

AMERICAN CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE  
SIXTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF SLAVISTS

VOLUME II

# SLAVISTIC PRINTINGS AND REPRINTINGS

81



1968

**MOUTON**

THE HAGUE • PARIS

AMERICAN CONTRIBUTIONS  
TO THE  
SIXTH INTERNATIONAL  
CONGRESS OF SLAVISTS

*Prague, 1968, August 7-13*

VOLUME II:  
LITERARY CONTRIBUTIONS

*edited by*

WILLIAM E. HARKINS

*Columbia University*



1968  
MOUTON  
THE HAGUE • PARIS

© Copyright 1968 in The Netherlands.  
Mouton & Co. N.V., Publishers, The Hague.

*No part of this book may be translated or reproduced in any form, by print, photo-print, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publishers.*

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOG CARD NUMBER: 68-57400

Printed in The Netherlands by Mouton & Co., Printers, The Hague.

## CONTENTS

<i>Robert Belknap</i>	
The Origins of Alëša Karamazov. . . . .	7
<i>Deming Brown</i>	
The <i>očerk</i> : Suggestions Toward a Redefinition . . . . .	29
<i>Edward J. Brown</i>	
Majakovskij's Poem <i>Čelovek</i> : The Problem of Interpretation . .	43
<i>William B. Edgerton</i>	
The Artist Turned Prophet: Leo Tolstoj After 1880. . . . .	61
<i>Т. Эрман</i>	
Рифма в поэзии славянских народов несколько заметок . .	87
<i>Zbigniew Folejewski</i>	
Uwagi o roli dialektyzmów w literaturze pięknej (Na podstawie materiałów z literatury polskiej i rosyjskiej) . . . . .	115
<i>Вильям Харкинс</i>	
К сравнению тематики и композиционной структуры русской и чешской народной баллады . . . . .	133
<i>Kenneth E. Harper</i>	
Dickens and Gogol's "Šinel" . . . . .	165
<i>Norman W. Ingham</i>	
The Limits of Secular Biography in Medieval Slavic Literature, Particularly Old Russian . . . . .	181

*Ante Kadić*

- Surrealists Versus Modernists in Serbian Literature . . . . . 201

*C. Nicholas Lee*

- Philosophy and Artistic Devices in the Historical Fiction of  
L. N. Tolstoj and M. A. Aldanov . . . . . 239

*Rufus W. Mathewson, Jr.*

- Intimations of Mortality in four Čexov Stories . . . . . 261

*Hugh McLean*

- Čexov's "V Ovrage": Six Antipodes . . . . . 285

*John Mersereau, Jr.*

- Orest Somov and the Illusion of Reality . . . . . 307

*Krystyna Pomorska*

- Skamandryci a poezja rosyjska początku XX wieku . . . . . 333

*Walter N. Vickery*

- On the Question of the Syntactic Structure of *Gavriiliada* and  
*Boris Godunov* . . . . . 355

*Thomas Winner*

- Some Remarks About the Style of Bunin's Early Prose . . . . . 369

## THE ORIGINS OF ALĚŠA KARAMAZOV

ROBERT BELKNAP

### I

Conforming to one of the standard formulas of his time, Dostoevskij often claimed not to invent, but to record what he presented in his fiction. Gončarov, although he had made much the same claim, once blamed Dostoevskij for using the word "photographic" to describe his work.<sup>1</sup> Most of the time, however, Dostoevskij emphasized that he was reproducing not merely the world that anybody might see better at first hand, but the world as it actually was, a truth not accessible without his special insights. Ascribing this superior vision to the care with which he anchored every detail in reality, Dostoevskij used two kinds of evidence to prove its superiority. The first evidence was the enthusiasm with which a large body of readers accepted his works as "true". A dozen decades of enthusiastic readers seem to leave one argument against this evidence: that those who used the word "true" about his works may have been responding not to any correspondence with any world, visible or not, but to a certain integrity of impact whose expression demands a word as heavily loaded with emotion as "true".

Dostoevskij's second proof of his "truth" is easier to test. He claimed to present truths which became evident to others only later, that is, to prophesy. When his opponents attacked *Crime and Punishment* and *The Possessed* as vicious and libelous impossibilities,<sup>2</sup> Dostoevskij showed a certain morbid glee in pointing to crimes that closely matched those described but occurred between the writing and the publication of the

<sup>1</sup> Н. К. Пиксанов (ред.), *Из архива Достоевского* (Москва-Ленинград, 1923), 20.

<sup>2</sup> *Современник*, февраль, 1866, "Современное обозрение", 276; Н. М., "Литературные и журнальные заметки", *Отечественные записки*, CCVI (1873), отдел II, 323-324.

novels.<sup>3</sup> He carried this faith in his insight or prophetic power over into everyday life. His wife mentions a servant whose son had not been heard from for two years and who wished to have a funeral mass sung for him in the superstitious hope of supernaturally summoning him. Dostoevskij urged her to avoid this sacrilege because her son would appear in two weeks anyway. He did.<sup>4</sup> On another occasion, Dostoevskij warned his wife that he had dreamed of his own son's suffering a dangerous fall, and not long afterward, the son collapsed and died of epilepsy. There is something Darwinian in such accounts of fulfilled prophecies. Unfulfilled ones tend to be forgotten. We do have, moreover, the statistical outcome of Dostoevskij's longest series of predictions. As a gambler, Dostoevskij confined himself to a game that depends entirely upon prediction, unlike "21", for example, at which even omniscience would not assure success if one always received bad cards. At roulette, Dostoevskij's faith in his predictive capacity conflicted notoriously with his performance.

These two kinds of evidence which Dostoevskij used to substantiate his claim to superior vision are therefore subject to doubts sufficient to warrant a closer inspection of the basis for his claim, the way he anchored his details in reality. Only one part of the reality Dostoevskij experienced can normally be recovered with enough exactitude to justify close comparison with his fictional use of it. This part is Dostoevskij's reading, the letters, journalism, and fiction which constituted such an important part of his experience. This paper will examine certain ways in which a single figure, Alëša Karamazov, is related to Dostoevskij's reading. Although the *Brothers Karamazov* notebooks are less complete than those for *The Raw Youth*, for example, a richer body of source studies, as well as fifty years of work on creative history, lie ready to be integrated into a description, systematization and explanation of the differences between this novel and the literary, sub-literary, and non-literary experiences out of which it emerged.

## II

The first paragraph of Chapter IV, Book One, of *The Brothers Karamazov* shows how Alëša's Mother and Father Zosima instilled the grace of God in him, and how Alëša's loving faith in his fellow men, coupled with a

<sup>3</sup> А. Ф. Кони, *Воспоминания о писателях* (Ленинград, 1965), 230; Ф. М. Достоевский, *Письма*, IV (Москва, 1959), 53.

<sup>4</sup> Л. П. Гроссман, *Семинарий по Достоевскому* (Москва-Петроград, 1922), 67.



capacity not to judge or fear or wonder, though not naively ignorant of faults, awakened in old Fëdor the first profound and sincere love he had ever known. The paragraph is organized chiastically, with Alëša's childhood recollection of his mother sandwiched between two discussions of his eccentricity, and these in turn between two discussions of his loving-kindness and religious involvement. Each half of this paragraph begins analytically, discussing the relation between Alëša's loving-kindness and his eccentricity, and ends narratively, presenting his actual experience with his parent:

### ТРЕТИЙ СЫН АЛЕША

Было ему тогда всего двадцать лет (брату его Ивану шел тогда двадцать четвертый год, а старшему их брату, Дмитрию — двадцать восьмой). Прежде всего объявляю, что этот юноша, Алеша, был вовсе не фанатик, и, по-моему по крайней мере, даже и не мистик вовсе. Заранее скажу мое полное мнение: был он просто ранний человеколюбец, и если ударился на монастырскую дорогу, то потому только, что в то время она одна поразила его и представила ему, так сказать, идеал исхода рвавшейся из мрака мирской злобы к свету любви души его. И поразила-то его эта дорога лишь потому, что на ней он встретил тогда необыкновенное, по его мнению, существо — нашего знаменитого монастырского старца Зосиму, к которому привязался всюю горячею первою любовью своего неутолимого сердца. Впрочем, я не спорю, что был он и тогда уже очень странен, начав даже с колыбели. Кстати, я уже упоминал про него, что, оставшись после матери всего лишь по четвертому году, он запомнил ее потом на всю жизнь, ее лицо, ее ласки, “точно как будто она стоит предо мной живая”. Такие воспоминания могут запоминаться (и это всем известно) даже и из более раннего возраста, даже с двухлетнего, но лишь выступая всю жизнь как бы светлыми точками из мрака, как бы вырванным уголком из огромной картины, которая вся погасла и исчезла, кроме этого только уголка. Так точно было и с ним: он запомнил один вечер, летний, тихий, отворенное окно, косые лучи заходящего солнца (косые-то лучи и запомнились всего более), в комнате в углу образ, пред ним зажженную лампадку, а пред образом на коленях рыдающую как в истерике, со взвизгиваниями и вскрикиваниями, мать свою, схватившую его в обе руки, обнявшую его крепко до боли и молящую за него богородицу, протягивающую его из объятий своих обеими руками к образу как бы под покров богородице ... и вдруг вбегает нянька и вырывает его у нее в испуге. Вот картина! Алеша запомнил в тот миг и лицо своей матери: он говорил, что оно было иступленное, но прекрасное, судя по тому, сколько мог он припомнить. Но он редко кому любил поверять это воспоминание. В детстве и юности он был мало экспансивен и даже мало разговорчив, но не от недоверия, не от робости или угрюмой нелюди-

мости, вовсе даже напротив, а от чего-то другого, от какой-то как бы внутренней заботы, собственно личной, до других не касавшейся, но столь для него важной, что он из-за нее как бы забывал других. Но людей он любил: он, казалось, всю жизнь жил, совершенно веря в людей, а между тем никто и никогда не считал его ни простячком, ни наивным человеком. Что-то было в нем, что говорило и внушало (да и всю жизнь потом), что он не хочет быть судьей людей, что он не захочет взять на себя осуждения и ни за что не осудит. Казалось даже, что он все допускал, нимало не осуждая, хотя часто очень горько грустя. Мало того, в этом смысле он до того дошел, что его никто не мог ни удивить, ни испугать, и это даже в самой ранней своей молодости. Являсь по двадцатому году к отцу, положительно в вертеп грязного разврата, он, целомудренный и чистый, лишь молча удалялся, когда глядеть было нестерпимо, но без малейшего вида презрения или осуждения кому бы то ни было. Отец же, бывший когда-то приживальщик, а потому человек чуткий и тонкий на обиду, сначала недоверчиво и угрюмо его встретивший ("много, дескать, молчит и много про себя рассуждает"), скоро кончил, однакоже, тем, что стал его ужасно часто обнимать и целовать, не далее как через две какие-нибудь недели, правда с пьяными слезами, в хмельной чувствительности, но видно, что полюбив его искренно и глубоко и так, как никогда, конечно, не удавалось такому, как он, никого любить ...<sup>5</sup>

This paragraph can be traced to so many sources that the first few sentences will bear separate examination. In English, they read as follows:

He was just twenty years old at the time (his brother Ivan was twenty-four, and their older brother Dmitri, twenty-eight). First of all, I shall state that this youth, Alëša, was not a fanatic at all, and in my opinion, at least, not even a mystic at all. I'll say my full opinion in advance: he was simply precocious in his love of people, and if he had set out on the monastic way, that was just because right then it was the only one that struck him, offering his heart what one might call the ideal of escape as it struggled out of the murk of worldly nastiness toward the light of love. And this way had caught his imagination just because at that moment upon it he encountered what he considered a rare being, our monastery's well-known elder, Zosima, to whom he bound himself with all the burning first love of his unjaded heart. Still, I do not dispute that he already was very strange at that time, and had been from his cradle on.

### III

One of the best-known sources for Alëša is Michael, the hero of the story "Mixail" by Dostoevskij's close friend Anna Korvin-Krukovskaja.

<sup>5</sup> Ф. М. Достоевский, *Полное собрание сочинений*, IX (Москва-Ленинград, 1926-30), 21. Further references to this edition will be in text, thus: (IX,21).

Dostoevskij read this story in 1864 and liked it well enough to print it on the first fifty-eight pages of his journal *Ėpoxa* for September of that year. The author's sister called attention to the parallel between Michael and AlĚša; "You know, it's really true!" said Fĕdor Mixajlovič, striking his hand against his forehead, "but, believe me, I had forgotten about Michael when I thought up my AlĚša. Still, couldn't I have had him in my mind unconsciously", he added after thinking a little.<sup>6</sup>

The story of Michael is simple. At the age of seven or eight, Michael is taken by his nurse from the country to Moscow to see his dying father, whose kind and frivolous brother and nephews comfort the boy. The nurse takes him to a moving church service in the Cathedral of the Assumption. Eleven years elapse, during which Michael abandons society, where he has been ill at ease, for the Trinity Monastery, to which another uncle of his has retired into sumptuous austerity after years of social success followed by political exile. Two years later, Michael guides a princess and her daughter about the monastery, discovers that they are family acquaintances, and becomes enchanted with the daughter. Two weeks later, he leaves the monastery, is kindly received by his uncle and cousins in Moscow; but a morbid shyness and revulsion at the bewildering pointlessness and corruptness of Moscow drive him back to the monastery. There months later, he dies apathetically of tuberculosis.

Little in the story is unique. The neglected child, the dying aristocrat, the visit to the church, the monastic exemplar, the gentlewoman travelling with her daughter, the country cousin's revulsion at city life, and the death from tuberculosis are standard subject matter for the nineteenth-century novel anywhere in Europe. The parallels, however, are important and numerous. AlĚša, like Michael, is specifically called a *čudak*,<sup>7</sup> an odd character, and has a curiously self-contained quality and a reluctance to handle everyday practicalities. He is the motherless son of a rich and pleasure-loving father who abandons him in childhood to the care of a faithful servant. Early exposures to religious symbols and emotions, coupled with a rather maidenly delicacy, lead him towards a monastery, where he enters the tutelage of a remarkable and holy man (in the early notes for *The Brothers Karamazov*, an uncle, as in "Mixail")<sup>8</sup> with a deep awareness of the ways of the world. In a later chapter when he reaches twenty, this novice is allowed by his mentor to leave the monastery and

<sup>6</sup> С. В. Ковалевская, *Воспоминания и письма* (Москва, 1961), 96.

<sup>7</sup> *Эпоха*, IX (сентябрь, 1864), 26.

<sup>8</sup> А. С. Долянин (ред.), *Ф. М. Достоевский, материалы и исследования* (Москва-Ленинград, 1935), 82.

be drawn to a capricious girl who has visited the monastery with her mother, but the temptations of the world do not corrupt him.

These parallels startled Dostoevskij, and it startles us also to see the subconscious operate in such a workmanlike way.

#### IV

To avoid positing such a methodical operation for the unconscious memory, it seems natural to look for a common source or for an intermediate source, a work influenced by "Mixail" which in turn influenced *The Brothers Karamazov*. Postponing consideration of common sources, I shall cite a book by Dostoevskij's favorite author which also contains the arrival of a sickly, other-worldly cousin in a great city house, the warm, but puzzled reception of him, the kind, vague, frivolous mother and the aggressive, attractive daughter, the gauche irresolution or sexual terror which isolates him from the girl he loves, his bewilderment in the streets of the great city, and his flight back to seclusion and sickness. This intermediate source is Dostoevskij's own *Idiot*, which he wrote less than four years after publishing "Mixail". If Michael is a source for Myškin and Myškin is a source for Alëša, the unconscious influence of Michael on Alëša is comprehensible. His own more recent and more powerful vision of the man too excellent for this world had simply eclipsed its sources in Dostoevskij's mind.

There can be no doubt that Myškin is a source for Alëša. The early notes for *The Brothers Karamazov* use the name "Idiot" for Alëša. Except for the monastic details, all the traits and experiences shared by Michael and Alëša also belong to Myškin. In addition to these, Alëša inherits Myškin's tendency to love and trust those around him, and to inspire answering love, and his related tendency not to notice insults. He also inherits Myškin's shamefacedness and chastity, which produce scenes with Lize Xoxlakova and Grušenka analogous to those with Aglaja Epančina and Nastasja Filipovna, whose roles in society and in the hero's life are also comparable in the two novels. Finally, Myškin's and Alëša's impracticality in financial matters and their disinterest in the problems of their own support inspire hospitality, helpfulness, and good humor in those around them. Even certain events in the novels are closely parallel. Both Myškin and Alëša befriend an outcast who is attacked and teased and pelted by the children of the town, and finally bring the children to love and help this pitiable creature, whose death

from tuberculosis draws all the children to the burial, where they shout, "Hurrah!" (VI, 69)

The differences between these two sources and AlĚša are rather more interesting than the similarities. Michael is not a mystic, but could be fairly called a fanatic; he is characterized as "one of those rare natures which proceed unwaveringly under the influence of an abstract idea, never giving way, to the end of their powers, and are broken irreparably",<sup>9</sup> and sometimes "there flashed through his mind a confused idea of distant wanderings in foreign lands and exploits in the name of Christ and all-forgiving love".<sup>10</sup> Myškin is not in any sense a fanatic, but does have basically mystical experiences before his epileptic fits or when it seems to him "that if I should walk straight on, walk a long time, and get up to that line, the very one where the sky meets the earth, then there would be the solution to it all, and you would see a new life straightaway a thousand times more powerful and tumultuous than ours. ..." (VI, 54)

We have seen that AlĚša is "not a fanatic at all, and in my opinion, at least, not even a mystic at all", and we know that this is no casual remark, because it occupies one of the most strategic positions in the chapter, and because Dostoevskij's early notes for the novel contain the phrase "by no means a fanatic: by no means a mystic".<sup>11</sup> Rhetorically, moreover, the statement is redundant, a litotes denying the opposite of the qualities ascribed to AlĚša in the next sentence.

Dostoevskij's ideological polemic offers the easiest explanation for such an emphatic denial of Myškin's and Michael's predicates. In a period when mysticism was suspect and fanaticism fashionable only in politics, Dostoevskij's opponents found it useful to label as mystics or fanatics all believers who could not be dismissed as hypocrites. Dostoevskij naturally used all available resources to emphasize his departure not only from his opponents, but from his own sources. This dialectical relation to his sources can be expressed in another way. Dostoevskij published "Mixail" for many reasons, including his fondness for the author, but it seems likely that she fascinated him in large part because of her writing, and because he shared her interest in certain problems. Among those that appear in "Mixail" were such technical problems as the creation of an unremarkable hero, about which Dostoevskij wrote a digression in *The Idiot*, and again at the start of *The Brothers Karamazov*; social questions, such as the uselessness of monasticism, moral questions, such

<sup>9</sup> *Эпоха*, IX (сентябрь, 1864), 13.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 21.

<sup>11</sup> А. С. Долинин (ред.), *op. cit.*, 84.

as the ineffectiveness of a really good man or the danger implicit in isolation from frivolity, and ethical questions, involving the tension between Christian love and sexual love. This collection of problems lies somewhere near the center of *The Idiot*, relating it to "Mixail" not as to a mere source of detail, nor yet dialectically, as *The Brothers Karamazov* seems to be, but rather in the manner of Zola's experimental novels. Drawing from "Mixail", from Dickens, Cervantes, Puškin, the Bible, a series of trials reported in the newspapers, and his own observations, Dostoevskij assembled the materials for a positively good man, set them to interact, and described the result in *The Idiot*. Having carried out this experiment, he turned to other problems, but continued to seek conditions where such a figure could be more positively effective. With children and the childlike, Myškin is effective in *The Idiot*, and Dostoevskij decided to write a novel about children. This idea dates back at least as far as the plan for the life of a great sinner, and the "teacher" plays a prominent part in the early notes for *The Possessed* and *The Raw Youth*.<sup>12</sup> A decisive moment in the genesis of Alëša may be the note Dostoevskij wrote to himself, "find out whether an Idiot can run a school".<sup>13</sup>

This polemical relation between Alëša and Myškin makes Alëša an assertion that Myškin's failures and passive successes are accidental and not generic, and that his active successes could hold a central position. Myškin's brief account of converting school children to love the dying Maria is thus expanded into the major episode of Iľjuša and the boys. Alëša and Myškin both foresense but cannot prevent the murder of a person close to them, but the failure drives Myškin out of the world and Alëša into it. In the same way, Myškin's loss of the fierce and beautiful kept woman to a strong and violently passionate rival splits into three separate episodes, one a success for Alëša, when his active love transforms Grušenka's apparently corrupting plan, while the other two, Grušenka's flight to her Polish lover and her rapprochement with Mitja completely exclude Alëša from the role of abandoned suitor or fiancé.

## V

Dostoevskij's desire to show the practical power of love in action explains more obviously how the plot and the rhetoric of *The Brothers Karamazov*

<sup>12</sup> Е. Н. Коншина (ред.), *Записные тетради Ф. М. Достоевского* (Москва-Ленинград, 1935), 47; Л. М. Розенблюм (ред.), *Ф. М. Достоевский в работе над романом "Подросток"*, *Литературное наследство* (Москва, 1965), 59.

<sup>13</sup> А. С. Долинин (ред.), *op. cit.*, 81.

developed than it explains how the imagery of the novel is related to its sources. The passage which follows the four sentences discussed so far is particularly rich in imagery, and it seems to be only incidentally related to Michael or Myškin:

I have already mentioned that although [Alěša] had lost his mother when only four, he remembered her from then on, for his whole life, her face, her caresses, "just as if she stood before me alive". Such recollections (as we all know) can be remembered from an even earlier age, even from two years, but only emerging all one's life as bright spots from the murk, as if they were corners torn from a great picture which is extinguished and lost except for just that corner. Just so it was with him: he remembered one quiet summer evening, an open window, the slanting beams of the setting sun (these slanting beams were what he most remembered), in a room, in the corner, an image, a lamp lighted before it, and before the image his mother, on her knees, sobbing as if in hysterics, shrieking and wailing, clasping him in both arms, embracing him tightly, till it hurt, and praying to the Virgin for him, stretching him from her embrace with both hands towards the image as if for the Virgin's protection. Suddenly the nurse runs in and snatches him from her in terror. There's the picture! In that instant Alěša also remembered his mother's face: he said it was ecstatic but beautiful, judging by as much as he could remember. But he seldom liked to confide this memory to anyone. (IX, 21)

Different parts of this passage have different sources. Various sources can be found even for the figure of the beautiful mother weeping in the slanting sunlight before an icon, and separated from her son. Dostoevskij's tendency to borrow from his own works, as noticed already with *The Idiot*, suggests that we look at Dostoevskij's recent journalistic work, since his journalism has been characterized as the chief workshop in which Dostoevskij's novels were initially wrought.<sup>14</sup> In *The Diary of a Writer* for April, 1876 (part iii of Chapter One) Dostoevskij introduced a weeping mother in a curiously revealing passage. As an example of the peasant benevolence and acuity in understanding human needs, he asks his readers,

Don't you remember how in Aksakov's *Family Chronicle* the mother tearfully begged the peasants to take her across the wide Volga to Kazan', to her sick child, across the thin ice, in the spring, when it had been several days since any one had dared to step on the ice, which crashed and washed out just a few hours after her crossing. Do you remember the charming description of this crossing, the way afterwards, when they had crossed, the peasants did not want to take any money, understanding that they had done it all because of the mother's tears and for the sake of our Jesus Christ. (XI, 257)

<sup>14</sup> В. Л. Комарович, "Фельетоны Достоевского" в книге Ю. Г. Оксмана, *Фельетоны сороковых годов* (Москва-Ленинград, 1930), 117.

The recent involvement in *The Diary of a Writer*, coupled with the parallel desperation, separation from the son, maternal tears suggest that this part of Dostoevskij's journal could not be unconnected with this description of Alěša. The relation to Aksakov, however, is complicated by the absence of any such passage in Aksakov's *Family Chronicle*.

Dostoevskij probably owned a copy of this memoir in the 1856 edition, which contains Aksakov's *Reminiscences* in the same volume,<sup>15</sup> and the *Reminiscences* contains the following passage:

The river Kama had not yet broken up, but had swelled and turned blue; the day before, they had carried the mail across on foot, but that night it had rained, and no one agreed to take my mother and her company across to the other side. My mother had to spend the night in Murzixa, dreading every moment's delay; she herself went from house to house through the village and begged the good people to help her, telling her woe and offering as recompense all that she had. Good and daring people were found, who understood a mother's heart, and promised her that if the rain stopped in the night and it froze just a bit in the morning, they would undertake to get her to the other side and accept what she offered for their labors. Till dawn my mother prayed, kneeling in the corner in front of the icon in the house where she was staying. ...

[When she had crossed the river] my mother gave a hundred rubles to those who had taken her, that is, half the money she had, but these honorable people did not want to take them; they took only ... [five rubles each]. In astonishment, they heard her glowing expressions of gratitude and benediction ... and promptly set out for home, because there was no time to delay: the river broke up the next day.<sup>16</sup>

The trivial error about the title is clearly not the only evidence that Dostoevskij was quoting from memory. He naturally shortened and simplified this passage, but he also changed it in a curiously systematic way. The wide Volga replaces its tributary the Kama. The last crossing shifts from the previous day to several days ago. Dostoevskij's river burst and washed out (*vzlomavšijsja i prošedšij*) just a few hours later, while Aksakov's broke up (*prošla*) the next day. Dostoevskij's peasants did not want to take any money; Aksakov's took five rubles each. Each of these changes amplifies the risk or the nobility of the peasants, supporting Dostoevskij's argument. The other changes lack such a polemical explanation, while those maternal tears which are so decisive in the peasants' decision actually tend to weaken his argument, since the instinctive comprehension of a brave mother's heart impresses us rather more than a surrender to woman's weapons, water drops.

<sup>15</sup> Л. П. Гроссман, *op. cit.*, 22.

<sup>16</sup> С. Т. Аксаков, *Собрание сочинений*, II (Москва, 1955), 36-37.



Emerging into Dostoevskij's memory, for no polemical reason, and not from the passage he was citing, these maternal tears seem more closely related to *The Brothers Karamazov* than to Aksakov. For the tears of AlĚša's mother are closely related to the tears of the believing woman who has also lost a son, the tears of a woman Ivan described, whose son has been hunted to death by dogs, the tears of the woman in Seville before Christ resurrects her child, the tears of Markel's and Iliuša's mothers at the deaths of their sons.

In *The Diary of a Writer*, then, are these proleptic tears? Did they come not from Aksakov, as Dostoevskij imagined, but from *The Brothers Karamazov*, or, to be more precise, from the collection of energies, ideas, images, and memories, that would generate *The Brothers Karamazov* three years later? If so, the obvious question remains, "Where did this weeping mother come from?" One answer is the book which Dostoevskij believed he was citing, Aksakov's *Family Chronicle*, where we have not a weeping mother, but an unfortunate wife, Praskovja Ivanovna Kurolesova, married, like AlĚša's mother, below her station, although technically within the gentry, to a depraved, vicious, shrewd, suddenly successful master; on one occasion "it was already light, and the sun was even up ... Praskovja Ivanovna knelt and tearfully prayed to a new church cross, which burned with the rising sun by the very windows of the house. ..." <sup>17</sup>

## VI

Even closer to *The Brothers Karamazov*, and perhaps not uninfluenced by the Aksakov passage, is Arkadij's description of his earliest memories in I, vi, 3 of the *Raw Youth*:

... something of your face remained in my heart my whole life, and besides that, remained the knowledge that you were my mother. I see that whole village as if in a dream, now, and I have even forgotten my nurse. ... I still remember the huge trees near the house, willows, I guess, then sometimes the strong light of the sun through the open windows, the fenced flower garden, the path, and you, Mother, I remember only at one moment, when they held communion in the local church, and you took me up to receive the sacrament and kiss the cup; it was summer, and a dove flew through across the dome, from window to window. ... Your face, or something about it, the expression, stayed so in my memory that five years later, in Moscow, I knew you right away. ... (VIII, 94)

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 127.

Here, not only the mother and child, the season, the window, the sunlight, the expression on her face, remembered all his life, but also the fact that she was separated from her son thereafter — all find echoes in *The Brothers Karamazov*. But certain components of this scene could not possibly have come from Aksakov, since Dostoevskij was already using them before Aksakov wrote, in *The Landlady*, I, i, where

The service had just ended; ... The rays of the setting sun streamed broadly down through the narrow window of the dome and lit one of the chapels with a sea of brilliance, but they kept weakening, and the blacker the gloom became, thickening under the vaults of the church, the more brightly shone the occasional gilded icons, bathed in the trembling glow of lamps and candles. In a fit of profoundly troubled pain, and somehow overwhelming feeling, Ordynov leaned against the wall in the darkest corner of the church and forgot himself for a moment. [Murin and Katerina entered. She] prostrated herself before the icon. The old man took the end of the cover hanging from the icon support, and covered her head. A stifled sobbing sounded through the church. ...

Two minutes later she raised her head and again the bright light of the lamps bathed her charming face. ... Tears boiled in her dark blue eyes. (I, 298-299)

Or in *Netočka Nezvanova*, whose second chapter begins:

My memories began very late, from my ninth year only. I do not know how everything that happened to me before that age left no clear impression I can now recall. But from the middle of my ninth year I recall everything exactly, day by day, uninterruptedly, as if everything that happened after that had occurred only yesterday. True, I can remember something earlier as if through a dream: the lamp always lighted in the dark corner by the old-fashioned icon; then, a horse once hit me on the street, and I was sick in bed for three months, as people told me later; also that during this sickness I once woke up at night beside Mother, sleeping together, and the way I suddenly was terrified of my sickbed nightmares, the silence of the night, the mice scraping in the corner, and how I trembled in terror all night. ... (II, 22-23)

Taken together, these two works of Dostoevskij's early period contain the essay on infantile memory, the summer evening, the quiet of the slanting rays of the setting sun, the lamplit icon in the corner, the beautiful woman kneeling before an icon, wailing hysterically. Sergej Durylin has traced the sequence of passages running through Dostoevskij's works where the slanting rays of sunlight appear, and V. G. Komarovič has linked these with the writings of the Utopian socialists and others.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>18</sup> С. Н. Дурылин, "Об одном символе у Достоевского", *Труды государственной академии художественных наук*, 1928; В. Г. Комарович, *Мировая гармония Достоевского* (Атены, 1924), 1-21.

## VII

The particular elements which are relevant to the scene in *The Brothers Karamazov* can perhaps also be traced to an author whom Dostoevskij claimed to have read completely, in Russian or in German, as a very young man, and whom he certainly admired deeply. E. T. A. Hoffmann's *Devil's Elixirs*, the story of a great sinner, parallels *The Brothers Karamazov* in its involvement with miracles, monasticism and the operation of grace in the world, and begins with the early recollection of Brother Medardus.<sup>19</sup> The first few pages of these recollections contain the following passages:

The first conscious impressions that dawn in my mind are of the monastery and the wonderful chapel of the Holy Linden. ... The stillness is broken only by the devout chanting of the priests who, together with the pilgrims, file past in long lines, swinging golden censers from which ascends the odour of sacrificial incense. ... The shining figures of saints and angels still smile down upon me. ... Yet my memory cannot possibly reach back so far, for my mother left that holy city after a year and a half. ...

My clear recollection of personal experience begins with the occasion when, on the journey home, my mother came to a Cistercian convent where the Abbess — by birth a princess — who had known my father, received her kindly. ...

Holding my mother's hand, I mounted the wide stone steps and entered the high, arched chamber adorned with paintings of the saints, where we found the Abbess. ... The bell sounded for vespers. The Abbess rose, and said to my mother: "Good lady, I regard your son as my protégé, and from now on I will provide for him".

My mother was unable to speak for emotion. Sobbing violently, she kissed the Abbess's hands.

Just as we were about to go out of the door, the Abbess came after us, lifted me up again and, carefully moving the Crucifix to one side, embraced me. As her burning tears fell on my brow, she cried:

"Franciscus — Be kind and good."

St. Bernard's day falls in August, and I cannot recall the weather ever proving unfavorable in that most favored of seasons; ... I remember beautifully the feelings summoned up in me by the singing of the "Gloria". ... It seemed as if the sky itself had opened at that moment above the altar, and the representations of the seraphim and cherubim on the walls were spreading their wings as if called to life by a divine miracle, and flapping them, flew through the shrine praising the Lord with song and wondrous lute-playing. Plunging into meditative contemplation of the service, my soul was carried off on the clouds of incense to a distant home.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>19</sup> Charles Passage, *Dostoevsky the Adapter* (Chapel Hill, 1953), 178.

<sup>20</sup> E. T. A. Hoffmann, *The Devil's Elixirs*, tr. Ronald Taylor (London, 1963), 4-10.

Hoffmann's presentation in the temple contains many elements which Dostoevskij used over and over, the little discussions of early recollections, from the second year of one's life, the peace of a monastery, silence, chanting, incense rising, holy images that glow, mother and child entering a holy place, church bells, hospitality and protection offered at the first encounter, maternal tears, a cross and a blessing, and the angels flying about the temple, if indeed these last are a source for that image in the *Raw Youth* which is at once closer to earth and closer to the absolute, the Dove.

### VIII

If the first description of Alëša incorporates works by Anna Kovalevskaja as transformed in *The Idiot*, by Aksakov, as transformed in the *Diary of a Writer*, and by Hoffmann, transformed many times, the over-determination demands a search for some redundancy or other organizing principle among the sources, as well as a search for some pattern of exclusion, abstraction, or condensation which makes the process work without overburdening Dostoevskij's text. To begin with, let us examine certain of Dostoevskij's omissions, since we have already considered the omission of Myškin's mysticism and Michael's fanaticism. The most obvious omission from all the sources named so far is their sickness. Even the chief non-literary source for Alëša, Dostoevskij's own son Alëša, died of a seizure, apparently epileptic, while still a child. Medardus and Myškin were similarly afflicted, although Medardus recovered, and Myškin did not disintegrate mentally and physically until his constitutional weakness was aggravated by his failure to prevent a crucial murder. Aksakov was a nervous and sickly child, and dangerously ill at the time his mother crossed the Kama, while Michael, long before his youthful death from tuberculosis has "a pale, feeble face, large, dark blue eyes. ... He seemed a fragile, feeble boy, in whom a natural meditateness and a habit-reinforced tendency toward daydreaming and fixation had undermined a constitution feeble to start with, and had stamped his early childhood with sickness and weakness."<sup>21</sup> Faithfulness to his sources would demand that Dostoevskij somehow connect all this disease and death with Alëša; but, polemically, Alëša is Dostoevskij's final attempt to divorce an essentially religious excellence from the weakness, asceticism, submissiveness, and general unfitness for this world

<sup>21</sup> *Эпоха*, IX (сентябрь, 1864), 7.

with which it was associated in the minds not only of his ideological enemies, but also of his romantic predecessors, who loved to attribute inspiration to a wound or a disease such as tuberculosis.

And indeed, the first physical description of Alěša Karamazov begins with a redundant litotes startlingly like the one at the start of his spiritual description discussed earlier in this paper: "It may be that some reader will think my young man was of a sickly, ecstatic, poorly developed nature, a pale daydreamer, a wasted, worn out person. On the contrary ..." (IX, 27). Here are the terms which could not be ascribed to Alěša, retaining what a mathematician would call their "absolute value", but entering the description with their sign changed. To the polemical explanation of that other redundant litotes, which denied Alěša's mysticism and fanaticism, we can now add this genetic one, that such a figure of speech permits the survival in negative form of terms in the sources which would otherwise be excluded by Dostoevskij's ideological goals. The polemical and the genetic explanation, taken together, mean that Dostoevskij's reluctance to ignore his sources or his goals sometimes led him into a polemic with his own sources.

This single litotes hardly seems commensurate with the long list of sicknesses and deaths just cited. But Alěša Karamazov does not exist alone. He is primarily a member of two groups, of the Karamazov family, and of those touched with the grace of God, and these two groups seem to act as Alěša's attic, the repositories for those attributes which he inherits but cannot use. Thus, within the family, Smerdjakov receives the epilepsy, and the failure to prevent a crucial murder precipitates Ivan's mental and physical disintegration. Among those touched with grace, Alěša's mother is weak and ecstatic, and dies young. Iljuša is sickly and hysterical and dies of tuberculosis as a child, while Zosima's brother Markel and the believing peasant's son Alěša die in childhood of unspecified causes, and Zosima himself is weak and dying at the time of the novel.

This redistribution of attributes into related characters, taken together with the transformation into figures of speech, allows Dostoevskij to borrow extensively without producing characters identical with their sources. It also offers a genetic explanation for certain of the "doubles" who have received so much attention in Dostoevskij criticism. The double contains the leftovers, or, in Zola's terms, the alternative ingredients that might have gone into the makeup of a given character if Dostoevskij's artistic and ideological goals had been different.

Alěša thus receives Myškin's and Medardus's capacity to inspire instant

hospitality, but Markel receives Myškin's love of birds. The scenes in Aksakov and *Netočka Nezvanova* may be sources for the household icons in the passage at hand, but the church scenes in Hoffmann, "Mixail", and *The Raw Youth* are not wasted, for Zosima's mother led him alone "into the Lord's temple, in Holy Week, to the Monday mass. The day was clear, and recollecting, now, I see anew exactly how the incense mounted from the censer, and silently rose, and from above in the dome through a narrow slit, there poured upon us in the church the divine rays, and, rising to them in waves, the incense seemed to melt among them" (IX, 287).

On the basis of this rather neat relationship between the description of Alěša and its sources, a pattern of conservation seems to emerge which might be phrased as follows: "In Dostoevskij's creative laboratory, literary matter is neither created nor destroyed." This law, of course, is nothing but a restatement of the claim ascribed to Dostoevskij in the first sentence of this paper, but it breaks down into two laws which make explicit the assumptions underlying most studies of realism.

The first law has been a materialist's commonplace for millennia. Lucretius,<sup>22</sup> Lear,<sup>23</sup> and Livingston Lowes,<sup>24</sup> for example, accepted it as a long-established truth that nothing comes out of nothing. This law makes explicit the assumption underlying my recurrent question, "Where did this come from?", as well as the limitations which the length and the aesthetic identity of a nineteenth-century novel impose on such an enquiry, making any effort to write *The Road to Skotoprigonevsk* as hopeless as the title.

The second law is the converse of the first: "Nothing returns to nothing", which again was old for Democritus<sup>25</sup> and fresh for Freud. For the verification of this law a nineteenth-century novel gives a more natural scope than a lyric. If Kublai Khan contains all of Bartram, the mechanisms of condensation are largely inaccessible. In one way or another, however, the description of Alěša does contain enough of the items in his sources to warrant further testing of this law, asking "What became of this item?" in any character or any passage which seems to be a source.

<sup>22</sup> *King Lear*, I, i, 90.

<sup>23</sup> *De rerum natura*, I, 150.

<sup>24</sup> John Livingston Lowes, *The Road to Xanadu* (New York, 1959), 44.

<sup>25</sup> Diogenes Laertius, *Lives and Opinions of the Philosophers*, IX, 44.

## IX

The first of these two conservation laws suggests a look at certain items in the passage being studied which have not yet been accounted for. The most striking of these is perhaps not a part of AlĚša's memory at all, but the simile which the narrator applies to it, "as if it was a corner torn from a vast picture which is altogether vanished and extinct except for just that corner". There are magnificent pictures in the Hoffmann passages, but not the image of a surviving fragment.

Dostoevskij once wrote, "In getting ready to write, I reread my previous observations in my notebooks, and besides that, reread all the correspondence I had with me."<sup>26</sup> If he reread his correspondence in this way while the plan for *The Brothers Karamazov* was crystallizing in his mind, in the spring and early summer of 1878, he came upon a letter which must have struck him when he first received it. The schoolteacher Vladimir Mixajlov, whom Dostoevskij had recently claimed to treasure and reread as a correspondent, had written this letter in response to Dostoevskij's request for materials about children for the new novel.<sup>27</sup> Mixajlov ends his long and dreary catalogue of personal, political, and pedagogical disasters with an apology for being too distraught to supply the accounts of children Dostoevskij wanted. One child, however, does appear in the letter, and in a way that echoed one of Dostoevskij's own haunting fears:<sup>28</sup>

It is a good thing that there are just two of us. We had a little son, but 13 years ago he died. And before me hangs a portrait of that lad, his whole four-year old figure. Kramskoj did it. Like a living being, he stands before me and gazes caressingly.<sup>29</sup> Yes, had you lived to the present, would you still have looked at me that way, my precious? God bless you. I see you not crippled by the latest quasi-pedagogical formula; from you, at 17, I hear no speeches striking for their bitterness; I see no conceit at your own ignorance, no sarcastic smile at a mushy-hearted old man. God bless you, my dear, glowing boy.<sup>30</sup> You do not see how badly your old folks are doing. Oh, we're tired, sinners that we are, how tired we are. But one must live. None of that. And live we will, we will!

Thank you, my dear Fědor Mixajlovič, for writing your warm note at just

<sup>26</sup> Ф. М. Достоевский, *Письма*, III (Москва, 1934), 225.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, IV, 7: "В вас чувствуете *своего* человека. ... Все Ваше письмо прочел раза три и (виноват) прочел и еще кой-кому, и еще кой-кому прочту."

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 181: "I saw Fedja and Lilja in a dream today and am worried that something may have happened to them. Oh, Anja, I think of them day and night."

<sup>29</sup> "Как живой стоит он передо мной и ласково смотрит."

<sup>30</sup> "Господь с тобою, мой дорогой, светлый мальчишка!"

such a moment. The response of a glowing heart worked healingly on my mood. I pulled myself together, and went to get myself photographed. Come, I thought, I'll send it to him. And I came out pretty grim, but still it came out so good that I've never had one like it taken before, or probably ever will. You have the only copy of its kind, since just after this print, the negative broke, and the second attempt is no good at all.<sup>31</sup>

If Dostoevskij reread this letter two or three months after receiving it, its impact would have become hideously intimate, for his own son Aleksei died unexpectedly on May 16, 1878. Both the Mixajlov letter and *The Brothers Karamazov* as a whole look back to a period thirteen years earlier, and the two boys are separated by death at the age of four from a loving and unfortunate parent, but remain linked by a lifelong memory. Neither boys completes his education or acquires the nasty concerns and ways of schoolboys, and both retain a child's association with light, love, caresses, and benediction. Both passages involve pictures. The Mixajlov passage begins with a portrait so fine that its subject "stands like a living being before me and gazes caressingly"; it ends with the destruction of a uniquely excellent picture except for one surviving print. The Dostoevskij passage ends with the compressed metaphor of a picture, has the candle-lit image of the Madonna at its heart, and begins with an extended simile comparing the surviving corner of a vast picture otherwise destroyed to the kind of memory which let Alëša see his mother "as if she were standing before me alive".

The differences between these pictures follow a pattern. In the Mixajlov letter, the parent and the child are both excellent persons, and the pictures are both excellently done. The first Dostoevskij picture is excellently done, but it has no subject matter at all; the second Dostoevskij picture shows an excellent parent and child, but has no quality of execution at all; and the third Dostoevskij picture is simply a name for the passage that precedes the word. In short, Mixajlov presents wholes here, pictures with physical substance, a maker whose mastery is described, a subject, and a usefulness (material, effective, formal, and final causes) while the first and last Dostoevskij pictures have none of the four Aristotelian causes, and the second has form and material existence, but no execution, and no use that is made explicit at this point.

If Dostoevskij transformed Mixajlov's two real pictures into figures of speech, and did the same thing with his benediction, drawing the simile "as if under the Virgin's protection" from the actual benediction "God

<sup>31</sup> Владимир Михайлов, письмо к Ф. М. Достоевскому, 2 апр., 1878 г., стр. 13. Рукопись хранится в Библиотеке имени Ленина, фонд 93, II, 6/102.



bless you, my dear glowing boy"; he also reversed the process and incarnated certain figures of speech into real things. This glow about the boy, for example, is a figurative epithet for Mixajlov's son, while in the Dostoevskij passage, the light is emitted by a real sun and real lamps. In the same way the word "caressingly" is a suppressed metaphor in Mixajlov, where it modifies the word "gazes", while in Dostoevskij, it is the real caress of a real mother. These movements into and out of the figurative have a symmetry comparable to that of the more obvious displacements, dead child and living parent replaced by dead parent and living child, or father separated from child grieves before separate pictures of child and father, while a mother holding a child weeps before the picture of a mother holding a child.

In the natural sciences, such symmetry would suggest the operation of still another conservation law, a conservation of figurativeness which might be stated as follows: "When items juxtaposed in the source are juxtaposed in the novel, the number of rhetorically subordinated items remains constant." If one item from the source is pushed back into a figure of speech, another figure of speech is incarnated into a presence in the novel.

## X

These three conservation laws have led us to relate most of the paragraphs at hand to written sources which have survived. Indeed, we seem to have rather more sources than are necessary. The comment which follows was written by Anna Grigor'evna Dostoevskij on her copy of *The Brothers Karamazov*, at the page this paper has been discussing: "Dostoevskij preserved such a recollection from the age of two, about how his mother took him to communion in their village church, and a pigeon flew through the church from one window to another."<sup>32</sup> The sources already discussed in this paper can be reconciled with this note by invoking deceit, coincidence or error. Dostoevskij loved to catch the imagination of attractive girls, recounting the fascinating terrors of epilepsy, Siberia, or impending execution, and Anna Grigor'evna was very young. To impress her, he may have simply appropriated a detail from the *Raw Youth* that had no biographical sources at all.

On the other hand, Dostoevskij's mother did die when he was young, apparently for non-literary reasons, and it is rather likely that she took

<sup>32</sup> Л. П. Гроссман, *op. cit.*, 66.

him to a church where he saw a pigeon. Such an experience would have made him more receptive to the literary passages already cited in this paper.

The possibility of error seems even more plausible than that of falsehood or coincidence. The half century since he was two, and the four decades since he had first read Hoffmann were quite enough to blur the boundary between fact and fiction, especially since, in either case, he had incorporated the recollection in his own fiction. In far less time, Dostoevskij claimed to have forgotten two-thirds of his own novels.<sup>33</sup> If some early personal experience did occur, the distinction between error and coincidence is a quantitative one, depending on the amount of overlap between Dostoevskij's experience and his reading. If this overlap is substantial, the character of the initial experience becomes immaterial, for the neatness of the symbolism, the melodramatic quality of the scene, and its usefulness in catching his wife's attention are simply due to that same force which shaped Dostoevskij's memories and his fiction when he recalled Aksakov's mother.

This elaborate over-determination jeopardizes the theory that literary matter is not destroyed. Even if Dostoevskij could relegate a substantial part of what he inherited to figures of speech or closely related characters, the multiplicity of sources will over-saturate a given passage unless they are related to one another so closely that this relationship itself demands an explanation. And as a matter of fact, all the passages cited are closely related, including the biographical episode, if it is accurate. Directly or indirectly, all these passages derive from a common source, the Bible. Mixajlov, Michael, Myškin, Medardus, Aksakov, and Aleksei Dostoevskij all are involved in Christian concerns and Christian imagery. Such scenes as Christ's presentation in the temple have pagan and Hebrew antecedents, dating to remotest antiquity of course, but for Dostoevskij and his sources, these were largely filtered through the New Testament.

The Christ figure not only generates the common features of Alëša's sources, it also underlies Alëša directly. Christ, for example, is the only source for Alëša who is physically healthy. Alëša's loving-kindness, his sanctification by his mother, his inner involvement, his reluctance to judge, his freedom from fear and wonder, his chastity and his capacity to inspire answering love, can all be traced directly to the gospel as well as to the various intermediate sources which were consciously and often nostalgically using the biblical imagery of sunlight, the maternal tears,

<sup>33</sup> Ф. М. Достоевский, *Письма*, IV (Москва, 1959), 14.

the embrace, and benediction, the presentation in the temple, the paintings, candles, prayer, incense, and ecstasy.

The richness of Dostoevskij's sources (and I know that this paper does not exhaust them) is therefore possible because of a common source which shaped Dostoevskij's intent, literary and polemical, the Bible. This source reached him through his reading of the text, his experience of the liturgy, his reading of books influenced by those books, etc. At this point it becomes clear that the patterns of change and conservation presented in this paper do not operate consciously or unconsciously on independently existing entities, but act as criteria for the selection of those materials whose accretion produced the first description of AlĚša. In this paragraph, Dostoevskij gathered a body of memories, sometimes distorted toward the melodramatic, but always able to be condensed, combined, and incorporated into the novel without inventing new materials, abandoning parts of passages he used, or altering the level of figurative expression. In this particular paragraph, Dostoevskij's goals were closely related to the Bible, and so were his sources. It would be interesting to test this formulation on other passages, related to other books, and perhaps, if some real life experience of Dostoevskij's could be reconstructed as accurately as can his reading, to learn whether in general Dostoevskij did record and not create, and whether as he claimed, he often reached beyond his immediate sources to the truth behind them, as he reached behind his own childhood, and Aksakov's, his own son's, and Mixajlov's, behind Medardus and Michael, and all the times he had reworked these in his memory and writing, to their generating point, which coincided with the point he wished to make here in his novel — the presentation in the temple, with all its implications for God and church, and man.



## THE OČERK: SUGGESTIONS TOWARD A REDEFINITION

DEMING BROWN

The *očerk* has been employed as a genre of Russian *xudožestvennaja literatura* for nearly two centuries. Among the earliest works that are generally designated in this category are Radiščev's *Putešestvie iz Peterburga v Moskvu* and Karamzin's *Pis'ma russkogo putešestvennika*. Nearly every prominent Russian writer of prose fiction in the nineteenth century also wrote works that are usually classified as *očerki*. In the twentieth century, and particularly in the Soviet period, the *očerk* has played an increasingly major role in Russian letters.

At present the *očerk* is gaining added prominence because of the rapid development of documentary prose in Soviet Russian literature — the trend toward the displacement of fiction by non-fiction, or toward the infusion in fictional works of increasing elements of verifiable fact. (It is not a function of the present study to attempt to explain this trend; one merely notes that it exists, for complex historical reasons, not only in the Soviet Union but in other countries as well.)<sup>1</sup> As the mass of documentary literature grows, and as its variety increases, it would appear that the term *očerk* is being made to expand so as to embrace an ever-widening range of works, of both past and present. It would seem, in fact, that the label *očerk* has now been applied, without being seriously challenged, to nearly every kind of prose that is not the purest fiction.

There seems to be a certain amount of pragmatic agreement — perhaps merely a “gentlemen's agreement” — as to just what an *očerk* is. It is freely discussed as a genre, and works are liberally and off-handedly labeled as such. In the interest of precision, it is true, attempts have been made to break down the category into various sub-groups: according to topics (*kolxoznyj očerk*, *voennyj očerk*, etc.), social function (*problemnyj*

<sup>1</sup> Mikloš Sabolči, “Spory vokrug dokumental'noj literatury”, *Inostrannaja literatura*, No. 4 (1965), 211-214.

*očerk*), or proximity to other genres (*očerk-rasskaz*, *očerk-dnevnik*, *očerk-memuary*, etc.) Most of these efforts, however, have been confined to the classification of subject matter and ideological content. As a formal entity, the *očerk* remains largely undefined. As a consequence, literary scholars in recent years have become increasingly conscious of the need for the discussion of the intrinsic nature of this genre.

A major difficulty in approaching such a definition is the fact that other literatures do not seem to have developed terminological problems that are the exact counterpart of this one. Western literatures seem to be relatively satisfied with such omnibus terms as "essay", "article" and "story". While students of Russian literature, in recent times, have discussed the theory of the *očerk* at length, those in the West who comment on the documentary qualities in literature do not seem compelled to evolve a noun that designates any specific documentary genre including the properties that are attributed to the *očerk*.

The boundaries between literary genres must always be vague; none is exclusive or clearly limited, and all impinge upon or blend into others at times. It can even be argued that overly zealous attempts to be definitive can degenerate into exercises in hairsplitting and, furthermore, can lead to rigidly dogmatic literary appraisals:

Daže matematikam v samyx tonkix razdelax svoej nauki prixoditsja izbegat' odnoznačnyx rešenij. Čto že do *formul* literaturovedčeskix žanrov, to oni neizmenno prevraščajutsja v dogmu, v prokrustovo lože dlja ljubogo novatorskogo proizvedenija. Kritiki, storonniki iščerpjvajuščix neistoričeskix formul, vzyvaja k "zakonom žanra", trebujut potom amputacii živyx členov xudožestvennogo organizma, kotorye ne ukladyvajutsja v privyčnuju dlja nix normal'. Inače govorja, pogonja za definicijami do dobra ne dovodit, a ee storonniki vystupajut obyčno kak konservatory.<sup>2</sup>

Even if one agrees with these remarks, the value and importance of precise literary terminology is still self-evident. The striving for exactitude in literary matters is just as legitimate as it is in all disciplines. And the danger of establishing excessively rigid categories for genres is no greater than that of excessively loose terminology. *Očerk*, as a term, has now been stretched near to the breaking point and is in danger of becoming simply a receptacle for containing modes of literature of any documentary nature whatever.

The most common approach to defining the *očerk* has been through the topics with which it deals, its social function, and the purpose which

<sup>2</sup> Vladimir Kantorovič, "Polemičeskie mysli ob očerke", *Voprosy literatury*, No. 12 (1966), 41.

the author seemed to have in mind in writing it. It has been generally agreed that the *očerk* is concerned with public life, matters of social or popular interest. In Soviet Russian literature there has been special emphasis on the publicistic quality of the *očerk* — its social *operativnost'*. Mark Ščeglov has characterized the *očerk* as an instrument of *vospitanie* and *agitacija*, one which “priobretaet osobuju važnost' v periody bol'six obščestvennyx dviženij ... .”<sup>3</sup> He has stressed its *exploratory* role as “peredovogo otrjada, avangarda literatury, otkryvajuščego dlja “bol'six” xudožestvennyx zamyslov novye temy, novye storony žizni”.<sup>4</sup> Others have pointed out that *očerki* tend to be written in times of swiftly-developing public events and that they give the author an opportunity to react quickly by expressing his thoughts and his attitude to what is happening about him directly and without disguise. It is argued that the *očerk* enables a writer to concern himself with current topics of public interest by uniting *narrative* with *analysis*, and by combining the “xudožestvennyj” with the “naučno-poznavatel'nyj”, in terms of immediacy and without the necessity of significant aesthetic distance between the author and his subject.

All of these things would seem to be true of many *očerki*, and particularly of those which have been written in the Soviet period. It is questionable, however, whether the criterion of social or public interest is sufficiently stable and clear to provide a basis for definition, since such interest is a relative matter: the criterion is often subjective, depending on the views of the definer. Furthermore, discussion of agitational and educational qualities merely shows how the *očerk* is currently employed, and while it indicates a trend of usage it contributes little toward a definition of the genre. For example, the *očerk* is by no means the only kind of writing that can provide an immediate, opinionated, hortatory response to public events. This can be provided in a lyric poem, or even in a novel. Finally, there is no intrinsic reason why *očerki* should have the trait of immediacy; many *očerki* have been written in tranquillity. The conditions of writing, moreover, have little to do with the *formal* traits of the genre. Whatever the distinguishing features of the *očerk* may be, they are largely independent of the themes, topics, purposes, and conditions of writing. In seeking a definition, one must look to the narrative means which the *očerk* employs.

The *očerk* has long been regarded as the property of both the fields of literature and of journalism; it is considered both an art and a craft.

<sup>3</sup> Mark Ščeglov, *Literaturno-kritičeskie stat'i* (Moscow, 1958), 9.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 18.

A reason for considering the *očerk* as belonging to journalism is that most *očerki* appear in newspapers and periodicals, and relatively few of them ultimately appear in book form. Moreover, the vast majority of works that are labeled as *očerki* neither claim nor merit consideration as *xudožestvennaja literatura*. But since many of them *do* claim this quality, it is necessary to identify the element that differentiates a “*xudožestvennyj očerk*” from one that is *not* “*xudožestvennyj*”.

A few additional factors must be considered, however, before the attempt is made. First, it is necessary to dismiss the notion that the *očerk* is a “low form” of literature, or that, as a “literature of fact” it does not belong in the realm of *xudožestvennaja literatura*. The very term *očerk* can suggest, erroneously, something brief, sketchy, preliminary and insignificant. But even the most cursory examination of famous works that have been given this appellation shows that the term has long since departed from the meaning suggested by the verb (*očerčivat*) to which it relates.

The widespread use of the term *očerk* makes necessary yet another minor definition for the purposes of the present argument. Critics have frequently applied the term *očerk-reportaž* to works of a journalistic nature which they do not consider to be “*xudožestvennyj*”. Some would call a work of this type a *stat’ja*. In the present discussion, *očerk-reportaž* will be included under the term *stat’ja*.

Another distinction is necessary because the term *xudožestvennyj očerk* has frequently been bestowed in an honorific sense on a *stat’ja* which the bestower happens to admire. There is a tendency to call a work “*xudožestvennyj*” simply because it is written well. The distinction between a *stat’ja* (which may, indeed, be written with great skill and profundity) and a *xudožestvennyj očerk* is not one of degree of excellence but of intrinsic nature.

For the purposes of the present discussion, also, one must regard as irrelevant the widespread notion that the *xudožestvennyj očerk* is some kind of “connecting link between publicistic and *xudožestvennaya literatura*”, a “special artistic-publicistic alloy” or a “special, hybrid artistic-publicistic genre”. There can be no questioning the fact, of course, that the *xudožestvennyj očerk* does have both artistic and publicistic qualities, but so also do many other forms of literature. The oft-quoted dictum of Maksim Gor’kij that the *očerk* is “between *rasskaz* and *issledovanie*” is likewise of little assistance in this effort.

Yet another erroneous distinction suggests that whereas the *stat’ja* is designed to make the reader *understand* a collection of facts and their



relationships, a *xudožestvennyj očerk* contains, in addition, devices designed to work on the *feelings* of the reader, to arouse his emotions. This distinction would limit the *stat'ja* to little more than the direct reportage of facts, and would seem to endow the *očerk* with a monopoly on rhetoric, and for this reason is patently inapplicable.

The above-mentioned difficulties would seem to stem from the fact that the *očerk* and the *stat'ja* have one main characteristic in common: both serve to bring *facts* before the reader. What they do *not* seem to have in common is the element of fiction. For while a *stat'ja* may contain expressions of opinion, and may arrange facts in a strategic manner, it must still stick to the facts. It would seem to follow, then, that if a work contains invented material, that is, if it adds anything fictional (no matter how "realistic" it may be), it is not a *stat'ja* but a *xudožestvennyj očerk*. The *očerk* is similar to the *stat'ja*, then, in that it has a documentary, factual quality, but unlike the *stat'ja* in that it contains at least some fictional elements.

Although there is general agreement that an *očerk* contains both fact and fiction, there is considerable difference of opinion as to the proportion of fiction that can be included. Efim Doroš, one of the most distinguished contemporary writers of *očerki*, has insisted:

Ja xoču liš' skazat', što vot uže dvenadcat' let "pišu s natury" — i ljudej, i predmety obstanovki, i prirodu, — ničego ne pridumyvaja i ne dodumyvaja, ne privnosja iz uvidennogo v drugom meste, ne ispytyvaja v ètom nuždy. Ja tol'ko izmenjaju imena i nazvanija, vybrasyvaju vse, na moj vzgljad, slučajnoe da inogda, sorazmernosti radi, perestavljaju sobytija.<sup>5</sup>

On the other hand, Ščeglov, who has argued that in an *očerk*, "soderžaniem javljaetsja nečto dejstvitel'no byvšee, slučivšeesja, što my uvideli by i sami, okazavšis' v odnix obstojatel'stvax s avtorom, podtverždaemoe očevidcami, dokumentami i t.d.", nevertheless contends that "polnocennyj xudožestvennyj očerk, s čelovekom v centre, nevozmožen bez tvorčeskogo vymysla, bez učastija fantasii avtora", and added that the author can even "vvodit' vymyšlennye èpizody, sceny, razgovory ...".<sup>6</sup> Clearly a major problem, both in writing the *očerk* and defining it, is that of determining the appropriate proportion of fact and *vymysel*. The documentary nature of an *očerk* leads the reader to assume that the work is based on fact. And yet *dokumental'nost'* can easily be used to perpetuate myths and untruths: its very aura of "realism" can lend a false authenticity to distor-

<sup>5</sup> "Žiznennyj material i xudožestvennoe obobščenie", *Voprosy literatury*, No. 9 (1966), 29.

<sup>6</sup> Ščeglov, *op. cit.*, 19, 26.

tions of the truth. Gor'kij outlined this danger in a letter in 1930:

No nekotorye iz našix očerkistov, načinaja ponimat' gluboko social'no-političeskoe i revoljucionnoe značenie *opisanija* našej novoj dejstvitel'nosti, pridajut očerku vse bolee "xudožestvennuju" formu. Vse časče zamečaeš', čto, opisывая podlinno suščestvujuščee, sozdavaemoe energiej rabočego klassa, avtory očerkov vvodjat v opisanie dejstvitel'nogo — želaemoe. Èto ešče ne značit, čto oni pribegajut k "vymyslu", no oni dogovarivajut to, čto xotja ešče ne skazano segodnja, odnako neobxodimo dolžno byt' skazano zavtra.<sup>7</sup>

It is sometimes said that the *očerk* does not *create*, but rather "recreates" or *reconstructs* reality in the "image" of life. In this process, the extent and quality of invention is, of course, the decisive element.

There is general agreement that a characteristic feature of the *očerk* is its analytical quality, i.e. that it combines narrative with analysis. P. Jušin writes that, "kak by ni raskrašival avtor real'noe sobytie slovesnymi formami, s kakoi by točnost'ju ne opisывal ego, očerk ne polučitsja, esli ne budet dan analiz fakta".<sup>8</sup> The source of this analysis is the author himself, whose "prjamye mysli i čuvstva" *must* be provided if the work is to qualify as an *očerk*.<sup>9</sup> In this sense, according to Ščeglov, the *očerk* can even be close to lyric poetry in giving the author an opportunity for open self-expression. But in addition to analysis, an *očerk* must give the impression that the facts and events it describes were directly perceived and experienced by the author. It must have an "eye-witness" quality, so that the author may convince the reader that "tak dejstvitel'no bylo, on èto videl tam-to i togda-to".<sup>10</sup> For this reason also, an important characteristic of the *očerk* is the presence of the "ličnost' avtora" or, as it has been remarked about *Zapiski oxotnika*, the "avtorskoe ja."

*Zapiski oxotnika* is often referred to as providing excellent examples of the *xudožestvennyj očerk*. The most frequently cited of these is "Xor' i Kalinyč", which Turgenev himself was inclined to designate as an *očerk*. It is notable, however, that *Zapiski oxotnika* is usually called simply a collection of "rasskazy i očerki", with no attempt to differentiate between the "rasskazy" and "očerki" which it contains. When critics are discussing the *rasskaz*, they call these works of Turgenev *rasskazy*; in discussing the *očerk*, they call them *očerki*. This is true, however, not only of the way in which the works in *Zapiski oxotnika* are treated, but many other works of Russian literature as well. Although the two terms

<sup>7</sup> M. Gor'kij, "Učit'sja nadobno u masterov", *Voprosy literatury*, No. 12 (1964), 98.

<sup>8</sup> P. Jušin, "O žanre očerkovoj literatury", *Ob očerke* (Moscow, 1958), 43.

<sup>9</sup> Ščeglov, 25.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 20.

obviously have distinct meanings for most students of Russian literature, in their actual usage they often seem virtually interchangeable.

The two genres do indeed live in extremely close proximity. Gor'kij has remarked, referring to works of Turgenev, Sienkiewicz, Maupassant, Gleb Uspenskij and Prišvin, that "očerk približaetsja k rasskazu, a často i neotdelim ot rasskaza".<sup>11</sup> It is often said that there is a category of works that are at one and the same time *očerki* and *rasskazy*. Ščeglov attempted to accommodate this phenomenon by calling the *očerk* a "rasskaz o sud'be dejstvitel'no suščestvujuščix ljudej".<sup>12</sup> And there are numerous examples of authors who have redesignated their works from one category to another long after their first publication, or whose editors have done this. Petr Rebrin has given a recent example from his own experience: he intended to write, and thought he had written, an *očerk*, but the editors of *Naš sovremennik* printed it as a *povest'* and later convinced him that that was indeed what it was.<sup>13</sup>

The tradition persists that the *očerk* contains factual material, whereas the *rasskaz* contains invention, or fiction. We have seen, however, that this is a false dichotomy, because it is generally agreed that an *očerk* may be based on significant quantities of *vymysel*. Likewise, the strong present-day trend to create documentary fiction makes it abundantly evident that a *rasskaz* can embody large quantities of fact. It is true that a weighing of the proportions of fact and fiction in any given work can serve as an aid in identifying it. One can attempt to assess, for example, the degree to which the narrative structure is the product of the author's imagination or the degree to which it seems to have been dictated by the actual facts and events on which it is based. But a group of authors of *očerki*, responding to a questionnaire in 1966, overwhelmingly agreed that "vodorazdel meždu dokumental'noj očerkovoj literaturoj i ostal'noj xudožestvennoj prozoi [ne] opredeljalsja pri pomošči iskusstvennogo protivopostavlenija: fakt — vymysel".<sup>14</sup> This would seem to be evident if only for the reason that a reader himself often has no means of discriminating between fact and fiction in a given work. As Jušin points out, "Ved' v realističeskom proizvedenii vse kažetsja pravdivym".<sup>15</sup>

The responsibility for discriminating between fact and fiction, then, must lie with the author. A few examples will serve to show various ways

<sup>11</sup> Gor'kij, *op. cit.*, 98.

<sup>12</sup> Ščeglov, 19.

<sup>13</sup> "Žiznennyj material i xudožestvennoe obobščenie", *loc. cit.*, 44-45.

<sup>14</sup> Kantorovič, *op. cit.*, 36.

<sup>15</sup> Jušin, *op. cit.*, 42.

in which this problem has been solved. Sergej Smirnov reports that:

... sčitaju, čto glavnoj objazannost'ju avtora xudožestvenno-dokumental'nogo proizvedenija javljaetsja vernost' osnovnym, kardinal'nym faktam, o kotoryx idet reč', pri vozmožnosti svobodnogo dviženija vnutri ramok, sozdavaemyx ètimi glavnymi faktami. No esli pisatel', krome ètix glavnix faktov, берет na sebja smelost' ostavit' v knige dejstvitel'nye familii učastnikov, to èto zaključaet ego uže v soveršenno žestkie ramki. On dolžen vse vremja očkuščat' otvetstvennost' pered ljud'mi, kotorye vyvedeny na pečatnyx stranicax. Nikakie apelljácii k pravu na xudožestvennyj vymysel ne spasut pisatelja ot spravedlivyx narekanij, esli on dopustit netočnosti ili izlišnie vol'nosti. Dlja togo, kto zaščiščaet takoe pravo na vymysel, est' tol'ko odin vyxod: vzjav dokumental'nuju osnovu v širokom smysle ètogo slova, pol'zovat'sja vymyšlennymi imenami i familijami.<sup>16</sup>

Boris Polevoj, in publishing his account of the exploits of the flier Aleksej Mares'ev, changed the name of his hero and went one step further by labeling the work "*Povest' o nastojaščem čeloveke*". For the writer of the *xudožestvennyj očerk*, however, it seems to me that the *očerkist* Sergej Zalygin suggests what is by far the soundest practical solution:

To, čto v očerke dolžen byt' domysel, — èto bessporno! I delo ne v količestvennom sootnošenii faktičeskogo i vymyšlennogo, a v kačestve fakta i domysla.

V rasskaze fakt, sobytie mogut byt' izmeneny po želaniju avtora, a svoj domysel avtor široko osuščestvljaet posredstvom sozdannyx im obrazov i čerez nix.

V očerke fakt ostaëtsja točnym, a domysel soveršenno čëtko i nedvumyslennno vyskazyvaetsja ot lica avtora. [Italics mine.]

I togda, v silu vot takoj nezavualirovannosti, prjamoty i nezavisimosti domysla, avtor bespredel'no svoboden. Ego ne ograničivajut bol'se daže xaraktery geroev, ix vozrast, obrazovanie i professija, ne ograničivajut ni vremja, ni mesto dejstvija, on možet pustit'sja v lubuju fantaziju, sdelat' èkskurs v prošloe ili v buduščee.<sup>17</sup>

Attempts are frequently made to distinguish between the *očerk* and the *rasskaz* in terms of the narrative means which each employs. Not all critics, however, agree that such attempts can be productive. Ščeglov, for example, insisted that "svoeobrazija sposobov sozdanija tipičeskix obrazov, sjužetiki, kompozicii, pozicii avtora i t.d. v očerke poprostu ne suščestvuet".<sup>18</sup> Nevertheless, most critics argue that it is possible to isolate creative techniques which the *očerk* does not share with other genres. V. Bogdanov feels that the *očerk* is primarily a *descriptive* genre, in which it is required that "sceny i èpizody 'scepljajutsja' v kompozicionnoe celoe vnešnim obrazom, za sčet avtorskogo vmešatel'stva ili rass-

<sup>16</sup> "Žiznennyj material i xudožestvennoe obobščenie", 46.

<sup>17</sup> S. Zalygin, "Rabotaja nad očerkom", *Novyj mir*, No. 12 (1954), 118.

<sup>18</sup> Ščeglov, 23.

kazčika ... .”<sup>19</sup> The author makes it evident that he alone is arranging the facts and events he is depicting, and the author, in his own voice, provides whatever material of a generalizing and evaluating nature the *očerk* contains. Or, Bogdanov adds, the author can create a “special compositional hero” to lead the reader over the terrain he is depicting. Other critics, however, object to the notion of the *očerk* as primarily a descriptive genre, since, they feel, an *očerk* must center around a *problem*, and specifically one of a social nature. As one critic puts it,

... v *očerke* — v tom čisle i v samom “čelovekovedčeskom”, bliže vsego stojaščem k rasskazu po ob’ektivirovannosti obrazov personažej, — veduščim, osnovnym, “diktujuščim” i otbor materiala, i arxitektoniku sjužeta, i daže issledovanie xarakterov, javljaetsja vse-taki *problema*, *delo* čeloveka; v *rasskaze* čelovekovedenie, issledovanie xarakterov i čerez nix — poroždajuščego ix vremeni i est’ *glavnoe* delo, *problema* nomer odin.<sup>20</sup>

It is argued, then, that the “organizing element” of an *očerk* is likely to be a social problem. One of the consequences of this situation is that an *očerk* is not faced with the task of development of plot or character (although it is generally agreed that an *očerk*, in distinction to a *stat’ja*, must contain characters), since the narrative motivation need not come from circumstances established in the author’s imagination. The emphasis of the *sjužet* is placed not on nuances of character or on intrigue, as it is likely to be in a work of fiction, but rather on exposition and the arrangement of documentary detail. And since there is no “inner causality” in an *očerk*, it tends to be less complex than a work of pure fiction. This offers both advantages and disadvantages:

... po sravneniju s romanom, rasskazom, liričeskoj prozoi očerk daet bolee uzkoje predstavlenie o vnutrennej žizni, xaraktere čeloveka. No takoe suženie i uproščenie zadači imeet i svoi položitel’nye storony, pozvoljaja očerkistu sosredotočit’ svoe vnimanie na tex aspektax žizni i čelovečeskix vzaimootnošenij, kotorye v drugix žanrax vystupajut po preimuščestvu v “snjatom”, oposredstvovannom vide i polučajut tam skoree kosvennoe, čem prjamoe izobraženie.<sup>21</sup>

Considerations such as these are helpful in pointing to the problems of narrative strategy with which the writer of an *očerk* is likely to be confronted, but they are of limited value in attempts to distinguish the *xudožestvennyj očerk* from other genres, since these considerations apply not only to the *očerk* but to the *rasskaz* and *povest’* as well. Many works

<sup>19</sup> V. Bogdanov, “Teorija v dolgu”, *Voprosy literatury*, No. 12 (1964), 67.

<sup>20</sup> A. Kogan, “Prodolžaja razgovor ...”, *Literatura i sovremennost’*, Sbornik 6 (Moscow, 1965), 293.

<sup>21</sup> B. Kosteljanec, “Opisatel’nyj žanr? ... Net!”, *Voprosy literatury*, No. 7 (1966), 35.

which are clearly in the latter categories, for example, can be shown to be essentially "descriptive" or to have a social problem as their "organizing element" (e.g. "Krejcerova sonata"). One must therefore look elsewhere for sources of uniqueness in the *očerk*.

Ultimately the most important factor affecting the *sjužet* of an *očerk* is the presence of the author in the narrative. As B. Kosteljanec expresses it:

Esli v romane ili rasskaze my imeem "samo soboju" razvivajuščijsja sjužet, opredeljaemyj vzaimootnošenijami geroev, to v očerkovom proizvedenii avtorskaja mysl' "v svoem neposredstvennom vyražeenii sostavljaet važnejšee i edinstvennoe sredstvo kompozicii."<sup>22</sup>

I have already pointed out that a *xudožestvennyj očerk* must be provided with both an "eye-witness" quality and an explicit analysis of the things it depicts, and that, although it contains *vymysel*, it must have a means of discriminating between facts and fiction. The only source from which these elements can come is the *narrator*, whose commentary upon and intervention in the events depicted provide interpretation, verification and *dokumental'nost'*. What is most essential, however, is that the narrator be identified closely with the author himself.

Let us take some brief illustrations from *Zapiski oxotnika*. As I have indicated, "Xor' i Kalinyč" has frequently been called a *xudožestvennyj očerk*. Although Turgenev does not make it explicit that he is the narrator, every one of the few characterizing traits that are provided for the narrator (such as the fact that he is a hunter and a *barin*) make him inseparable from Turgenev himself. The author-narrator in this work plays the role of observer and commentator. As in many of the works in *Zapiski oxotnika*, the author-narrator is a passive "witness", not an active participant, and he is involved in events only in the sense that he occasionally directs a brief question to one of the other characters. He is passive with regard to events, but active in his response to them by means of comments that are directed solely to the reader. Furthermore, the *sjužet* is governed not by the interaction of characters, or of characters and events, but by the volition of the author-observer, who has set for himself the "problem" of comparing two general types of peasants. In only one respect, it would seem, is there reason to doubt that "Xor' i Kalinyč" should be called an *očerk*: the author gives the reader no way of knowing how much is fact and how much is fiction.

The close proximity of "Xor' i Kalinyč" to the *očerk* can be illustrated

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 27. The quotations by Kosteljanec are from Bogdanov, *op. cit.*, 58-59.

by contrast to other works from *Zapiski oxotnika*. "Bežin Lug", for example, should probably not be called an *očerk* because it lacks the authorial analysis that comes from the consideration of a clearly formulated proposition — a "problem". "Pevcy" would probably fail to qualify as an *očerk* for the same reason, although Ščeglov cites "Pevcy" — "kak by liričeskaja ispoved' xudožnika, zaxvačennogo čudom narodnoj talantlivosti"<sup>23</sup> — as an example of the way in which an *očerk* can provide an opportunity for the expression of an author's *emotions*.

The question of the degree of personal authorial involvement in the events described in an *očerk* has been a source of disagreement. There are those who contend that the author can be a major character, participating fully as an active agent in the events he is depicting, quarreling with other characters, etc. Others contend that it is essential that the author confine himself to the role of an uninvolved, passive observer. These latter would surely find that "L'gov" is a *rasskaz*, and not an *očerk*, because in the second part of this work the author is completely involved in an adventure as an active participant.<sup>24</sup> On the other hand, "Les i Step'", centering on the "problem" of describing the pleasures of hunting in the Russian countryside, would seem to be in most respects just as "očerkistic" as "Xor' i Kalinyč". However, in "Les i Step'" the author-narrator portrays himself as the central lyrical hero, actively experiencing deeply pleasurable emotions as he wanders about the fields. One could conclude — though I am not inclined to do so — that for this reason "Les i Step'" is not an *očerk* but a *rasskaz*.

The *Sevastopol'skie rasskazy* of Tolstoj can be helpful in illustrating the differences between an *očerk* and a *rasskaz*. In "Sevastopol' v dekabre mesjace" the author is present not as a character but as an unseen guide, conducting the reader about the besieged city. He addresses the reader directly (using the second person plural), pointing out items of interest, commenting on them, and interpreting them. "Sevastopol' v dekabre mesjace", then, would seem to be truly an *očerk*. In contrast, "Sevastopol' v mae" and "Sevastopol' v avguste 1855 goda", related in the third person, employ obvious fictional techniques — including interior monologue — which cannot be the properties of an *očerk*. For this reason, the latter two works are clearly *rasskazy*.

The "documentary" trend in recent literature has given rise not only

<sup>23</sup> Ščeglov, 16-17.

<sup>24</sup> I am grateful to Lubomir Doležel for insights into the nature of the narrator-observer in *Zapiski oxotnika*, as presented in his lectures at the University of Michigan in 1967.