj is enclosed in quotation marks as though to emphasize that its colloquial flavor makes it different from the tone of the rest of the paragraph, while there are no such punctuation marks on its first appearance in the narrator's slangier language. Still another typographical convention sets this and similar passages off from the rest of the work; whenever the narrative contains information that Ivan Denisovič cannot possibly witness or know, the passage is preceded by three periods. At the end of such a passage, just before returning to what is within Šuxov's ken, the same signal is employed. In addition to the passage already cited, there are four other occurrences of this device: on page 25 to give the private reasons of Cezar' Markovič, one of the camp intellectuals, for switching from cigarettes to a pipe; on page 61 to show how Captain Bužnovskij, without being aware of it himself, is adopting the kind of behaviour that will help him survive as a prisoner; on page 62 in describing the Captain's reaction to receiving an extra bowl of gruel; and on page 66 in quoting gang-boss Tjurin's story of his dismissal from the Red Army as the son of a kulak. The passage on page 62 reads:

* * * Vinovataja ulybka razdvinula istreskannye guby kapitana, xodivšego i vokrug Evropy, i Velikim severnym putem. I on naklonilsja, ščastlivyj, nad nepolnym čerpakom ščidoj ovsjanoj kaši, bezširnoj vovce,—nad ovsom i vodoj.

(* * * A guilty smile split the cracked lips of the Captain, who had traveled all around Europe and through the Great Polar Route. Happy, he leaned over the scanted porringer of thin oat gruel with no fat whatever in it—over his oats and water.)

The passage on page 66 seems to represent the use of the same
convention for a somewhat different purpose. The three dots are probably intended merely to give the notion of the gang-boss's natural and easy manner in relating his adventures. The rules regulating the use of . . . in Russian prose are at best vague, but in the passages on pages 19, 25, 61 and 62, Solženicyn is evidently employing this punctuational peculiarity to make a distinction between what the narrator tells the reader and information coming from the author.

Once the distinction between "narrator" and "author" is acknowledged, it becomes obvious that the consciousness of the narrator corresponds precisely to that of Ivan Denisovič, for the narrator is afforded immediate access to all of Ivan's thoughts and feelings, while he can report only the outward words and actions of other characters that express inner states of being; he does not know anything that Ivan cannot know. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that the narrator's consciousness coincides with Ivan Denisovič's consciousness and subconsciousness, for on one occasion, at least, the narrator—not the author—remembers something that Ivan had experienced but has forgotten:

I Šuxovu čudno, čtoby kto-to mog rabotat', zvonka ne zamečaja. Šuxov sovésem zabyl, čto sam on tol'ko čto tak že rabotal,— i dosadoval, čto sliškom rano sobirajutsja k vaxte. (p. 89.)

(And Šuxov found it strange that anyone could work so as not to notice the bell.
(Suxov had quite forgotten that he himself had just been working like that, and that he was annoyed because it was time to assemble at the guard-room so soon.)

Although the narrator does not appear as a character with a name and identity, he frequently expresses himself in the kinds of emotional terms that would be expected from a prisoner who is actually experiencing the events described but would be inappropriate from an "objective" observer. At the end of the working day the march back to the compound is held up because a Moldavian (reportedly a real spy) has fallen asleep in some cozy corner and missed the head-count. Due to the resultant delay, free time during which the prisoners usually take care of their personal needs is lost, and the frustration and anger felt not only by Ivan Denisovič but undoubtedly by all the prisoners is expressed in the narrator's words: "Propal večer! . . . Moldavan prokljatyj. Konvoj prokljatyj.
"Žizn' prokljataja!" ("The evening's lost! Damned Moldavian. Damned escort. This damned life!") (p. 91.) There are other instances in which the narrator's strong language quite clearly represents the thoughts and words of Ivan and his fellow-prisoners, but they are recorded without any of the punctuation that usually indicates direct quotation. For example, in relation to the same incident discussed immediately above, the following passage is found:

A tolpu vsju i Šuxova zlo beret. Ved' čto čto za sterva, gad, padal', paskuda, zagrebanec? Už nebo temno, svet, ščitaj, ot mesjaca idet, zvezdy von, moroz silu noćnuju zabiraet—a ego, paščenka, net! Čto, ne narabotalsja, padlo? (p. 89.)

(But malice overcomes Šuxov and the whole crowd. Why, what kind of rotten carrion, snake, shit and greedy bum was he? The sky is already dark, see how much light is coming from the moon, the stars are out, the frost is gathering its night strength, and he's missing, the son-of-a-bitch! What's the matter, hasn't he had enough work for the day, the shit?)

The use of such emotionally charged expressions amounts to nesobstvenno-prizamajna rec' (impersonal-direct or represented speech). Solženicyn does not ascribe these exact words to any particular character in the story—there are no quotation marks—yet they are such terms as the prisoners would undoubtedly use in such a situation. The conventional means of indicating that these words are—indirectly—those of one or more of the prisoners ("The prisoners said that ..." "They felt that ..." "Ivan Denisovič thought to himself that ...) are not present. It is the narrator speaking, yet the words are representative of the speech of the characters in the work, while the narrator—this disembodied "other consciousness"—is direct and angry in response to the situation. Such a reaction is quite plausible (indeed, it is probably perfect) if viewed as the immediate reaction of the prisoners, but expressed in impersonal—direct, or represented, speech.

Given the congruence of Ivan Denisovič and the narrator, it may be asked why a first-person narration by the central figure is not used. Ivan Šuxov, from his nondescript appearance to his commonplace name, is

---

12 See the Appendix to this dissertation (pp. 122-123) for definitions and examples of nesobstvenno-prizamajna rec' and represented speech.
a plain, simple man; although the narrator focuses chiefly (but not ex-
clusively) on him, Ivan remains a generalized rather than a particular-
ized character who could be any peasant or workman from anywhere in
Russia. These "Everyman" qualities would be jeopardized if he were to
tell his own story and assume too clear and specific an individuality.
His plight is so pitiable and his prospects so unpromising that his
strengths and qualities as a representative of the pertinacity of the
masses would be lost were Ivan to tell his own story. Sympathetic con-
cern for the individual Ivan Denisovič and his predicament might ob-
scure the fact that, in addition to his being a single and identifiable
character, he stands for all those who were unjustly punished and im-
prisoned. There are, after all, five spies like Ivan, i.e., innocent
men, in each work-gang, as the narrator states on page 88. In addition,
if Ivan were the narrator, it would imply that he had the leisure at
some point to sit back and relate his story. He has no leisure, however;
he husband his time very carefully and uses his spare moments to earn
a little extra money or food, or to see to his simple needs. It would be
quite out of character for this frugal, humble man to waste his time
talking about himself or even to think that anyone else would be inter-
ested in his story. In comparison, Dostoevskij's treatment of the im-
poverished clerk in Poor People may seem implausible. The situation in
which the elderly Makar Devuškin writes reams of letters to a young girl
who, after all, lives only across a small court from him, has an outland-
ish quality that is absent from Ivan Denisovič's occupations, even though
contribution would ordinarily be considered a more "normal" mode of
behavior than the activities in which Šuxov and his comrades are forced
to participate.

Third-person narration does not, however, make Ivan Denisovič
seem too distant. As has already been noted, the narrator is not cold
and objective; he is emotional and involved. Indeed, he is so much a
part of the milieu that occasionally he lapses into the first person,
seeming thus to identify himself with the prisoners as if he were a
character in the work. Here is how the Camp Commandant's rule that pris-
oners may not move about the compound singly falls gradually into de-
suetude:
Očen' nacal'nik lagerja upiralsja v tot prikaz. Nikto perečit' emu ne smel. Nadzirateli xvatali odinček, i nomera pisali, i v BUR taskali--a polomalsja prikaz. Natixuju, kak mnogo sumnych prikazov lomaetsja. Skazh vzyvayut że sami čeloveka k operu--tak ne posylat' s nim komandy! Ili tebe za produktami svoimi v kapterku nado, a ja s toboj začem pojdu? A tot v KVC nadumal, gazety čitat', da kto s nim pojdet? (p. 105.)

(The Camp Commandant had really insisted on this order. Nobody dared oppose him. The warders would grab loners, write down their numbers and drag them to the disciplinary barracks. But the order fell apart. On the q.t., the way so many of these big-sounding orders fall apart. Let's say the screws send for a man themselves. You can't send a whole squad over! Or you have to go to the package room to pick up your provisions, why should I go with you? Or someone else takes a notion to go to the C/ulture and E/ducation S/ection to read the newspapers, who's going to go with him?)

In the preceding passage there are, of course, no "real" first persons; the forms are used conventionally to signify hypothetical cases. But there are other ways to do so (less direct, lively and immediate, however) without using first-person forms. If "skazh' emu" were replaced by eali ("if"), for example, the sentence would be just as hypothetical but would contain no first-person form. The next sentence could be deprived of emotional charge with the following minimal changes: "Ili odnomu za produktami svoimi v kapterku nado, a drugoj s nim začem pojdet?" ("Or if one has to pick up provisions at the package room, why should another go with one?") A passage in which the narrator seems more palpably present, counting himself one of the prisoners in the word "idem" (we're going), is found on page 96:

Sejčas rasstegivat' ne strasno, domoj idem.
Tak i govorjat vse--"domoj".

(now it's not so terrible to unbutton /for the frisk/; we're going home.
That's what everyone says /for the camp/; "home.")

The character of Ivan is kept in nicely balanced perspective by this combination of third-person narration and emotional first-person expressions. While the emotionally charged passages generate sympathy for the predicament of Ivan Denisovič as an individual, the use of the third-person point of view provides the detachment necessary to maintain his
validity as an Everyman figure.  

Solženicyn's stylistic peculiarities, some of which have been discussed above, e.g., substandard forms, folk speech, jargon, profanity, have inevitably led many commentators to detect an element of skaz in One Day as well as in other works. If skaz is defined as a manner of diction intended to represent the spoken language of a particular (frequently lower) class or social stratum and employed by the narrator in a work of fiction, then it is obvious that this factor is important in One Day. The narrator in this work expresses himself in a manner which, as has been seen, is far from "literary." The color and vigor of his speech are due to the imaginative and trenchant use of a level of language which is accessible to all native speakers of Russian. The skaz technique is not "pure," however, as Leonid Rzhevsky, again, was among the first to point out. As has already been seen, the narrator's "idiolect" is not maintained in those sections where the authorial voice is heard, for in those parts of the work the language is quite standard literary Russian. In addition, the narrator does not transpose the language of the camp intellectuals into his own style when he quotes them. There is, therefore, no skaz-induced distortion in Cezar' Markovič's conversation with Captain Bujnovskij about Ėjzenštejn's film Potemkin:

---Naprimer, pensne na korabel'noj snasti povislo, pomynte?  
---M-da... --Kavtorang tabаčok pokurivaet.  
---ili koljaska po lestnice--katitsja, katitsja.  
---Da... No morskaja źizn' tam nemnožko kukol'naja.  
---Vidite li, my izbalovany sovremennoj technikoj s'emki...  
---I červi po mjasu prjamo kak doždevye polzajut. Neuželi už takie byli?

---Leonid Rzhevsky calls attention to what he calls Solženicyn's "... strange and productive... amalgam of ordinary first-person narrative with a peculiar form of indirect speech in which the personality of the narrator intrudes, speaking of himself as if in the third person (and sometimes in the first person as well)..." on page 76 of his study "The New Idiom," Soviet Literature in the Sixties, ed. Max Hayward and Edward Crowley (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1964, pp. 55-80.

— No bolee melkix sredstvami kino ne pokazeš! (pp. 89-90.)

("For example, remember the pince-nez hanging from the rigging?"
("M-m-m, yes," said the Captain, smoking the bit of tobacco.
("Or the baby-carriage rolling and rolling down the stairway."
("Yes, but it shows naval life as rather puppet-like.
("Well, you see, we're spoiled by modern film techniques. ..."
("And the maggots crawled about that meat just like earthworms. Could they really have been like that?"
("But you can't show anything smaller by means of film!"

In contrast, note how Leskov's use of the skaz technique in "Levša" compels Emperor Aleksandr Pavlovič to speak in a most un-Czarlike, comical fashion when he wishes to tell his aide, the untutored Cossack Captain Platov, to stop interfering in matters of diplomacy:

A gosudar' ego za rukav đernul i tixo skazal:
— Pozalusta /sic/, ne port' mne politiki. 15

(And the monarch tugged him by the sleeve and said quietly:
("Please, don't mess up my politics.")

Ludmila Koehler has remarked perceptively on Solženicyn's similarity to Leskov in his use of skaz, 16 while V. Zavalishin suggests the influence of Sergej Klyčkov, 17 and Roman Goul detects echoes of Remizov. 18 While there is some merit in all of these suggestions, Professor Koehler makes the best case for her views, excerpting from Leskov and Solženicyn passages with telling resemblances. Zavalishin makes some general statements about Solženicyn's affinity to Klyčkov and cites some passages from One Day, but he does not illustrate with any excerpts from Klyčkov's works. In particular, the element of fantasy so prevalent in Klyčkov is absent from Solženicyn's works, especially One Day. Goul offers some lines from


17 V. Zavalishin, "Povest' o Mertvyx Domax i Sovetskam Krest'janstve," Grani, No. 54 (1963), 133-150.

One Day which he maintains, undoubtedly with some validity, are Remizovian, but he provides no parallel excerpts from the earlier writer. There is a playfulness in Remizov’s idiosyncratic use of language that is rare in Solženicyn. This is not to suggest that Remizov is merely an irrepresibly comic writer, for he is certainly subdued and serious enough in the sensitive On a Field Azure, nor is it to imply that Solženicyn is always stern and unsmiling, for he likes a joke or a pun now and then. His description of the way the sophisticated natives of Moscow recognize each other in the camp is really quite amusing, if rather abusive:


(These Muscovites, they could tell each other from afar off, like dogs. And when they got together, they’d keep sniffing around each other in their fashion. And they’d jabber away quick as anything, see who could say the most words. And when they jabbered like that, you came across a Russian word so seldom, listening to them’s the same as listening to Latvians or Rumanians.)

In keeping with his keen interest in words, Solženicyn makes frequent use of word-play, also. The following two examples are chosen because, with a bit of kneading and prodding, they can be made to work in English:

—Ty, Vanja, vosem’ sidel—v kakix lagerjax?—Kilgas perečit.
—Ty v bytovyx sidel, vy tam s babami žili. . . .
—S babami! ** Sbalanami, a ne s babami *** (p. 53.)

(“What kind of camps did you do your eight years in, Vanja?” Kilgas retorted. “In ‘life-situation’ camps where you lived with broads. . . .

(“With broads! ** With boards, you mean, not with broads *** In one of those camps, Ivan had worked cutting timber.)

Later Ivan overhears a work-supervisor complain:

—A cement okolo sklada na dnjax zaključennie razgruzali na sil’nom vetru i ešče nosilkami nosili do desjati metrov, tak vsa ploščadka vokrug sklada v cemente po ščikolotku, i rabočie ušli ne černye, a serye.— (p. 63.)

(“And around the warehouse the other day the prisoners were un-
loading cement in a strong wind, and besides that they were carry­
ing it ten meters in hand barrows, so the whole area around the
warehouse was ankle-deep in cement; when the prisoners left, they
weren't blue-collar workers but gray ones." /In the original, the
color contrast is between "black" workers--a common term for those
engaged in unskilled and/or heavy manual labor--and, of course, the
gray cement dust. To those who do not use the term "blue-collar"
to refer to unskilled labor, I apologize, and in justification of
my usage I ask that this wording be accepted as an example of the
"kneading and prodding" that is required to make the word-play
work in English./

The humor in these passages and elsewhere in One Day is rather
bitter and sardonic, and thereby, of course, completely appropriate to
the setting and situation.

The world of the labor camp is, by its very nature, restricted
and narrow in the extreme, and although Ivan Denisovič's thoughts must
necessarily be concerned with the problem of survival within his envi­
ronment, the narrative contains material that extends beyond the limi­
tations in time, space, action and intellectual perspectives that cir­
cumscribe the central character and the story of his day. The means by
which Solženicyn broadens the horizons of his story are never artifi­
cial but are related organically, as it were, to the work; there are no
gratuitous digressions or comments. Far beyond the prison watchtowers
but still closely related to Ivan Denisovič are reflections on condi­
tions in the Russian countryside. On the march out to the work-site in
the morning, Ivan is feeling cold and hungry, so in order to take his
mind off his stomach he begins to think of the next letter that he will
be permitted to send home. In this way, naturally and with utmost
economy, a stream of recollections and reflections about the outside
world is introduced into the narrative. This device serves admirably
to broaden the scope and range of the work's concerns and interests
without losing its focus on Ivan's immediate situation.

Further removed from Ivan but still generated by the dynamics
of the work itself is the story of the gang-boss Tjurin's ignominious
expulsion from the Red Army during the period of collectivization.
Tjurin has managed to wangle favorable work rates for his gang and has
just finished his midday meal, so in an expansive mood he relates his
adventures in a lively narrative during the last remaining minutes of the meal break. The anecdote fleshes out Tjurin's character and shows his manliness and absence of self-pity, so the reader unquestioningly accepts the men's ready response when, a few moments later, the gang-boss tells them to return to work before the break has quite ended.  

A rather different type of ancillary material is that represented by reflections that are beyond the physical or mental purview of Ivan Denisovič. On such occasions it is the authorial voice that is heard, as in the passage which explains how Vdovuškin, who—all unsuspected by the trusting prisoners—is not even a real medical orderly, has been encouraged by the camp doctor to write the kind of poetry that would be forbidden on the "outside". But even here the material is directly related to the events of the story and, in turn, helps to establish and define the atmosphere of the camp. It might be thought that the necessity of introducing the authorial voice at such times constitutes a structural weakness due to Solţenicyn's insistence upon a restricted point of view, but the work does not break down in these sections and the cohesiveness of the limited narrator is not diffused because the shift from narrator to author is always unobtrusive. Since neither the author nor the narrator is given a concrete personality and identity, there is no perceptible wrench when a change is made from one viewpoint to the other. Both voices are ostensibly disembodied and fall alike into the category of an amorphous third-person narrative point of view. Rather than a weakness, the presence of the authorial voice represents an innovation in narrative technique. After all, the narrator is not a character in the work whose fictional "reality" must be maintained, and the occasional insight lent by the views of a more knowledgeable observer gives greater meaning to some details of
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19 One Day. Ivan's thoughts about his next letter and the ensuing reflections about his native village are found on pages 32-34. Tjurin's story is on pages 65-69.

20 One Day, p. 19.
the setting without invalidating the interpretations and assumptions of the more restricted narrator.

There is no doubting Solženicyn's command of the resources and uses of the Russian language. Together with his rediscovery of a rich native Russian vocabulary, his original and apt innovations in the use of nesobstvenno-prjamaja reč', skaz and techniques of narration in One Day alone have earned him a secure place as a superb master of Russian prose.
CHAPTER II

An Incident at Krečetovka Station

The short story "An Incident at Krečetovka Station" begins with nearly two pages of dialogue with no authorial comment. This device, to which Solženicyn returns even more extensively in other works, immediately thrusts the reader into the confused and hectic atmosphere of a military train-dispatching office in the early days of World War II. The combination of military and railroad terminology, which is sometimes almost incomprehensible to a reader without the appropriate background, establishes the setting and atmosphere of the story at once.

A varied group of characters from different social origins, geographical areas and intellectual levels participates in the events of "An Incident". In this work as in others, Solženicyn displays his ability to capture the speech habits of all members of this variegated crowd. The speech of one Aunt Frosja, for example, characterizes her as an uneducated but observant woman who speaks in peasant dialect and makes amusing errors in her attempts to use unfamiliar words, whether they are Russian or non-Russian:

"U vykovyrennyx-to i brat'! Oni otrezy vezut, kustjumy vezut, mylo vezut—prjam kak na jarmarku i snarjažilis'. Tam takie mordatyje edu-u-t'!—otvarnuju kuricu im, slyš', podavaj, drugogo no xotjat! U kogo daše, ljudi videli, sotennye prjamo pačkami perevjažany, i paček polon čemojda. Bank, čto l', zabrali? Tol'ko den'gi nam ne nužny, vezite dal'še." (p. 142.)


2Aleksandr Solženicyn, "Slučaj na stancii Krečetovka," Sočinenija, 2nd ed. (Possev-Verlag: Frankfurt/Main, 1968), pp. 135-193. All further page references are to this edition of "An Incident."
("Take from the evacuated vykovyrennyx: "from those who have been plucked out" for evakuirovannyx: "from those who have been evacuated"! They're carrying lengths of cloth, suits, soap—they're loaded up like as if for the fair. What mugs is travelin'! Give 'em a boiled chicken, y'hear, they don't want anything else! Some of 'em even got packs of hundred-ruble notes, people have seen 'em, and valises full of the packs. What'd they do, clean out a bank? Only we don't need any money, take it along.")

The use of vykovyrennyx has already been commented upon, while other words in the passage, e.g., kostjumy for kostjumy, prjamo for prjamo, edut for edut and ěm for ěm, are also substandard forms or solecisms which give Auntie Frosja her characteristic voice. She is that representative of rural, elemental Russia speaking in village dialect who appears in nearly all of Solženicyn's works.

While the strictly narrative portions of the work are recorded in a more formal, literary manner, Solženicyn does not abandon his keen interest in expressive language and le mot juste. Leonid Rzhevsky cites such words and expressions as liv ("... stojal v šineli pod liv, xlest, tolčki vetra ...") (p. 140.) and in his overcoat in the gush, the lash and the gusts of wind. and vraznokap ("Ix šineli i šapki byli toloko slegka primoceny, vraznokap.") (p. 160) Their overcoats and caps were only slightly wet, drop-spattered here and there as evidence of the aptness of Solženicyn's ear in creating neologisms. These words, whittled down to their bare bones, display the author's ability to return to the primitive roots of his language for its expressive resources.

The point of view of "An Incident" is that of an omniscient observer perceiving events primarily through the eyes of a single character, Lieutenant Vasilij Zotov. The narrator has direct access to Zotov's mind and can provide the reader with material from the shy, comical looking officer's innermost thoughts. Information is thus given about Zotov's concern for his pregnant wife, who is in German-held terri-
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tory in the early days of the war, about his efforts to improve himself as a Soviet citizen and increase his effectiveness as an army officer, and other details of his life.

The narrator can give the unspoken thoughts of some of the other characters also, but does not do so very extensively. In a rare excursion inside the mind of Valja Podšebjakina, an attractive young train dispatcher who suggests that Zotov move his quarters to her house, we hear:

Valja videla, čto lejtenant zakolebalsja, čto on sejčas soglasit'sja. I počemu b emu ne soglasit'sja, čudaku takomu? Vse voennye vsega govorjat, čto ne ženaty, a on ožin--ženat. Vse voennye, raskvaritolivannye v poselke,—v xorošix sem'jas, v teple i,v zabote. Xotelos' i Valja, čtoby v dome, otkuda otec i brat ušli na vojnu, žil by mužčina. Togda i so smeny, pozdno večerom, po zatemennnym, zamešannym grjaz'ju ulicam poselka oni budut voz-vraščat'sja vместe (už pridetsja pod ruku), potom veselo sadit'sja vместе за obed, šutit', drug drugu čto-nibud' rasskazyvat' ***(pp. 153-154.)*

(Valja saw that the Lieutenant was wavering and that he'd soon agree. And why shouldn't he agree, the eccentric? Soldiers always say they're not married, and he's the only one who says he is. All the soldiers quartered in the village are in good families where they're warm and cared for. Valja, too, would like a man living in her home, from which her father and brother had gone off to the war. Then late in the evening they would return from their shift ((arm in arm, of necessity)) together through the darkened, mired streets of the village, and then they'd sit down cheerfully to dinner, joke, tell each other things ***)

The bold and dashing young Sergeant Gajdukov enters the story, and some of his private thoughts are given also:

Čego Gajdukov opasalsja sejčas pered komendantom (no tot, vidno, paren' sxodnyj i stereč'sja nečego)—čtob ne pošel on zagljanut' v ego teplušku. Xotja soldaty v konvoe Gajdukova exali bol'še novički, no sam on uže pobyval na perednem kraе i v ijule byl ranen на Dneprе, dva mesjaca proležal v gospitale i porabotal tam pri kapterke, i vot snova exal na front. Poètomu on znal i ustavy i kak ix možno i nado narušat'. (p. 161.)

(What Gajdukov was apprehensive about now in front of the transport officer—but he looked like a nice guy, so there was nothing to be guarded about—was that he'd go and look into the heated car.

** indicates that . . . appears in the original.
Although most of the soldiers traveling in Gajdukov's convoy were green, he himself had already been in the main line and had been wounded at the Dniepr in July. He spent two months in the hospital and worked in the supply room there for a while, and now he was going back to the front. That's how he knew the regulations and how it was possible—and even necessary—to break them.

As can be seen from the passages of what may be termed interior monologues of Valja Podzhebkakina and Sergeant Gajdukov cited above, Solzhenicyn effectively captures the appropriate level of language and individualized manner of speech for his characters.

Similar rather limited expositions of internal states are given for a few other figures, but there is one important exception which results in a puzzle and moral question left disturbingly unresolved in the tale. Traveling with documents of dubious authenticity under the name Igor' Dement'evič Tveritinov, a shabbily-uniformed middle-aged man claims to have been separated from his unit. Initially suspicious, Zotov is soon reassured by the man's plausible answers to all questions put to him and is quickly charmed by the stranger's gracious manners and speech:

Zotovu byla na redkost' prijatna ego manera govorit'; ego manera ostanavlivat'sja, esli kazalos', čto sobesednik xočet vozrazit'; ego manera ne razmaxivat' rukami, a kak-to legkim dvizhenijami pal'cev pojasnjat' svoju reč'. (p. 174.)

(His manner of speaking was exceedingly pleasant to Zotov; his manner of stopping if it seemed the other person wished to raise an objection; his manner of not waving his hands around, but of explaining his speech somehow by slight movements of his fingers.)

Tveritinov represents himself as a minor actor from Moscow, hastily mobilized at the age of forty-nine and provided with only a few days training and parts of old uniforms. All of this is probably true; Tveritinov seems generally frank, but also knows the value of judicious reticence. When explaining how he attempted to catch up with his unit, he says in part:

— . . . Videl ja odnaždy passazhirskij poezd, čudo takoe, tak konduktory stojat na stupen'kax po dvoe i prijamo, znaete, stalkivajut ljudej', čtob ne xvatalis' za poručni. A tovarnye—kogda uže tronutaja, togda sadit'sja pozdno, a poka stojat bez parovoza—v kakuju storonu oni pojдут, ne dogadajt'sja. Emalirovannoj dočečki "Moskva—Mineral'nye vođy" na nix net. Sprašivat' ni u kogo nel'zja, za špiona poščitatuj, k tomu ž ja tak odet ** * Da voobsče u nas zadavat' voprosy opasno. (pp. 173-174.)
Once I saw a passenger train. It was such a wonder; the conductors stood in two's on the steps, you know, and just pushed people off so they wouldn't catch hold of the railings. And freight-trains—when they're already moving it's too late to get aboard, and while they're standing without engines you can't guess which direction they're going in. They don't bear any enamelled disc saying "Moscow-Mineral'nye Vody." You can't ask anyone; they'll take you for a spy. Besides, the way I'm dressed * * * And in general it's dangerous in our country to ask questions."

It is unlikely that a real spy would call attention to the fact that he even might be taken for a spy. Neither would he voice even such a mild complaint about the prevalent mood of suspicion as that contained in his last sentence. Tveritinov is probably exactly what he claims to be; his story is most likely true in all important respects. Nevertheless, since the narrator never provides the reader with the straggler's inner thoughts and feelings, it is impossible to be absolutely certain of his motives and intentions. The narrator simply never shows the inner workings of Tveritinov's mind as he shows us the private thoughts and feelings of Lieutenant Zotov, Valja Podšebjakina and Sergeant Gajdukov.

Just as the polite and ingratiating traveler is about to obtain transportation farther along the line, it is discovered that he seems to be unfamiliar with the name Stalingrad but knows the city only by its previous name, Caricyn. Zotov cannot believe that any Soviet citizen would not know the city of Stalingrad, and his disbelief and shock are expressed by the narrator through nesobstvenno-prjama reš':

I—vse oborvalos' i oxolonulo v Zotove! Vozmožno li? Sovetskij čelovek—ne znaet Stalingrada? Da ne možet byt' nikak! Nikak! Nikak! Eto ne pomeščaetsja v golove! (p. 186.)

(And—everything came to a standstill and cooled off within Zotov! Is it possible? A Soviet citizen who doesn't know Stalingrad? But that's not at all possible! Not at all! Not at all! The mind won't accommodate it!)

Suspicions aroused, Zotov now reinterprets some of Tveritinov's previous behavior as compromising. Using a slight subterfuge, the Lieutenant turns the straggler over to the NKVD as a possible spy. He does not carry out the act maliciously or thoughtlessly, however; in
fact, he is from the outset plagued by anxiety about whether he has done the right thing. What fate might await even a mistakenly suspected spy in war-time? The reader, although he may believe Tveritinov innocent, can understand Zotov's actions; the man's training, the environment of suspicion and distrust in which he was reared have this unfortunate, perhaps even tragic, result. But if the reader could be absolutely certain that Tveritinov is blameless, if the narrator had opened to him Tveritinov's mind, then it is doubtful that the reader would be emotionally capable of understanding Zotov's act and accepting him as a decent man, even though there would be no means for Zotov to be as certain as the reader of Tveritinov's innocence. It is undoubtedly due to this rather subtle psychological consideration that Solženicyn never delves beneath Tveritinov's external behavior. The author's choice, then, not to employ anything that might be termed interior monologue or an exposition of Tveritinov's inner state is central to the effect and the interpretation of the story.

Solženicyn, like Tolstoj, effectively uses leitmotifs based on physical characteristics or gestures to fix an identity, endow an act with special significance or establish a mood or atmosphere. In One Day, it is frequently noted that Ivan Denisović speaks with a peculiar lisp because he has lost many of his teeth due to scurvy, and the deafness of Ivan's fellow-prisoner Sen'ka Klevšin is alluded to nearly every time his name is mentioned. The device is even more extensively used in "An Incident." Zotov's glasses, "... pridavavšie strogoe vyraženie ego sovsem ne strogomu licu ..." (p. 136) ("... which gave a stern expression to his not at all stern face ..."), are mentioned no less than eight times in the course of the story, while his army cap lends a somewhat mendacious note of authority to his otherwise
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5Prof. Deming Brown comments perceptively and succinctly on some aspects of stylistic similarity between Solženicyn and Tolstoj in his review article "Cancer Ward and The First Circle," Slavic Review, XXVIII, No. 2, 304-313.
nondescript and uncommanding appearance. Mere mention of the cap or
glasses soon comes to imply all these aspects of the Lieutenant's
character and appearance. Zotov removes his glasses and "Lico ego
srazu poterjalo delovitost' i bystryj smysl, stalo rebjačeskoe, zašči-
ščennoe tol'ko zelenoj furazkoj." (p. 176) ("His face instantly lost
its business-like and clever look; it became boyish, protected only by
the green service cap.") Meanwhile, it is Tveritinov's smile—rather
guilty, but sad and eliciting sympathy—that comes to evoke the whole
of his character and situation. It is this smile which remains inerad-
icably in Zotov's memory after Tveritinov has been turned over to the
security authorities: "No ne uxošil iz pamjati etot čelovek s takoj
udivitel'noj ulybkoj . . ." (p. 193) ("But the man with such an aston-
ishing smile did not leave his memory . . .") These physical details
become the signals that evoke the complex of traits and behavior with
which Solženicyn endows his characters, in somewhat the same way that
Aleksej Karenin's identity is called forth by mention of his prominent
ears and Anna Karenina's by her black, curly hair.

Structurally, this short story is rather conventionally made.
In contrast to One Day, which follows a basically chronological scheme
with points of tension occurring sporadically throughout the narrative,
"An Incident" begins by establishing situation, atmosphere and character,
then swiftly builds to the climactic point of Zotov's reluctant suspi-
cion of Tveritinov and the latter's subsequent arrest. The falling
action consists of Zotov's later attempts to discover his strange
visitor's fate at the hands of the NKVD. Within this scheme, however,
are details which explore matters rather distant from what ultimately
emerges as the basic story-line. Through the introduction of a number
of characters who participate only indirectly or not at all in the events
of the central story, Solženicyn enhances the characterization of his
central figures. This, too, is reminiscent of Tolstoj's use of "foils"
against whom major characters elaborate and display their personalities,
e.g., as Konstantin Levin's philosophy emerges to a great extent through
his disputes and discussions with his half-brother Sergej Koznyšev and brother-in-law Stiva Oblonskij. Zotov's relations with Polina, a young woman from Kiev who is separated from her husband by the war, have no direct connection with the fundamental scheme of the story, but they establish the young Lieutenant as a sincere, sensitive and sympathetic character, while his horror at the bold advances of an over-aggressive war-profiteeress, Antonina Ivanovna, conveys his ridiculousness and extreme shyness, but also expresses his attitude that sexual intimacy must be based on more than mere physical desire. Several sharply different kinds of travelers are depicted—the self-assured and outgoing Sergeant Gajdukov; the sullen, inexperienced and callously disregarded Sergeant Dygin; and finally, of course, the mysterious yet charming Tveritinov, who soon emerges as an important character. The function of the first two, basically, is to establish atmosphere and to help characterize the major figure, Zotov.

The ancillary characters and events of "An Incident" serve still another purpose, however. They break up the contours of the plot, thus preventing the story from being schematic. In addition to the basic, underlying plot of the work, the lateral actions and personages provide the story with vividness and breadth. Thus the imperious behavior of Samorukov, the sergeant in charge of distributing provisions to military travelers, and his cynical disregard of the people who depend upon his services do not finally have much to do with the central action of the story, but they add enlivening details to the atmosphere and suggest other directions that the story might have taken, such as a direct confrontation between Samorukov and Zotov.

Tightly controlled in matters of time, place and action (one day, one place, one "incident"), the story nevertheless contains material beyond the immediate setting, rounding out Zotov's character and explaining his particular circumstances. Such material, in flash-backs and asides, is introduced in a manner which is completely unforced and is organically related to the work, just as in One Day. When the dispatcher-clerk Valja rather innocently flirts with Zotov, a train of
events and thoughts are set in motion, leading consecutively and logi­cally from the officer's resisting the attractive young woman's ad­vances to his reminiscing about his wife and then to his thinking about his relationship with Polina, who, like himself, is living in Krečetovka because of the war. Valja exclaims:

"Vasil' Vasil'ič! A vy--perexodite k nam! U nas komnata Vovkina svobodnaja--vaša budet. Pečka tuda greet, teplo."

(p. 153.)

("Vasil' Vasil'ič! You move in with us! Vovka's room is empty; it'll be yours. The heat from the stove reaches there; it'll be warm.")

The young man is strongly tempted, but he steels himself to refuse:

On popravil vorotnlk s krasnymi kubikami v zelenyx petlicax, xot' vorotnlk emu ne žal, očki popravil.
--Net, Valja, nikuda ne pojdu . . .
I nadel zelenuju furažku, otčego bezzaščitnoe kurnoše lico postroželo očen'. (p. 154.)

(He straightened his collar with its red insignia in their green buttonholes, although his collar was not squeezing him, and straightened his glasses.
"No, Valja, I'm not moving anywhere . . ."
(And he put on his green service cap, which made his defense­less snub-nosed face seem very stern.)

As determined as he is, however, he might yet succumb to human weakness:

A on rasterjannomorgnul. Možet, vernis' by ona ešče raz i skaži emu tverdo very colloquial phrase/---on ustupil by.
No ona ne vozvrásčelas'. (p. 154.)

(He blinked perplexedly. Maybe if she'd come back and say it once more, firmly, he'd give in.
(But she didn't come back.)

Valja's invitation leads Zotov to reflect on why he denies himself the pleasures of female companionship and cheerful quarters, and although these reflections are formally reported by the narrator, they are--like the passage so marked above--couched in colloquial terms, as though Zotov were speaking himself. At first the narrator comments:
V ogromnoj žestokovatoj mužskoj tol'ce sorok pervogo goda ego uže raz-drugoj podnimali na peresmex, kogda on val'ut raskazałyval, čto ljubit ženu i dumet byt' ej vsju vojnu veren i za nee tože vpolne ručaetsja. (pp. 154-155.)

(In the huge crass male crowd of '41 he had already been held up to mockery when he mentioned aloud that he loved his wife, that he meant to be faithful to her all through the war and that he would vouch for her completely, too.)

Then, continuing in phrasing so natural that thoughts break off before they are completed, the narrator shows Zotov's ruminations spiraling off to still other related topics. Although the use of the third-person pronoun and lack of quotation marks indicate that this is a passage of reported speech, the informality and interrupted thoughts make it clear that this is nesobstvenno-prjamaja reč', or "represented speech":

No ne iz-za ženy dažė on otkazal sejčas Vale, a iz-za Poliny
I ne iz-za Poliny dažė, a iz-za * * * (p. 155.)

(But it wasn't even because of his wife that he had refused Valja just now, but because of Polina * * *
(And it wasn't even because of Polina, but because of * * *)

Zotov and Polina share the newspapers at the post office in their efforts to learn about the war because they both have loved ones in or near German-held territories. The story of their relationship is another direction "An Incident" might have taken, but it serves primarily to establish the atmosphere and Zotov's character.

Although the events of the story may at first seem haphazard, eventually it becomes clear that each action has its logical connection with the others, just as the thoughts and actions cited above proceed organically one from another. The central action emerges from the flux of events in "An Incident" so that Tveritinov's fate is related to Auntie Frosja's compassion for those who have been dislocated and impoverished by the war as well as to Zotov's concern for those who have been separated from their loved ones, for the front-line soldiers, and for those who suffer because of the rigid and arbitrary rules of this society in a time of upheaval. Due to the mystery sur-
rounding the outcome of the Tveritinov incident, Zotov begins to doubt and question the justice of his act, apparently because he now sees the possible injustice of its consequences. This interconnection of one event with another and the awakening of doubt in one individual make it apparent that even a minor "incident" in the back-water of "Krečetovka" can have far-reaching, long-lasting and serious effects.
CHAPTER III

Matrena's Homestead

In the short story "Matrena's Homestead" Solzhenitsyn uses skaz extensively. The story is told in the first person by a man who is ostensibly a member of the intelligentsia, but whose speech contains many colloquial and non-literary—if not substandard—forms. His linguistic mannerisms, which comprise the first level of skaz in "Matrena's Homestead," include slang, prison jargon and "simple speech" (prostorečie) as well as a conscious and deliberate toying with the folk-style devices of sound similarities, word inversions and fairy-tale formulas. The story's very first page provides examples of nearly all these elements:

Letom 1953 goda iz pyl'noj gorjačej pustyni ja vozvrashčalsja naugad—prosto v Rossiju. Ni v odnoj točke ee nikto menja ne ždal i ne zval, potomu što ja zaderžalsja s vozvratom godikov na desjat'. Mne prosto xotelos' v srednju polosu—bez žary, s listvennym rokотom lesa. Mne xotelos' zatesat'sja i zaterjat'sja v samoj nutrjanoj Rossi—esli takaja gde-to byla, žila.

Za god do togo po sju storonu Ural'skogo xrebta ja mog nanjat'-sja razve taskat' nosilki. Daže elektrikom na porjačnoe stroitel'stvo menja by ne vzjali. A menja tjanulo učitel'stvovat'. Govorili mne znajušcie ljudi, što nečego i na bilet tratit'sja, vpustuju proezžu.

No čto-to načinalo uže stragivat'sja. Kogda ja podnjalsja po lestnice * * * skogo oblono i sprosil, gde otđel kadrov, to s uđivleniem uvijel, što kadry uže ne sideli zdes' za černoj kožanoj dver'ju . . . 2 (p. 195.)


(In the summer of 1953 I was returning from the dusty hot desert—just to Russia, at random. There wasn't a single spot in Russia where anyone expected me or beckoned to me, because I was delayed in my return by a little stretch of about ten years. I just felt like getting to some moderate zone out of the heat where there's a leafy forest murmur. I felt like wriggling into deepest Russia, if there ever was such a place, and losing myself. (A year before I had only been able to hire myself out lugging hand-barrows on the nigh side of the Ural ridge. They wouldn't even take me on as an electrician on a decent construction job. And I was yearning to be a teacher. People in the know told me there was no sense in wasting a ticket, I'd be going for nothing. (But things had already started to budge. When I had ascended the staircase of the * * * ak Regional Department of Public Education and asked where the Personnel Department was, I was amazed to see that there Personnel was no longer situated behind a door upholstered in black leather . . . )

In the passage above, the narrator employs words of similar sound with similar meaning—a feature of the Russian proverb—in three places: zdal/zval (expected/beckoned), zatesat'sja/zaterjat'sja (wriggle into/lose oneself) and byla/žila (was/lived), which is the reversed order of a fairy-tale formula roughly corresponding to "once upon a time" in English. Such devices give the narrative a genuinely aphoristic ring at times, and at others, as in the byla/žila reversal, there is a tone of good-humored, affectionate parody. There is irony in the ex-prisoner's use of an affectionate diminutive (godik rather than the neutral god) to mean "year" in talking about the length of his sentence. There are words from the level of prostoreče (simple speech) like nutrjanoj (innard), the rather antiquated sej (this, nigh) and the colloquial stragivat'sja (to budge) to give the narrative an informal, unliterary tone. The passage is frequently tongue-in-cheek in its use of folk-style features, with occasional flashes of a more savage irony.

Other elements are found but a few pages further into the story:

Teper' ja uvidel kroxotnyj bazarec. Po rani edinstvennaja zeničina stojala tam, torguja molokom. . . .
Menja porazila ee reč'. Ona ne govorila, a napevala umil'no, i slova ee byli te samye, za kotorymi potjanula menja toska iz Azii:
--Pej, pej s dušoju želadačnoj. Ty, potaj, priesžij?
Now I saw a tiny bazaar. As it was so early, a solitary woman stood there, selling milk. . .

(I was struck by her speech. She didn't speak; she chanted sweetly, and her words were the very ones for which longing had drawn me from Asia:

"Drink, drink with soul athirsted. Thou'rt, hap, a newcomer?"

"And where are you from?" I brightened.

(And I discovered that not everything around here was the peat-works, that beyond the rail-bed was a hillock, and beyond the hillock—a village, and this village is Tal'novo, it had been here from time immemorial, when there had been the Gypsy-mistress and there was a wild forest all around. And farther on stretched a whole region of villages: Časlicy, Ovincy, Spudni, Ševertni, Šestimirovo—all a bit remoter, a bit farther from the railroad, toward the lakes.

(A soothing wind was wafted to me from those names. They promised me a solid Russia.)

Solženicyn favors the conversational word kroxotnyj (tiny, wee); he even uses the word in the collective title for a number of short, generally lyrical works—Etudy i kroxotnye rasskazy (Etudes and Wee Stories). Ran' (extreme earliness) is also conversational. Solženicyn takes advantage of the flexibility of the verb potjanut'—basically "to pull" or "to drag"—by using it in "... potjanula menja toska . . ." ("... longing drew me . . .") and impersonally in "Vetrom uspokoenija potjanulo na menja . . ." ("A soothing wind was wafted to me . . .") Two especially interesting word usages occur in this passage: les lixoj (wild forest) and kondovuju Rossiju (solid

---

Russia. The former phrase, containing the word lixoj (meaning either "evil" or "bold, dashing" in standard literary Russian, but in the folk-sense which Solzhenicyn obviously intends here it means "wild" with positive connotations), transposes the neutral adjective-noun order in the manner of folk-speech. The latter expression—kondovuju Rossiju—uses an uncommon word freighted with meaning (strong, dense, healthy, not rotten; artful, excellent, first-rate) to emphasize the object of the narrator's quest—a deep, elemental Russia free of outside influences.

The information that the narrator receives from the peasant woman is transmitted in a manner that could be considered nesobstvenno-prjamaja reč'. The paragraph is written in such a way that, to a significant extent, it "... soxranjaet, polnost'ju ili častično, leksičeskie, frazeologičeskie i sintaksičeskie osobennosti reči govorjaščego lica ..." ("... preserves, in full or in part, the lexical, phraseological and syntactic features of the language of a speaking character ...") The dialectal podale (a bit farther), the string of one simple independent clause after another ("... beyond the rail-bed was a hillock, and beyond the hillock—a village, and this village is Tal'novo, it has been here from time immemorial ..."), the implications of the inclusion without comment of a bit of local history (the reference to the era of the "Gypsy-mistress") as though it were known to the whole world (or, perhaps, as though the whole world consisted of just what is familiar to the peasant woman), the noun-modifier inversions (les lixoj instead of lixoj les—wild forest; derevnja èta instead of èta derevnja—this village) all indicate that this could be the "represented speech" of the milk-dealer. If the whole passage were just a paraphrase and did not attempt to retain the woman's speech features, then one would probably find tam (there) instead of zdes' (here) on line four of the passage quoted on page 47 above. The tenses

---

of the verbs are not conclusive evidence one way or the other in this passage. Most likely this excerpt comprises a skillful splicing of the narrator's and the peasant woman's speech with both elements so cleverly intertwined that it is scarcely possible to tell where one leaves off and the other begins.

The village woman's direct speech, although short, contains several striking features which effectively serve to characterize her as a simple, natural country-woman and establish the atmosphere of an unspoiled back-woods locale. She addresses a complete stranger, who in age and social standing would merit the polite forms in standard Russian, by the familiar ty (thou) forms, but not because she is being impolite. On the contrary, her entire utterance expresses concern for and interest in the newcomer. She reverses the neutral adjective-noun order in dušoju želadnoj (soul athirsted). The word želadnyj is not attested even in Dal', but native speakers apparently do not hesitate to associate the word with both žažda (thirst) and želat' (to desire). In Dal', the word potaj is identified by the synonyms vtaj, otaj f tajno, sekretno (all meaning approximately "secretly" or "stealthily"), but these equivalents are inappropriate here; natives readily interpret potaj as a quaint way of saying the already colloquial word čaj (probably, perhaps).

The inclusion above of the milk-dealer's speech indicates the source of the second level of skaz in "Matrena's Homestead" (the first level is noted on page 45). The narrator (his patronymic—Ignatić—used as a term of address by the story's heroine is all we ever learn of his name) is very language-conscious; it is an elemental and uncontaminated Russian land and people—as evidenced in the speech of the region—that he is seeking, as is indicated by the passages quoted above. When talking about Matrena and her fellow villagers, the narrator frequently employs items from the lexicon of the local dialect and sometimes explains them to the reader. When Matrena wishes to ask him what he would like for his next meal, she says, "Nu, a k užotkomo čto
vam prigotovit'?' (p. 202.) ("Well, what should I make you for supper?") The narrator explains that k užotkomu—a dialect form—means k večeru (for the evening). He later uses, in his own direct speech, a word from Matrena's dialect, establishing its meaning in context by pointing out its equivalence to the standard Russian word: "No v tot ţe den' načalas' metel'—duel', po-matreninomu." (p. 218.) ("But on that very day there began a storm, or a blower, to put it Matrena's way.") The word duel', (literally "blower" and obviously from dut'--"to blow") is an apt equivalent, analogously constructed, of metel'—specifically "snowstorm" and literally "sweeper" (from mesti—"to sweep"). Sometimes, with orthographic emphasis but no further comment, explanation or definition, the narrator adopts a "Matrena-word" when the heroine is the topic of discussion, e.g., "Bojalas' ona požara, bojalas' molon'! (instead of standard moliль), a bol'še vsego počemu-to--poezda." (p. 208.) ("She was afraid of fire, she was afraid of lightnin', but for some reason she was most afraid of trains.") Thus, in addition to his own speech peculiarities, the narrator transcribes dialect items of Matrena and her neighbors in both direct and indirect usage to produce the intriguing language of "Matrena's Homestead." The reader need not even understand all the dialect forms so long as he accepts them as talismans of kondovaja Rossija.

Ignatič's genuine love for the Russian people and their language does not prevent his having some good-natured fun at their expense. The narrator calls attention to the unintentional wry humor in the local name for potato soup:

čto na zavtrak, ona ne ob'javljala, da éto i dogadat'sja bylo legko; kartov' neobluplennaja ili sup kartonnyj (tak vygоваривал vse v derevne) ... (p. 202.)

(What was for breakfast she didn't announce, but it was easy to guess: unpeeled tatters /potatoes, "taters"/ or tattered soup ((that's what everyone in the village called it)) ...)

In Russian, of course, the word-play is not as forced as in the English translation above, and the regional name for this delightful dish sounds—and perhaps tastes?—like "pasteboard soup." Other less
elaborate malaprops based on similarities of sounds are razvedka for rozetka (reconnaissance/electric outlet) and porciya for porča (portion/hex). (pp. 210 and 216.) Leskov, too, frequently uses such distortions based on mistaken analogies and sound similarities for their comic effect and to establish atmosphere and character.

The narrator is not tolerant of officialdom's crimes against his mother tongue, however. When confronted by still another of the proliferating Soviet acronyms, he mocks the mind that could produce such a monster by referring to Turgenev, who, among other things, extolled the strength and flexibility of the Russian language: "Torfoprodukt? Ax, Turgenev ne znal, čto možno po-russki sostavit' takoe!" (p. 196.) ("Feat produce? Ah, Turgenev did not know that such a word could be constructed in Russian!") "Torfoprodukt," because of its clumsiness and foreignness, clashes ironically with the native appropriateness and attractiveness—based primarily on the aptly agricultural and workaday connotations lurking in the words—of place-names like Ovinky and Spudni, which are similar in sound to the words ovin (a drying-barn) and spud (a bushel-measure, or, in a transferred sense, a hiding place where things are kept in secret or without serving their proper functions). Turgenev himself, especially in A Sportsman's Sketches, used local terms in a similar manner to denote the natural harmony among the people, places and events of village life.

Matrena is not only the chief character of this story, but a moral force—a "righteous person" of a sort that has been portrayed in Russian writings from at least Aleksej the Man of God to Turgenev's Luker'ja, Dostoevskij's Sonja Marmeladova and Leskov's Malanija the Muttonhead:5 oppressed, maligned and impoverished, yet simple, cheerful,

sympathetic and self-sacrificing. It is appropriate, then, that much of her story is told in her own dialect, both when she is quoted directly (including her frequent "distress signal"—oj-oj-ojin'ki—on pages 210, 215, and 219) and when the narrator borrows some of her regional and individual peculiarities to use in his speech. Solženicyn obviously feels, as did Turgenev and Leskov, that the words—even their simple, untutored and "substandard" ones—of the world's Luker'jas, Malanijas and Matrenas can express something of importance to everyone.

After the initial scene-setting in "Matrena's Homestead," the character of Matrena begins to be presented, essentially through the narrator's observation of her. Thus we learn from Ignatiev about her poverty, her illness, her love for her plants and affection toward her lame cat, her time-and-energy-consuming attempts to obtain a pension, and some other details of her life. Information about the other important characters in the story is usually given through the same agency. Occasionally Matrena is prompted to speak to Ignatiev about herself, her past and about other characters, and her own words reach the reader, again, through the narrator, who therefore speaks in his own skaz and in Matrena's as well. In this way it is learned that Matrena was once engaged to marry Faddej Grigor'ev, but when he was reported missing and feared dead in World War I, she married his younger brother Efim instead. From the point when the narrator learns the details of Matrena's marriage the story proceeds quite rapidly to its climactic event, a tragic train accident in which Matrena—who, ironically, had always feared trains—is killed.

Although Matrena's character and the reactions of others to her have been firmly established by the time of the accident, Solženicyn includes an unexpectedly long section of falling action, i.e., everything that takes place after the reader is apprised of the climactic and calamitous accident, to provide the reader with still more information about the heroine's life. In order to justify the ending's apotheosis of Matrena as the "Righteous Person" without whom a village, a city, and, indeed, the whole land cannot survive (p. 231), Solženicyn
emphasizes her virtues and contrasts them to the faults of many of her fellow-villagers. Matrena’s merits are enumerated by her neighbors and relatives, who, ironically, intend their words as censure—even in their laments at Matrena’s funeral! The narrator explains how the laments are conducted and gives some examples of the reproaches slyly uttered in them:

Samyj že plač dostavaloš' vesti rodstvennicam. V plače zametil ja xolodno-produmannyj, iskono-zavedennyj porjadok . . . Tut uznal ja, što plač nad pokojnoj ne prosto est' plač, a svoego roda politika. Sletelis' tri sestry Matreny . . . I nad grobom plakali tak:

— Ax, njan'ka-njan'ka! Ax, lël'ka-lël'ka! I ty ž naša edinstvennaja! I žila by ty tixo-smirno! I my by tebja vsegda prilaskali! A pogubila tebja tvoja gornica! A dokonala tebja, zakljataja! I začem ty ee lomala? I začem ty nas ne poslušala? Tak plač sester byli obvinitel'nye plači protiv mužinoj rodni . . . (pp. 225-226.)

(The female relatives got to conduct the lamentation itself. In the lamentation I noted a coldly thought out and anciently established order . . . (Here I discovered that lamentation over the deceased was not simply a lamentation, but politics in its own way. Matrena’s three sisters swooped together . . . And they lamented thus over the coffin:

"Oh, Nanny, Nanny! Oh, Cosset, Cosset! Our one and only! If you’d only lived quietly, placidly! And we would have petted you always! But your garret-room destroyed you! But the cussed thing did you in! And why did you break it up? And why didn’t you listen to us?

(So the laments of the sisters were laments of accusation against the husband’s kinfolk . . .)

They are also complaints against what the sisters consider defects in the departed Matrena’s character. The greedy, grasping survivors reproach their sister for her selflessness, humility and helpfulness, and thus—despite their intentions—point out her virtues rather than her faults.

Old Faddej is shown behaving in despicably greedy fashion:

I imeno eto—sto odni sani drzalili, žalili s gotovym trosom, a vtorye ešče možno bylo vyxvatyvat' iz ognja—imenno eto terzalo dušu černoborodogo Faddeja vaju pjatnicu i vaju sobbotu. Doč' ego trogalas' razumom, nad zjatem visel sud, v sobstvennom dome ležal ubityj im syn, na toj že ulice—ubitaja im ženičina, koto-ruju on ljubil kogda-to—Faddej tol'ko nenadolgo prixodil posto-
jat' u grobov, deržas' za borodu. Vysokij lob ego byl omražen tjaželoj dumej, no duma eto byla—spasti brevna gornicy ot ognja i ot koznej Matrennyx sester. (p. 228.)

(And it was precisely this—that one sled was teasing, waiting with its cable ready, and the other could still be saved from the fire—that tormented the soul of black-bearded Faddej all of Friday and Saturday. His daughter's reason was being affected, legal proceedings hung over his son-in-law, in his own house there lay the son he had killed, on the same street lay a woman—killed by him—whom he had once loved; Faddej came to stand for only a short time at the coffins, holding on to his beard. His high forehead was clouded by oppressive thought, and that thought was—to save the logs of the garret-room from fire and from the intrigues of Matrena's sisters.)

In contrast to Faddej, Matrena is a generous and sympathetic person whose self-denial and concern for others approach saintliness. The contrast is heightened by the juxtaposition of the passages recording Faddej's actions and those that evoke Matrena's virtues.

Ignatič later finds lodgings with one of Matrena's sisters-in-law, who tells him:

"Efim ee ne ljubil. Govoril: ljublju odevat'sja kul'turno, a ona—koe-kak, vsë po derevenski. Nu, raz, mol, ej ničego ne nužno, stal vse izliški propivat'. A otnovó my s nim v gorod ezdili, na zarabotkl, tak on sebe tam sudarku zavel, k Matrene i vozvrasčat'sja ne xotel.

Vse ozyvy ee o Matrene byli neodobritel'ny: i nečistoplotnaja ona byla; i za obzavodom ne gnalas'; i ne berežnaja; i daže porosenka ne deržala, vykarmlivat' počemu-to ne ljubila; i, glupaja, pomogala čužim ljudjam besplatno (i samyj povód vspomnit' Matrenu vypal—nekogo bylo dozvat' gorod vspaxat' na sebe soxoju).

I daže o serdečnosti i prostote Matreny, kotorye zolovka za nej priznavala, ona govorila s prezritel'nym sožaleniem. (pp. 230-231.)

("Efim didn't love her. He'd say, 'I like to dress properly, but she dresses just anyhow, always like a rustic.' Well, as he might say, since she doesn't need anything, he began to drink up their savings. And once he and I went to the city to work for wages, so he fixed himself up with a fancy woman there and he didn't even want to go back to Matrena."

(All her references to Matrena were deprecatory: she was slovenly; she didn't chase after acquisitions; she wasn't prudent; she didn't even keep a young pig—for some reason she didn't like to raise one; and like a fool she helped strangers without payment ((and the very reason for remembering Matrena had befallen--
there was no one to call upon to till the garden-plot with the wooden plow.))

(And even of Matrena's cordiality and simplicity, which the sister-in-law acknowledged, she spoke with contemptuous pity.)

The sister-in-law has obviously noticed Matrena's virtues and sufferings, but she interprets them negatively because her own values are distorted by selfishness and acquisitiveness. Presumably the reader is able to see the truth beyond the character's words, so Matrena's goodness comes through despite--rather than because of--what the sister-in-law says. This is a form of irony in which the effect of the discourse is quite the opposite of the character's awareness or intentions. The disparaging remarks of this woman are the inception of the narrator's deeper appreciation of Matrena:

I tol'ko tut--iz etix neodobritel'nyx otzyvov zolovki--vyplyl peredo mnoju obraz Matreny, kakoj ja ne ponimal ee, daje zivja s neju bok o bok.

V samom dele--ved' porosenok-to v kazdoj izbe! A u nee ne bylo. Çto mozhet byt' legcše--vykarmlivat' žadnego porosenka, nic'cego v mire ne priznajuščego, krome edy! Trisdy v den' varit' emu, žit' dlja nego--i potom zarezzat' i imet' salo.

A ona ne imela * * *

Ne gnalas' za obzavodom * * * Ne vybivalas', čtoby kupit' večci i potom bereč' ix bol'se svoej žizni.

Ne gnalas' za narjadami. Za odeždoj, priukrašivajuščej urodov i zlodeev. (p. 231.)

(And only now--from these disparaging remarks of the sister-in-law--there emerged before me an image of Matrena as I had not understood her before, even while living side by side with her.

(Why, indeed! There was a young pig in every cottage! But she didn't have one. What could be easier than to raise a greedy little pig that acknowledges nothing but food! To warm its food three times a day, to live for it--and then slaughter it for its lard.

(But she didn't have one * * *

(She didn't chase after acquisitions * * * She didn't exert herself to buy things and then to guard them more than her own life.

(She didn't chase after fancy dress. After clothes that embellish monsters and villains.)

In these passages even the words and deeds of her enemies, despite their intentions, cannot help revealing Matrena's essential goodness. It is an affirmation by negation in which the narrator and
reader "discover" Matrena's qualities from the evidence of "hostile witnesses." The discovery is therefore more satisfying and more convincing than a mere avowal of her goodness by a character or the narrator would be. The action of the story is brought to a standstill; the climactic event has already occurred. The stopped action permits significant details of Matrena's character to be brought out and serves a tendentious function—to show that indifference and even ill-will cannot conceal true virtue. The author commands this device so well that it fulfills its purpose without a jarring or awkward note. Solženicyn's chief stylistic achievement in "Matrena's Homestead," however, is the innovative use and successful integration of two levels of skaz, the narrator's and the central character's.

The point of view from which Solženicyn has chosen to relate "Matrena's Homestead" makes it difficult—if not impossible—to get inside the heroine's mind. Yet the characterization of Matrena as a virtuous woman is psychologically persuasive because the evidence is presented from a variety of sources which confirm one another, so that ultimately a convincing portrait emerges. Through the narrator's observations of Matrena and the reactions of others to her, through what Matrena tells Ignatić of herself and what others tell him of her, the reader obtains sufficient knowledge of Matrena's character. The evidence of her neighbors bears particular weight in this regard, since it is intended as censure but actually serves to affirm the best qualities of Matrena in this short story, which is one of Solženicyn's finest works to date.
CHAPTER IV

For the Good of the Cause

"For the Good of the Cause"¹ is narrated by an omniscient observer, but this short story is told to a great extent through dramatic scenes—action and dialogues of the characters involved. In fact, the story begins with an extended dialogue which contains absolutely no commentary from the narrator and so continues for the entire first part. The work is divided into six parts of about eight to eleven pages each, a new section being designated whenever the action is being viewed through the eyes of a new individual or group—the students at a technical high school, the director of the school, the Secretary of the Municipal Committee, etc.—or whenever there is a significant break in the action, such as a portentous visit by an inspection committee or the discovery by the students that the building for which they have worked so long and enthusiastically is being given to someone else.

Time, place and action are very restricted in "For the Good of the Cause," as is frequently the case in Solženicyn's works. The events of the story take place in a period of approximately twenty-four hours, from early one August 29 until early the next day. The action centers around a technical high school located in a provincial town, with some events taking place at the school itself, others at a nearby new building which had been promised to the school, and still others in a couple of local government offices close at hand.

The action, revolving around the assignment of the new build-

¹Aleksandr I. Solženicyn, "Dlja pol'zy dela," Nov. mir, No. 7 (July 1963).
ing to a scientific research institute, proceeds in a basically chron-
ological fashion. In establishing character, there are some reminis-
cences of World War II, a period preceding the events of the story
by about twenty years. Thus we learn that the school's director,
Fedor Mixeevič, has been partially but permanently disabled by wounds
received in the war; he accepts his fate without complaint, however,
and does his best despite his disabilities. Thoroughly shaken by the
news that he is losing his much-needed building, Fedor Mixeevič is
outwardly calm, but his inner agitation is betrayed by his inability
to command his wound-weakened arm to function:

Fedor Mixeevič omaknul pero, brasletom pal'cev levoj ruki
oxvatil kist' pravoj i podnes uže raspisat'sja--no, daže sceplen-
nye, ruki ego pljasali.
On poproboval raspisat'sja na bumažke. Pero načalo pisat'
nepopožeče čto-to, potom kovyrnulo bumagu i bryznulo.
Fedor Mixeevič podnjal glaza na buxgaltera i ulybnulsja.
(p. 262.)

(Fedor Mixeevič dipped his pen, seized his right hand in a
bracelet made of the fingers of his left and had already brought
it up to record his signature, but, even clasped, his hands twitched.
(He tried to put his signature on the slip of paper. The pen
began to write something unrecognizable, then it snagged on the
paper and spattered.
(Fedor Mixeevič raised his eyes to the bookkeeper and smiled.)

The use of a flashback to wartime in characterizing Secretary
of the Municipal Committee Ivan Kapitonovič Gračikov is a more complex
matter. The narrator first mentions Gračikov's aversion to wartime
reminiscences and to the use of military terms in non-military situa-
tions—a matter which will be touched upon later—but then goes on to
say that Gračikov makes an exception in order to encourage Fedor Mixee-
vič, with whom he had served for a time in the army. Although his
stories do not have the desired effect on the school director, Gračikov
finds that other memories of the war, having been triggered by his re-
miniscing, occur to him involuntarily. At first the recollection of
Major Gračikov’s conflict with a Lieutenant General trying to pull rank seems irrelevant, although it does contain a phrase which illustrates an important element in Gračikov’s personality:

No kogda stalkivalis’ lbumi spravedlivost’ i nespravedlivost’, a u vtoroj-to lob ot prirody krepče,—nogii Gračikova kak v zemlju vrastali, i už emu bylo vse ravno, čto s nim budet. (p. 280.)

(But when justice and injustice bumped foreheads, and the latter by nature has a stronger forehead, Gračikov’s feet seemed to grow into the ground and he was indifferent to what would happen to him.)

The relevance of this memory becomes apparent, however, in Gračikov’s interview on behalf of Fedor Mixevič with their superior Viktor Knorozov, First Secretary of the Regional Committee. Standing up for what he considers to be right:

... on Gračikov počuvval podstup odnoj iz tex rešajučih minut žizni, kogda nogii ego sami vrastali v zemlju... Ottogo, čto stalkivalis’ spravedlivost’ i nespravedlivost’. (p. 283.)

(... he felt the approach of one of those decisive minutes of his life when his legs of themselves grew into the ground...)

(Gračikov bravely and stubbornly insists on justice, and the force of his righteousness wins a compromise from a rigid martinet.

Even the weather, in a long-established literary tradition, seems to participate in the moods of the story. Near the beginning it is noted that it is a partly sunny day, but that occasionally clouds obscure the sun. Some anxiety is expressed by the students lest the rain not hold off until the move to the new building is completed. When the automobiles bearing the inspection committee—and, as is later discovered, evil tidings—arrive, the narrator observes that large clouds are scudding rapidly across the sky (p. 253). The next day, when the students have already discovered the bad news for themselves, "Utrom zapasmurnelo. Natjagivalo dožd." (p. 270.) ("By morning it had become overcast. It threatened rain.") Later, having won a partial victory—he has kept the minor villain Xabalygin from gobbling up still another building and has obtained assurances from a man whose word can be trusted
that the school will get a new building the following year—Fedor Mixeevič steps outside and observes that the weather has broken at last. The threatening rain has come, but the weather, too, is a compromise; it contains something refreshing and invigorating. "Dul prokladnyj, no prijatnyj veter i nes na sebe melkie svežie kapli." (p. 286.) ("A cool but pleasant wind was blowing and bearing upon itself fine fresh drops.")

Although Solženicyn does not employ skaz in "For the Good of the Cause" (i.e., the narrative portions of the text are rendered in standard literary Russian rather than a stylized language intended to reflect the speech peculiarities of a narrator), he pays close and careful attention to language, particularly in the dialogues. Together with their attitudes toward literature and their new styles of dress—both of which their teacher, who seems to be a mouthpiece for Solženicyn, finds disconcerting—the slang of the teenagers is brought to the reader's attention. "'Et /for èto/ vse erunda, tet' /for tet'ja/ Dusja!' modnoj sredi rebjat prigovorkoj ostanovil ee Miška Zimin." (p. 273.) ("'Tha's all nonsense, Antie Dusja!' Miška Zimin stopped her with lingo fashionable among the lads.") This youthful distortion of the language, with its negative implications, is not the only linguistic peculiarity of this group, however. For Ivan Gražikov, Secretary of the Municipal Committee, the astonishing amount of complex technical knowledge which these youngsters possess is expressed for him in their familiar use of esoteric phrases incomprehensible to him. In amazed admiration he exclaims:

( . . . "What words he /a mere boy who is explaining the uses of a number of technical devices which he has built himself/ uses, what concepts: the inadequacies of available indicators; the operating principle of my indicator; we take as the value of the anode current; the indications of the meters; economic efficiency; the coefficient of constructive succession!—Damn! .Huh?"")
In general, Secretary Gračikov seems sensitive to various styles and levels of language and has a sense of fittingness about their usage. In particular, he does not care for the use of military terminology where it is inappropriate:

Takže ne ljubil on, čto i na vtorom desjatke let posle vojny žužžat voennymi slovami tam, gde oni sovsem ne nadobny. Na zavode on i sam ne govoril i drugix otučal govorit': "Na fronte nastuplenija za vnedrenie peredovoj tehniki ** ** brosim v proryv ** ** forsiruem rubež ** ** podtjanem rezervy ** **" On sčital, čto vse vyraženija èti, vseljajuščie vojnu v samyj mir, utomljajut ljuðej. A russkiy jazyk rasčudesno obmožetsja i bez nix. (p. 278.)

(He was also displeased that in the second decade after the war military words were buzzed where they were entirely unnecessary. At the factory he himself did not say and he dissuaded others from saying: "In the front line of the attack for the inculcation of progressive technology ** ** we shall throw into the breach ** ** we shall force the line ** ** we shall draw in the reserves ** ** He considered that all these expressions implanting war in the time of peace wearied people. And the Russian language will get along wonderfully without them.)

This passage constitutes a criticism of the Soviet press and the clichés used by Party and State officials, who frequently employ the terminology of warfare in order to exhort Soviet citizens to greater efforts and achievements in agricultural, industrial, cultural and other fields.

The members of the committee who come to inspect the school facilities (and who have decided in advance, apparently, to hand over to a research institute the new building originally designated for the school) use a number of words and phrases associated with Soviet bureaucracy and perhaps any highly organized industrial state—reorganizacija (p. 256) ("reorganization"), the somewhat ominous vat opravitelj net (p. 260) ("you have no excuses"), zaplanirovannyj (p. 260) ("planned"), etc. Indeed, the very name of the story is taken from an expression which has become an official catch-phrase, and is uttered in the work by one of the most irksome types of bureaucrats, the oppor-
tunist Xabalygin (p. 260). School Director Fedor Mixeevič throws the phrase back in the face of Xabalygin when the latter is observed trying to increase even further his area of control at the expense of the technical school by surreptitiously moving some surveyors' stakes (p. 289). Another unpleasant sort of official, the punctiliously correct and pettily efficient Party Bureau Secretary, Jakov Anan'ević, sounds like a thesaurus of State and Party cliches:

"... institut, važnyj dlja rodiny. On rodstvenen nam po profilju, a elektronika sejčas--osnova tehniceskogo progressa, i nikto ne dolžen stavat' ej prepjatství, a naprotiv--rasčiščat' dorogu."

"... etot institut--gosudarstvennogo značenija, i ne nam s vami obsuždat' celesoobraznost'." (p. 276.)

("... an institute important for our homeland. It is related to us by profile, and right now electronics is the foundation of technical progress, and no one should raise obstacles to it, but, on the contrary, clear its path.")

("... this institute is of state importance, and it is not for you and me to discuss its expediency.")

There are many more such pompous, official-sounding phrases from Jakov Anan'ević on these pages.

"For the Good of the Cause" contains much that is familiar to the reader of Solženicyn. The restricted time, setting and action have already been mentioned, as has the interest in language and the author's keen ear in reproducing the speech of a variety of groups and individuals. The method of relating the story by means of dramatic scenes, especially the use of dialogue unaccompanied by any authorial comment, is emerging as one of Solženicyn's favorite devices and is well-exemplified in this short story. In plot structure, "For the Good of the Cause" is rather conventional. The atmosphere is quickly established by the gathering of students, a complication is introduced when it becomes apparent that other factions covet the technical school's new building, and the point of highest tension is reached in the struggle by Fedor Mixeevič to preserve the building for his students and faculty. Finally, the resolution—a compromise based on a firm
promise to make a new building available to the school in the near
future--is worked out in the falling action.

Within this scheme, Solženicyn introduces a large number of
characters--so many, in fact, and some so briefly, that a few of them
lack definition and become just names in a crowd. The story definite­
ly has a didactic aim: to show that unjust actions by adults can have
a deleterious effect on the younger generation's morals, which are al­
ready in a precarious state. There is little respect among them for
their teachers and elders or for learning, the boys wear flashy and
vaguely effeminate clothing, and the girls court the boys, or at least
this is the situation as their teacher Lidija Georgievna seems to see
it. The cautiously optimistic ending suggests that men of good will
can win in the struggle against injustice, although the forces of
cynicism, hypocrisy and opportunism are far from destroyed at the
story's conclusion.

Stylistically, Solženicyn continues to display his mastery of
phrasing, although not so brilliantly as in other works. The use of
the dramatic scene presented entirely in dialogue form is a striking
feature of this work that has already been used in "An Incident" and
seems to be developing as an important feature of Solženicyn's style.
CHAPTER V

Cancer Ward

As Ludmila Koehler points out in an article on Cancer Ward, Solženicyn is "language-oriented."\(^1\) In support of this view, she goes on to quote from a rare newspaper interview the following statement by Solženicyn:

I am convinced that in our literature the richness of the Russian language is not utilized to its full extent. In the twentieth century languages tend to contract, to become standardized. We are losing many of the old values . . . . When I began to study Russian in the camp (with the help of dictionaries, too) it became clear to me that a lot of verbal beauty is contained in the lexical reserves. I am trying to use it.\(^2\)

Cancer Ward, with its large cast of characters from many walks of life and of several national origins, provides Solženicyn with numerous opportunities to use those reserves. The language of the work's most important character, Oleg Kostoglotov, is often quite "salty," showing the influence of his many years as a soldier, camp-inmate and exile (a few of the details which, together with his suffering from stomach cancer, are obvious reflections of Solženicyn's own experiences). In his first encounter with Pavel Rusanov, a Party functionary who attempts to rule the ward to which he has been admitted for the treatment of a tumor, Kostoglotov uses vulgar expressions that shock and upset the official, who wants to sleep and therefore has


\(^2\)Ibid., p. 55.
ordered another patient to extinguish the light in the ward:

—Что значит—"попуши"?—зарычал сзади Рusanova Ogloed.

—Укротите, вишь нет один.

Pavel Nikolaeviс сел как следуют, натягнув глаза и, подберя опушку, визжала шеткой, обернувшись:

—А вы повели вас моете разговаривать?

Грубый укорили кривоусту руку и отвесил низким голосом:

—Не оттягивайте, я не у вас в аппарате.

Pavel Nikolaevи смотрился в неплохо иззялажу щем вглядом, но на Ogloed это не подействовало ничуть.

—Хорошо, а зачем нужен свет?—вступил Rusanov v корректные переговоры.

—В заднем проходе ковыряйт', сгребил Kostoglotov.

("What do you mean, "Turn off the light!?" Bonecruncher
Rusanov's private nickname for Kostoglotov/ snarled from behind Rusanov. "Simmer down, you're not the only one here."

(Pavel Nikolaevi с сел up properly, donned his glasses and turned, favoring his tumor and squeaking the bedsprings:

("Can you converse a bit more politely?"

(The churl contorted his crooked mug and answered in a low, measured voice:

("Don't change the subject; I'm not one of your underlings.

(Pavel Nikolaevи shot him a withering glance, but it had no effect whatever on Bonecruncher.

("All right, but what do you need the light for?" Rusanov entered into courteous negotiations.

("To pick my asshole," Kostoglotov cussed.)

Solženicyn’s use of the "lexical reserves" of Russian is not limited to phrases intended pour épater le bourgeois, however. As do all of Solženicyn's works, Cancer Ward contains a core of aphoristic expressions whose common-sense insights and trenchant manner of expression make them lively candidates for some future collection of "winged words." When Dr. Ljudmila Doncova asks the patient Kostoglotov to explain the logic of his reluctance to be treated, he replies:

—Полукаетсья, логике нет... No может быть', ee i ne должно быть'; Ljudmila Afanas'eva? Ved' čelovek že--očen' složnoe suščestvo, počemu on должен быть' ob'jasnjen logikoj? Ili tam--èkonomikoj? Ili fiziologijej? (p. 75.)

("There is no logic in it, it turns out. But perhaps there really shouldn't be any, Ljudmila Afans'evna? Now, man is a very complicated being. Why should he be explained by logic? Or economics, for that matter? Or physiology?")

With his tersely posed query, Kostoglotov expresses his skepticism about systems which propose simplistic answers to complex problems, hints at a belief that some aspects of human existence lie beyond the realm of reason, and, of course, calls into question fundamental tenets of materialistic approaches to the interpretation of human behavior. It is small wonder that orthodox Soviet thinkers find Solženicyn a disturbing writer.

Kostoglotov takes the raw material of his daily life and composes from it appropriate aphoristic phrases: "Lišnee lečenie--lišnee mučenie." (p. 77) ("Extra treatment is extra torment.") "Veď nam, bol'nym, vrač--kak poromščik; nužen na čas, a tam--ne znaj nas." (p. 127) ("Why, for us patients a doctor's like a ferryman: we need him for a time and then we forget him.") The phrase could be the basis of a riddle, the answer to which is obvious--after we hear it: Why is a doctor like a ferryman? "I kogo on vylečit," Kostoglotov continues aphoristically, "tot pis'mo vybrosit." (p. 127) ("And as soon as he cures you, you throw out his letter.") On the whole, however, the skeptical Kostoglotov is more amazed at the magnanimity and generosity of an old country doctor, who thinks he might have found an effective folk-remedy against cancer, than at the ingratitude and disrespect shown by those who accept the old man's help and then do not even write to him about their reactions to the treatment.

Kostoglotov is constantly searching for the proper way to live. Indeed, "What Do Men Live By?" is the title of Chapter 8, in which Tolstoj's didactic tale of that name provides the basis of a lively discussion in the ward. An old couple--the Kadrains--who are friends of the hero have suffered unjust imprisonment and exile, yet they have managed to maintain a cheerful attitude toward life and a deep affection for one another. The wisdom of their approach to life is summed up in a brief phrase: "Tot i mudrec, kto dovolen nemnogim."
Such pungent maxims—the pure extract of Kostoglotov’s harsh experiences and keen observation—are found scattered throughout Cancer Ward, but increase in frequency of occurrence toward the end of the work. In the last two chapters, examples of Solzhenicyn’s epigrammatic expressions can be found on nearly every page:

"Čto ž, sravneniem postigaetsja istina." (p. 418.)
(Well, through comparison the truth is gained.)

Oleg prostojal p’ят минут и с восхищением отошел: так козел и не посевелися! Вот с таким характерцем можно переносит’ жизнь! (p. 421.)
(Oleg stood there for five minutes and then went away in admiration: The goat had not stirred! With a character like that one could get through life!)

Ne bylo v kletke vnest’ sily, kotoraja mogla by ostanovit’ koleso ili spasti otuda belku, и ne bylo razuma, kotoryj vnušil by ej: "Pokin’! Što--tâščeta!" Net! Tol’ko odin byl neizbežnyj jasnyj vyxod--smert’ belki. (p. 422.)
(There was no external force in that cage that could have stopped the wheel or saved the squirrel, and there was no intelligence to suggest to it: "Quit! It’s all in vain!" No! There was only one clear and inescapable way out—the death of the squirrel.)

Fria kletke nadpis’: "Nevolju belye sovy perenosit’ ploxo."
Znajut že!--и вse-taki sažajut! A kakoj že vyrodok perenosit’ xorošo nevolju?
(The cage had a sign: "White owls endure captivity poorly." They know it, and still they imprison him!
(And what kind of degenerate endures captivity well?)

Ptica--ne živet bez gnezda, ženačina--ne živet bez posteli. Bud’ ty triždy netlenna, bud’ ty triždy vozvyšenna-- no kuda tebe det’aja ot vos’mi neizbežnyx nočnyx časov?
Ot zasypanij?
Ot prosypanij? (p. 431.)
(A bird does not live without her nest, nor a woman without her bed.
(From falling asleep?
(From waking?)
Kostoglotov nikogda ne razrešal sebe ulybat'sja turemski-kam, dažе esli te ulybalis'. On sčital dolgom napomnit', čto-vse pomnit. (p. 433.)

(Kostoglotov never permitted himself to smile at jailers, even if they smiled. He considered it his duty to remind them that he remembered everything.)

These lines capture the reader's attention, making him stop--and think. Artfully worded and sententious, they impinge upon the memory and give the work pointe.

Solženicyn's mastery of the short, pithy line is not gained at the expense of control of other modes of expression, however. He can be lyrical and expansive as well, as the following passage illustrates:

Vzdoxnuli. Pered nimi, davno uexavšimi iz Rossii (kto i dobrovol'no) ili dažе nikogda ne byvavšimi tam, prošlo videnie etoj nepritjazatel'noj, umernoj, ne prožzennoj solncem strany, to v zavese legkogo griibnogo doždika, to v vesennix polovod'jax i uvjazistyx polevyx i lesnyx dorogax, tixoj storony, gde prosto lesnoe derevo tak služit i tak nužno čeloveku. Ljudi, živušcie v toj strane, ne vsegda ponimajut svoju rodinu, im xocetsja jarko-sinego morja i bananov, a von ono, čto nužno čeloveku; černyj, urodlivyj narost na belen'koj bereze, ee bolezn', ee opuxol'.

Tol'ko Mursalimov s Egenberdievym ponimali pro sebya tak, čto i zdes'--v stepi i v gorax--objazatel'no est' to, čto nužno im, potomu što v každom meste zemli vse predusmotreno dlja čeloveka, liš' nado znat' i umet'. (p. 131.)

(They sighed. Before these men, who had long since left Russia ((some even voluntarily)) or even those who had never been there, there passed a vision of that unassuming, temperate country, unscorched by the sun, now in a veil of a light, mushroom-fostering shower, now in the vernal floodwaters and the miry field and forest roads, a quiet land, where a simple forest tree is so helpful and so necessary to man. People living in that country do not always understand their homeland, they feel like having the bright blue sea and bananas, but what man needs is there--a black, deformed growth on the white birch, its illness, its tumor.

(Only Mursalimov and Egenberdiev understood aright within themselves that here, too--in the steppe and in the mountains--there is bound to be what they need, because in every place on earth everything is provided for man; he need only discover and learn to use it.)
This passage not only displays Solženicyn's lyrical side, but touches upon a topic of considerable importance in his works—a profound affection for Russia and a deep appreciation of even her humblest or least attractive qualities. It also includes a recurrent Solženicyn theme—man's relationship to his natural environment; harm results when man fails to treat his surroundings in a way that is fitting and appropriate—by attempting to exert excessive control or neglecting to pay sufficient attention—and simple men whose instincts have not been perverted by technology maintain the proper harmony with nature. That is how Mursalimov and Egenberdiev achieve their proper understanding. And with all this, there is yet a hint of that slightly mocking tone: "... they feel like having ... bananas ... "—that one finds in some of Solženicyn's more sardonic passages. His aphoristic bent is still very evident, of course, in the last couple of lines: "... in every place on earth everything is provided for man; he need only discover and learn to use it."

Solženicyn does not give all the good lines to Kostoglotov or to the sections devoted to him, however. Rusanov's masterful use of lengthy personal-history questionnaires inspires a passage of mock lyricism, in which the paragraph's morally repellent subject-matter is expressed in totally—and, of course, deliberately—inappropriate language. Rusanov and his profession are bitterly satirized by the ironic use of ostensibly favorable dithyrambs extolling the "poetry" of such questionnaires:

Rod raboty Rusanova v tečenje už mnogix let, edva li ne dvadcati, byl—ankanetnoe xozjajstvo. Dolžnost' eta v raznyx učreždenijax nazyvalas' po-raznomu, no sut' byla vsegda odna. Tol'ko neuči, neveduščie postoromnie ljudi ne znajut, kakaja eto ažurnaja tondaja rabota, skol'ko ona trebuet talanta. Šta—poëzija, do kotoroj ešče do šis por ne dobrals' poëty. Každyj čelovek na žizennom puti zapolnjaet nemaloe čislo anket, i v každoj ankete—neizvestnoe čislo voprosov. Otvet odnogo čeloveka na odin vopros odnoj ankety—eto uže nitočka, navsegda protja-nuvšajaja ot čeloveka v mestnyj centr anketnogo xozjajstva. Ot každogo čeloveka protjanuty takim obrazom sotni nitoček, a vsego ix axoditsja mnogie milliony, i esli b nitočki ěti stali vidny, to vse nebo my videli by v pautine, a esli by oni stali material'no-uprugi, to i avtobusy, i tramvai, i sami ljudi
poterjali by vozmožnost' dvigate'sja, i veter ne mog by v dol'
ulicy prostei klockov gazety ili osennix list'ev. No oni ne
vidimy, i ne material'ny, a odnako čuvstvujutsja čelovekom posto-
janno. Delo v tom, čto tak nazyvaemye kristal'nye ankety--eto
kak absoljutnaja istina, kak ideal, oni poštii ne dostižimy. Na
každago živogo čeloveka vsegda možno zapisat' čto-nibud' otrica-
tel'noe i podozritel'noe, každyj čelovek v čem-nibud' vinovat
ili čto-nibud' utaivaet, esli razobrat'sja do tostoño. (p. 168.)

The kind of work Rusanov had been engaged in for many years now
--was questionnaire record-keeping. These duties went by differ­
ent names in different institutions, but their essence was always
the same. Only ignoramuses and uninformed outsiders do not know
what sublime, delicate work it is, and how much talent it demands.
It is poetry of a kind that poets have not yet achieved. Along
life's path, every man fills out not a few questionnaires, and
in every questionnaire there is an unknown number of questions.
The answer of one man to one question on one questionnaire is a
thread which stretches forever from the man to the local record-
keeping center. In this way, hundreds of threads are drawn from
every man. But this amounts to many millions of threads all to-
gether, and if the threads were to become visible, then we would
see the whole sky through a web, and if they were to become mate­
rially resilient, then buses, streetcars and people themselves
would lose the ability to move, and the wind would not be able to
blow shreds of newspaper or autumn leaves along the street. But
they were invisible and immaterial; however, they are constantly
felt by a man. The point is that a so-called crystal-clear re­
cord is like absolute truth: it's like an ideal, almost unattain­
able. Something negative and suspicious could be written down
against any living person; everyone is guilty of something or is
hiding something--if one investigates meticulously.)

Rusanov, too, employs an easily identifiable language style.
Whether reported directly or indirectly, his speech is always full of
Party- and government-flavored jargon and allusions to Socialism's
sacred cows. "...čerez vse kanaly dobyvat'sja napravlenija v Mos­
kvu ..." ("... a permit to go to Moscow was to be obtained by
going through all channels . . .")--a typical locution of a middle­
echelon bureaucrat--is found in a paragraph which also repeats the
murderous epithet--"Ubijcy v belyx xalatax!" ("Murderers in white
coats!")--with which the victims of Stalin's infamous "Doctor's Plot"
purge were vilified. The aforementioned phrase is not ostensibly
couched in direct speech or thought, but is obviously intended to give
the reader an accurate depiction of the workings of Rusanov's mind. Similarly rendered passages later in the work are so jargon-encrusted as to become parodies of "officialese":

Takoe oborudovanie rabočego mesta i takoj porjadok допуска očen' sposobstvoval vdućivomu i reguljarnomu vypolneniju obja-

zannostej v rusanovskom otdеле. . . .

Razumeet'sja, po dialektičeskoj vzaimosyjazi vseh javlenij dejstvitel'nostи, obraz povedenija Pavla Nikolaevića na rabote ne mog ostavat'sja bez vlijanija na ego obraz žизni voobščе. . . .

(p. 171.)

(This outfitting of his employment area and this reception protocol contributed greatly to the thoughtful and systematic execution of the obligations of Rusanov's department. . . .
	(Of course, according to the dialectic interdependence of all phenomena of reality, Pavel Nikolaević's mode of behavior at work could not remain without influence on his mode of life in general. . . .)

The extent to which Rusanov is a creature of the State is made strikingly manifest in his attitudes toward literature and its authors. When the name Tolstoj is mentioned, for example, he immediately (and erroneously) assumes that the reference is to Aleksej N. Tolstoj, who has received Party endorsement, rather than to Lev Tolstoj, many of whose views cannot be made to fit comfortably the Party line.

Rusanov's use in direct speech of such words and phrases as 
gosudarstvenaja neobxodlomost' (p. 317) (state necessity), meropri-

jatija (p. 317) (official measures), sozdanie instruktorskix grupp po zonam MTS--eto rešajuščee zveno (p. 318) (the creation of instruc-
tor groups throughout the Machine Tractor Station zones is the deci-

sive link), and aprobirovan v kakoj-nibud' instancii (p. 130) (ap-

proved in some official instance) and his repetition of the terms 
zerkalo russkoj revoljucii (p. 99) (mirror-image of the Russian Re-

volution) and risovye kotlety (p. 99) (rice croquettes) with which Lenin attacked the views of Tolstoj mark him a parrot of the State's phrases and slogans.

Just as characteristic and more amusing is Rusanov's attri-

bution to the politically safe Maksim Gor'kij of nearly every plati-
tude that pops into his mind:
Kak skazal, kažetsja, Gor'kij, tol'ko tot dostoin svobody, kto za nee povsednevno idet v boj. (p. 47.)

(As Gor'kij, it seems, said, only he is worthy of freedom who does battle for it daily.)

Kak skazal Gor'kij, v zdorovom tele, zdorovoj duš. (p. 317.)

(As Gor'kij said, a sound mind in a sound body.)

Kostoglotov sometimes taunts Rusanov by throwing the official's jargon back in his face. Discussing an old doctor's kindness, Kostoglotov says:

"I eto ne ego objazannost', ne služba ego, eto prosto ego dobroe delo. Ili kak nado skazat'?--Kostoglotov zlopamjatno obernula k Rusanovu. --Gumannee, da? (p. 127.)"

("And it's not his obligation, it's not his job, it's just his kind deed. Or how must you say it?" Kostoglotov turned rancorously toward Rusanov. "Humanitarian, right?")

By his mocking question, Kostoglotov indicates his awareness that the use of official jargon soon robs words of any real meaning. Indeed, much later in the work, Rusanov does refer to kindness by a similar word in an interrupted utterance: "Gumannost'--eto osnovnaja čerta nasego * * * (p. 341.)" ("Humanitarianism is the basic feature of our * * *")

A more direct and immediate jeer by Kostoglotov at Rusanov's words is found on page 130:

--A--oficial'no etot sposob priznan? On aprobirovan v kakoj-nibud' instancii?

Kostoglotov sverxu, so svoego podokonnika, usmexnula:

--Vot naščet instancii ne znaju. . . .

("But--is this method accepted officially? Has it been approved in any official instance?

(Kostoglotov smiled down ironically from his seat on the window sill:"

("Now I don't know anything about an instance. . . .

Kostoglotov's most virulent attack on Rusanov's jargon, however, occurs on pages 342-343:

* * * indicates that . . . appears in the original.
"In such instances if you investigate, a bourgeois social origin will always be the explanation."

(Kostoglotov jerked his head and spat out:
("That's all nonsense—social origin!

("What do you mean—nonsense?!" Pavel Nikolaevič clutched at shooting pain in his side. He didn't expect such a flagrant exhibition even from Bonecruncher.

"Listen.' Listen.' Rusanov actually staggered and called upon the whole room, the whole ward, with movements of his arms. "I want witnesses! I want witnesses! This is ideological sabotage!!"

(Here Kostoglotov quickly dropped his feet from the bed and with a swing of both elbows gave Rusanov one of the most indecent gestures, and besides uttered the most vulgar word written on all the fence-boards:

("** you and your dialogue /sic/ sabotage! The mother-** as soon as a man disagrees with them the least bit, it's ideological sabotage!"

--Čto vy kak znaxar' kudaxčete--"socproisxoždenie, socproisxoždenie"? V dvadcatye gody znaete kak govorili?--pokažite vaši mozoli! A otčego vaši ručki takie belye da puxlye? Vot ěto byl marksizm!

--Ja rabotal, ja rabotal!--vosklical Rusanov, no ploxo videl obidčika, potomu čto ne mog naladit' očkov.

--Ve-erju!--otvratitel'no myčal Kostoglotov. --Ve-erju! Vy daže na odnom subbotnike sam brevno podnimal, tol'ko posredne stanovilis'! A ja možet byt' syn kupečeskij, tret'ej gildii, a vaju žizn' zakladyvaju, i vot moi mozoli, smotrite!--tak ja čto--buržuj? Čto u menja ot papaši--eritrocities drugie? lejkocity? Vot ja i govorju, čto vaš vzgljad ne klassovyj, a rasovyj. Vy--rasist!
"Why do you cackle like a sorcerer 'social origins, social origins'? You know what they said in the Twenties? Show us your calluses! And why are your hands so white and puffy? Now that was Marxism!"

"I worked, I worked!" Rusanov exclaimed, but he saw his antagonist poorly because he couldn't get his glasses adjusted.

"I believe you!" Kostoglotov bellowed repulsively. "I believe you! You even went out one work-Saturday and lifted a log, only you stood in the middle! And maybe I'm the son of a third guild merchant, but I've put in the labor all my life, and here are my calluses—look at them!--so what does that make me—a bourgeois? What did I get from Papa—different red and white blood cells? That's why I say that your view is based on race, not class. You're a racist!"

Here, of course, Kostoglotov is assailing more than Rusanov's speech mannerisms or the State's phrasemakers. Nevertheless, the impassioned assault is triggered by the invidious use of words which, to Kostoglotov, are manifestations of the corruption of social ideals.

The "extra dimensions" of words are of great significance to Kostoglotov in his assessments of other characters. The gross lexical meaning of a word or phrase becomes secondary to the word per se, so that the utterance takes on the function of a password or "open sesame." Kostoglotov's favorable first impression of the efficient and energetic surgeon, Lev Leonidovič, is reinforced by the doctor's use of prison slang:

A odin raz o kakom-to bol'nom, kotoryj otpiralsja, a potom priznalsja, Lev Leonidovič so smexom skazal: "Raskolololaja-taki! --i ešče bol'še zadel Olega. Potomu čto slovo čto v takom smysle znal i mog upotrebit' ne vajakij čelovek. (p. 323.)

"And once, referring to a patient who had first denied something and then confessed, Lev Leonidovič said with a laugh: "So he sang, did he!" and impressed Oleg even more. Because it wasn't every man who knew that word in that sense and was capable of using it.

For additional assurance, however, Kostoglotov tests the doctor with a phrase which would probably be known only to those who have "done time" in the camps:

Vy * * * --on tože snizil golos i odnim glazom přiščuril'sja--tam gde večno pljašut i pojut--vy * * * ne byli? (p. 326.)
(. . . Were you * * *" He, too, lowered his voice and squinted one eye. "You weren't ever where there's eternal singing and dancing (an ironic expression for the camps?"

When Lev Leonidovič asks Kostoglotov how he guessed, the patient answers:

---Po odnomu slovečku: "raskololsja". Net, kažetsja i "zanačka" vy skazali. (p. 326.)

("Because of one little word, 'sang'. No, I think you said 'fence' too.

The most casual remark by any of Solženicyn's characters, then, is extremely important, for each word may have a significance deeper than the contextual surface of the utterance. The vocabulary for each figure is carefully chosen to establish character, social status, personal history and mood. The use of such individualized vocabulary is not restricted to direct utterances, however. Even the language of the narrative portions of text is expressive of the character who dominates the work at the time. Thus all the passages in which Kostoglotov plays the central role and where his views are being presented use the language which is appropriate for this character. The same is true for Rusanov when he commands the reader's attention, and the other characters who become, if only for a time, the dominant figures of the work are treated in a similar fashion. This procedure is thoroughly consistent with Solženicyn's ideas regarding the form of the novel as he expressed them in an interview with a Slovak journalist, P. Idčko:

What genre do I consider the most interesting? A polyphonic novel with concrete details specifying the time and place of action. A novel without a main hero. * * * Every character becomes main when the action reverts to him.

---Quoted in Ludmila Koehler's "Eternal Themes in Solzhenitsyn's 'The Cancer Ward'," Russian Review, XXVII, No. 1 (January 1969), 55. Prof. Koehler also notes that the term 'polyphonic' was first applied by M. M. Baxtin to Dostoevskij's works in Problemy tvorčestva Dostoevskogo (Leningrad: Priboj, 1929).
Whether or not Solženicyn’s intention is to eliminate the "traditional hero," he does not actually do so, for each of his longer works—“One Day," "An Incident," "Matrena’s Homestead," Cancer Ward and even First Circle (which is more "polyphonic" than any of his other works) does contain one figure who is more "central" than all the rest. Nevertheless, in Cancer Ward a number of characters do come to the fore one after another, and the dominance of each is established and accompanied by an appropriate use of language. The book opens with an account of Rusanov’s admittance to the cancer wing of a hospital. Although very little of this scene is actually presented in direct speech, the narrator’s language in this section is a clear reflection of Rusanov’s state of mind, his fears, prejudices and emotions. The opening paragraph reads:

Rakovýj korpus nosil i nomer trinadcat’. Pavel Nikolaevič Rusanov nikogda ne byl i ne mog byt’ sveren, no čto-to opustilos’ v nem, kogda v napravlenii emu napisali: "trinadcatyj korpus". Vot uže takta ne xvatilo nazvat’ trinadcatym kakoj-nibud’ proteznyj ili kišechnyj. (p. 13 [sic])

(The cancer wing even bore the number thirteen. Pavel Nikolaeviç Rusanov had never been and could not be superstitious, but something in him sank when they wrote on his admittance slip "Wing Thirteen." They even lacked the delicacy to assign thirteen to some sort of prosthetic or intestinal wing.)

The narrator, then, usually adopts temporarily the views, attitudes, opinions and prejudices of the dominant character, although the characters themselves are frequently antagonistic toward one another. Rusanov fears and dislikes Kostoglotov immediately, as the following passage, expressed by the narrator, indicates:

... a po druguju ruku na poslednej priokonnoj kojke tože bužto russkij, no ne obradeš’sja takomu sosedstvu: morda u nego byla banditskaja. Tak on vygìjašel, naverno, ot šrama (načinala bliz uga rta i perexodil po nizu levoj šček počti do šei); možet byt’—ot nepričesannyx dbliviyx černyx volos, torčaščix i vverx, i vbok, a možet, voobšče ot grubogo žestkogo vyraženija. Bandjuga ětot tua že tjanulsa, k kul’ture—dočityval knigu. (p. 21.)

(.... on the other side in the last cot by the window there was, apparently, another Russian, but there was no cause for re-
joicing in such a neighbor; he had a bandit's mug. He undoubt-
edly looked that way from the scar that began near the corner
of his mouth and ran along the bottom of his left cheek almost
to his neck. Or perhaps it was from his uncombed, bristly black
hair, which stuck up in the air and out to the side. And per-
haps it was from his generally crude, tough expression. This
hoodlum was drawn to culture; he was reading a book and had al-
most finished it.

Nevertheless, Kostoglotov's ideas, attitudes and feelings find
empathic expression in the narrative when he becomes the dominant
character:

Kostoglotov oščuščal nedobruju legkost'. Stol'ko let on
privyk pered vol'nymi pomalkivat', ruki deržat' nazađ, a golovu
opuščennoj, čto što vošlo v nego kak prirodnyj priznak, kak sutu-
lost' ot roždenija, ot čego on ne vozve otstal i za god žizni v
seyike. A ruki ego na progulke po allejam medgorodka i sejčas
legče i prošče vsego skladavalis' pozadi. No vot vol'nye, kotorym
stol'ko let zapreščalos' razgоварivat' s nim kak s ravnymi,
voobšče vseh, čto-nibuž' kak s ělonečeskim susče-
tvom, a gorše togo--požat' emu ruku ili prinjat' ot nego pis'mo,
--ěti vol'nye teper', ničego ne podozrevajà, sideli pered nim,
razvjazno umostivšajà na podokonnik i učitel'stvujúcim,--i
žđali opory svojim nadeźđam. I za soboj zamečal teper' Oleg,
čto tože ne protivpostavljal sebja im, kak privyk, a v obščej
beđe soedinjal sebja s nimi. (pp. 126-127.)

(Kostoglotov experienced an ominous lightness. For so many
years he had been accustomed to keeping quiet in front of free
people, keeping his hands behind his back and his head lowered,
that it had become second nature to him, like a congenital stoop,
and he had not got entirely out of the habit even in his year of
exile. Even now it was easier and simpler to keep his hands
clasped behind him on his walks along the paths of the hospital
grounds. But here were those free men, who had been forbidden
for so many years to speak with him as with an equal or gener-
ally to discuss anything seriously man to man or--more bitter
than that--to shake hands or accept a letter from him--these free
men, suspecting nothing, sat before him as he sprawled impudently
on the window sill and played the teacher, and they awaited sup-
port for their hopes. And Oleg now observed that he, too, no
longer set himself in opposition to them as he had been accus-
tomed to do but joined with them in common adversity.)

Rusanov and Kostoglotov are by no means the only characters
presented in this way. Chapters devoted to the young medical student
Zoja, to shy, attractive Dr. Vera Gangart, to the very competent but
harassed Dr. Ljudmila Doncova and to wise old Dr. Dormidont Oreščenkov
present these secondary figures empathically. Solženicyn not only gives each personage’s views, but, through the use of nesobstvenno-prjamaja reč’, provides direct expression of his characters’ feelings without direct speech. This means that Solženicyn does not have to deprive of emotion narrative material presented by the "omniscient observer," for nesobstvenno-prjamaja reč’, or "represented speech," permits at least the same expression of passionate feeling as direct speech.

Although the narrator usually seems well-disposed toward the dominant character, there are passages in which an antagonistic attitude is apparent. The irony of the mock lyric on personal-history questionnaires has already been mentioned. The "defense" of Rusanov’s actions in unjustly denouncing a friend becomes, instead, an indictment of a selfish, disgusting and cowardly act. In order to obtain a whole apartment for themselves and to settle some inter-family squabbles, the Rusanovs accused their fellow-tenant Rodičev of plotting sabotage, and after his arrest contrived to evict Rodičev’s wife from her quarters. Now, eighteen years later, the Rusanovs have heard rumors that many prisoners--Rodičev among them--have been rehabilitated, a development which fills Rusanov with terror. In the following passage, the narrator uses words and expressions that are those that Rusanov would use himself, but the events being related speak for themselves; the actions of the Rusanov family are so repugnant that the author obviously expects the reader to condemn rather than approve:

... Kapa tak namečala: kak tol’ko Rodičeva arestujut, tak Kat’ku Rodičevu sejčas že vyselit’, i zaxvatit’ vaju kvartiru, i balkon togda budet ves’ ix. (Teper’ smešno, što komnata v vosemnadcat’ metrov i kvartira bez gaza mogla imeť takoe značenie). Operacija eta s komnatoy byla uže vsja soglasovana i prišli Kat’ku vyseljat’, no ona vykinula nomer--zajavila, što beremenna. Nastojali proverit’--prinesla spravku. Točno! Kak predvidela; po zakonu beremenuju vyseljat’ nel’zja. I tol’ko k sledujuščej zime ee vyselili, a dlinnye mesjacy prišlos’ terpet’ i žit’ s nej bok-o-bok, poka ona nosila, poka rodila i ešče do konca dekretnogo. Nu, pravda, teper’ ej Kapa piknut’ ne davala na kuxne, i Ave uže šel pjatyj god, ona ochen’ smešno ee drznila i plevala v
(. . . Kapa [Rusanov's wife] planned it this way: As soon as Rodichev was arrested, evict Kat'ka Rodicheva immediately, seize the whole apartment, and then the balcony would be all theirs. ((It was ridiculous, now, that an eighteen-meter room and an apartment without gas could have such importance.)) This operation with the room was already agreed upon and they had gone to evict Kat'ka, but she pulled a fast one; she declared she was pregnant. They insisted on verifying it and she produced a certificate. Just the thing! As if she had planned it; according to the law it is forbidden to evict a pregnant woman. It was toward the next winter before they could evict her, and for long months they had to bear it and live side by side with her while she carried the child, then bore it and then until the end of the legal period. Well, it's true Kapa didn't let her open her mouth in the kitchen. Ava [Rusanov's daughter] was more than four then, and she very amusingly teased the woman and spat into her saucepans.)

In most passages, then, Solzhenicyn relinquishes the possible detachment and neutrality for which omniscient narration can provide the opportunity. The narrative is usually presented in a manner that is sympathetic toward the character who is "central" at the time. This allows the presentation of direct and immediate reactions of vitally involved characters, while still permitting the author to "know" every detail of a character's actions, being and consciousness. Through the use of irony, however, the author can maintain what appears to be his well-established manner of empathic narration but is actually a condemnatory moral stance.

Solzhenicyn's use of nesobstvenno-prjamaja reč' in Cancer Ward is so extensive and pervasive that it establishes several varieties of skaz. While in Leskov's Sobornaja (Cathedral Folk) the style of narration is controlled throughout the entire novel by the background, training and perceptions of a provincial Russian Orthodox cleric, Cancer Ward deals with characters of many different backgrounds and outlooks, and an appropriate manner is adopted for each figure in both the narrative and dramatic portions of the sections in which he appears. The narrator never really speaks in "neutral" standard
literary Russian; there is always the color in his language of the character of the moment. Solženicyn's mastery of his craft in Cancer Ward has given new flexibility to the use of skaz, nesobstvenno-prjamaja reč', and omniscient narration.

The mosaic of different manners of speech does not cause a disintegration of the unity of Cancer Ward, however. The central importance of Kostoglotov serves as a welding force to keep the work unified, as does the restricted setting. Deming Brown suggests still another unifying factor:

The main unifying force in Cancer Ward is the shadow of death. Although the patients seldom discuss it openly, their very taciturnity, the progress of their diseases (some are cured) and their concern for each other emphasize its presence. Under its threat they examine their lives, values, and aspirations and show varying shades of apprehension and resignation. The narrative attitude is serene and compassionate; death is frightening and unjust, but it must be faced with dignity.

The theme of death certainly pervades the book, as does the problem of how man should live. Kostoglotov, Doncova, Oreščenkov and others examine the moral principles upon which they base their behavior. Brown goes on to say:

Cancer Ward is held together also by its circumscribed setting but, in addition, by a more distinct plot based on the developing relationships between the characters, the progress of their diseases, and the evolution of their views of morality, life, and death. 6

It seems that setting, themes, the dominance of the hero and the interrelationships among the characters all combine to knit Cancer Ward together.

In Cancer Ward, as in his other works thus far, Solženicyn employs a restricted setting. Basically, it consists of one wing of a hospital, but there are a few scenes which take place in the town out-

---


7 Ibid, 312.
side the hospital walls. The concerns of the work cannot be encompassed by the small space and brief time period (approximately one month in the early spring of 1955), however, and Solženicyn has once again proven himself a master of devices which expand the horizons of fictional representation. Through the use of letters, reminiscences and anecdote—all of which were used earlier, especially in One Day—Solženicyn integrates into the fabric of his narrative material which covers broad spans of time and space, yet is vitally related to the actions and themes of the work. Thus Kostoglotov's letters to and from his friends and fellow-exiles, the Kadmins, and reminiscences about this old gynecologist and his wife provide, in an unobtrusive and organic fashion, material about the absurd yet tragic excesses and injustices perpetrated in the name of state security in the period 1937-1954, the almost miraculous survival in today's Russia of the most profound personal affection and devotion, the lives of exiles in a lonely village of an Asian Soviet Socialist Republic and more. When Dr. Doncova has a disagreement with Kostoglotov over treatment, attention is drawn to the professional and domestic cares of this dedicated physician. Later, she in turn visits her old mentor, Dr. Dormidot Tixonovič Oreščenkov, to consult with him about the possibility that she has been struck with cancer, and this results in a chapter devoted to the old doctor. In Chapters 30 and 32 we hear, directly and indirectly, Dr. Oreščenkov's rather naive views on the virtues of the private practice of medicine, mention of his youthful Revolutionary activities in 1902, reminiscences of the First World War, of the Moscow Art Theater's premiere of Tolstoj's The Power of Darkness, and the old man's opinion that "... sovremennyj čelovek bespomoščen pered likom smerti, čto ničem on ne vooružen vstrečit' ee." (p. 376.) ("...

---

8 It is interesting to note that, when the narrator is relaying this event from Dr. Oreščenkov's reminiscences, he refers to the leg-wrappings of a character from the play (Akim) as onuci. Characters younger than Dr. Oreščenkov call such wrappings portjanki. The choice of one term rather than the other apparently marks a generation difference.
modern man is helpless before the visage of death, that he is armed
with nothing to meet it." The logic of the narrative itself pro-
vides a natural means for introducing all this material.

Another device that Solženicyn uses to introduce background
and supplementary material into his work is the conversation rather
carefully staged as an interview from which the reader gleams infor-
ma­tion and attitudes that the author wishes to impart. An occasion
when Solženicyn uses this device very well is the dialogue between
the medical student Zoja and Kostoglotov after he has finished help-
ing her to transcribe some hospital statistics. The questions and
answers occur in what seems to be a natural conversational manner,
and the reader—along with Zoja—receives the messages that Solženi-
cyn wishes to transmit. These messages not only contain factual ma-
terial, but attempt to impart attitudes and emotions. In the follow-
ing exchange, Zoja asks how long Kostoglotov was condemned to exile,
but she learns much more; she discovers the government's incredible
severity as well as the exile's great longing for Russia, although
this is expressed in rather ironic fashion:

"And * * * For how long have you been exiled?" she asked
quietly.

("Eternally!" he cracked like a pistol-shot.
It even made her ears ring.
"For life?" she asked again in a half-whisper.
("No, precisely eternally!" Kostoglotov insisted. "It is
written in the document eternally, precisely. If it were for
life, then at least it would be possible to bring my coffin out
of there, but since it's eternally, probably even that's im-
possible. The sun will be extinguished, but it makes no differ-
ence, eternity is longer."

Another interview, however, does not appear to be as success-
ful. In a conversation with Elizaveta Anatol'evna, a conscientious
and intelligent hospital orderly, Kostoglotov poses questions, but they are quite tendentiously rhetorical; he expects the melancholy answers he gets:

"And are you married? Or are you alone?"

Just as readily and directly as if he were asking her about her regular duty, she answered:

"The whole family was arrested. You couldn't tell who was arrested for whom."

"And now you're all together?"

"On, no! My daughter died in exile. After the war we came here. My husband was taken from here for another round. In a camp."

"And now you're alone?"

"I have an eight-year-old son."

Oleg looked at her face, which had not trembled pitifully.

"Well, they were just having a business-like discussion."

"The second round was in Forty-nine?"

"Yes."

"That's typical. Which camp?"

"Tajšet Station."

Oleg nodded again:

"That's clear. Lake Camp. He may actually be right on the Lena, but the mailing address is still Tajšet Station."

"Were you there??" She was unable to restrain her hope.

Solženicyn's purpose seems plain enough; he wants to point out
how depressingly common—and consequently how predictable—such sto-
ries are. But the process is too mechanical, the questions too ob-
vviously "rigged." Kostoglotov seems cynically smug rather than sym-
pathetic in his knowledge of Elizaveta Anatol'evna's predicament.
The emphasis of the passage appears to be more on Kostoglotov's in-
timate knowledge of the "system" than on the misery and injustice
of Elizaveta's situation. Here, Solženicyn's well-meant protest is
not integrated into his novel, and, as Victor Erlich writes, "... a 'message' not assimilated into the literary work—however 'relevant'
it may be otherwise—is more likely to impair than to enhance the
total effect."9

The same criticism can also be made of the zoo scene which
takes place at the end of the book. At the urging of Demka, a young
cancer victim who has never seen a zoo, Kostoglotov has promised to
observe the town menagerie's exotic animals and write a description
of the beasts to his youthful friend. In this section of the work,
the narrator constantly draws parallels between situations, reactions
or treatment of the animals on the one hand and the human condition
on the other. These parables are presented in a way obviously in-
tended to show the workings of the wily ex-convict Kostoglotov's
mind. On the badger's cage he reads:

A "barsuk živet v glubokix i složnyx norax". Vot čto po-
-našemu! Molodec, barsuk, a čto ostaetsja? I morda u nego
matrasno-polosataja, čistyj katoržnik. (p. 422.)

("The badger lives in deep, complex burrows." Now that's
just our style! That a boy, badger; what else can you do? Even
his snout is striped like mattress-ticking; a real convict.)

As Kostoglotov moves from one section of the zoo to another,
the narrator continues to make such analogies. The stock-still goat
mentioned earlier is part of this section; a bear is confined to a
cage that resembles a detention cell; a squirrel runs vainly, madly

9Victor Erlich, Russian Formalism: History and Doctrine,
in a wheel and its only escape from this fruitless labor is death, etc. All this is expressed with Solženicyn's true verbal skill, but these vignettes do not become a part of the story; they are com-
ments on the world at large without being rooted in the microcosm of Cancer Ward. The cancer ward as a metaphor for the Soviet Union seems explicit enough on page 436 of the work:

Čelovek umiraet ot opuxoli--kak že možet žit' strana, proraščennaja lagerjami i ssylkami?

(Man dies from a tumor; how, then, can a country live with growths like camps and exile?)

The identification of the cancer ward and the country has been intimated by all the pages of the work that have preceded this passage. The vignettes from the zoo scene, while effective in them-
selves, seem appended to the work rather than integrated into it. In a work of such over-all excellence, however, these are minor faults.
CHAPTER VI

First Circle

First Circle is without doubt the most intellectual work by Solzhenitsyn to appear thus far. He not only displays the vast extent of his own familiarity with the great achievements of world culture, but he obviously expects from his audience a considerable awareness of these matters, from Dante's Divine Comedy to even more esoteric references and allusions, which include such figures, works and topics as Epicureanism, Beethoven's Seventeenth Sonata in D Minor, Goethe's Faust, Taoism, Mommsen's History of Rome, Thomas More's Utopia, Shakespeare's Richard III, Parsifal, the Holy Grail, Liszt's Étude in F Minor and Boethius's Consolation of Philosophy. The setting is a forced-labor scientific institute in a Moscow suburb, and consequently most of the characters are highly trained specialists in technical fields such as radio electronics, mathematics and electrical engineering, although one prisoner—Lev Rubin—is a philologist. Most of the language of the novel, therefore, is that of well-educated Russians, because the characters and the omniscient narrator usually express themselves in this idiom.

In addition to the prisoners, a large number of Soviet officials—from the highest levels (Stalin himself) to middle-echelon bureaucrats (government security officers, minor diplomats, scientific project supervisors) to the lowest strata of officialdom (penitentiary guards and prison laundry workers)—comprise another important group of characters who lend their peculiar linguistic flavor to the language of First Circle.

Two characters in particular—Dmitrij Sologdin and Spridon Egorov—have striking and unmistakable speech habits. Sologdin, an
engineer-designer, has something about him of an "indecently handsome ... Varangian knight"1 or Aleksandr Nevskij (although he sports a "French beard"). He attempts to rid his speech of all foreign borrowings—which he calls "bird words" (ptičie slova, p. 122)—and express himself only in words based on Slavic roots—or the "Language of Maximum Clarity" (Jazyk Predel'noj Jasnosti, p. 122). Unfortunately there are a few shortcomings in Super Slavophil's purification program. For one thing, Sologdin's rejection of borrowed terms sometimes results in ridiculous periphrasis, so that "obščij ogljad na puti podxoda" ("common view of the path of approach") is the phrase used by this twentieth century disciple of Admiral Šiškov to render metodika (method). Sologdinisms are sometimes clumsy—"usugublennoe somnenie" ("aggravated doubt") for skepticism (skepticism) and "bytijnoe vremja" ("been time") for istorija (history)—and often he must pause in his speech for extended periods before he can think of an appropriate Slavic-rooted equivalent of a borrowed term. Occasionally he nods and uses a word of foreign origin, for which he gives himself penalty marks. Worst of all, however, the "Language of Maximum Clarity" is sometimes just plain incomprehensible; it is most unlikely that anyone would guess the meaning of Sologdin's elaborate Slavicization of metodika, for example. At other times, Sologdin hits upon a felicitous—although not necessarily original—replacement, as when he uses the nearly forgotten word "oderžimec" (p. 339), which really has the same meaning as fanatik (fanatic).

The narrator deliberately plants a doubt about the seriousness of Sologdin's attempts to purge Russian of foreign elements (p. 122), and in moments of excitement the "dokūčnyj gidal'go" (p. 339) ("importunate hidalgo")—as Lev Rubin calls him—sometimes forgets himself

1Aleksandr I. Solženicyn, V Kruge Pervom (New York: Harper and Row, 1968). Details of Sologdin's physical appearance are found on pages 122, 125, 158 and 283. All references are to this edition of First Circle. ** * * indicates that ... appears in the original.
and uses a "bird word." On one occasion another prisoner, Gleb Neržin, reminds him that "sfera" is a borrowing and Sologdin quickly invents "ošarie" (p. 124) to render "sphere," but further on the word "deviz" (p. 358) ("heraldic motto") escapes the hidalgo's lips and goes "uncorrected," while it is the narrator who calls the reader's attention to the lapsus linguæ: "... u nego vyrvalos' inostrannoe slovo, no ono bylo rycarskoe." (p. 358.) ("... a foreign word escaped him, but it was a chivalric one.")

Sologdin is portrayed as a positive character: he has endured with fortitude his twelve years of imprisonment, he adheres to a Spartan code of behavior of his own devising, he confronts the chief of the šaraška's² technical operations and is frightened because he has just embarked on a bold and risky path, but he controls his fear and masters the situation; he is a Mensch. Nevertheless, Solže­nicyn's portrayal of this "čudak" (p. 122) ("eccentric") includes his faults--his haughtiness and undisguised condescension toward others, for example--and occasionally makes him a figure of fun because of his idiosyncrasies and the absurd excesses of his "Language of Maximum Clarity." There is something inept about the "Varangian's" attempts to adapt to the Slavic element of Russian culture. The strain of Sologdin's constant efforts to become assimilated has the undesired result of making him appear outlandishly different from his fellows.

A psychologist might wonder whether Solže­nicyn--consciously or otherwise--is satirizing through his portrait of Sologdin certain tendencies in himself toward Slavophilism and a recherché vocabulary. Whatever the case may be, Sologdin's personal quirks and the possibility that his "Language of Maximum Clarity" is an elaborate joke make him an attractive, interesting character and contribute to the dry, subtle

²Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn, The First Circle, trans. Thomas P. Whitney (New York: Bantam, 1969), p. ix: "Translator's Note: The word 'šarashka' as it occurs in this story derives from a Soviet slang expression meaning 'a sinister enterprise based on bluff or deceit.' By 1949, the time of the novel, it meant, particularly, a special scientific or technical institute staffed with prisoners . . ."
humor of First Circle.

In contrast to the aristocratic and intellectual Varangian Sologdin, Spiridon Egorov is an example of the Russian peasant. A comparison of their attitudes toward one another is made explicit when they meet in the yard of the šaraška and saw wood together:

Каждый из них осущевал своё явное превосходство над другим: Sologdin—потому, что знал теоретическую механику, сопротивление материалов и многое ещё наук, Spiridon—потому, что все вещи служили ему. Но Sologdin не скрывал своего презрения к дворнику, Spiridon же скрывал своё презрение к инженеру. (p. 121.)

(Each of them felt his obvious superiority over the other, Sologdin because he knew theoretical mechanics, the resistance of materials and many other sciences; Spiridon because all material things were obedient to him. But Sologdin did not hide his condescension toward the janitor; Spiridon hid his for the engineer.)

Spiridon's manner is not only shrewder than Sologdin's, but more tactful as well. The janitor is no less "Russian" than the engineer but is not at all self-conscious about it. This aspect of characterization, in Spiridon's case as in Sologdin's, is established primarily through the character's use of language. While Sologdin's language, however, is a deliberately idiosyncratic medium—a conscious idiolect, as it were—Spiridon simply speaks in his native dialect. Since he is the only character we meet who speaks almost entirely in the language of his own village, his manner of speaking is as striking as is Sologdin's within the context of the universe of First Circle. In contrast to Sologdin, Spiridon does not deliberately avoid the use of foreign words, although it happens that he seldom employs them, and when he does they are likely to be mispronounced—"период" for period (meaning "period," p. 350) and "президиум" for prezidium (meaning "presidium," p. 349)—or misused:

"... он иногда вворачивал (чаще—некстати) такие слова как 'принц', 'период' и 'аналогично'..." (p. 348.) ("... he sometimes stuck in ((more often than not, inappropriately)) such words as 'prince,' 'period,' and 'analogously...'") While such errors have their comic effect, they also demonstrate that the elemental Spiridon
never quite assimilates foreign borrowings. Paradoxically, although the concepts of nationality and patriotism appear to be unknown to Spiridon, and although his loyalty, love and faith are all associated with family rather than with nation—as the narrator remarks on page 352—he remains the representative of the "Russian folk" in First Circle.

Solženincyn's virtuoso command of all the levels of the Russian language is on brilliant display in this work, the only one thus far published to be designated a novel (roman) by the author himself. The broad spectrum of social and educational levels, occupations, philosophical viewpoints and character types makes the display possible and the mastery necessary. In First Circle Solženincyn is apparently aiming at the creation of a "polyphonic novel," in which "Every character becomes main when the action reverts to him." There are at least half a dozen characters who are examined at considerable length in First Circle and thus become temporarily "main." There is Lev Rubin—a Jewish intellectual, philologist and loyal Communist—who plays an important part in the plot of the novel. There is Iosif Stalin, depicted by Solženincyn as a sick, paranoid old man with a comic Georgian accent near the end of his reign (the novel takes place on the eve of the year 1950). Dmitrij Sologdin, the atavistic Varangian, is a complex and interesting character who figures in a number of important scenes. Among others who receive significant attention are the young diplomat Innokentij Volodin, the earthy janitor Spiridon Egorov and Anton Jakonov, Colonel of Engineers of the State Security Service, chief of operations at the Mavrino Institute and a former political prisoner; but none of these is the central character of First Circle. The one character who seems to generate more inter-
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est than any other and who emerges as the figure with the most numer­
ous and important links to all the actions and ideas of the novel is
Gleb Neržin. A contemplative, strong, moral character, the mathema­
tician Neržin not only occupies more of the narrative than any other
single character, but the novel ends with his being transported--
because through his refusal to work in cryptography he has angered
Jakovov--from the šaraška back to the labor camps. Other prisoners
are being transported, too, and they have behaved as courageously
as Gleb, but the relatively greater amount of attention that has been
focused on him in the course of the scant four days in which the events
of First Circle take place earns him the dominant place in the novel.
Perhaps it is impossible for a work of this length to hold together
without a central character; perhaps Solženicyn envisions the poly­
phonic novel as one in which a character who ultimately does come
to dominate the work nevertheless does not overwhelm it and frequent­
ly relinquishes his primacy to other characters. Whatever the auth­
or's intentions, Gleb Neržin is First Circle's hero, though a modest
one who often gives up his place for others.

First Circle begins with young diplomat Innokentij (a name
that is certainly not without significance) Volodin contemplating
and finally committing a fateful act--warning Dr. Dobroumov, an old
family physician, that he is the intended victim of a government-laid
trap. The thread of Innokentij's ill-fated actions, which eventually
becomes interwoven with the work of the Mavrino šaraška, is followed
throughout the considerable length (more than 500 pages in tiny Cyril­
lic type in the Harper and Row edition) of First Circle, but Volodin
is far from being the central character of the novel. He is important,
however, in providing both the initial impetus of the novel's plot
and a point of reference which helps to unite all the diverse actions
of the work. The second chapter, without any transition and with no
apparent connection with the events of the first, is set in the šara­
ška. In addition, while Chapter 1 is presented in a rather conven­
tional fashion by an omniscient narrator and with a few passages of
direct speech by the characters involved, Chapter 2 consists entirely of dialogue with no explanatory or "auxiliary" material from the author, so that everything about the setting and the characters must be gleaned from the short, rapid, jumbled exchanges between the "old" *zëks* (prison slang for "prisoners") and a group of new arrivals. The dramatic method of presentation is in striking contrast to the more conventional method of Chapter 1; this use of dialogue requires from the reader an effort of the imagination to fill in background, for he must use the clues provided by what is said in order to construct the setting, to discover the attitudes of the characters toward one another and to their situation, and in general to deduce from the dialogue the kind of background information which the narrator would provide in the more customary narrative method of representation. Although the reader is invited to "read between the lines" when the action is presented by dramatic means, he must remember, in his participation in the creation of the work, to bear in mind the limits established by the context.

The following excerpt from Chapter 1, with its narrator's commentary and Innokentij's unuttered thoughts in parentheses, provides the reader with supplementary information about the characters' emotions, tones of voice and inner reflections:

— Vidite * * * Vy menja ne znaete * * * Èto ne tak važno. Mne krajne neobxodimo. Pozovite, požalujsta, professora! (Mnogo ližnih slov i vsé iz-za prokljatoy vežlivosti!)
— No professor ne možet podxodit' i razgovarivat' so vsjakim neizvestnym čelovekom,— oskorbilas' damą. Ton ee byl takov, čto ona mogla sejčas povesit' trubku. (p. 7.)

("You see * * * You don't know me * * * That's not so important. It's extremely necessary for me. Please call the professor to the phone.

((Many superfluous words, and all out of damned politeness!))

(But the professor can't come and speak with every unknown person who calls." The woman sounded insulted.

(Her tone indicated she might hang up any minute.)

In contrast to the above are Chapter 2's first eight lines:
"Newcomers!"
"They've brought newcomers!"
"Where are you from, Comrades?"
"Friends, where are you from?"
"And what kinds of spots do you all have on your chests and hats?"
"That's where our numbers were. On our backs and knees, too. They ripped them off when they shipped us out of camp."
"What do you mean--numbers?!"

The reader must deduce from just the words and the hints given by punctuation what the situation, setting and atmosphere are in the Chapter 2 excerpt. The excitement and confusion of the newcomers' arrival is transmitted by the short, staccato speeches and the fact that the reader rarely learns who is speaking; the information--which characters in the work already know--that a new group of prisoners from harsher labor camps has come to the šaraška is conveyed by the content of those speeches. Innokentij Volodin and his plight seem totally divorced from this new milieu. No single character dominates Chapter 2 as Volodin does Chapter 1.

The use of unsupplemented dialogue makes the author's task difficult, for no narrational voice can then interpose itself between the characters and the reader to present interpretive material. On the other hand, this method of representation has a more direct impact than does the use of more conventional means of narration. Episodes presented in pure dialogue have the character of drama; they occur in the reader's "present" and are interpreted as raw data as they are taking place, while material related by a narrator usually appears to have occurred in the reader's "past" and therefore its meaning and perhaps even its consequences seem to have been already established before the reader perceives it. Solženicyn apparently appreciates the dramatic qualities of narration through di-
rect speech, for he uses it not only in Chapter 2 but in Chapters 7, 13 and 39 of First Circle, at the beginning of "An Incident," and in the first part of "For the Good of the Cause."

At the other extreme, there are long passages (in Chapters 6, 21, 35, 48, 61 and 68) in which there is little or no direct speech, and where almost everything is related by the omniscient narrator. Nevertheless, even in these chapters Solženitsyn finds the means to present direct and vivid views of the characters involved through passages of intermittent interior monologue based primarily on nesobstvenno-prjamaja reč'. The narrator will occasionally interrupt the interior monologue to present material which is not going on in the character's mind and then shift back to interior monologue. If the manner of narration cannot always be identified with complete certainty as nesobstvenno-prjamaja reč', at least it expresses the character's views empathically. In the following excerpt, the narrator refers to Major Adam Rojtman—Jakonov's deputy at the šaraška and a talented engineer—in the third person, but relates what are obviously the direct thoughts of the character:

Net, glavnaja obida dlja Rojtmana v tom, čto ty ot duši xočeš' byt' svoim, takim, kak vse,—a tebja ne'xotjat, ottalkivajut, govorjat: ty—čujoj. Ty—neprikajannyj. Ty—žid. (p. 374.)

(No, the chief injury for Rojtman was that you wanted with all your heart to belong, to be like everyone else. But you're not wanted, you're rejected. They say you're alien. You're unproven. You're a kike.)

Another passage begins in a fashion that could be just the narrator's voice then shifts to expressions that are clearly nesobstvenno prjamaja reč':

Kogda gruppu ljudej travjat za to, čto oni byli ran'še pritesniteljami, ili členami kasty, ili za ix političeskie vzgljady, ili za krug znakomstva,—vsegda est' razumnoe (ili psevdo-razumnoe?) obosnovanie. Vsegda znaeš', čto ty sam vybral svoj žrebij, čto ty mog i ne byt' v etoj gruppe. No nacional'nost? * * * (p. 374.)

(When a group of people are hounded because formerly they had been oppressors, or members of a caste, or for their poli-
tical views, or for their circle of acquaintances there was always a rational (or pseudo-rational?) basis. You always knew that you had chosen your own fate, that you could have elected not to be in that group. But nationality? ** **

The parenthetical question indicates an unresolved doubt occurring to the thinker of these thoughts; it would be inappropriate in the lines of an omniscient narrator. The ruptured rhetorical question at the end of the paragraph also has the character of inchoate thought or speech. It is clear, moreover, from the very next line of the novel that the paragraph above is a record of Rojtman's thought:

(Vnutrennj nočnoj sobesednik tut vozrazil Rojtmanu: no socproisxoždenija tože ne vybirali? A za nego gnali.) (p. 374.)

(Here an inner nocturnal opponent objected to Rojtman: But people didn't choose their social origins either, did they? And yet they were persecuted for them.)

Not only is the earlier passage a rendering of Rojtman's thoughts, but the parenthetical material suggests, moreover, that the Major's mind is split, so that what is presented here is more accurately interior dialogue than interior monologue. At any rate, they are the direct thoughts of the character, but recorded with references to Rojtman in the third person. The impact of this kind of narration can be as immediate as that of direct speech, while it allows the narrator to slip easily back and forth from the character's mind to the omniscient observer's commentary. This gives both great directness and flexibility to this chapter and to others presented in the same way.

Major Rojtman is a rather positive character, and so perhaps it is not surprising that the narrative section devoted to him is couched in positive terms. However, Solženicyn uses the same kind of empathic narration in chapters in which Stalin plays a central role, and the aging dictator is certainly the chief villain of First Circle. Although the fictionalized Stalin's own thoughts are represented through nesobstvenno-prjamaja reč' and he is making no genuine attempt to criticize his own faults, his cynicism, insensitive
cruelty and cowardice all permeate the words which are given as a record of his thoughts. In a passage that seems to imply a knowledge of Shakespeare that is undoubtedly out of character for the historical Stalin, the dictator is compared to Richard III and the nation to Lady Anne in a cynical simile intended to show how fickle is the common herd—in the Party Secretary's opinion. If the passage is to be taken as consisting of the very words of the character, then there is quite likely an implausibility; it is possible, however, in using nesobstvenno-prjamaJa reč' (especially to represent thoughts rather than utterances) for the author to select words as appropriate clothing for the thoughts of his character without positing them as the actual phraseology of the character. The Academy Grammar's definition acknowledges that, ultimately, the words in a passage of nesobstvenno-prjamaJa reč' are those of the narrator, not the character:

Poskol'ku nesobstvenno-prjamaJa reč' ne javljaetsja neposredstvennoj peredačej č'ej-to reči, a prinadležit reči avtora, rasskažčika, postol'ku v nej nel'zja videt' doslovno, kak v prjamoj reči, vosпроизведене cužого vyskazyvaniJa.

(Insofar as nesobstvenno-prjamaJa reč' is not a direct transcription of someone's speech but belongs to the speech of the author, the narrator, then one cannot view it as a literal reproduction of another's expression, as one can view direct speech.)

Another passage implies that Stalin's insensitivity makes him incapable of distinguishing between pity for others and self-pity:

A kogda tret'ego iulja pered mikrofonom peresoxsee gorlo

---

Deming Brown, "Cancer Ward and The First Circle," Slavic Review, XXVIII, No. 2 (June 1969), 305. Despite the apparent implausibility, it is Prof. Brown's opinion that Solženicyn's portrait of Stalin in First Circle is more reliable than TolstoJ's depiction of Napoleon in War and Peace.

ego s'zimalo straxom i sleznoj žalost'ju k sebe (potomu čto ne
byvaet serdec, sovsem ne sposobnyx k žalosti)—ne slučajno s
gub ego sorvalis' "brat'ja i sestry". (p. 104.)

(And on the third of July before the microphone when his
parched throat constricted with fear and tearful pity for him­
self ((for there are no hearts entirely incapable of pity)),
it was not by accident that the words "brothers and sisters"
were torn from his lips.)

This is a condemnation of Stalin—although conveyed uncon­
sciously by his own thoughts as related by the narrator--as long as
the reader comprehends the vast difference between pity for others
who are in extreme danger and the self-pity of a leader who has im­
periled himself and millions of others. The passage refers to Ger­
many's attack on Russia despite the nonagression pact that Stalin
had signed with Hitler and the trust that Russia's dictator had put
in Germany's:

I doverilsja on--odnomu tol'ko čeloveku, edinstvennomu
za vsju svoju polnuju nedoverija žizn'. Pered vsem mirom
čelovek etot byl tak rešitelen v druželjubii i vo vražebnosti,
on tak kruto razvurnula i, iz vragov, protjanul družeskuyu
ruku.

I Stalin poveril emu.
Čelovek etot byl—Adol'f Gitler. (p. 96.)

(And he had trusted only one person, a single person in his
whole life full of distrust. Before the whole world, this man
was as decisive in friendships as in enmity; he had turned
around so sharply and, from among enemies, had extended a friend­
ly hand.

(And Stalin had trusted him.
(That man was Adolph Hitler.)

Stalin relied so heavily on this agreement and friendship that
the Soviet Union was caught quite unprepared for war. Few readers
are likely to miss the irony, and thus Solženicyn succeeds in depict­
ing a character who exposes, nolens volens, his own villainy.

When focusing on a character, whether it be Stalin, Spiridon,
Innokentij or one of the many others, Solženicyn usually restricts
himself to viewing the world through only that character's eyes even
when not necessarily recording the direct speech or thoughts of the
figure in question. He does not maintain the distant, "objective"
stance that might be expected with omniscient narration, but rather
adopts—at least temporarily—the views of the figure he is limning,
not just sympathetically—as if agreeing with those views from the
outside—but empathically—as though feeling and believing them as
the character, and then expressing that empathy through the choice
of words and phrasing in the narrative. Merely sympathetic narra-
tion would express the narrator's understanding, as a discrete being,
of the situation, thoughts and emotions of another creature; it im-
plies that the narrator has felt and thought or would feel and think
the same way under similar circumstances. Empathic narration does
not imply that the narrator would react or behave in the same manner
as some other figure; rather, it erases the distinction between one
consciousness and another. There is extremely little likelihood that
Solženicyn would respond to the phenomenon of language as Stalin did,
yet this does not prevent the author from appearing to enter the mind
of the dictator and presenting his thoughts as if from within Stalin's
being. To oversimplify to some extent, sympathy is expressed in that
wince that most of us would exhibit on seeing another creature beaten;
we can understand what we would feel in such a situation. Empathy
would be to feel the other's pain with no distinction between self
and other. This is certainly the tone of the passage above regarding
pity. Nevertheless, this does not prevent Solženicyn from depicting
characters about whom strong moral judgements are made, as is seen in
the chapters directly concerned with Stalin. This is done through a
use of irony in which Solženicyn relies upon the reader to perceive,
behind the ostensibly favorable and empathic narration, the qualities
that give the character his moral definition. This judgment is only
implicit in what the narrator says, however; it is made explicit only
by the reader, so that such judgements are not, technically speaking,
included in the work, although Solženicyn undoubtedly expects them to
be made.

Solženicyn has a way of circling around a theme or topic in
an ever-decreasing spiral, covering first those aspects of the subject that lie at the periphery and then finally zeroing in on the essential point. This elaborate device is used in criticizing Stalin's style in First Circle. Early in the novel, Gleb Neržin expresses his criticism of Stalin's thoughts and his manner of presenting them:

--Ja ešče mal'čiškoj vzjalo ego knigi posle leninskix--ja čitat' ix ne mog. Posle bystrego, gorjačego, točnogo stilja--vdrug kakaja-to manaja kaša po tarelke. Ljubaja ego myal' ograbljaetsja, oglupljaetsja-- i same vožnoe zernyško on i sam ne zamečaat', kak terjaet. (p. 35.)

("When I was still a boy I took up his Stalin's books after Lenin's; I couldn't read them. After that swift, ardent, precise style--suddenly there's a plate of insipid porridge. His every thought becomes crude and stupid; he himself doesn't notice how he loses the most important kernel of an idea.")

Later Solženicyn provides examples of Stalin's style in a chapter which cleverly "recreates" the composition by the "Wisest of the Wisest" (one of the many honorific titles applied ironically to Stalin by Solženicyn in First Circle, but which were actually used during the "Cult of Personality" years) of his well-known work, Marxism and Problems of Linguistics:

(Eto možno buđet jarko, vyrazitel'no napisat' (on uže sidel i pisal): "Kakoj by jazyk sovetskix nacij my ne vzjali--rus- skij, ukraïinskij, belorusskij, uzbekskij, kazaxskij, gruzinskij, estonskij, latviskij, litovskij, moldavskij, tatarskij, azerbaij- džanskij, baškirskij, turkmenskij * * * (vot čert, s godami vse trudnee ostanavlivať'sja v perečisleniøjax. No nado li? Tak lučše v golovu vxođit čitatel'ju, emu i vozražat' ne xočetsja) * * * --každomu jasno, čto * * *" Nu, i tam čto-nibud', čto každomu jasno. (p. 89.)

(It would be possible to write all this down clearly and expressively ((he was already sitting and writing)): "Whichever language of the Soviet nations we take--Russian, Ukrainian, Belorussian, Uzbek, Kazakh, Georgian, Armenian, Estonian, Lat- vian, Lithuanian, Moldavian, Tartar, Azerbajdjanian, Bashkirian, Turkmen * * *") (Damn! As the years go by it's harder and harder to stop-enumerating things. But why stop? That way it gets into the reader's head better; he doesn't even feel like objecting.) "* * * it is clear to everyone that * * *" Well, now something that's clear to everyone.)
Later, Stalin continues to write:

"My perešli ot buržuaznogo individual'no-krest'janskogo stroja (nový termin polučilsja! i xorošij termin!) k socialističeskому kolkoznому".

I, postaviv, kak vse ljudi, točku, on podumal i dopisal: "stroju". Ėto byl ego ljubimyj stil', ešče odin udar po uže zabitomu gvozdju. S povtoreniem vseh slov ljubaja fraza vos-prinimalas' im kak-to ponjatnee. (p. 89.)

("We went from a bourgeois individual-peasant type structure ((A new term had turned up! And a good term!)) to a Socialist collective type."

(And, having written a period like all other people, he thought for a moment and added "structure." That was his favorite style; one more blow on an already driven nail. With the repetition of all its words any sentence is thereby apprehended more understandably somehow.)

Two chapters later, Stalin is once again alone in his study, not writing this time but thinking about death, and the following passage is given an empathic narration:

Davno bylo dokazano to, čto nado, a čto mešalo--to oprovergnuto. Dokazano bylo, čto materija ne uničtožaetsja i ne voznikaet. Dokazano bylo, čto vseelennoj net granic. Dokazano bylo, čto žizn' legko voznikaet v teplov okeane. Dokazano bylo, čto ne dokazat' čto Kristos byl. Dokazano bylo, čto vajakie iscelelrija, predskazanija i peredača myslej na rasstojanie--ba-buškiny skazki. (pp. 103-104.)

(Everything necessary had long ago been proved, and all hindrances had been refuted. It had been proved that matter is indestructible and is not created anew. It had been proved that the universe is limitless. It had been proved that life had arisen easily in the warm ocean. It had been proved that it was impossible to prove that Christ had existed. It had been proved that all miraculous cures, prophecies and thought transference were old wives' tales.)

The progression of the excerpts cited has been from Neržin's criticism of Stalin's style to an example of that style which bears out the criticism, then to a passage which, although not directly in his words, contains features of Stalin's manner of expression--deadly repetition of the same wearisome phrase and a long, dull catalogue of tired ideas--that Solženicyn has primed the reader to expect from the Immortal, as Iosif Vissarionovič is ironically yclept in the first line of Chapter 21 (p. 103).
It is readily seen that, when focusing his attention on the various characters in the novel, Solženicyn employs a form of *skaz*, especially when the characters have distinctive manners of expression which differ notably from literary Russian, as is true of Stalin's language. The narrator seems to become each character in turn, relating through empathic narration the thoughts and feelings of each figure in words and phrases so appropriate to the character in question as to amount to extended passages of *nesobstvenno-prjamaja reč*.

In the preceding discussion, the term "interior monologue" has been used several times in connection with a number of passages in which *nesobstvenno-prjamaja reč* plays an important role. The two concepts are very closely related. Interior monologue is a manner or narration intended to give the impression of the inner workings of a character's mind, whether the words themselves are transmitted through the medium of a narrator or by the character involved. In passages of *nesobstvenno-prjamaja reč* that present, through the narrator, the unuttered thoughts of a character while using a manner of expression appropriate to that character, the technique and impact are the same as those of interior monologue. In the section of *First Circle* devoted to Major Rojtman's nocturnal ruminations, one gets the impression of being presented with the raw, uncensored processes of the character's mind. While these thoughts are more high-
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This technique is distinguished by its effort to induce the reader to suspend disbelief; that is to forget for the moment that an author works behind the words and that the reader is a witness to discourse which, fictionally speaking, has no auditor. This is accomplished, in part, by an absence of speech-tags, an eschewing of punctuation and conventional rhetorical coherence, and a predominance of candor in subject matter.
ly organized and less sensational than material found in the interior monologues of James Joyce's Molly Bloom, they nevertheless afford the reader immediate access to Rojtman's mind, so that the character becomes swiftly and intimately known.

The use of nesobstvenno-prjamaa rec' to present interior monologues is an important feature of Solzenicyn's style. It is one of his most effective means of characterization. In this respect, at least, Solzenicyn finds himself in the company of the moderns, although generally he derives from nineteenth-century Russian realism. By portraying his characters directly "from within" rather than only by their external behavior or interaction with other characters, Solzenicyn has advanced the tradition to which he belongs and has added a new dimension to nesobstvenno-prjamaa rec'.

Only rarely does Solzenicyn step out from behind the masks of his characters, so that when he does, the impact is great. Near the end of Chapter 85, the author not only speaks out in his own voice, but he explicitly recognizes the existence of his reader by hurling an accusation at him:

Vy vse videli ego /the prisoner/ v etot moment na nasix zheleznodorozhnyx standax--no speili truslivoo potupit'sja, vernopodanno oturnut'sja, chtoby konvojnij lejtenant ne zapodozrel vas v chem ploxom i ne zaderzal by. (p. 492.)

(You have all seen him /the prisoner/ at such times at our railway stations, but you hurried cravenly to feign ignorance, to turn loyally away, so that the transport lieutenant would not suspect you of something bad and detain you.)

A few paragraphs later Solzenicyn utters a prayer for those prisoners who died in transit to the camps: "Pomjani, Gospodi, tex, kto ne doexal!" (p. 492.) ("Remember, O Lord, those who did not arrive!")

These direct manifestations of the author, and particularly his provocative address to the reader, are quite unexpected for the author has scarcely been evident up to this point since he has usually been cloaked in the personalities of his characters. The direct words of the author to the reader are very emotional, with some of
the shrillness that occasionally mars the works of Solženicyn in his more tendentious moments.

As Deming Brown observes in a review article, Solženicyn is very sparing in his use of figurative language and symbolism. Nevertheless there are a number of allegorical implications in the text—and, indeed, in the title—of *First Circle*. One can consider most of Solženicyn's works as microcosmic representations of the Soviet Union, so that in one instance the country is shown as a labor camp, in another as a remote and almost primitive village, in still another as a cancer ward and in *First Circle* as Hell. Solženicyn does not trap himself into rigidly following Dante's landscape, so there is no precise correspondence between the city of Moscow and any particular place on the map of the Inferno, but perhaps the world outside the šaraška's walls is roughly the Dark Wood of Error, since the chapter in which Innokentij enters the Lubjanka Prison is entitled "Abandon Hope, Ye Who Enter!" It is the šaraška itself that is specifically identified—although in Rubin's typical ironic tone—as Hell's "... best and highest circle... the first circle." (p. 11.)

In the *Inferno*, of course, the first circle is the place reserved for the sages of ancient times who lived before Christ had brought to earth the true faith that would permit men to enter Heaven. In Solženicyn's work it is an institution in which intellectuals and scientists are expected to work while enduring the physically mildest form of incarceration.

Many of the works other allusions to intellectual and aesthetic matters such as philosophy, music and literature (in addition to the references to Dante's *Divine Comedy* just mentioned) are associated with Lev Rubin. It is he who is responsible for the ironic burlesque of the *Igor* Tale which lampoons the monstrous distortions of the Soviet criminal code—distortions of the kind that brought many of the šaraška's inmates to prison in the first place. A kan-

---

garoo court composed of the \v{S}era\v{s}ka\'s inmates tries the twelfth-century prince and finds him guilty of treason against--of all things--the USSR. Chapter 50 ("Knjaz'-predatel'"--"The Traitor-Prince"), in which the mock trial takes place, is a masterful parody of Soviet legalese, a tribute to the anonymous author of the Igor' Tale and a bitter yet subtle commentary on the kind of corruption of justice that resulted in the imprisonment of many of those present.

Another ironical allegory--this one composed by Gleb Neržin and another prisoner, Andrej Potapov--concerns an imaginary visit by a "Mrs. R." (obviously Eleanor-Roosevelt) to the Butyrskaja Prison. One large cell and a handful of its inmates (the balance are hurriedly thrust into other already overcrowded quarters) are swiftly "Potemkinized" then selected ostensibly at random to be shown to the visiting humanitarian and her entourage. The visitor is duly impressed with the model prison and its well-cared-for if crude inmates, and, after being thoroughly deceived regarding the utterances of the prisoners and their warders, she is shown out. Just as swiftly as it was assembled, the false front is removed and conditions in the cell return to their previous squalid state. A statuette of Buddha is overlooked, however, and after all mementos of Mrs. R.'s visit are gone, the idol continues to smile mysteriously from its niche in the wall. While the intentions of the other allegorical touches in First Circle are quite clear and straightforward, the meaning of "Buddha's Smile" is a disconcerting puzzle. An optimist might interpret the chapter to mean that Buddha reminds the prisoners that things of the spirit cannot be taken from them and that they can maintain an inner freedom despite their imprisonment. On the other hand, the pessimist might say that the smiling little statue serves as a mocking reminder to the prisoners that they are damned and forgotten, for even their well-intentioned American visitors are convinced that the convicts of Butyrskaja are receiving better treatment than they deserve, so no one who could or would raise his voice
In protest is aware of the great injustices being done these men.

In all the allegorical passages of *First Circle* and, indeed, throughout most of the novel there is a strong note of irony which culminates in the novel's ending. The prisoners who are being transported from the ēaraška are herded into a truck which has the word for "meat" emblazoned in four languages on its sides. In addition to the bitter irony of the system's concealing its cruelty by referring to human beings as mere flesh, a foreign reporter sees the van traveling through the streets of Moscow and consequently concludes that the city is well-provisioned.

Despite this mockery of justice and humanitarianism, *First Circle* is not a novel of despair but of personal integrity and inner peace, which the transported prisoners gain through having lost everything, as the author paradoxically expresses it:

No v dušax ix byl mir,
Imi vladelo besstrašie ljudej, uterjavšix vse do konca,—
besstrašie, dostajuščeeaja trudno, no pročno. (p. 510.)

(But in their souls there was peace.
(Tey were possessed by the fearlessness of people who have lost absolutely everything, a fearlessness which is achieved with difficulty, but which lasts.)

The passage above is an echo of an idea uttered earlier by Bobynin, one of the prisoners being transported:

--Voobščě, pojmite i peredajte tam, komu nado vyše, čto
vy sil'ny liš' postol'ku, poskol'ku otbiraete u ljudej ne vse.
No čelovek, u kotorego vy otobrali vse—užе ne podvlasten vam,
on snova svoboden. (p. 78.)

("In general, understand this and pass it on to whom it may concern higher up: You are strong only as long as you do not deprive people of everything. But a man whom you have deprived of everything is not subject to you; he is free again.

The resonance of the later passage with the earlier one (a device which Solženicyn uses rather frequently in *First Circle*, e.g., the first hint on page 79 of a problem with a broken lathe and the full description, on pages 425-429, of the investigation of the matter; Rubin's evanescent suspicion on page 265 that a certain inmate
is an informer and the unmasking of that very man—who ironically refused to participate in such practices on the "outside" and partly for that reason is now in prison—as a stool-pigeon on page 415) causes reverberations which make the note of the prisoners' peace and fearlessness triumphant over the ironic one of the correspondent's false conclusion.
CHAPTER VII

Other Works

"Zaxar the Pouch"¹ is designated a short story (rasskaz), but it is rather like a combination character sketch and essay. There is a notable lack of the conventional plot devices of fiction; no complication is introduced into the narrative, nor is there a climax or resolution or denouement. Chiefly, "Zaxar the Pouch" provides a portrait of a simple but interesting man and decries the callous neglect of important historical monuments that Solženicyn finds characteristic of the present era in the Soviet Union.

The piece uses a narrational "we" (it is never really clear whether the narrator is giving an account of the experiences of others in addition to himself or is using an editorial "we") and presents what appears to be a factual account of a visit to Kulikovo Field, site of a famous battle between the Russians and the Tatars in the late 14th century. Solženicyn depicts—warts and all—Zaxar, the underpaid guardian of a neglected national monument and makes a patriotic appeal for greater attention to be paid to such shrines as Kulikovo and such people as Zaxar.

Using a device that was used frequently in the Nineteenth century, especially by Turgenev and Čexov, Solženicyn begins this work with a phrase which indicates that a group of friends has asked the narrator to relate a story. The tone is rather light:

Druz'ja moi, vy prosite rasskazat' čto-nibud' iz letnego

velosipednogo? Nu vot, esli neskučno, poslušajte o Pole Kulikovom.

(My friends, you want me to tell you something from my summer bicycle trip? Well, if you won't be bored, listen to this—about Kulikovo Field.)

When recalling the events of those two fateful days in September 1380, however, the narrator is appropriately solemn:

Gor'ka pravda istorii, no legče vyskazat' ee, čem tait': ne toľ'ko čerkesov i genuțezev privel Mamaj, ne toľ'ko litovcy s nim byli v sojuze, no i kniaz' rjazanskij Oleg. (I Olega tože ponjat' by nado: on zemlju svoju proxdnuju ne umel inače sbereč' ot tatar. Žgli ego zemlju pered tem za sem' let, za tri goda i za dva.) Dlja togo i perešli russkie čerez Don, čtoby Donom oščitit' svoju spinu ot svoix že, ot rjazancev ... (pp. 304-305.)

(Bitter is the truth of history, but it is easier to state it than to conceal it: Mamaj led not only the Circassians and the Genoans [members of an Italian colony in the Crimea]; not only the Lithuanians were in league with him, but also Oleg, Prince of Rjazan'. ((And Oleg must also be understood: he knew no other way to preserve his easily penetrable land from the Tatars. His land had been razed seven years and three years and two years before.)) And so the Russians crossed the Don in order to defend their backs from their own people, from the men of Rjazan', by means of the Don ...)

The passage above proceeds in stately fashion to explain in dignified phrases the situation of the Russians at Kulikovo Field. Zaxar, on the other hand, is described as a crude, tough brawler:

Smotritel' byl ražij mužik, pokoži otčasti i na razbojnika. (p. 306.)

(The watchman was a robust peasant, even looking somewhat like a brigand.)

From the fresh scratch on his cheek (p. 306) to his brusque treatment of visitors (p. 307) to the axe he carries in a special loop inside his coat (shades of Raskol'nikov! p. 314), Zaxar seems
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2Aleksandr Solženicyn, "Zaxar-Kalita," Sočinenija (Frankfurt/Main: Possev-Verlag, 1968), pp. 303-316. All further references to "Zaxar the Pouch" are from this edition.
a thoroughly unsavory character. But by the end of the tale the narrator has learned to admire and respect—perhaps even to love—Zaxar:

(He had spent the night in a hayrick in that penetrating cold! Why? What worry, what bonds could have compelled him?
(Everything mocking and condescending that we had thought about him the previous day fell from him. Rising from the rick on that frosty morning, he was no longer the Watchman but the Spirit of that Field, a kind of guardian faun who had never abandoned the place.)

Zaxar is another of Solženicyn's simple, earthy Russians. In this case he is crude and fault-ridden, but admirable nevertheless, because he preserves an inner sense of his own dignity, he yearns for justice and he is devoted to his task—the preservation of both the monument and spirit at Kulikovo Field.

In the very short story "The Right Hand,"³ the setting—a hospital in the Asian lands of the Soviet Union—and the characters—a former hero of the Revolution who has fallen on evil days, an exiled ex-prisoner, young doctors, nurses and other hospital personnel—are familiar to Solženicyn readers. These features of the work, in combination with the straightforward colloquial flavor of the language and the general indignant tone of the piece, point to the possibility that "The Right Hand" is a sketch for Cancer Ward. This notion is reinforced by details of striking similarity in the narratives of both works. Each work contains a scene in which one patient, exhausted by stomach cancer, supports a seriously ill comrade along a hospital

path; in both works there are incidents which expose the exasperating pettiness and red tape that stand in the way of kindness and compassion.

Another bit of circumstantial evidence suggesting that "The Right Hand" was not intended to stand in its present form as a single, complete work of fiction is the fact that it comes without a label indicating genre, while Solženicyn's other works are designated "short story," "novella," "novel," etc. Of course, when dealing with clandestinely produced copies (samizdat, as this kind of privately produced illegal publication is known back in the USSR), the loss of the author's indication of genre is perhaps the least of the changes that haste, carelessness and a host of other related factors can effect upon a work.

"The Right Hand" is narrated in the first person by a man whose personal history seems very similar to Kostoglotov's in Cancer Ward. Considerable attention is given his situation, moods and frame of mind. Then another character—a poor, sick former hero of the Revolution—is introduced, and his plight is examined. In so short a work, concentration upon both these pathetic figures seems to rob each of the reader's well-deserved sympathy.

There is nothing particularly striking about the language or methods of characterization in this rather tendentious tale, and generally it does not come up to the standards of most of Solženicyn's fiction. If, however, this work is actually a sketch or "mood piece," perhaps it is unjust to demand of it the artistic accomplishment of "An Incident" or "Matrena's Homestead." In any event, there is no mistaking Solženicyn's sincerity and his genuine sense of outrage at the shabby treatment accorded an old, dying hero by a callow bureaucratic cog.

Although not properly a part of the material under examination here, Solženicyn's études, sketches, plays and verse must be commented upon, for they comprise a significant, if minor—and in
some respects inferior—part of his works. In a yet unpublished paper, Richard Sheldon has called the fifteen pieces that comprise Solženi­
cyn's Etudes and Wee Stories \(^4\) "... superior to anything else he has
written."\(^5\) While one may quarrel with this judgement, it is clear
that this collection of short works, many of them reminiscent of
Turgenev's prose poems, contains much fine writing that is themat­
ically related—as Sheldon ably and convincingly demonstrates—to
Solženi­ cyn's better known works. As regards form, Sheldon points
out that in all but one piece a simple scene or ordinary event is
presented as a tableau referring to some positive value, then a con­
trasting allusion is made to some negative aspect of Soviet life,
thus heightening the positive and attractive qualities of the first
tableau. Sheldon considers a failure the one "poem"—"Beginning the
Day"—in which Solženi­ cyn reverses this usual order. The impact of
this étude (in which Solženi­ cyn compares a group's preparation for
exercise to preparation for prayer) would perhaps be lost if the
author attempted to maintain the same form.

The vignette entitled "Easter Procession of the Cross"\(^6\) de­
scribes a traditional religious ritual at a church in Peredelkino,
a village outside of Moscow which contains not only a residence of
the Patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church but a famous artists'
colony where Pasternak spent the last years of his life. A dichot­
omony is quickly established between believers and insolent young hooli­
gans who seem to be assigned to disrupt the proceedings.

\(^4\)Aleksandr I. Solženi­ cyn, "Etjudy i kroxotnye rasskazy,"
Grani, No. 56 (1964), I-XI.

\(^5\)Richard Sheldon, "Dissent With No Rhyme: The Etudes of
Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn," (unpublished study, Center for Advanced

\(^6\)Aleksandr I. Solženi­ cyn, "Pasxal'nyj krestnyj xod," Grani,
No. 71 (May 1969), I-XI.
Language contrast plays an important role in establishing the atmosphere of this work. At one extreme, we are told that the language of the young hooligans is crude and full of obscenities. In addition to that, the "spoilers" themselves are described by the narrator in terms that point out their coarseness:

...každyj četvertyj vypivši, každyj desjatyj p'jan, každyj vtoroj kurit, da i protivno kak kurit, prilepivši papirosu k nižnej gube.'

(.... every fourth one was tipsy, every tenth one was drunk, every other one was smoking, and smoking so disgustingly, the cigarette stuck to his lower lip.)

At the other extreme are words of solemnity, terms associated with the religious ritual that is taking place: the Resurrection of Christ, Christ's Passion, verger, chasuble, priest's stole, censer, etc. The difference in vocabulary emphasizes the differences between the two groups—to the advantage of the faithful.

A double irony operates to give the work its impact. Some of the women, because of their faith, remain unaware of the desecrations of the vandals, and so in effect there is no desecration for the faithful:

Desjat' žensčin pojut i idut spločennym stroem. Oni tak toržestvenny, budto yokrug krestjatsja, moljatsja, kajutsja, padajut y poklony. Eti žensčiny ne čyšat papirosnym dymom, ix uši zaveleny ot rugatel'stv, ix podosvy ne čuvstvujut, čto cerkovnyj dvor obratilsja v tancploščadku. (p. 236.)

(Ten women sing and walk in serried formation. They are as triumphant as though there were people all around crossing themselves, praying, repenting, bowing to the ground. These women do not smell the cigarette smoke, their ears are shielded against the obscenities, the soles of their feet do not sense that the churchyard has been turned into a dance floor.)

Alessandr I. Solżenicyn, "Pasxal'nyj krestnyj xod,"
Alessandr Solženicyn: Sobranie sočinenij v šesti tomah, 2d.ed. Frankfurt/Main: Possev-Verlag, 1971), V, 233-237. All further references to "Easter Procession" are to this edition.
Also important is the dim ray of hope expressed in the effect that the ritual has on those who have come only to mock, and this is the second irony of the work:

Tak načinaetsja podlinnyj krestnyj xod! Čto-to probralo i zverjat po obe storony, pritixli nemogo. (p. 236.)

(Thus begins an authentic Procession of the Cross! Something reached even the savage cubs along both sides and they became a little quieter.)

The author's outrage at the persecution of the faithful is expressed in the Biblical-sounding prophecy with which he concludes the piece:

Voietlnu: obernutsja kogda-nibud' i rastopčut nas vsem! I tex, kto natravil ix sjuda,--tože rastopčut! (p. 237.)

(Verily, they /the young hooligans/ will someday turn around and trample all of us!
(And those who loosed them to come here will be trampled also!)

"The Easter Procession of the Cross" is an example of Solženicyn's polemical bent. It is full of passionate indignation and entirely on the side of the underdog.

The play The Love-Girl and the Innocent takes place in a prison camp, and the stage directions call for the creation of an atmosphere which makes the audience feel that they are prisoners; guards are posted to watch the theater-goers and to shout at them as they file in and out between the acts. There is even a kind of play-within-the-play seen from a backstage viewpoint when the prisoners are putting on an evening's entertainment. Most of the significant action, however, takes place in a foundry which is the camp's chief industrial establishment.

The Russian title of this work is Olen' i šalasovka. Olen'

is literally "deer", but it is also a slang term meaning something on the order of "greenhorn," while šalašovka is derived from šalaš--"hut"--and refers to a woman prisoner who sleeps with prison officials or with male prisoners who occupy positions of some importance.

The language and action of this play are, as one would expect, crude and violent, as the "greenhorn" learns what to expect from real criminals, opportunistic prisoners and heartless prison officials, while the girl he loves guarantees his and her own survival by becoming a camp concubine.

Irony is a fundamental element of the play. A special curtain depicts the happy, healthy workers and smiling children of typical Soviet poster art, while the play itself portrays the misery of the camp laborers, some of them worked to death and at least one of them a mere teenager himself. Real criminals--thieves and cutthroats --receive better treatment than the so-called "politics," who are for the most part actually innocent, patriotic Soviet citizens. As though the universe has been reflected in a mirror of some house of horrors, virtue is punished and vice rewarded in the specular world of the labor camp.

The play Candle in the Wind, which bears the Biblical sub-title The Light Which Is in You,9 does not contain any novel or striking uses of the dramatic medium. It is the story of two scientists--both former prisoners who had been sentenced for a murder they did not commit--who develop a process for personality control based on the latest advances in cybernetics. Each man has been affected by his prison experiences in a different way, so that one has become a humanist who is repelled by the possible immoral uses to which the process might be put, while the other has become an egotistical opportunist who ignores all such questions. Once again, the language is quite varied, running the gamut from prison slang to literary Russian

---

to scientific jargon. The setting of Candle in the Wind represents a departure for Solzhenitsyn. The play takes place, not in Russia, but in a sort of generalized Western industrialized country. The names of the characters, e.g., Koriel, Radagajs, Terbol'm, Sinbar, are no clue to any specific nationality. Solzhenitsyn's apparent intention here is to make the events of this play of universal significance.

There is little that one can say at present about Solzhenitsyn's poetry; there is too little of it available in Russian. The verses attributed to him which appeared in the June 1964 issue of Grani are plaintive and emotional in tone. The poet prays that he not lose his mind in prison so that the lines he is composing secretly in his head might someday find public expression. The phrasing is elliptical and striking, couched in terms that range in level of diction from Biblical quotations to prison slang. The lines are generally iambic and end-stopped, varying from three to seven feet, although the great majority are pentameter or hexameter. Rhymes are usually exact and predominantly masculine, while the rhyme scheme mixes couplets, cross and closed rhyme in an apparently random pattern. The excerpts from an epic poem entitled Prussian Nights that appeared in German translation in Die Zeit in December 1969 are unaccompanied by any remarks concerning the prosodic or stylistic features of the original. The work, attributed to Solzhenitsyn, concerns World War II and asks who is really to blame for all the killing and for causing decent young men to become killers.

Of all Solzhenitsyn's "miscellaneous" writings, the Études and Wee Stories are generally the best, attaining—in the most outstanding

---

selections—the high standards of his finest prose fiction. The works are so short and compact that there cannot be any character development in them, but they are very moving in their lyricism and poetic evocation of nature and remarkable for the amount of feeling that Solženicyn has been able to compress within just a few lines.
CONCLUSION

One of the most striking elements of Solženicyn's style is his mastery of the use of words. Not only is his vocabulary huge, encompassing all levels of the language from the most erudite to the most obscure, humble dialect terms for everyday activities and ordinary objects, but he has an uncanny ability to select from his storehouse precisely the right words for each particular set of circumstances and characters in his works. Among the words Solženicyn uses—with justification and to good effect—are those obscenities which have been prudishly forbidden in the written language for too long. This knowledge of the language is not sterile, either; it amounts to more than the accumulation of extant linguistic items and an ability to use them, for Solženicyn is capable of creating new words as well. His neologisms range from the sublimity of liiv, xlest, vraznokap (see p. 35, Chapter II of this study) to the ridiculousness of some of Sologdin's inventions in First Circle (see pp. 87-88, Chapter VI).

Another important aspect of Solženicyn's style is his blend of various methods of narration. Sometimes he speaks as author (indeed, sometimes he shouts as the moralist Aleksandr Solženicyn!), sometimes he shifts from mask to mask of his characters, adopting new identities endlessly in subtle adaptations of nesobstvenno-prjamaja reč'. Frequently his characters "speak for themselves" in lengthy dialogues with no apparent help from the narrator.

Solženicyn displays a great virtuosity in assembling his words in a varied array of forms. His phrases sometimes take the form of short, pithy apothegms and sometimes they are long, periodic, Tolstojan sentences with numerous dependent clauses. Especially in Cancer Ward
and First Circle, he combines with great effectiveness short, epigrammatic passages with long lyric ones to create moving—but not sentimental—works.

The use of skaz is a basic element of Solženicyn's style closely related to those previously mentioned. His ability to adopt a distinctive, idiosyncratic manner of expression is great, and he has also introduced innovations in the form of mixed levels of skaz and a subtle meandering from skaz to literary Russian and back to skaz.

Tight concentration in time, place and incident seems to be another feature of Solženicyn's prose fiction, although here he appears to be branching out and extending at least the field and action (his latest work, August 1914, with its movement from the Ukraine to Prussia and back is evidence of that), but the span of time remains quite short in all his works so far. Nevertheless, he finds the means to expand all these areas through devices such as flash-back, reminiscence and anecdote so that there is no impression of narrowness or stagnation in his works.

Solženicyn's tales, short stories, novels, etc., often express powerful indignation. When his justifiable wrath and moral outrage are tempered by irony, wit and humor, the result is a moving depiction of man triumphant—barely!—in a world made hostile by other men, as in One Day or First Circle. Solženicyn also forges his strong feelings into his works by relating them organically to the narrative. In "Matrena's Homestead," for example, he makes his profound admiration of his heroine's righteousness moving and convincing by showing that righteousness in every humble task of Matrena's day as well as by contrasting it to the behavior of her neighbors. Only rarely does he fail to integrate his message and his art in this way.

Solženicyn is firmly within the tradition of Russian realism. His works are vitally connected with contemporary reality in settings
which he knows intimately, and the events depicted by him are frequently similar to those which he has experienced himself. In these respects he greatly resembles Turgenev, Dostoevskij and Tolstoj. There are no fantastic worlds of the imagination, no Utopias, in Solženicyn's works. The closest he comes to that kind of invention is in the setting of the play Candle in the Wind, but even there the locale is quite concrete and familiar, as it is intended to represent a modern industrialized nation.

Attention to detail, especially the recurrent observation of some aspect of a character's physical appearance, and the knack of selecting telling ones are other traits which display Solženicyn's roots in nineteenth-century Russian realism and particularly his similarity to Tolstoj. With each work that appears, it becomes ever more apparent that—in esthetic as well as in ethical terms—Tolstoj is the most important influence in Solženicyn's writing. His talent is so great and his intelligence so extensive, however, that the list of figures thought by various investigators to be reflected in his work reads like a catalogue of all the major (and some minor) Russian writers from the 1840's to the early 20th century: Turgenev, Dostoevskij, Tolstoj, Saltykov-Ščedrin, Leskov, Melnikov-Pečerskij, Čexov, Remizov, Bunin, Pilnjak, Prišvin, Babel', Klyčkov, and Makarenko do not exhaust the list. But as Deming Brown writes, "No one, however, has suggested that Solženicyn is an imitator. The most 'limiting' thing that could be said is that he is a synthesizer, who partakes of many influences and adds much that is his own."  

Everything that Solženicyn has received from the heritage of Russian literature (and it is significant that, despite his apparent familiarity with Western European literature—Goethe, Dante, More, Shakespeare, Oscar Wilde—no one has noted any influence from this direction on his writing) has been combined creatively to produce a

---

distinctive style. Starting with the precision of Tolstoj, the lyric sensitivity of Turgenev and the linguistic inventiveness of Leskov, Solženicyn weaves innovative uses of skaz, shifting narrational points of view, subtle utilization of nesobstvenno-prjamaja rečь and a firm grounding in his knowledge of setting and milieu into the rich and colorful tapestry of his remarkable works.

Many of Solženicyn's younger contemporaries, notably Jurij Nagibin, Vasilij Aksenov and Jurij Kazakov, have written fine prose fiction. Significantly, most of their work has been in the shorter genres. They shun the broader picture and avoid the kind of literature which involves depicting all of their society and milieu. Their works tend to explore the subtle, private moods and personal emotions of individuals rather than the great questions of the day which are of general interest to all readers as members of society at large. This tendency could be due to any number of causes, not the least of which is that the younger writers may find such a broad social concern unpalatable because it has for so long been part of the program of Socialistic Realism. But perhaps it is because these writers fear that in order to broaden their canvases they would have to embellish, prettify or even falsify the picture, so that rather than write dishonestly about such matters they prefer to remain silent. Perhaps the example of Solženicyn's courage and honesty will provide them with the spirit to depict, for the Sixties and Seventies, the more extended interaction of man and society, the conflict between the individual and the State, as Solženicyn has done for the Forties and Fifties. Many of the younger writers, especially Aksenov, seem to be interested in using the living language of ordinary Russians in their works. If they will add to this the imaginative use of shifting focus, multiple points of view and interesting narrational methods, then perhaps they will be able to create around the nucleus provided by Solženicyn another great age of Russian literature. Whatever others may do, however, Aleksandr Solženicyn has already created a number of
outstanding literary works which will assure him of a place among the great names of Russian literature.
The following excerpts regarding нособстvenno-prjamaJa рец (impersonal-direct speech) are taken from Grammatika russkogo jazyka, Vol. II, Part 2 (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1960), pp. 428-430:

... Нособстvenno-prjamaJa рец—это сложный прием передачи чужой реции, не только соединяющий в себе особенности прямой и косвенной речи, но и обладающий своими специфическими чертами. Так же, как прямая реци, нособстvenno-prjamая реци сохраняет, полноту и частичность, лексические, фразеологические и синтаксические особенности реции говорящего лица; но синтаксически она может совершенно не выделяться из авторской реции. С другой стороны, в нособстvenno-prjamaJь реции, так же как и в косвенной реции, выделяются правила замены личных форм местоимений и глаголов..., напр.: Брат был против: он сказал: "Как же, так я и согласился на это" (прямая рец'); Брат был против; он сказал, что не согласился на это (косвенная рец'); Брат был против. Как же, так он и согласился на это! (нособстvenno-prjamaJa рец')....

... В косвенной реции структура сложноподчиненного предложения, наличие в главном предложении глаголов реции или мысли отчетливо показывают, что автор выступает здесь только как персональная реция, безымянная; в нособстvenno-prjamaJь реции автор, по сути, не пересказывает реции или мысли своего персонажа, а говорит или думает за него. По своим функциям нособстvenno-prjamaJa реци ближе всего стоит к той разновидности косвенной реции, которая пересказывает, помимо содержания, также и некоторые лексические, фразеологические и синтаксические черты воспроизведенного высказывания. Не будучи связанна структурными особенностями косвенной реции, нособстvenno-prjamaJa рец способна полнее, точнее передать характерные особенности реции персонажа, в частности его эмоциональную окраску (восклицательные предложения, риторический вопрос и т. д.)...

... Impersonal-direct speech is a complex method of transmitting another's speech. It not only combines features of direct and indirect speech, but it has its own specific features also. Like direct speech, impersonal direct speech
preserves, in full or in part, the lexical, phraseological and syntactic features of the language of a speaking character, but syntactically it may be completely indistinguishable from the author's speech. On the other hand, in impersonal-direct speech just as in direct speech the rules of substitution of the personal forms of pronouns and verbs are maintained . . . , e.g.: Brother was against it. He said, "What! As if I would agree to that!" ((direct speech)); Brother was against it. He said that he would not agree to that. ((indirect speech)); Brother was against it. What! As if he would agree to that! ((impersonal-direct speech)). . . .

(. . . In indirect speech the structure of the subordinate clause and the presence in the main clause of verbs denoting speech or thought distinctly show that the author is acting only as a relayer of another's speech or thoughts. In impersonal-direct speech the author is not really transmitting the speech or thoughts of his character but is speaking or thinking for him. In its functions, impersonal-direct speech is closest of all to that variety of indirect speech which transmits, in addition to content, certain lexical, phraseological and syntactic features of the reproduced expression as well. Not being bound by the structural features of indirect speech, impersonal-direct speech is capable of more fully and precisely transmitting characteristic features of a character's speech, in particular its emotional coloring ((exclamations, rhetorical questions, etc.)) . . .)

"Represented speech," in English literary tradition, is similar in form and function to nesobstvenno-prjamaja reč'. The following passage is from A. A. Mendilow, Time and the Novel (London: Peter Nevill Ltd., 1952), p. 112:

There is an intermediate form between dialogue and narrative, represented speech:

He had left the letter upon the table in the Auberge—he would run for it, and be back with it in three minutes.

That she was very well: that there were many women deemed passable who were inferior to herself: that she was always thought comely; and comeliness, let her tell me, having not too much to lose as beauty had, would hold ** Nothing, in short, to be found fault with, though nothing—very engaging she doubted—was there, Clary?
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