

BEYOND HISTORY: A STUDY OF SALTYKOV'S

THE HISTORY OF A TOWN

by

Peter Petro

B.A., The University of British Columbia, 1970

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULTILMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department

of

Slavonic Studies

We accept this thesis as conforming to

the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

April, 1972

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study.

I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Slavonic Studies

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver 8, Canada

Date April 30, 1972

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this work is to show the evolution of The History of a Town and analyze its satirical form and thus to elucidate the obscure points that until recently prevented the recognition of The History of a Town (Istoriya odnogo goroda, 1869-1870; from now on, mentioned as The History) as a major work of Mikhail Evgrafovich Saltykov-Shchedrin (1826-1889), a work that came into the Russian literature after the time of the Great Reforms and which expressed the spirit of the time, understanding of the historical process and aimed deeper beyond the satirical rendering of the historical facts.

Considered by most of the critics as a kind of parody of Russian history, where a provincial town, Glupov, stands for Russia and whose governors are caricatures of Russian sovereigns and ministers, this work survived the onslaught of various interpretations. Shortly after its first appearance it generated much controversy and grounds for suspicion as to whether it was not more than a parody of Russian history and the characters that appear in it more than mere caricatures of the House of Romanov and their ministers. After the heated polemics and discussions so typical of the period of the publication of Saltykov's satiric chronicle subsided, neglect descended upon it, to cover it for several

decades. The interest in Saltykov's works increased after the books were dusted and rediscovered by the Soviet propagandists who also gave an impetus to a serious study of Saltykov's work, which, with a few exceptions, lacked both in objectivity and in assertion of the chronicle's significance beyond the historically ramified period which The History ostensibly covered.

An attempt will be made here to show that Saltykov tried, successfully, to transcend the temporary framework of a definite situation of the period between 1731-1826 in order to give us an insight into the relationship of the governors and the governed, encompassing the epoch highlighted by the reform of 1961 and the decade that followed it. This study will also undertake an analysis of Saltykov's technique of satire and humour, as well as the gradual development of his technique and ideas in the course of the decade preceding the publication of The History.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABSTRACT	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER	
I. THE EMERGENCE OF GLUPOV	4
II. THE IDEA OF GLUPOV	21
III. <u>KONFUZ</u> AND THE CHARACTERS	26
IV. THE HISTORY OF GLUPOV	40
V. THE TWO KINDS OF <u>NAROD</u>	53
VI. THE GOVERNORS	57
VII. LAUGHTER THROUGH TEARS	64
VIII. THE MEN AND THE PUPPETS	80
IX. GLUPOVIANS AND THEIR WORLD	91
CONCLUSION	103
FOOTNOTES	106
BIBLIOGRAPHY	117

INTRODUCTION

"What description, then,
can I find for the men
of this generation?
What are they like?"
--Luke, VII, 31-32.

According to the biographers of Mikhail Evgrafovich Saltykov-Shchedrin, the single and strongest influence in his youth was exercised by The New Testament. Here the young Saltykov discovered the quest for justice, something that he failed to see in the actions of the people around him. The clash between the lessons of the Gospels and (for him) the shocking reality formed early in his life that highly critical disposition toward society which was to make him the foremost satirist of the second half of the nineteenth century. Out of this critical disposition evolved also his most powerful satire, The History of a Town, which, more than any other work, bears out his effort to record in satiric form the iniquities of his age.

Saltykov's idea of placating the present while seeming to depict the past was not met with unanimous understanding, either in the nineteenth century or even now. One could explain this by the temptation to associate the governors of the town of Glupov, whom The History describes, with the Russian monarchs of the period between 1731 and 1826. It is undisputable that such a comparison could be made, and

it was indeed made by many scholars, starting with Ivanov-Razumnik¹ and B. Eikhenbaum,² and ending with C. Kulešov's annotated edition of The History,³ the most comprehensive and detailed one, so far. The correspondence between the characters of The History and Russian monarchs, however, should not be the focal point of the research of this masterpiece of Saltykov: it should rather be its starting point. In that respect this thesis attempts to go beyond what I generally call "history", i.e., beyond the formal limitations (acknowledged as such by Saltykov himself⁴) of the said period 1731-1826.

A more appropriate way of looking at this fruit of Saltykov's critical spirit is contained in the words of I. P. Foote: "The History of a Town . . . is . . . the most far-reaching of his [Saltykov's] attacks on the Russian situation."⁵ For, with the advantage of looking at Saltykov's work a hundred years later, it is possible to see what his contemporaries could not: namely, the persistence of the kind of situation described in his work. If we take his work as an expression of the power and exclusivity of the governors, and the helplessness and passivity of the masses --and there is no reason why we should not take it as such-- then we shall be unable to set the date when the situation in Russia radically changed.

The critical disposition of Saltykov evolved with the

times, and this thesis will undertake an analysis of the development of the main themes contributing to the genesis of The History in the first three chapters. The following two chapters are concerned with Saltykov's ideas on history and the role which the people play in it. The remaining four chapters then analyze the satirical devices and the role of laughter through tears, of the grotesque, as effective means of conveying the author's ideas, and discuss briefly Saltykov's satiric excursion into Utopia.

CHAPTER I

THE EMERGENCE OF GLUPOV

The History of a Town is a history of Glupov, or--as Mirsky translated it--Sillytown.¹ The beginnings of the intimate love affair that Saltykov had with the idea of Glupov can be easily traced to another geographical entity: his Krutogorsk, a provincial town that happened to be the target of his satire in the Provincial Sketches (1856).

Although Saltykov departed considerably from the descriptiveness and characterization of provincial life that made his name after 1856, when he published his Provincial Sketches--a series of satirical portrayals of a pathetically stagnant Russian province after 1848--one recognizes without difficulty the affinity between Krutogorsk and Glupov: on the level of the character deployment we detect embryonic features of the terrible Ugryum-Burcheyev in Feier, the governor of Krutogorsk.

Yet, while the aim of Saltykov's Provincial Sketches was to point out the contrast between the cities and the province by delving endlessly into the abhorrently backward and stultifying life in the province, with Glupov of The History he tried ambitiously for a coup that was almost unprecedented in the history of Russian literature. Glupov was to stand for the whole of Russia. This the critics

readily understood. The misunderstanding came when the critics tried to ascribe false motives to this work. This was crowned by persistent efforts that survived until now, which consist of identifying various characters of The History, mainly the governors of the town of Glupov, with Russian sovereigns. From there it is only a short step towards fitting interpretations of this work as a clever attack on the monarchy. But at the time of the publication of Saltykov's work, to attack only the past, its too obvious deficiencies, was hardly worth the satirist's pen.² All the same, Saltykov was known as a powerful critic of absolutism as a journalist, and so many readers find it difficult to dissociate him from his alter ego, the one with whom this thesis is concerned: Saltykov, the man of letters, satirist, novelist. This curious division, of course, does not serve as a disposal bag for "the journalist", since the latter is an integral part of the former; but where Saltykov the journalist concerned himself with day-to-day problems of social life, at the same time he collected material for Saltykov the man of letters, whose aim was to get deeper to the roots from which the day-to-day problems originated.

Careful study reveals this obvious dichotomy that Saltykov himself readily admitted when he said that he had to be objective when writing fiction. It was this objectivity that made him the target of both progressive and

conservative groups throughout the nineteenth century.

People of every walk of life and of every shade of political conviction felt his lash. It fell alike on governor and on peasant; on radical and conservative. More than any other man, it flayed the srednii chelovek, the 'average man', whose cupidity, hypocrisy and vulgarity Saltykov set himself to expose and to indict again and again.³

Saltykov posed a problem with his often enigmatic character and his less enigmatic work. His contemporaries found they had to revise the ideas that they held about Saltykov. Turgenev wrote in one of his letters of 1857 that if Saltykov had success with his writings, then it was not worthwhile to write any more;⁴ but it was Turgenev's review of The History, written in 1871 for The Academy, an English journal, which presented Saltykov, and specifically his satiric chronicle of Glupov, to the English reader:

There is something of Swift in Saltykov . . . that serious and grim comedy, that realism-- prosaic in its lucidity amid the wildest play of fancy--and, above all that constant good sense . . .⁵

It is hardly necessary to add that, at the time of this review, Turgenev had a deep respect for Saltykov. Nekrasov went through a similar transformation; Saltykov was labelled "bureaucrat" by Rzhevskiy and deystvitel'no-statskiy progressist by Pisarev.⁶ All this illustrates the degree of misunderstanding that the satirist had to suffer to a certain extent throughout his life. He was not to find peace even at home, where he was considered by his family a morose old

man. Strelsky rightly asserts his plight:

As a critic of life, he was far in advance of his own times; not until our own day did his judgment begin to evince their true depth and meaning.⁷

Georg Lukacs joins in with his evaluation of Saltykov which appeared in his Probleme des Realismus II:

Saltykov-Schtschedrin, wohl der grosste Satiriker der Weltliteratur seit Swift, beginnt erst in der letzten Zeit einigermassen bekannt zu werden.⁸

These assertions come very closely to a just appreciation of the satirist, but they are not by any means characteristic of all scholarship on Saltykov. An example which illustrates the conventional attitudes of the literary historian comes from the Concise History of Russian Literature by Thais S. Lindstrom, who devoted to Saltykov not more than two and a half pages, which the satirist shares with S. Aksakov:

His attacks on corrupt officialdom were couched in literary circumlocutions to confound the censor and delight his leftist [sic!] audience, but while they were immensely popular in the heated climate of the mid-nineteenth century, they were too immediately topical to survive. Saltykov-Shchedrin owes his enduring reputation to one masterpiece-- The Golovlevs (1872), a largely autobiographical novel for which his family never forgave him.⁹

This thesis is also an attempt to show that The History was not "too immediately topical to survive". I. P. Foote tells us, in his article on The History,¹⁰ that it is the most easily understood of Saltykov's satires. In this way, Glupov will emerge, as we pass by the conflicting

opinions of many critics.

L. Grossman, a Soviet critic, tried to connect The History with the works whose object was historical satire. He mentions Pushkin's fragment Istoriya sela Goryukhina (1830); A. Tolstoy's Russkaya istoriya ot Gostomysla; A. France's Penguin Island; and goes to great lengths in order to prove his point: the idea of the historical satire as an interpretation of The History. He identifies in the chronicle particular historical personalities, and factual historical periods, disregarding and brushing aside Saltykov's express desire not to consider it as a historical satire.¹¹ To ignore the author's explanations written after the work had been published is nothing new, as the famous letter written by Belinsky to Gogol exemplifies; in the case of The History the text does not justify entirely a conjecture of this kind.

More tempting and instructive seems to be the attempt of V. V. Gippius, who looks at Saltykov in an original way in his essay Lyudi i kukly v satire Saltykova,¹² where he traces the motif of the puppet and other elements to their place of origine, namely, German Romanticism in general and E. T. A. Hoffmann in particular. With this in mind he follows Pypin:

. . . впечатление, полученное от очерка Салтыкова, не сатирическое -- это скорее впечатление сказки Гофмана.¹³

The flights of fantasy, grotesquerie and occasional drops of nonsensical humour would support this supposition if it were not for the fantastic reality that anchors the whole work into the realm of the possible.

Pushkin's Istoriya sela Goryukhina (1830), mentioned in connection with L. Grossman's view, is included in most critics' treatment of The History. The short fragment of some twenty-five pages does indeed bear resemblance to Saltykov's work, if only formally. Unfortunately, Pushkin did not finish this manuscript and we are left with only a fragment, which gives us the introduction to the History, which he used for his Povesti Belkina, mainly as the background for the biography of Belkin.¹⁴

The detailed plan which Pushkin wrote for his History was preserved, and we can find some similarities to Saltykov's chronicle: the peasant rebellion, the destruction of a village by fire, the abrupt changes in the "government", etc. Saltykov also might have taken over, in his introduction, Pushkin's device of "finding some old documents" from which the author compiles the story. The most important of the similarities, however, is the general idea of substituting a village (Pushkin) or a small provincial town (Saltykov) for the whole Russian Empire. Here the similarities end.

Saltykov had a definite purpose when he decided to hide behind the mask of an editor and three chroniclers. In

doing so, he put himself in a position from which he could attack and ridicule the pompous celebrations of the millennium of the Russian Empire, an event which was met with laudatory and pseudo-historical writing by some historians and crowned by a monumental sculpture designed by Mikeshin and raised in Novgorod. Grossman juxtaposes Saltykov's work to this monumental sculpture and shows how the writer tried to de-pathetize the myth of Russian rulers as wise and kind, and show in a different light the legend of the invitation of the Varangians.¹⁵

It was probably at that time, during or after these celebrations, that an idea of Glupov began to emerge in Saltykov's mind, we are told by Grossman. Two catalytic incidents took place before 1862, when some short stories about Glupov appeared for the first time. One was the unfortunate Martiyanov's attempt to influence Alexander II by his letter from London in 1862. The letter urged the Emperor to introduce more reforms. The other incident was a public lecture given by Professor Pavlov of the University of St. Petersburg. Among other daring statements, he said that during the whole millennium Russia was a slave society and that by the middle of the nineteenth century the patience of the destitute was exhausted. He finished his lecture with Imeyushchiy ushi da slyshit.¹⁶ This, of course, ran counter to the mandatory official picture of Russia extolled in

Mikeshin's sculpture; but, without dwelling unnecessarily long on this point, it is quite possible to imagine Saltykov as conceiving an allegorical picture of his contemporary Russia, for the construction of which he would use his favourite tools and even material. He could once again draw from the experiences he had in Vyatka, where he was banished during the upsurge of repression after 1848, on account of having written a short story Zaputannoe delo.

Saltykov's banishment seems cruel by any standards, at first sight, but it was in Vyatka that Saltykov made his remarkable career, and it was in Vyatka that he found an abundant fountain of material for his satires. From its beginnings, Russian literature includes a martyrologue of writers who were punished solely on account of their writings; but the persistent efforts, mainly of Soviet scholars, to place Saltykov in it seem to be slightly exaggerated in view of the beneficial influence that Vyatka exercised on Saltykov's career, both literary and official. It may seem strange, but the reader should be rather thankful for Vyatka. Vyatka turned out to be immortalized by its fictional counterpart, Krutogorsk, and it happened to be at the cradle of Glupov as well. The difference between Krutogorsk and Glupov was an important one, as can be seen from Skabichevsky's editorial in Iskra:

В "Губернских очерках" г. Щедрин стоит еще на

почве той самой обличительной литературы, которая была в такой моде в конце 50-х годов . . .¹⁷

Some thirteen years later, however, the development of Saltykov's prose had progressed considerably from the beginnings of the Provincial Sketches. It was no more glavnoe delo -- raketu pustit' i smekh proizvesti,¹⁸ as Pisarev would have liked to have it. As a matter of fact, the laughter that The History produces is of a different kind. In a 1970 edition of the satiric chronicle, V. Putintsev writes:

Книга Щедрина вызывает смех, но это не веселая книга, и смех над ее страницами горек и мрачен.¹⁹

This is in accordance with Saltykov's idea. He did not view his book as an entertaining piece. And it is doubtful that he considered any of his satirical pieces for entertainment only. He must, then, have been deeply perturbed and worried about the attempts of such an influential man as Pisarev who, in his time, put him in the same bag with Pisemsky (not of the time of T'yufyak [1850]; but of the time of Vzbalamuchennoe more [1863], the anti-nihilist novel) and A. K. Tolstoy (mentioning Knyaz Serebryany [1862] as an example of the light genre in which, according to Pisarev, Saltykov's satirical production belongs), topping off his comparison with:

. . . Легкий смех г. Щедрина и легкая мечтательность г. Фета связаны между собою тесными узами умственного родства.²⁰

The dubious sense that these derogatory lines had in the early sixties of the nineteenth century has long since vanished, Fet being a fine poet despite the radicals' (and also Saltykov's²¹) dislike for him. Saltykov, however, found a good supporter in Skabichevsky, who defended him in an explanatory editorial in Iskra (in 1871).²² This and many other voices of sympathy for Saltykov came later. In the fervent days of Russkoe slovo and Pisarev, and furious discussions of Turgenev's Fathers and Sons (1862), Chernyshevsky's arrest and subsequent publication of Chto delat'? (1864), Saltykov stands curiously aloof. His sparse reactions to these hot issues of the day were of a negative character. He would describe Fathers and Sons in the following manner:

. . . как некоторый хвастунишка и болтунишка [presumably Bazarov], да вдобавок еще из проходимцев вздумал приударить за важной барышней и что из этого произошло.²³

For the nihilists in general he had a theory that was hardly one to make him a darling of the radicals:

Так называемые нигилисты суть не что иное, как титулярные советники в диком и нераскаянном состоянии а титулярные советники суть раскаявшиеся нигилисты.²⁴

In both of these examples we recognize the original voice of Saltykov, who was suspicious of the torrent of lofty polemics which was losing ground with each degree of its ever-increasing intensity. At that particular time

Saltykov the journalist was the head of Sovremennik, a magazine of high intellectual standards founded by Pushkin. He had to move very carefully in his position because, having received many warnings from the administration, he did not wish to put the existence of Sovremennik at stake. This was hardly making him appealing to the younger generation. F. Venturi summed up the situation in this way:

In place of this appeal to the young generation, Saltykov-Shchedrin was able to make use of his marvellous satirical power, which expressed the bitterness that most sensitive spirits felt about the suffocating ugliness of life in Russia. He was able to attack all the various moral, political and social bigotry that was again coming to the fore after the shock of the reforms. But though Saltykov-Shchedrin played an important part in the formation of the intelligentsia between the 'sixties and 'seventies, he had no chance of providing a new political line or a direct spur to the younger generation.²⁵

If, as Venturi said, Saltykov had no chance of providing a new political line as a journalist, he never cared for one as a writer. Here again, we come across the distinction of those, supposedly, two different "beings". Saltykov the journalist took part in the oblique journalistic practice of in-fighting (e.g., his polemics with the brothers Dostoevsky). Saltykov the writer remained without a political commitment, "a restless aviator, to whom the old earth, overgrown with the moss of tradition, is more hateful than anything else."²⁶

In his literary art he rather concentrated on a

certain type, or various types which became his targets in his satires. The gallery of these types contains the Ivans, also called Van'ki or Ivashki. The Ivans are Glupovians, whose counterparts are Sidorichi²⁷ (those who decide the fate of the Ivans). The Sidorichi are the governors, the minority; the Van'ki are the majority, powerless in relation to the "better off" minority. Then come the pompadury,²⁸ started in 1863. This edifice is crowned by the gradonachal'niki, or the governors of the town of Glupov from The History. Apart from this "Glupovian cycle" stand the later type: the tashkentsy (from the cycle Gospoda tashkentsy [1869-1872]).²⁹

The author allows for considerable movement within any of these categories or types, but there is no movement from one type or category to another. This hints of a rather integrated belief in a sort of typology which we can see only with difficulty, and very vaguely. In the extreme sense, it would mean that Saltykov does not view society as divided into classes, as some would like to have it, but rather into various types of people that periodically occur in history and are easily recognized by him in his contemporary Russia.³⁰ This point is then ignored in the studies which place The History in the category of historical satire and is one of the indicators which point beyond the simplistic interpretations.

The nightmarish theatre of the elaborate game which the Sidorichi play with the Van'ki strikes us with apparent rules that are obvious to all the observers and to none of the observed. One of the rules is that no matter what the gradonachal'niki (the type which Saltykov uses in The History whose predecessor was Sidorich) do, they are not to be understood by the Glupovians (the Ivashki) and vice versa. To make the possibilities of contact (and positive communication) even more distant, there is a rule which makes the Glupovians unable to understand themselves. To make the chaos complete, Saltykov throws in a nonsensically irrational gradonachal'nik (governor), at a time when things seem to be getting better.

If this was Saltykov's weltanschauung, he could be hardly committed to any of the existing salvationist groups. The articles written on the Glupov theme together with The History, like an opus surrounded by the opuscula from which it originated, are saturated by this typology. As Lunacharsky said, Saltykov was really a man who awoke sooner than the rest, and was forced to live among the sleeping. The point which Lunacharsky missed is the one where he speaks about the sleeping majority in the past tense. The History shows us precisely that the "old forms" against which Saltykov rails cannot be replaced by forms which will never grow old; for some people, even what others consider "new" seems

to be "old" (in this Saltykov is very close to E. Zamyatin, who desperately fought the entrenchment of what appeared to be the "new forms" after the Soviet Revolution of 1917). Saltykov's satires are les utopies a rebours,³¹ in the sense that they show that Utopia can be striven for, but hardly attained.

All this is perfectly in keeping with the author's chronic impatience to see things "moving", and especially so if considered at the background of Saltykov's political thought. D. N. Ovsyaniko-Kulikovsky tells us that Saltykov, like Nekrasov, was at first under the influence of populism (narodnichestvo) not devoid of sentimentalism coming from the idealization of the muzhik.³² Saltykov parted with the idealization of the muzhik and, similarly, with another set of ideas which had appeared on his intellectual horizon in his student days, when, with his veneration of Belinsky, he imbibed the ideas of French Utopian socialism represented by Proudhon, Fourier and especially Saint-Simon. D. V. Grishin wrote the following in his comparative study of Dostoevsky and Saltykov:

Like Dostoevsky, S. Shchedrin in the forties was under the powerful influence of the ideas of Utopian socialism. Both writers paid for their enthusiasm with exile. Both accepted the ideas of Utopian socialism in a purely idealistic spirit. Later S. Shchedrin broke with the ideas of Utopian socialism. Like Dostoevsky, he was angered by the aim of this system's founders to "regulate" and "calculate" the future fully and arbitrarily; and he criticized "the

pictures of the future socialist society" drawn by Chernishevsky in the novel What Are We To Do? (dreams of Vera Pavlovna).³³

Saltykov's total rejection of the "regulated future" found expression in the picture of Glupov under the governorship of Ugryum-Burcheyev. This account of a totalitarian regime, in many ways prophetic, shows without doubt the breadth of Saltykov's intellectual independence which was to remain his hallmark.

Although he was an impatient man, Saltykov found time to stop and pose himself a question about the nature of his own effort. He did so in his story Capons (Kapluny, 1862), and tried to answer it:

Зачем ты волнуешься, зачем забегаешь вперед?

-- а просто потому и волнуюсь, потому и забегаю вперед, что усидеть на месте не могу!³⁴

and further on--

Я не могу есть, спать и топтать жизнь, как едят, спят и топчут ее глуповцы, ибо у меня другие вкусы, другие наклонности.³⁵

The incessant energy which was pushing him on was a force whose nature, and even direction, was changing as the times were changing; but the ultimate aim--the service to common sense, so uncommon in his time, and more substantially, his exposure of both official and radical humbug--remained essentially the same. This same force is also responsible for Saltykov's campaign to recognize Glupov for

what it really was: his contemporary Russia. In this he went to such lengths that Glupov became an obsession from which he finally wanted to be freed. The whole process, including the period of obsession as well as liberation from it, involves roughly a decade, beginning with the Emancipation of the Serfs.

Я должен сказать правду: Глупов составляет для меня истинный кошмар. Ни мысль, ни действия мои не свободны. Глупов давит их всею своею тяжестью; Глупов представляется мне везде: и в хлебе, который я ем, и в вине, которое я пью. Войду ли я в гостинную -- он там, выйду ли я в сени -- он там, сойду ли в погреб, или в кухню -- он там... В самый мой кабинет, как я ни проветриваю его, настойчиво врываются глуповские запахи...³⁶

He very soon realized that he was a prisoner of Glupov, and his effort to escape from this prison ended in failure on one plane: that on which Glupov was indeed Russia personified and devoid of fancy grotesquerie to make it palpable and understandable. From this Glupov he did not free himself and remained, in a way, an enemy to the Glupovian style of life, its institutions and representatives, to the end of his life. On another plane, where Glupov figured as an imaginative, fictional entity, a literary idea that usurped the right to represent reality in its own way and with its own devices,--there Saltykov scored success.

He put together all his anguish, knowledge and skill and wrote his satirical chronicle, The History of a Town, then wrote to a friend that it (The History) closed a

chapter, to which he wished never to return.³⁷

Thus Saltykov abandoned the road on which he first set out in 1848 when, banished, he came to Vyatka. As a writer, he had followed the road to Krutogorsk, and then to Glupov. The world of petty officials and mighty governors, of rebellious and passive peasants, of poor townsfolk complemented by artisans and the occasional freethinker, of the fleas which plagued it, of hunger and fire, of the drab and grey countryside,--all that made up the microcosm of Russia we find in Glupov, which then emerges through the exorcism of the author, who disposed of this painful accumulation weighing heavily on his mind by immortalizing Glupov in The History.

CHAPTER II

THE IDEA OF GLUPOV

The idea of Glupov did not develop harmoniously. It proceeded from a statement which Saltykof wrote in Glupov and Glupovians (Glupov i glupovtsy, 1862), to an elaborate satiric chronicle in The History. The structure of the whole Glupovian cycle reminds one, by its form, of konfuz, which the cycle depicts.

Saltykov's konfuz is simply not the same as "confusion". His konfuz, writes S. Vilinskij in his book O Literarni činnosti M. Jev. Saltykova-Ščedrina,¹ has a political colour. While in Glupov i glupovtsy Saltykov denies that Glupov ever had any history, later on, with the advent of konfuz brought about by the Reform of 1861, he changes his mind as he follows the peculiar situation when the old order was disturbed and the new one was not yet established. Saltykov, looking at this situation through the prism of satire, considers this a tragicomic development and decides that Glupov has a history after all, but one which was very special from those of the other civilized countries. It was konfuz that marked the history of Glupov. The many desperate rebellions in the history of Russia, its stubborn resistance of the new that was not marked by the peasants' expectations, the hysterical thrill that ran through the body of the

peasantry after the forced routine of inertia, all this was included in the concept of Saltykov's konfuz. More specifically, konfuz originated when the authorities wanted to establish an order, a new order. Then chaos reigned supreme. For Saltykov, the pieces of the puzzle fell together after February 19, 1861:

The publication of the manifesto in 19th February brought back in a flash all the hopes, and disappointments, of the peasants. Throughout 1861 the great news of freedom produced a state of passionate excitement. The peasants protested against any aspect of the new situation which did not correspond to their immediate interest or to the notion of freedom that they had already formed. The in the two following years hopes began to wane; the wave of excitement ebbed. The blow was severe and it left indelible traces on the most sensitive men of all classes.²

One almost visualizes a sleeping giant who has just received a severe blow: he wakes up, gropes for something, but does not find what he hoped to find. He is puzzled for a while, then goes back to sleep again...

There was a gap between the newly powerless nobility and the advent of the bourgeoisie. For a time, the army had to apply strong repression. The consequence of this, the puzzled giant, is at the heart of Saltykov's konfuz. From this emanates the idea of The History.

The comparison with the sleeping giant is not sufficient to clarify all the intricacies of those troubled times. We know now that what followed the awakening was not a sleep.

The forces within the multitudinous mass of peasantry which craved for more of both zemlya and volya were not dormant from that time. The confusion, too, was not limited to just the illiterate peasant. The gentry were as puzzled as their serfs. This was indeed a period of very curious uncertainty regarding the future, this period immediately preceding the decree of Emancipation. It took a long time for everything to settle as it "ought" to be.

Saltykov, in his official position as vice-governor of the Ryazan' and later, Tver provinces, had an excellent chance to see the whole province from the bird's eye view of his office, but this also constituted his torment, because he was literally flooded by reports of the monstrosities which befell the poor peasants on account of the army's intervention, and his already gloomy nature needed no further lacerations of the worst possible kind that could happen to any Russian gentleman of that period. At this point he decided to interrupt his double career (official and literary) in favour of the vocation of a man of letters and a journalist. In 1860 he began his collaboration with Sovremennik.

The innocently naive peasants, killed at the period of troubles shortly after the decree was proclaimed, are sometimes difficult to recognize in Glupovians. We will see, however, that they were included there as part of a broader concept: as the people, narod, whom he did not wish to put

forward in a rough, glorifying and epic way, because any pathetic representation was foreign to him. He proved this in his criticism of the Slavophil idea of narod found in Skazanie o stranstvii inoka Parfeniya, (1856):

. . . странная мысль целому народу дать какую-то безразлично-добродетельную физиономию.⁴

Thus he was caught in a contradiction that, for anyone but Saltykov, would have been very bothersome to reconcile. On the one hand, he felt deeply with the peasants, since he knew them very well (even as a child he talked with and knew every single peasant belonging to his family estate) but he could not bear to submit to any idealization of peasant life, or even to such description as one finds in Turgenev and Tolstoy. More specifically, he objected to the karataevshchina, and so one cannot find a single positive reference to the peasants or even to narod. He reconciled this with his compassion for the odd Ivanushka who gets killed (thrown down from the belfry) at the times of disturbances in Glupov, and with his sympathy for the few martyrs who died without being understood by the people. We could say that he loved what he considered the cream of the people, be it a simple Ivanushka or a Belinsky-like character, but for the great mass, the Glupovians, he had anger and uncommon hatred⁵ of some of its characteristics,--mainly the traditional inertia and the resistance to the new.

He did not leave us, then, narod with a particular, set physiognomy, but left us with a terrifying crown of utterly irrational people who sway with events as birch trees do. Like them, they respond only when they are bothered. With Glupovians everything happens. They are genuinely innocent of any intentions, good or evil. If there is a good year and they have plenty of food--they did not cause it. Comes hunger--they die like flies. They are not the positive hero of the chronicle. The anguish of the writer is divided equally between the governors of the town of Glupov (gradonachal'niki) and the subjects (glupovtsy).

Judging from all this, it becomes evident that the idea of Glupov, the conception of the Glupovian cycle which terminated in the creation of The History, is related to the political developments of the decade which began on the eve of the Great Reforms. Despite the overt references to the past, the konfuz and the characters of The History were modelled by the development of the decade mentioned, and so indicate in what way the chronicle transcends the past and consequently goes beyond mere history.

CHAPTER III

KONFUZ AND THE CHARACTERS

Considering the socio-political developments of the late 'fifties and early 'sixties, we get the idea of the progression of the central theme of The History: the relationship between the authorities and the people.¹

In the early 'sixties, the morale of the progressive and liberal circles was still very high. The spirit of reform which appeared in Russian society in the late 'fifties ran very high before the actual reform, mainly because all kinds of speculations about the nature of impending changes stimulated the liberal imagination. Many imagined some fantastic, spectacular events would take place, but all the plans of the more imaginative pomeshchik seem to vanish when those who were most involved--the peasants--began to inquire in their own uneducated but spectacular way. Then it appeared that their voices were not needed. The gentry automatically assumed the right to decide what would be best for their subjects, and this ended the brief spate of condescension which marked the late 'fifties. One of the reasons for the misunderstandings which followed was that the Tsar used the gentry as a transmission link with the lowest class, but this lowest class refused the authority of the gentry and was willing to listen only to the Tsar. In this way, there

was no connection between the Tsar and the peasants. From the peasant's point of view, it seemed absurd to listen to the gentry because he thought the gentry would be stripped of their authority and power over him, and so would not be able to implement the changes (the Great Reforms), being considered by the peasant the party inimical to the Emperor. The peasant viewed the Emperor as the liberator who would end with the pomeshchiki once and for all. Here, too, are the elements of konfuz.

Конфуз проник всюду; конфуз в сердцах помещиков, конфуз в соображениях почтенного купечества, конфуз в литературе и журналистике, конфуз в умах администраторов.²

One of the many aspects of konfuz is the change in the attitude of the administration and gentry towards their subjects. In Saltykov's Satires in Prose (Satiry v proze, 1861) this aspect is analyzed.

It appears that the konfuz brought about a "softening" of the hard way of dealing with the peasants and the author wonders where all this came from. He suggests I. S. Turgenev and Napoleon as the people who started the democratic ideas in Russia. He mentions Turgenev's Rudin (1856), but the French influence is preeminent:

. . . достаточно вспомнить только о той пользе, которую принесли Глупову сначала эмигранты французские и потом оборванные остатки de la grrrande armée, и о той, которую до наших дней приносят французы-гувернёры, французы-куафёры, французы-камердинеры.³

The tone of the stories that deal with Glupov in the Satires in Prose is very light compared to the tone of The History (within The History itself the progression to the tragic is noticeable). We can see here the elements of the future satiric chronicle in a very loose form; Glupov is still not considered in that magnanimous, all-embracing way as it was to become a few years later.

The cycle of Glupov was begun in the Satires in Prose. First came the story Literatory-obyvateli, then Kleveta, and the last one: Nashi glupovskie dela. In all these three stories there is an abundance of material of a "publicist" character, yet it does not make them as temporarily topical as some critics feared. There are, of course, numerous allusions to various public figures, but the point from which they are attacked or commented upon has not yet lost interest and the reason for that is the apparent parallel with contemporary (Soviet) Russia.⁴ One could almost say that the reason for the living interest in Saltykov in the Soviet Union today, and for the new editions of his work (his Collected Works are being published at the present time and the last edition of The History was published in 1970), is his criticism of those phenomena which have survived for a whole century.

But the Satires in Prose are not particularly conspicuous in this respect. The degree of generalization (and

consequently the universality of its meaning) is not as high as it is in The History. It is the generalization of the shortcomings of the autocratic system of government and their critique that makes The History so applicable wherever the autocracy, and all that goes with it, in any form still survives.

With the debut of Glupov and its subsequent establishment in stories like Glupovskoe rasputstvo (1862), Glupov i glupovtsy (1862), and Kapluny (written in 1862 but not published at the time because of censorship), Saltykov had a firm basis ready for his satiric chronicle. He had, more or less, the idea of Glupov and its inhabitants in mind ever since. He did not know yet what shape it would take, but as the picture of the narod became solid, he started to work on its counterpart: the Sidorichi, pompadury, gradonachal'niki, all of them being the "representatives" (as we now call them) of the people, of the Glupovians.

In the second half of the 'sixties, a book by B. Chicherin, O narodnom predstavitel'stve (1866), appeared in Russia. In it Chicherin, an influential apologist for the regime, tries to show why it is, and how it came about, that the monarchy represents the people, and goes to great lengths to show the supposed natural character of the autocracy.⁵ This book was of great interest to Saltykov, as in his writings he was trying to prove the contrary, hating the autocracy

as his most ideological colleagues seldom did. The theories of another apologist--M. Pogodin's praise of the Bezuslovnaya pokornost' naroda,⁶--is an example of the adversaries that the germinating ideas to be expressed in The History had to combat.

At the time of writing Satires in Prose, Saltykov's hope for an improved political situation was still high; he expected further changes after the decrees. Expression of this hope can be found in Kleveta (1861):

По всем признакам, положение Глупова одно из самых безнадежных: его точит какой-то недуг, который неминуемо должен привести к одру смерти. Однако, он не только не умирает, но даже изъявляет твердое намерение жить без конца. И не смотря на видимую нелепость этих надежд, я не могу не разделять их, я не могу не признать их вполне основательными . . . хотя сограждане твои и поражены проказой, но воздух Глупова чист, ибо освежается прилетающими из Умнова ветрами.⁷

Here, Saltykov believes in Umnov, which will help to change Glupov. Elsewhere in Satires in Prose, he mentions that a very long time ago, Glupov was called Umnov too. He believes in a renaissance of this forgotten Umnov. This is another of the important differences between the idea of Glupov which Saltykov had in the early 'sixties and the final idea expressed in The History, where the renaissance of Glupov is not mentioned. Obviously Saltykov, like many of his contemporaries, at first believed in a substantial progress which never materialized.

The loss of optimism is explained by Soviet critics accordingly: the counter-attack of the reaction after the Great Reforms made any progress illusory. For Saltykov it was a bitter loss, since he wished to see the last minutes of Glupov:

Я даже чувствую некоторую симпатию к новоглуповцу. Он мил мне потому, что он -- последний из глуповцев.⁸

Saltykov never returned to the novoglupovets and Umnov. Instead, he chose to concentrate on the counterpart of the glupovets, on the type which, in the guise of a governor or even a Tsar, ruled over the grey domain of Glupov. This time he chose to name it pompadur, but the reader recognized the Sidorich in him, as we might recognize pompadur in the governors, those formidable gradonachal'niki of the town of Glupov.

The Pompadours and Pompadouresses (Pompadury i pompadurshi) is a collection of stories which were published during the years 1863-1874. For our convenience, they can be divided into two parts: those published between 1863 and 1871, and those between 1871 and 1874. The stories were published in Sovremennik and Otechestvennye zapiski. There were four editions of Pompadours in Saltykov's lifetime: in 1873, 1879 and 1886.⁹

The pompadours were modelled after the provincial governors and vice-governors whose life Saltykov knew

intimately through his service in Ryazan' and Tver. The pompadouresses are the ingenious lovers of these provincial administrators. The choice of the pompadur was more than fortunate. The obvious sense that comes into one's mind first is the Marquise de Pompadour, the famous eighteenth century favourite of Louis XV. Like her, Saltykov's pompadursha is able to take care of the affairs of her lover. But the other sense of the word is closer to the Russian reader than the first. Here, the words pompa and the colloquial samodur (or dur) convey a mixture of the pomp and stupidity which Saltykov wanted to express with this type in the first place.¹⁰

When Saltykov began to write this collection of stories, he visualized something different from the final product. His intent at the beginning, around 1863, was to write what he called a Provintsial'ny romans v deystvii, and so in his letter to Nekrasov he called them "stories about the governors".¹¹ Saltykov's classification of the genre as romans (a small musical form similar to the ballad, usually composed to an already popular poem) shows the ironic bent which he wanted to give to these stories in order to annoy Fet, with whom he was at the time engaged in a polemic.¹² For the same reason he gave one of his stories the title Nazare ty ee ne budi, which was the first line of one of Fet's poems. Similarly, another story from the same series bears

the title Ona eshche edva umeet lepetat', which was the first line of Maykov's poem.

On the whole, the content of the Pompadours is to a great degree topical, as had been said many times by many critics about the whole body of Saltykov's work. Topical in the sense that he is very open in addressing his satirical charges to his political opponents. It is dated by its analysis of the post-reform period. However, there are stories which are closer in character to The History than to the series for which they were intended. Such is the late story of the first group, Edinstvenny (Utopia, 1871), where he presents a very exceptional pompadur who resembles the governor, Pryshch, of The History:

Ни наук, ни искусств он не знал; но если попадалась под руку книжка с картинками, то рассматривал ее с удовольствием. В особенности нравилась ему повесть о похождениях Робинзона Крузо на необитаемом острове (к счастью изданная с картинками).¹³

This pompadur was a man who hated violence which the administration used to keep "law and order". He is very sad and annoyed by the reports filed by a non-commissioned police-officer, who regularly turns in reports about impending rebellions and revolutionary activities. Since "etot pompadur dazhe sredi neobyknovennykh byl samy neobyknovenny", he decided that rebellions and revolutions existed only in the mind of the non-commissioned police-officer.

В администрации он был философ и был убежден,

что самая лучшая администрация заключается в
отсутствии таковой.¹⁴

As this is a "Utopia", the pompadur proclaims: "Net
revolyutsiy-s! Net i nikogda nebyvalo-s!" and arrests the
non-commissioned police-officer.

This, of course, does not take place in that Russia
as we know it from other stories from the same series. The
example, in its obvious absurdity, is close to the spirit of
The History and was picked up with that in mind.

In the other stories we come across things which Sal-
tykov used later in The History. Such is the title of the
pompadur's writing, O blagovidnoy administratora naruzhnosti,
which we find in the story Stary kot na pokoe (1868), where
the author of the mentioned piece of inspired writing is the
pompadur Blamanzhe, while in The History, Saltykov changed
the title to O blagovidnoy vsekh gradonachal'nikov naruzh-
nosti,¹⁵ whose "author" there is the governor Mikeladze.
Also, in the already quoted Maykovian-titled story, Ona
eshche edva umeet lepetat' (1864), we come across a form of
warning: "Razzoryu!", which will be so typical for the gover-
nor Organchik (Brudasty), who will pronounce it with the
mechanical "little organ" in The History.

A typical pompadur, however, is not the one who
arrests his non-commissioned police-officer, nor the one who
shouts "Razzoryu!". It is a different man, a character like

Mit'ka Kozlik, created according to Saltykov's personal experience. A young man, whose only occupation until he is thirty consists of promenading down the Nevsky, having dinner at the Dusseaus (on credit), and going to the Mikhailovsky Theatre in the evening, is the most likely future pompadur. After he passes his thirtieth year, the dirty jokes, which he kept telling the company of young fashionable men in St. Petersburg, begin to bore him and he yearns for a distinguished position in the province. Having an influential uncle and aunt, his wish readily turns into reality, and he becomes Dmitry Pavlovich Kozelkov. Very economically sketched, this brisk development of Mit'ka Kozlik into a provincial governor is a masterly miniature found in the story Zdravstvuy milaya, khoroshaya moya! (1864). In another story, Na zare ty ee ne budi (1864), the same Kozelkov's exploits, as those of an established pompadur, are followed. He is compared to Metternich on account of the skillful way he plays his opponents against each other. But ingenuity is not a predominant feature of the pompadur type in general; rather, it is their stupidity as demonstrated in Staraya pompadursha (1868), where a widow--pompadursha--wins over, unceremoniously, the new pompadur, discovering that he is as stupid as her husband was. After a while, she reigns over the province...

Saltykov's pompadurs are essentially bureaucrats. We

see them in their daily contact with their subordinates, and we learn about the problems of a provincial character; their occasionally absurd reaction to these problems does not make this series a writing of the absurd. There is a mass of very concrete political material that its satire exploits. All the pompadurs strive for power and more power, and some are unhappy that they are not allowed to write the law for their provinces. Despite their hunger for power, they lack the "greatness" of a gradonachal'nik, who does not have a nobler origin than the pompadur, but his "greatness" is achieved by attributing great designs to these officials, designs incompatible with the mere governorship of a provincial town. The gradonachal'nik gives us the impression that he, like an autocrat, is not interested in the "petty details" concerning the actual administration; he decides only the general course of his policies.

The Utopian pompadur who appeared in the story Edinstvenny (Utopia, 1871) has much in common with Gogol's Kostanzhoglo, Fonvizin's Pravdin, and also Goncharov's Stolz. They are all "too good to be true". They represent respectively the timely attitudes of their authors towards the qualities and abilities that a contemporary man should possess. However, Saltykov had the advantage of coming up as the last one of those mentioned writers, in that he did not repeat the "mistake" of his great colleagues. He did not

pretend to present the pompadur as the hero of just another of his stories, but as the hero of his Utopian story. In his own comic way, this pompadur represents the belief held by his author at the time of the publication of the story, i.e., around 1871 when, as we have seen, he did not believe any more in the reforms or Utopian socialism.

As different as the pompadurs are, they all come from the same stock. They invariably originate in the great family of Sidorichi, whom Saltykov avidly studied throughout the 'sixties:

. . . меня занимает не домашнее устройство Сидорычей, об этом и без меня довольно писали -- но поведение и дела их, как расы, существующей политически.¹⁶

This, no doubt, is perfectly in accordance with the peculiar typology (dela ikh kak rasy), already mentioned at the beginning of this work. The series Pompadury i pompadurshi is a study of this type, which evolved from a crude official of Krutogorsk through novoglupovets to pompadur.¹⁷ As Saltykov concentrates on this type, the mass (glupovtsy) is standing far in the background. Saltykov mentioned this earlier, in 1862, in what amounted to a little declaration of a programme:

. . . предметом моих изысканий были и будут исключительно Сидорычи.¹⁸

--that is, those in power, like pompadury, or gradonachal'niki.

In the series Pompadury we also find what will be so important in The History: the art of condensing his type into a sketch that bears all the necessary features to make him representative of the type, the characterization of the various characters according to their speech which, furthermore, determines their social standing; the role of nature as the factor which stresses the development of the character.

In 1865, Saltykov wrote to Annenkov that he was beginning to write Ocherki goroda Bryukhova;¹⁹ in 1867 and 1868 he wrote to Nekrasov about the pompadur with the stuffed head.²⁰ These plans, however, indicate the gradual development of The History. Instead of the history of Bryukhov, Saltykov wrote the history of Glupov, the pompadur with the stuffing in head turned into the gradonachal'nik Pryshch.

In 1869, the January issue of Otechestvennye zapiski carried the first chapters of The History. These chapters marked the synthesis of a decade-long quest for adequate expression of his ideas about the people and their rulers. I have attempted to trace the development of the type of the rulers, and also to point out the influence of the political situation in connection with Saltykov's konfuz, being aware of their significance for The History.

When Saltykov published the first chapters he did not know how controversial his satiric chronicle would be, nor did he foresee that his satiric presentation of the most

troublesome problem in Russian intellectual history--the problem of the relationship between the people and their rulers--would become a work of art which would free itself from the fetters of the time and present a view of the history of Russia that would not only transcend the period and the personalities with which it was dealing, but also give an insight into the characteristic features of the Russian nation.

CHAPTER IV

THE HISTORY OF GLUPOV

„Истории у Глупова
нет -- факт печальный
и тяжело отразившийся
на обитателях.“

-- Saltykov

Saltykov wrote the above in 1862.¹ At that time, he had not idea that what seemed to be a joke at the beginning (Glupov) would grow into a cycle which he would conclude with a history of Glupov. So, after all, Glupov had a history. It was written according to the principles which were used by Pogodin, Shubinsky, Bartenev, Mordovtsev, Mel'nikov, in their historical studies. That means that the history of Glupov was to be the history of its rulers, the governors (gradonachal'niki), because these historians took special pains to prove their thesis, according to which the history of Russia was actually the history of the ruling dynasty. Pokusaev writes:

Идеологи царизма, историки -- „государственники“ утверждают, что самодержавная власть -- это будто бы самая созидательная, самая распорядительная сила истории. Салтыков-Щедрин как бы до крайности доводит эту реакционную идею, выжимает все нелепости, которые она таит в себе.²

This meant, practically, that Saltykov, in order to parody the historians, chose to develop their ideas ad absurdum and show how wrong they were. This assumption seems to render

the pathos of the work ideally, ever since we can refer to the sympathies which Saltykov was supposed to have for Shchapov's ideas on history, more specifically, on the predominant role of people rather than sovereigns.³ Shchapov, a historian, said the following on that subject:

It is now a well-established notion that the fundamental factor of history is the people itself and that it is the spirit of the people that makes history. This idea is no longer new . . .⁴

Yet, in order to be satisfied by Pokusaev and Kirpotin, we should see Saltykov showing the people actually making history. Quite the contrary: The History is a powerful accusation of the people's lack of any constructive action except senseless rebellions, bunty that more than anything else stood as a target for Saltykov's sarcasm. It appears, then, that Saltykov's work rejects the implications of a narrow interpretation which operates with the "black and white" system (or, "reactionary and progressive"), since pointing out the author's criticism of something identified as "reactionary" does not necessarily bring us the same author's agreement with what is considered "progressive". Generally, it is much safer to point out what is being attacked than to show from what standpoint the attack was directed.

The reasons for which this work seems to invite the critics and lure them into political interpretations, is its powerful negativism. One feels in the chronicle the author's

strong dislike for the subject treated. It is, indeed, a morbid pathology of the times and the smell of decay which emanates from it invites the ideologue to pronounce his judgment only to be defied by the work's complexity which embraces more...

Quite apart from these considerations stand the fact that, for the most part, material for this satire was supplied by what we may call in general the Russian politics of the nineteenth century, but this does not give us license to construe a binding theory which not only fails to persuade the reader, but simply offers an unsatisfactory resolution.

The text which will be under analysis on the following pages comes from the latest (1969) edition of Sobranie sochinenii,⁵ which is reprinted from the 1883 edition: that is, the last one published during Saltykov's lifetime.⁶

There were important changes in the order of the chapters. In the first (journal) edition, the chapter O koreni proiskhozhdeniya glupovtsev appears as the last (sixteenth), while the first book edition puts it into third place. Another item, the Opravdatel'nye dokumenty, which in the journal text appeared in sixth place, is put at the end of the first definitive book edition (published in St. Petersburg in 1870).⁷

Formally, the composition of The History is a parody of the usual type of monograph that contemporary historians

wrote. It is a chronicle divided into two parts; the first consists of general and introductory chapters, the second devotes a special chapter to each "personality" or governor of Glupov.⁸ The whole work is appended by the "documents" mentioned above (Opravdatel'nye dokumenty). It is probably due to this structure that the censorship found it impossible to prevent the publication of this work (the material to which censorship objected was spread in such a way, due to the structure, that the complete picture is obtained only when all its parts are put together), but the composition was not the only device designed to confound the censor. The point of view was another of the author's multitude of ingenious ideas in this game. At the beginning, Saltykov pretends to the role of a mere publisher who edits and publishes "podlinnye dokumenty". He speaks in the work with many different voices: as a publisher and three different archivists, chroniclers. This gives him ample opportunity to interrupt the chronicler as the publisher (or as himself). But, most of all, this arrangement gives him a license whereby he describes the events through the eyes and sensitivity of a chronicler whose point of view itself is a source of satirical presentation of the said events. Finally, the chronicle is written in an Aesopic language, as termed by the critics, intentionally ambiguous enough to make the censor as well as the modern reader uncertain about the

meaning of many allusions.⁹

In the introduction, Ot izdatel'ya, we are told that the chronicle covers a period beginning in 1731 and ending in 1825. The whole period is summarized here and the reader also receives certain clues that tell him how to look at the work which he is about to read. For example, speaking about the variety of governors and their different approaches to the changing problems, the author suddenly reveals:

Все они секут обывателей, но первые секут абсолютно, вторые объясняют причины своей распорядительности требованиями цивилизации, третьи желают, чтоб обыватели во всем положились на их отвагу.¹⁰

--and the reader is aware that the preceding talk about the variety of the governors was a smoke-screen. In another part of the introduction, the author writes about the fantastic occurrences that took place in the period which the chronicle covers (1731-1825), saying that this should be enough to show the reader what an abyss separates him (the reader) from the past. However, the content of the chronicle is constantly proving the contrary (i.e., there is no abyss, no change). This false emphasis recurs in the chronicle as it is one of Saltykov's favourite devices.

After the introduction, there is another short item. It is the Obrashchenie k chitatelyu ot poslednego arkhivariusa-letopistsa. The function of this piece is to turn the attention to the implicit rank of the governors. Through

many hints, the "chronicler" lets the reader know that the governors (whom he calls Nero, Achilles, etc.) represent a more elevated office than the explicit rank of the governor of a provincial town. For that purpose, the "chronicler" quotes from Derzhavin's Vel'mozha (Калигула! твой конь в сенате / Не мог сиять, сияя в злате: / Сияют добрые дела!)¹¹

The comparison of the governors to despots does not leave the reader in doubt as to the real meaning of the forthcoming "historical" record. This chapter is written in the eighteenth century style with corresponding expressions, but the false impression of the mockingly old document is suddenly brought out by the reference to Bartenev (1829-1912), Saltykov's contemporary, and the reader is once again reminded of the present rather than the past.¹² In the conclusion of the Obrashchenie, the chronicler compares Glupov to Rome:

Разница в том только состоит, что в Риме сияло нечестие, а у нас--благочестие, Рим заражало буйство, а нас--кротость, в Риме бушевала подлая чернь, а у нас--начальники.¹³

With this, the short Obrashchenie ends, and the mercilessly ironic view on the origin of the Russian Empire follows in the chapter, O koreni proiskhozhdeniya glupovtsev, the chapter which in the journal edition appeared as the last.

Here we find the description of the beginning of Glupov, and so Saltykov deems it necessary to inaugurate it in

an appropriate fashion:

Не хочу я, подобно Костомарову, серым волком
по замли, ни, подобно Соловьёву, шизым орлом ширать
под облеку, ни подобно Пыпину, растекаться мыслью
по древу...¹⁴

This is a skillful travesty of the Slovo o polku Igoreve (Боян бо вещей, аще кому хотяше песнь творити, то растекашется мыслию по древу, серым влком по земли, шизым орлом под облаку),¹⁵ where Saltykov wove in the names of three contemporary historians known by their different approaches to the history of Russia. Mentioned are: N. I. Kostomarov (1817-1885), who stressed the importance of the national movements rather than the role of the rulers (his works Bogdan Khmel'nitsky and the Time of Troubles illustrate his opinion); S. M. Solov'ev (1820-1879), who belonged to the opposing camp, believing that the Russian state was developed because of the policy of the Tsars; and A. N. Pypin (1833-1904), who used for his works very broad background material of a cultural nature. It is amazing how well Saltykov managed to give the characteristics of these three scholars, while staying inside the stylized imitation.¹⁶

The function of this pseudo-poetical introduction to the history of Glupov is to show the way in which Saltykov's want to treat his material; to the exclusion of the most current methods, he will bring a record, a chronicle of trivia, which will as often as not be absurd, naive, feeble-

minded and also profound. If we could compare the events that Saltykov mentions to a cover which envelops some essence or implicit material, then with each absurdity this cover will deteriorate, and through the holes we will catch a glimpse of the essence of the chronicle, its adaptable, universal message of the predicament of the human being suffering under severe limitations imposed on him by the authorities. For this reason, we find in The History contemporary thought, knowledge of the concepts which appeared in the historiography in Saltykov's time. As Kirpotin says:

Если внимательно вчитаться в текст "Истории одного города" то обнаружится, что Щедрин черпал для своего шедевра материалы из современности не в меньшей степени чем из истории.¹⁷

--but at the same time, Kirpotin turns to the one-sided approach, the danger of which was already elucidated on the previous pages:

Самая форма пародии на труды ученых-современников, на их концепции, на их политические взгляды, едкая насмешка над отрицанием роли народных масс и исторической законности революций. вносили в книгу Щедрина дух актуальности.¹⁸

On the basis of The History, it is not possible to make Saltykov a champion of the "role of the masses" and the "historical inevitability of revolutions". Such opinion is useful for illustration of the reading subjected to one-sided interpretation. Kirpotin is right when he says that the book has a spirit of actuality.

In the chapter O koreni proiskhozhdeniya glupovtsev, Saltykov traces the origin of the Glupovians to a tribe which he calls golovot'yapy. The name comes from the tribe's main characteristic, that of hitting their heads on anything within reach. This tribe was surrounded by a number of other tribes with similarly funny names:

. . . моржееды, лукоеды, гущееды, клюковники, куралесы, вертячие бобы, лягушечники, лапотники, чернонёбные, долбежники, проломленные головы, слепороды, губошлепы, вислоухие, кособрюхие, ряпушники, заугольники, крошевники и рукосуи.¹⁹

Suvorin, the author of the most quoted negative review of The History, called the above-quoted names of the various tribes living in the area of present-day Russia a "mockery of the nation".²⁰ In defence, Saltykov wrote a letter to Vestnik Evropy, the journal in which Suvorin's review appeared in 1871:

. . . утверждаю [wrote Saltykov], что ни одно из этих названий не вымышлено мною, и ссылаюсь в этом случае на Даля, Сахарова и других любителей русской народности. Они засвидетельствуют, что этот "вздор" сочинен самим народом...²¹

I. P. Sakharov's work Skazaniya russkogo naroda fully supports Saltykov. "Morzheyed" was a name for the inhabitant of the Arkhangelsk area, "gushcheyed" and "dolbezhnik" for the inhabitants of Novgorod, and so on.²²

In a similar vein, Saltykov writes about the deeds of the golovot'yapy:

Волгу толочном замесили, потом теленка на баню

тащили, потом в кошеле кашу варили, потом козла в соложеном тесте утопили, потом свинью за бобра купили, да собаку за волка убили, потом лапти растеряли да по дворам искали: было лаптей шесть, а сыскали семь; потом рака с колокольным звоном встречали, потом щуку с яиц согнали, потом комара за восемь верст ловить ходили . . .²³

All this, as a presentation of the origin of Russian history, was very insulting to the feeling of national pride and prowess, so highly extolled during the celebrations of Russia's millennium. Both liberals and conservatives shared the boisterous feeling of accomplishment, although they certainly differed in their views as to the force responsible for the development of the Russian state. Saltykov, judging from his work, lacked--if we are to look at him through the eyes of his contemporaries--the sense of identity not only with the "historical Russian nation", but also with the sensibility of the intellectual milieu, and the prevailing zeitgeist of his time. He was skeptical when confronted with either the pathetic effervescence of those who praised narod, or the calculated plans of those who wished to prepare a better future for it with their rigid socialist schemes of a Utopian character. Clearly, then, he was an outcast...

In presenting the origin of the Glupovians (narod) in a profoundly anti-pathetic way, Saltykov made use of the rich folk expressions which supplied him with a folksy attitude toward what the people thought was stupid (рака с коло-

КОЛЬНЫМ ЗВОНОМ ВСТРЕЧАЛИ, ПОТОМ ШУКУ С ЯИЦ СОГНАЛИ, etc.).

The stupidity of the Glupovians is almost unlimited and the author does not waste a single line without stressing this in the chapter O koreni...; in one place, describing the search for a ruler undertaken by the Glupovians, they spend three years and three days looking for a suitable prince who would be willing to take them as his subjects (parody of the invitation of the Varangians). They make it known that they are looking for the most stupid prince in the world. On their way, they ask everyone to show them the way to the stupid prince:

Шли они по ровному месту три года и три дня, и всё никуда прийти не могли. Наконец, однако, дошли до болота. Видят, стоит на краю болота Чухломец-рукосуй, рукавицы торчат за поясом, а он других ищет.

-- Не знаешь ли, любезный рукосуюшко, где бы нам такого князя сыскать, чтобы не было его на свете глупее? -- взмолилися головотяпы.

-- Знаю, есть такой, -- отвечал рукосуй, -- вот идите прямо через болото, как раз тут.

Бросились они все разом в болото, и больше половины их тут потопло ("Многие за землю свою поревновали", говорит летописец); . . .²⁴

Here we have a good example of style of the whole work. In the first place, Saltykov shows us a non-event, a banal account of the group of silly people in search of one who should be even more silly. This group loses more than half its people in the swamp because of its stupidity. The

key to the understanding of this passage is in the words „Многие за землю свою поревновали“, a cliche one could find in a historical monograph of that time. This sentence, however, sets the whole non-event into its proper perspective, hinting that the real history, the real origin of what was later to become the Russian Empire consisted as well of similar non-events, the absurdity of which becomes immediately obvious as it is contrasted with any gross, glorificatory statement like „Многие за землю свою поревновали“.

Further on in The History, we will find even more banal and trivial incidents which Saltykov treats with all the seriousness and respect that a chronicler would invest into them.

The search-party of the Glupovians (at that time still called golovot'yapy), finally reaches the prince for whom they have been looking such a long time. It is their voluntary choice to become his vassals and they accept his demands. The ruthless prince, after giving them his orders, lets them go with these words:

„А как не умели вы жить на своей воле и сами, глупые, пожелали себе кабалы, то наивываться вам впредь не головотяпами, а глуповцами.“²⁵

Saltykov stresses here the voluntary character of this satirical "invitation of the Varangians". For our purpose, it is not important that modern historiography treats this "invitation" more or less as a supposed incident, pointing

out the half-legendary and almost mythical character of Rurik's appointment. The veracity of the facts is intentionally distorted or ignored for a simple reason: Saltykov was not writing a history of Russia. He was a satirist, not a historian. His aim as a satirist was not to give a satirical account of Russia's past, but a satirical account of the phenomena which originated in Russia in the past and haunted its present.

CHAPTER V

THE TWO KINDS OF NAROD

Since mystical and fatalistic views on the problems of Russia were foreign to him, Saltykov makes the golovot'yapy responsible for turning into the glupovtsy. Theirs was the choice and they chose submission instead of freedom. There exists a possibility of the Slavic tribes having been subjected by force, but Saltykov does not approach this, because contemporary historians did not, and, on the contrary, glorified the legendary "invitation". This glorification, rather than the historical incident itself, was objectionable to him, and The History sensitively records similar events which were interpreted officially in such a way that Saltykov reacted by ridiculing them in his chronicle. This is the case with the rest of the historical material with which Saltykov so prodigiously plays, leaving something out and adding something else instead, to the discomfiture and misunderstanding of those who looked for the missing events.

Suvorin, in the previously mentioned review of 1871, not only criticized Saltykov for not mentioning such important historical events as Pugachev's Uprising and many others, but, more seriously, accused Saltykov of what he called "glumlennie nad narodom", of mockery of the people.¹ Saltykov replied with two letters, in which he explained many

things about The History. These two letters are at the same time the most detailed statement about the aim and nature of The History. One is a personal letter to A. N. Pypin, the editor of Vestnik Evropy, the other is addressed to the journal itself. In the first one, as befits a private letter, Saltykov is more outspoken.²

In the letter to the journal, Saltykov defends himself against the charges of mockery of the people with a shatteringly bold theory. He comes out with the idea that a distinction should be made (presumably by the reviewer, Suvorin) between the historical people (narod istoricheskiy) and the people as the embodiment of democratic ideas (narod kak voplotitel' idei demokratizma). Saltykov accuses Suvorin of not making such a distinction:

Вообще, недоразумение относительно глумления над народом, как кажется, происходит от того, что рецензент мой не отличает народа исторического, то есть действующего на поприще истории, от народа как воплощения идеи демократизма. Первый оценивается и приобретает сочувствие по мере дел своих. Если он производит Бородавкиных и Угрюм-Бурчевых; [the most notorious governors of Glupov]; то о сочувствии не может быть речи; если он выказывает стремление выйти из состояния бессознательности тогда сочувствие к нему является вполне законным, но мера этого сочувствия все-таки обуславливается мерою усилий, делаемых народом на пути к сознательности.³

The position of Saltykov is made crystal clear by this explanation. He cannot be accused of the said mockery, because the people for him consist of two parts. His satire

hits only one part, the part which Saltykov thought deserved to be hit. Satire here is meant in the general meaning: a literary work that holds up to ridicule and contempt in denouncing, exposing, or deriding vice, folly, abuses, stupidities or evils of any kind. Saltykov then asserted the right to ridicule whatever he liked with a form which he considered appropriate.

It is no wonder that an introductory chapter like the one Saltykov wrote generated such an amount of criticism and dissatisfaction. It was here that the edifice built by the glorifiers was attacked at the very foundations.

The Glupovians are ruled indirectly at first. The "most stupid of princes", who had agreed to be the Glupovian ruler, sent a thief to substitute for him. This arrangement did not prove satisfactory, and so the prince came to Glupov personally and with a shout "I'll flog you to death!" took over control of the town of Glupov: "S etim slovom nachalis' istoricheskie vremena."⁴

The brisk ending of the introductory chapter expresses the "philosophy" of most of the governors who were to rule over the town of Glupov, the flogging being the unchanging characteristic of the changing times. In the preceding chapter the author had given us a list of the governors, whom we already know by the name which Saltykov gave them: gradonachal'niki. Although these are sent to Glupov "from

above", their existence depends on the tolerance of the Glupovians, as the author writes in his letter to Suvorin. For, if they are ready to tolerate the vicious governors, it means they (narod) are unconscious beings and as such they fully deserve to be ruled by them.

This, then, is the meaning of the two kinds of narod. The satiric chronicle tries to bring about a change and wake up the "unconscious beings" by concentrating on the governors by revealing their viciousness and, at the same time, their emptiness.

CHAPTER VI

THE GOVERNORS

The title gradonachal'nik, which Saltykov gave to his governors, was not fictitious. The office of gradonachal'nik was established in 1862. The gradonachal'nik was responsible for the administration of the two "capitals"-- St. Petersburg and Moscow--and also of the seven main ports, such as Odessa, Sevastopol and others. He directly supervised the police and the municipal "self'government". The main function of the gradonachal'nik (according to the Bol'shaya sovetskaya entsiklopediya) was to fight the revolutionary movement. The fact that Saltykov used this designation for the period preceding the actual establishment of the office makes it an intentional anachronism, in which The History abounds. The anachronisms were designed, in general, to direct the reader's attention to the present; in the case of the office of the governor, to direct attention higher than to the office of a mere governor of a town.

A short chapter, Opis' gradonachal'nikam (List of Governors), is a list of governors who ruled over Glupov between 1731 and 1826. The limit (the year 1826) is only formal, for he breaches it with his anachronisms and references to contemporary events that make any special identification and collation a senseless exercise. Saltykov

stressed in his already quoted letter that he did not want to be straitjacketed by any formal obstacles and chose to defy all the logical and factual precepts that a non-satirical work was obliged to follow:

. . . В сущности, я никогда не стеснялся формой и пользовался ею лишь настолько, насколько находил это нужным; в одном месте говорил от лица архивариуса, в другом--от своего собственного; в одном--придерживался указаний истории, в другом--говорил о таких фактах, которых в данную минуту совсем не было.²

The Opis' gradonachal'nikam (from now on, the List) contains twenty-two entries. The number of entries, however, does not correspond to the number of governors treated more extensively in the book. All in all, only seven of the total of twenty-two are accorded an extensive treatment, while the other serve another function. Thus, the next chapter does not begin with governor number one, Klementiy, as it should, but with number eight: Brudasty (Organchik). The List is also a sample of the kind of nonsensical humour which sporadically invades the pages of the chronicle. To show an example of contrasting entries, I will compare Boro-davkin (number twelve on the List) with Du Chariot (number eighteen):

12. Бородавкин, Василиск Семенович. Градоначальничество сие было самое продолжительное и самое блестящее. Предволителствовал в компании против недоимщиков, причем спалил тридцать три деревни и, с помощью сих мер, взыскал недоимок два рубля с полтиною. Ввел в употребление игру ламуш и прованское масло; замостил базарную площадь и засадил березками

улицу, ведущую к присутственным местам; вновь ходатайствовал о заведении в Глупове академии, но получив отказ, построил съезжий дом. Умер в 1798 году, на экзекуции, напутствуемый капитан-исправником.³

18. Дю Шарю, виконт, Ангел Дорофеевич, французский выходец. Любил рядиться в женское платье и лакомился лягушками. По рассмотрении, оказался девицею. Выслан в 1821 году за границу.⁴

Borodavkin is a character with whom Saltykov is concerned much more than with Du Chariot, if we take them as representatives of the two strains that make up this work. The first would be the serious one, of the Borodavkin kind, while the other might invite charges of the "laugh for laugh's sake" kind. On the whole, these two elements co-exist and are intermingled, which demonstrated in the very condensed account of governors' activities the Opis' gradonachal'nikam. If we look at Borodavkin, for example, we see two kinds of activities: he burned down thirty-three villages in his "administrative zealously", and also introduced some card game (lamush), and olive oil. The second activity offsets the heavy, tragic impression received by the sad fact of the burning down of the villages. Such is the function of the governor Du Chariot's place in the List; it is a light touch of the comic which keeps the balance of the tragic and comic in check. Later on in the chronicle this balance will be tipped on the side of the tragic.

As we look at the governors on the List, the problem of the topicality of this satiric work emerges once more: is

it possible for the reader to read this satiric chronicle without being acquainted with the specificum of that particular socio-political situation, the realia that served as a model for it? The answer is positive, because the merging of satiric and purely humorous elements makes for two kinds of reading. The chronicle offers a rich satiric palette for the initiated while making laugh those who are not. To understand this, we might perhaps modify slightly the statement of T. S. Eliot, who said about Shakespeare's plays:

For the simplest auditors there is the plot, for the more thoughtful the character and conflict of character, for the more literary the words and phrasing, for the more musically sensitive the rhythm, and for auditors of greater understanding and sensitiveness a meaning which reveals itself gradually.⁵

Thus, for some, Saltykov's work will be a work of humour, for others a biting satire which has lost its impact because it is topical, and for another group of people it will be both humorous and satirical and not at all dated in the nineteenth century, because for them Saltykov's characters are caught in the infernal machine of conflicts produced by the epoch which was made Saltykov's target--all of which could be expressed under the term condition humaine. If identified this way, The History projects the evolution of the human condition which he saw as a continuum easily discernible in the eighteenth century:

Может быть, я и ошибаюсь, но в всяком случае

ошибаюсь совершенно искренно, что те же самые основы жизни, которые существовали в XVIII веке--существуют и теперь.⁶

It is clear from this statement that the governors do not act in a void, they are rather limited in their actions by the said continuum. In view of this, the satirist refuses to populate the space that he created with identifiable monarchs; he rather uses certain types (faithful to the mentioned typology) who, to be sure, embody some of the characteristics of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century Russian autocrats, but never to the point of mere satiric plagiarism of actual Russian history, of which some accused him.

From amongst the governors that are accorded more extensive treatment, so far only Borodavkin has been mentioned. The rest of the seven are: Dvoekurov, Ferdyshchenko, Brudasty, Benevolensky, Grustilov, Ugryum-Burcheev. The remaining fifteen governors form a gallery of often incredible characters, where the mundane clashes with the fantastic: Pfeyfer, Bogdan Bogdanovich, sergeant of the guard, for example, was taken from his position because of his ignorance (this is mundane); a Frenchman, Marquis de Sanglot, a friend of Diderot, was known for his light-mindedness, his singing of obscene songs, and flying in the air. The latter was almost fatal for him, since once as he was flying in the garden he almost flew away but he got stuck on the point of

a tower (this is fantastic); another governor, Major Pryshch, had his head stuffed with appetizing stuffing, the governor Ivanov was of such a small stature that he could not absorb the voluminous regulations and died from exhaustion when trying to comprehend some senatorial ukaz (mundane and fantastic). The gradonachal'nik Mikeladze died of exhaustion too, after he had enlarged the population of Glupov twice.

The governors whom Saltykov treats more extensively later in his book are characterized in the List only briefly, but at the same time they are endowed with their most typical features or accomplishments to make the List comparable to a petite dictionary entry of a historical personage.

To sum up the List of Governors, one has to stress the importance of the possibility of reading and understanding this chronicle on more than one level. The material of the List can be readily adopted by the reader who does not know the relevant historical parallels which are offered to him; he will simply read it as a book of absurd humour. On the other hand, one can understand Suvorin's objection as the reaction of a man who knew very well the details on the socio-political level to the extent of excluding a more simple interpretation of the work, in fact disregarding any other possible reading except that of a consistent, biting historical satire.

In many respects, the whole chronicle resembles the

List. As in the List, the reader finds in the chronicle deep changes of both the tone and the characters; one is led through a perpetual circle of comedy and tragedy, the ups and downs of which, like bumps on a country road, remind one of the List. Here the reader also finds a sample of Saltykov's technique of humour, his laughter through tears.

CHAPTER VII

LAUGHTER THROUGH TEARS

"И должно еще определено мне озирать всю громадно-несущуюся жизнь, озирать ее сквозь видный миру смех и незримые, неведомые ему слезы."

-- Gogol

Laughter through tears was called a "serious philosophical element" by C. Kulešov in her work about The History.¹ Whether or not a philosophical element, laughter through tears appears to be the condition of the satiric chronicle. This condition consists of two contradictory ingredients: the comic and the tragic, yet it is not identical with tragicomedy inasmuch as the latter, as a rule, has a happy denouement, while Saltykov's satiric chronicle has a very macabre and mystical ending.²

Tragic, in our case, is the very situation or state of things. The Glupovians, flogged throughout the duration of the period covered by the chronicle, supply and constitute the tragic element here. Their predicament is one of the targets for Saltykov's mockery, irony and exercise in wit and humour. The laughter that results from the use of abundant satirical and humorous devices is not a boisterous, careless one; the reader, aware of the plight of the

Glupovians, laughs then through tears, as it were, unable to dissociate the humorous incident from the gruesome situation of the Glupovians in general.

The History was written for the reader who actually lived in Glupov, if we are to believe Saltykov. As such, he was sensitive to the above-mentioned "tragic element" as it was part of his life, and so it was necessary to show the Glupovians in such a way as to make him detest the Glupovians, to enlarge their stupidity to such an extent that he would be prevented from sympathizing with them.³ Saltykov did exactly that: he deprived the reader of the possibility of sympathizing, yet he made an effort to assure him that Glupov was not an ephemeral creation. This, no doubt, added a tinge of bitterness to even the craziest escapades that we encounter in the chronicle.

The role of the satirist who utilizes "smekh skvoz slezy" is to see life through both laughter and tears. For Gogol, as we can see from the quotation at the beginning of this chapter, thought that people could see only the laughter while he saw also the tears (незримые, неведомые [миру] слезы). Thus, in Gogol's The Greatcoat (Shinel', 1842), the people, mir, represented by the colleagues of Akaky Akakievich see only the comical part of the poor official's life. Gogol then makes a point of exploring the "unseen" part, the ridiculous but moving desire to own a nice, warm overcoat.

When reading it, we are conscious of the author's manipulation of our sympathy. In Eikhenbaum's analysis of The Greatcoat,⁴ the shift of emphasis, the distribution of priorities--the enlarging of the insignificant detail at the expense of what seems to require more attention--serves as a method of grotesque composition,⁵ which in its turn relays the idea of smekh skvoz' slezy to the reader.

Thus, when we look at smekh skvoz' slezy in The History, we inevitably turn to Gogol for comparison. This comparison is pertinent not only for the understanding of the satirical genre in general, but mainly for the understanding of Saltykov's utilization of the devices used by his great predecessor. C. Kulešov⁶ mentions, in this connection the work of A. Slonimskii (Tekhnika komicheskogo u Gogolya),⁷ whose analysis of Gogol's work is supposedly equally valid for Saltykov's work. The danger of comparison, however, lies in the closeness of the things compared; they are close to each other, but they retain their specific features. So it is with the works of the two authors discussed here. The genuinely tragic element never gains the upper hand in Gogol's work, while Saltykov's is often marked by excruciating gloom (an example of the last is supplied by Saltykov's most famous work, The Golovlevs [Gospoda Golovlevy, 1872-76], where all the principal characters die a slow death in an atmosphere of decay devoid of any hope).

A similar gloom hangs over Glupov. Kyra Sanine, in her book on Saltykov, writes:

. . . le fait est que l'élément tragique, absent de premières pages, prend ensuite une place de plus en plus grand.⁸

This similarity to The Golovlevs should be stressed and not overlooked, as it usually is in works devoted to The History. It is an indication of a change of direction. As pointed out in the discussion about the differences of approach in Provincial Sketches and The History, one that was examined in the first part of this work, Saltykov became sceptical about the outcome of the Great Reforms; and his satire in the decade that followed the abolition of serfdom, a satirical rendering of reality, reflected some of this scepticism. The light-hearted, humorous (albeit in the minority) gives way to the sardonic, expressed by means of sarcasm, irony and invective. The invective, designed to discredit the misconduct of the public, then takes the most important position in The Golovlevs.⁹

The gloomy, the tragic, present more than before in Saltykov's writing, still gives place to hilarious scenes and illogical commentaries supplied by the chroniclers (there were four of them). Such is the first chapter, Organchik, which describes the period of the governorship of one Brudasty (marked as number eight in the List of Governors, Opis' Gradonachal'nikam,¹⁰ who arrived in Glupov in 1762. Brudasty

is not a human being, but a puppet with a speaking apparatus enabling him to pronounce only two words, "Ne poterplyu!" and later, "Razoryu!" The juxtaposition of the image of a man-like mechanical object with the rationally thinking group of officials investigating the malfunction of the artificial vocal chords is hilarious, mainly because the officials are bothered less by finding that their governor was only a puppet with an empty head and a little machine than by the danger that might arise if the Glupovians were informed about it. They do not find it very strange and accept their governor, since he was sent to them from above:

. . . помощник градоначальника сообразил, что ежели однажды допущено, чтобы в Глупове был городничий, имеющий вместо головы простую укладку, то, стало быть, это так и следует.¹¹

The commentaries supplied by chroniclers whose judgment is often impaired is another device which helps to dispel the gloom. The following example functions on more than one level:

Возник вопрос: какую надобность мог иметь градоначальник в Байбакове, который, кроме того что пил без просыпа, был еще и явный прелюбодей?¹²

The matter concerns Baybakov, the watchmaker, called to repair the ill-functioning head of Brudasty, Organchik. The commentary employs five different ideas tightly packed in one short sentence: 1) the problem (voznik vopros), 2) the need for Baybakov (kakuyu nadobnost', etc.), 3) Baybakov drinks (kotoryi, krome togo chto pil), 4) Baybakov drinks

without restraint (bez prosypa), 5) Baybakov is a fornicator.

Not only illogical when we connect the beginning of the sentence with its conclusion (the need for Baybakov, the fornicator), it is also illogical (and written with that purpose) as a commentary, since the chronicler omitted the most important thing about Baybakov, the fact that he was a watchmaker in the first place, and then a drunkard and a fornicator. The wealth of irrelevancies reminds one of Gogol's writing. Like him, Saltykov tried to exploit this technique as often as the text permitted. In the following citation from the beginning of the chapter Voyny za prosveshchenie, Saltykov characterizes the new governor who has come to Glupov, Vasilisk Semenovich Borodavkin:

Бородавкин, сменивший бригадира Фердыщенко, представлял совершенную противоположность своему предместнику. Насколько последний был распушен и рыхл, настолько же первый поражал расторопностью и какую-то неслыханной административной выедчивостью, которая с особенной энергией проявлялась в вопросах, касавшихся выеденного яйца. Постоянно застегнутый на все пуговицы и имея поготове фуражку и перчатки, он представлял собой тип градоначальника, у которого ноги во всякое время готовы бежать неведомо куда. Днем он, как муха, мелькал по городу, наблюдая, чтоб обыватели имели бодрый и веселый вид, ночью--тушил пожары, делал фальшивые тревоги и вообще заставлял врасплох.¹³

Amidst what reads like a matter-of-fact description, we find devices that persistently recur throughout the work; irrelevant detail: "застегнутый на все пуговицы и имея поготове фуражку и перчатки"; play upon words: "поражал . . .

административной выедчивостью, которая с особенной энергией проявлялось в вопросах, касавшихся выеденного яйца," (from a proverbial expression, "не стоит выеденного яйца" = "not worth a wooden nickel"¹⁴); grotesque simile: "Днем он, как муха, мелькал по городу," a parody of logical form, where the projected sense of the sentence is turned into nonsense: ". . . он представлял собой тип градоначальника, у которого ноги во всякое время готовы бежать неведомо куда." The whole paragraph, moreover, is concluded with a bout of feverish activity which has nothing to do with the activity expected of a governor ("тушил пожары, делал фальшивые тревоги и вообще заставлял врасплох"), and which, therefore, makes us realize what kind of administrative efficiency distinguished this new governor from the old one. The author gradually leads the reader to accept that there was basically no difference among the various governors. Borodavkin, whom Saltykov presents as the opposite of his predecessor Ferdyshchenko ("представлял совершенную противоположность") appears to have no redeeming features which would help to ameliorate the life of the Glupovians.

The humour of this passage comes from the interplay of two sets of ideas: one set is our expectancy that the picture of Borodavkin will conform to our image of an efficient administrator, an improvement over the former one; the other set of ideas is the deformation of the ideal of an

administrator by skillful manipulation of the above-mentioned devices.

Seen from the point of view of the structure of the chronicle, the chapter Voyny za prosveshchenie comes after the chapters Solomennyi gorod and Fantasticheskii puteshestvennik; the first of those two chapters contains a deeply moving description of a village fire, hailed as one of the few powerful and authentic descriptions of a village on fire in Russian literature.¹⁵ The other shows the governor Ferdyshchenko indulging in "travels" through the territory of Glupov. It is a mockery of famous journeys undertaken by Catherine the Great through southern Russia. Both the chapters lean towards the tragic, and so the coming of Borodavkin and his description lifts for a while the painful impression and restores the balance of the tragic and the humorous. One feels that in the case of Solomennyi gorod Saltykov went too far in one direction, namely towards the deeply tragic, and this is not the only example (the conclusion of the chronicle, discussed further on, is another case of the same); it is a turning point of sorts, after which The History takes on a more serious tone and shows less of the playful comedy of its first half.

Borodavkin is an important character of the chronicle. Unlike those governors before him, Borodavkin contemplates the office of a governor and tries to evaluate the actions

of his predecessors:

. . . он явился в Глупов и прежде всего подвергнул строгому рассмотрению намерения и деяния своих предшественников. Но когда он взглянул на скрижали, то так и ахнул. Вереницею прошли перед ним: и Клементий, и Великанов, и Ламврокакис, и Баклан, и маркиз де Санглот, и Фердыщенко, но что делали эти люди, о чем они думали, какие задачи преследовали-- вот этого-то именно и нельзя было определить ни под каким видом. Казалось, что весь этот ряд--не что иное, как сонное мечтание, в котором мелькают образы без лиц, в котором звенят какие-то смутные крики, похожие на отдаленное галдение захмелевшей толпы... Вот вышла из мрака одна тень, хлопнула: раз-раз!--и исчезла неведомо куда; смотришь, на место ее выступает уж другая тень, и тоже хлопает как попало, и исчезает... "Раззорю!", "не потерплю!" слышится со всех сторон, а что разорю, чего не потерплю--того разобрать невозможно. Рад бы посторониться, прижаться к углу, но ни посторониться, ни прижаться нельзя, потому что из всякого угла раздается все то же "раззорю!", которое гонит укрывающегося в другой угол и там, в свою очередь, опять настигает его. Это была какая-то дикая энергия, лишенная всякого содержания, так что даже Бородавкин, несмотря на свою расторопность, несколько усомнился в достоинстве ее.¹⁶

It appears that no matter how distinct the governors were, they appear to Borodavkin as fleeting shadows who have left no other mark except the obstinate "razzoryu!" and "ne poterplyu!". We are suddenly in a serious domain, accentuated by the kind of imagery which envelops the most important ideas throughout the work. The image of a shadow appearing from the darkness ("Вот вышла из мрака одна тень"), the picture of phantoms ("сонное мечтание, в котором мелькают образы без лиц"), and the glupovians represented by a distant, sad crying resembling the hubbub of a drunken crowd--

all this we find in the chapter Solomenny gorod, and finally in the ending of the chronicle. It is an intercession of a strong element representing probably the strength of nature, a meaningless, savage energy ("дикая энергия, лишенная всякого содержания"), which visits Glupov in the form of hunger, fire, and as the "it", the latter being a controversial phenomenon which "ends the history of Glupov" ("история прекратила течение свое").¹⁷

The tragic, the "tears" of this work are accompanied by the imagery of gloom. Although the intensity of this gloom varies, there are places where it is left alone, where the author chose not to add his usual touch of humour, where the reader can see the seriousness of Saltykov's intent. Such is the passage in the above-mentioned chapter, Solomenny gorod:

Хотя был всего девятый час в начале, но небо до такой степени закрылось тучами, что на улицах сделалось совершенно темно. Сверху черная, безграничная бездна, прорезываемая молниями; кругом воздух, наполненный крутящимися атомами пыли, -- все это представляло неизобразимый хаос, на грозном фоне которого выступал не менее грозный силуэт пожара. Видно было, как в дали копошатся люди, и казалось, что они бессознательно толкуются на одном месте, а не мечутся в тоске и отчаянье.¹⁸

The picture of people jostling around unconsciously on the background of chaotic violence of a staggering natural force ("черная, безграничная бездна, прорезываемая молниями") brings out their powerlessness, the contrast between the

infinite chasm and swarms of people is further enlarged by the distancing of the people ("в дали копошатся люди").

What are the phantoms, the shadows that Borodavkin saw appearing from the darkness? Saltykov tried to answer this question in an article Contemporary Phantoms (Sovremennye prizraki), written in 1865 and published posthumously in 1935). The article is very useful for the clarification of many uncertainties regarding Saltykov's opinions on the Russian situation. About the phantoms he wrote as follows:

Что такое призрак? Рассуждая теоретически, это такая форма жизни которая силится заключить в себе нечто существенное, жизненное, трепущее, а в действительности заключает лишь пустоту.¹⁹

This sounds rather general, vague. The governors are, for Borodavkin, only phantoms: i.e., emptiness wrapped into a semblance of life, or a "form of life" ("форма жизни"); of this, the best example is the governor Brudasty (Organchik). As we go through the whole gallery of governors, we indeed find that Saltykov tried to give the reader the impression of the emptiness of the governors, an emptiness that signified or marked the absence of understanding for the needs of the Glupovians: the governors are empty of compassion for them. This, in turn, brings up a question: what about the Glupovians, their passivity, why do they accept the governors? Looking again into the same article we find Saltykov's reflection on this subject:

Виновато ли общество в том, что так легко подчиняется владычеству призраков? Властно ли оно выбирать между той или другой истиной? Нет, не виновато и не властно. Истина надумывается сама собою, почва нарастает исторически; следовательно, винить и некого, и не в чем.²⁰

One must take a statement like this into consideration when analyzing The History; in its light, Saltykov's satire is a critique written by a man who saw the historical reasons behind many of the things that he satirized. In this he equals Gogol. For both of them the things that other people were unable to see--things that others tolerated and accepted--were unacceptable. Saltykov hated the very forms that life had taken upon itself in Russia:

Но скажите на милость, можно ли не ненавидеть, можно ли не сгорать от негодования, когда жизнь путается в формах, утративших всякий смысл, когда есть сознание нелепости этих форм и когда тем не менее горькая необходимость заставляет подчиниться им, бог знает из-за чего, бог знает зачем?²¹

This is a rebellion against social conventions, against the social structure which, Saltykov thought, belonged to the distant past.

In this way the consideration of literary devices, imagery, generated questions which have brought us to the position from which the author created his satire.

As The History progresses, gloom descends on Glupov with corresponding speed. It reaches its climax in the ending. We find here the imagery discussed in Solomenny gorod:

Север потемнел и покрылся тучами; из этих туч нечто несло на город: не то ливень, не то смерч. Полное гнева, оно несло, бурвя землю, грохоча, гудя и и стена и по временам изрыгая из себя какие-то глухие, каркающие звуки. Хотя оно было еще не близко, но воздух в городе заколебался, колокола сами собой загудели, деревья взъерошились, животные обезумели и метались по полю, не находя дороги в город. Оно близилось и по мере того как близилось время останавливало бег свой. Наконец земля затряслась, солнце померкло . . . глуповцы пали ниц. Неисповедимый ужас выступил на всех лицах, охватил все сердца.

Оно пришло...²²

What is this "it" (ono)? Most of the scholars who wrote about The History tried to tackle this problem. The exhaustive study of I. Foote,²³ which traces the history of the research dealing with this problem, suggests that ono represents the coming of the rule of Nicholas I (1825-1855); or, more generally, the coming of the reaction (the title of the study is Reaction or Revolution?). There are, however, as many arguments pro as there are contra; a whole generation of Soviet scholars was proving for years that ono is the inevitable popular revolution, and now even the opposite opinion is heard. Without playing the arbiter, one should again go back to Saltykov's warnings contained in the letters to Pypin and Vestnik Evropy, where he warned against the misinterpretation of his work as a literal rendering of Russian history. It will become evident, then, that ono is neither revolution nor reaction, but an apocalyptic vision of a deus ex machina-like intervention of something supra-

human (probably nature) in human affairs. We can infer from other writings of Saltykov that the aim of such an intervention would be the forced ending of a cycle of history: not, of course, the cycle of the real Russian history, but the history of Glupov. This cyclical theory was known at the time; it was later popularized in the writings of Saltykov's contemporary, Nietzsche.²⁴ Saltykov might have read about it in Schopenhauer's works, which were widely known in Saltykov's time.²⁵

The following of the tragic element, its representation in The History shows, then, that the imagery (the dark clouds, the sun which grows suddenly dark) is repeated in the work with a definite purpose. The purpose is to prepare the reader for the climactic coming of the "it", ono. Written in evangelic style, the effect that ono has on various objects, animals and people is supernatural ("колокола сами собой загудели, деревья взмырошились, животные обезумели и метались по полю, . . . земля затряслась, солнце померкло . . . глуповцы пали ниц"); it goes beyond history (the factual history of Russia).

Satire is said to be flanked by comedy on one side and tragedy on the other.²⁶ The History, then, leans toward tragedy. Laughter through tears stops shortly before the ending. If Saltykov managed throughout the whole work to keep the laughter and tears together, he drops the former at

the end. The ending is disturbingly pessimistic as it stands, if we do not take into consideration the appendix, Opravdatel'nye dokumenty,²⁷ for as we know, this was appended in the book edition, not the original one. This appendix once more brings in laughter. Here Saltykov parodies the ideas and style of the tsarist statutes, projects, laws and decrees.²⁸

From the light-heartedly funny beginning, where the reader was amused by Brudasty (Organchik), the chronicle progresses to Ugryum-Burcheyev, also a caricature-like character, not a funny one, as Brudasty and others, but rather a freakish one. A similar pattern can be observed in The Golovlevs, but there is no appendix to confuse the reader.

Henri Bergson pointed out, in his celebrated essay on laughter (De rire, 1900), that "the absence of feeling . . . usually accompanies laughter."²⁹ It stands to reason, if we surmise then, that the kind of satire Saltykov wrote made one both laugh and feel at the same time. This, in turn, suggests that the public to whom this satire was offered did not react to the reality which was the subject of Saltykov's work in the same manner: i.e., the public did not laugh at the reality and did not "feel" it, or understand it to the extent that Saltykov did:

When the human comedy of manners and men is out of gear through the tyranny of either over the other and existence is become a travesty and

caricature of life, so heavy and lumpish that it cannot even move towards the melting pot, then, when men can neither laugh nor weep, comes satire to break the congestion in them and make them laugh and weep together.³⁰

If we accept this, then we find a new dimension to Lunacharsky's words about the man who woke up before the others did. But how does this man do it? Maybe this advice of Bergson offers the answer: "Now step aside, look upon life as a disinterested spectator: many a drama will turn into a comedy."³¹

Laughter through tears is, then, an alternation between such a "stepping aside" as Bergson mentioned and the return to the original position (the tears, the tragedy). As such, it is a condition of The History, its reality, which we strongly feel during the strangest happenings of Saltykov's men and puppets, the characters of this satiric chronicle.

CHAPTER VIII

THE MEN AND THE PUPPETS

"The attitudes, gestures and movements of the human body are laughable in exact proportion as that body reminds us of a mere machine."

-- Bergson

Arthur Koestler, in his discussion of humour and satire,¹ wrote this about satire:

The satire is a verbal caricature which distorts characteristic features of an individual or society by exaggeration and simplification. The features picked out for enlargement are, of course, those of which he disapproves . . .²

One of the things that Saltykov hated most were the "old forms of life", as he called them. In this category belongs the blind obedience of the people, their mechanical acceptance of the orders coming from above, and also the routine-like behaviour of those who were in power, their automatic administration which, once set on any course, was impossible to divert by any means, except by the intervention of the mysterious "it", as we saw in the previous chapter. These are the features "picked out for enlargement", as Koestler said.

In The History we find the utilization of this mechanical acceptance and machine-like behaviour in the form of

puppets, or puppet-like characters. The deployment of these in the chronicle was an exceptionally fortunate idea, because it serves two purposes at the same time: a puppet is a comical subject insofar as it resembles a man and acts like one, but not in a proper way; and it also shows the reader how far the criteria that a society tries to maintain are eroded when a puppet, or puppet-like behaviour, is permissible and acceptable. For the reader has the advantage of comparing the activity of Saltykov's puppet with his own experience. Thus the comical and the satirical are economically concentrated in a single device--the puppet.

Brudasty, sometimes called Organchik, had a speaking apparatus in his empty head. This puppet could say only two commands: "Razzoryu!" and "Ne poterplyu!" It is repetitious, and any cruel administrator in real life could be similarly limited and repetitious, but as Bergson showed us:

The truth is that really living life should never repeat itself. Wherever there is repetition or complete similarity, we always suspect some mechanism at work behind the living.³

And so, fantastic as it is, the prototype of Brudasty could very well be imagined by the reader. When Saltykov shows us an image of a man-like automaton, he draws our attention to what should not be; he projects what Bergson called the "[suspicion of] some mechanism at work behind the living" into a literary character.

Another governor, Pryshch (number 16 on the List), has, instead of brains, some meat stuffing inside his head. Although he speaks like a real man, he indulges in a kind of mechanical dolce far niente as he refuses to do any administrative work:

Прекратив все дела, он ходил по гостям и принимал обеды и балы и даже завед стаю борзых и гончих собак, с которыми травил на городском выгоне зайцев, лисиц, а однажды заповелевал очень хорошенькую мешаночку.⁴

It is during the governorship of Pryshch that Glupov flourished as never before. Pryshch's administrative passivity reminds one of a pompadur from the story Edinstvennyi (1871): „В администрации он был философ и был убежден, что лучшая администрация заключается в отсутствии таковой."⁵ In all other respects Pryshch is unlike a puppet. Apparently, the only artificial part of his body is his head. The good time that the Glupovians enjoyed under this period of absence of administration shows Saltykov's distrust of any kind of organized management of human affairs. The message is evident: if a fellow with a head full of mincemeat who does not care a bit about governing will do, what do you need government for, anyway?

With Ugryum-Burcheyev things take a different turn. Although described as a man, he creates the impression of a mechanical man, a puppet. He uses only half a dozen words like: "Zachem?" (his favourite), "Shabash!", "Goni!", etc.,

and always moves in a straight line. His thinking coincides with his marching:

Он никогда не бесновался, не закипал, не мстил, не преследовал, а, подобно всякой другой бессознательно действующей силе природы, шел вперед, сметая с лица земли все, что не успевало посторониться в дороги. "Зачем?" -- вот единственное слово, которым он выражал движения своей души.⁶

He is very unlike the governors before him ("не бесновался, не закипал, не мстил, не преследовал"), and the comparison used here ("подобно . . . силе природы") sets him even further from them. Lacking some of the common characteristics of human behaviour, he possesses a mechanical one:

Страстность была вычеркнута из числа элементов, составлявших его природу, и заменена непреклонностью, действовавшей с регулярностью самого отчетливого механизма. Он не жестикулировал, не возвышал голоса, не скрежетал зубами, не гоготал, не топал ногами, не заливался начальственно-язвительным смехом.⁷

With mechanical pedantry, Ugryum-Burcheyev sets out to do what he decided upon. He reorganizes Glupov along military lines, so that an analogy with Arakcheev's "military settlements" is easily recognized. Glupov is renamed Nepreklonsk to symbolize the fierce determination of its governor.

The motif of a puppet-like man does not find its place only among the governors. We also find it in the tin soldiers of Borodavkin which come to life at the climax of Borodavkin's "campaign for enlightenment" (Voyna za prosveshchenie). Borodavkin tried to talk the Glupovians into cultivating and using mustard, but they put up such a defense

against the mustard that Borodavkin had to use his army, and when this army became demoralized he used the tin soldiers. The reasons for this were mainly economic („провианту не просит, а маршировку и он исполнять может"). When needed, the tin soldiers came to life:

С ними происходило что-то совсем необыкновенное. Постепенно, в глазах у всех, солдатики начали наливать кровью. Глаза их, доселе неподвижные, вдруг стали вращаться и выражать гнев; усы нарисованные вкривь и вкось, встали на свои места и начали шевелиться; губы, представлявшие тонкую розовую черту, которая от бывших дождей почти уже смылась, оттопырились и изъявляли намерение нечто произнести. Появились ноздри, о которых прежде и в помине не было, и начали раздуваться и свидетельствовать о нетерпении.

-- Что скажете, служивые? -- спросил Бородавкин.⁸

Here Saltykov shows a man-made object becoming alive, acting like a man. Blood fills the bodies of the tin soldiers and they cease to be mechanical contraptions. In a different place, Saltykov shows real soldiers acting like mechanical ones, in contrast with the "tin soldiers":

Проходили через Глупов войска пешие, проходили войска конные.

-- Куда, голубчики? -- с волнением спрашивал Бородавкин солдатиков.

Но солдатики в трубы трубили, песни нели, носками сапогов играли, пыль столбом на улицах поднимали, и всё проходили, и всё проходили.

-- Валом валит солдат! -- говорили глуповцы, и казалось им, что это люди какие-то особенные, что они самой природой созданы для того, чтоб ходить без конца, ходить по всем направлениям. Что они спускаются с одной плоской возвышенности для того,

чтобы лезть на другую плоскую возвышенность, переходят через один мост для того, чтобы перейти вслед за тем через другой мост. И еще мост, и еще плоская возвышенность, и еще, и еще...⁹

The soldiers depicted here seem to act without motivation. The most pronounced characteristic of these soldiers is motion devoid of purpose ("спускаются с одной плоской возвышенности для того, чтобы лезть на другую . . ."), stressed by the use of repetition ("и всё проходили, и всё проходили, . . . другой мост. И еще мост, и еще плоская возвышенность, и еще, и еще..."). The soldiers do not answer Borodavkin's question. The general impression given by the quotation is one of a detachment of toy soldiers who, once wound up, march until the spring is released and the mechanical action stopped.

The above examples offer a whole scale of possibilities of puppet-like behaviour of characters. V. V. Gippius, who studied the "motif of mortification or mechanization"¹⁰ in the entire work of Saltykov, organized the puppet-like characters in the following manner:

1. Living Man,
2. Mechanized Man: a) organism creating an impression of being an automaton,
b) having in his organism some mechanical parts,
3. Living Puppet: a) automaton, b) talking puppet, c) talking, but immobile puppet, d) non-talking puppet,
4. Immobile Puppet (non-talking).¹¹

In The History, we find the mechanized man (an example of the variety a) is Ugryum-Burcheyev; of the variety b) Brudasty—Organchik). In the living puppet category we could include the tin soldiers of Borodavkin, and perhaps also the soldiers that march through Glupov, as described in the last quotation (both cases would come under b), as "talking puppets", although the other soldiers do not talk, but sing and play the trumpets).

The exposition of the "mechanical on the living" brings the Shchedrinist to a discussion of the grotesque, which is closely connected with it.¹² The grotesque, K. S. Guthke says,

. . . implies ludicrous horror or horrifying ludicrousness. Its fantastic distortions of reality make us apprehend, in a cold shudder, something abysmally uncanny and demonic, an awareness which generates the feelings of estrangement, stupefying bafflement, strained laughter and gruesome fright and anguish all at the same time.¹³

Another critic tells us about the two basic types of the grotesque: the "fantastic" and the "satiric". (Wolfgang Kayser in The Grotesque in Art and Literature¹⁴). Examples of the fantastic grotesque are contained in the work of E. T. A. Hoffmann¹⁵ and Gogol (e.g., Nos); the satiric grotesque can also be found in Gogol (e.g., Mertvye dushi).

In The History we find the grotesque as defined by Guthke above, but we find also another kind of grotesque, which is achieved by the juxtaposition of a cruelly realistic

incident with a context which is opposed to it (a humorous, comical situation), so that our laughter becomes strained, not by the "fantastic distortion of reality", but by its unexpected intrusion into the humorous, satirical domain. This is an example of a technique used profusely in The History.

The following quotation illustrates the "usual" kind of grotesque. It follows the discovery, by a marshal of the nobility, of Pryshch's mincement-stuffed head:

Завязалась борьба; но предводитель вошел уже в ярость и не помнил себя. Глаза его сверкали, брюхо сладостно ныло. Он задыхался, стонал, называл градоначальника "душкой", "милкой", и другими несвойственными этому сану именами; лизал его, нюхал и т.д. Наконец с неслыханным остервенением бросился предводитель на свою жертву, отрезал ножом ломоть головы и немедленно проглотил...

За первым ломтем наследовал другой, потом третий, до тех пор, пока не осталось ни крохи...¹⁶

The strangeness of this fight was achieved by utilizing the imagery of a hungry ("брюхо сладостно ныло") and sexually aroused man ("Он задыхался, стонал, называл градоначальника "душкой", "милкой", etc.). The latter is more effective since the erotic element is of a homosexual nature. The grotesque image is the gruesome cutting up of the governor's head, and mainly his agony:

Тогда градоначальник вдруг вскочил и стал обтирать лапками те места своего тела, которые предводитель полил уксусом. Потом он закружился на одном месте и вдруг всем корпусом грохнулся на пол.¹⁷

Here we have both "fantastic distortions of reality" and "ludicrous horror", expressed by calling the governor's hand "paws" (lapki) and by the death of the governor, respectively.

On another occasion, the grotesque results from a description of a cruel act committed by a Glupovian mob:

Аленка осталась снаружи с простертыми врозь руками. В таком положении застала ее толпа; застала бледную, трепещущую всем телом, почти безумную.

-- Пожалейте, атаманы-молодцы, мое тело белое!
-- говорила Аленка ослабевшим от ужаса голосом, -- ведомо вам самим, что он меня силком от мужа увел!

Но толпа ничего уж неслышала.

-- Сказывай, ведьма! -- гудела она, -- через какое твое колдовство на наш город сухость нашла?

Аленка словно обеспамятела. Она металась и, как бы уверенная в неизбежном исходе своего дела, только повторяла: "Тошно мне! ох, батюшки, тошно мне!"

Тогда совершилось неслыханное дело. Аленку разом, словно рух, внесли на верхний ярус колокольни и бросили оттуда на раскат с вышины более пятнадцати сажень...

"И неосталось от той бригадировой сладкой утехи даже ни единого лоскута. В одно мгновение ока разнесли ее приبلудные голодные псы."¹⁸

Here the fantastic element is absent. The death of Alenka is described in a very brisk, economical way. Alenka, the mistress of the governor Ferdyshchenko, is forced to live with the governor after he has sent her husband to Siberia. She is a sympathetic character, but Saltykov does not make

her entirely blameless: after she learns that her husband has been arrested, she no longer opposes Ferdyshchenko's advances. She is a clever girl, and the little game that she plays can be seen from the way she talks with the governor:

-- Что, дурья порода, надумалась? -- спросил он ее.

-- Ишь тебя, старого пса, ущемило! Или мало на стыдобушку мою насмотрелся! -- огрызнулась Аленка.

-- Ладно! -- сказал бригадир: [Ferdyshchenko].¹⁹

One does not expect her to die in such a terrible way after an introduction like this. The sudden death of Alenka, then, is a grotesque incident, which the reader could not anticipate. The cause of the mob's anger directed against her is the hungry year which has already killed many Glupovians. They take the irrational view that the relationship of Alenka and Ferdyshchenko has brought a curse upon Glupov. The incident itself is a very cruel one. Ferdyshchenko does not protect Alenka, and locks her out while he is safely hidden inside his mansion, waiting for the storm to pass by. The climax of the whole incident is introduced by "Тогда совершилось неслыханное дело; to make it realistic, Saltykov gives us the height of the bell-tower from which she was thrown down ("с вышины более пятнадцати сажень"). Suddenly the reader realizes Alenka's agony ("замок щелкнул, и Аленка осталась снаружи с простертыми врозь руками. . . бледная, . . . почти безумная . . . она металась", etc.). The comment

of the chronicler, brief as it is, supplies a touch of irony ("И не осталось от той бригадировой сладкой утехы даже ни единого лоскута"). But the irony cannot relieve the impact of the bloody incident, and the result is an uneasy feeling of bafflement: is this comedy, is this satire? It is satire, or--in N. Frye's words-- militant irony (it assumes standards against which the grotesque and absurd are measured²⁰). The militancy of this touch of irony rests in its being a comment to a tragic incident; the uneasy feeling of bafflement, the strained laughter tell us that we were dealing with the grotesque.

The world of Glupov is inhabited by puppets as well as people; they coexist by virtue of necessity. This often grotesque world reaches beyond Saltykov's model--Russia. Yet, it was the only world available for Glupovians.

CHAPTER IX

GLUPOVIANS AND THEIR WORLD

Но меркнет день--настала ночь;
Пришла--и с мира рокового
Ткань благодатную покрыва
Сорвав, отбрасывает прочь...
И бездна нам обнажена
С своими страхами и мглами,
И нет преград меж ей и нами:
Вот отчего нам ночь страшна!
-- Tyutchev

Throughout the satire, the most common terms used for the people inhabiting the town of Glupov are: the Glupovians (glupovtsy), average men (obyvateli), and citizens (grazhdane). On many occasions the Glupovians are presented as a crowd, or as "stunned ones", "subordinate ones", "authority-loving people", etc.¹ This partial list gives us the flavour of the derision with which Saltykov etches the crowded portrayal of the people. We know from the concept of the "two kinds of narod", which Saltykov explained in his letter to Vestnik Evropy,² that the people who "produce" the Ugryum-Burcheyevs and the Borodavkins do not deserve other treatment. In the first chapter which deals with the chronicle of Glupov, called Organchik, the author introduces the Glupovians to the reader:

Жители ликовали; еще не видав в глаза вновь назначенного правителя, они уже рассказывали об нем анекдоты и называли его "красавчиком" и "умницей". Поздравляли друг друга с радостью, целовались,

проливали слезы, заходили в кабаки, снова выходили из них и опять заходили.³

The Glupovians seem to be flourishing; their unwarranted joy, soon to be disappointed by the "krasavchik" and "umnitsa" Brudasty, the governor with a "little organ" in his head, is the joy of naive children. From the very beginning, the author sets the rules for the relationship between the Glupovians and the world. The immature behaviour of Glupovians is shown by their reactions ("целовались, проливали слезы, заходили в кабаки, снова выходили из них и опять заходили"); their coming in and out of the drinking house (kabak) suggests, with its apparent aimlessness, certain primitive qualities which, rather than their stupidity (such as shown in the genealogy of the Glupovians in O koreni proiskhozhdeniya glupovtsev⁴), will remain their main characteristic in The History. Their primitivism⁵ is a device that renders them unable to defend themselves; it almost absolves them from being accountable for their actions and their general passivity as social beings. Whenever they act, they do so as a mob which, as we saw in the case of Alenka, does not deliberate, but kills. Saltykov has no sympathy for this mob, and attacks it in the chronicle by exaggerating in Glupovians that which is so characteristic of a mob: unconscious, instinctive, impulsive action. All these features are recognizable as those of a lower being, a homo primitivus, as it

were. They are present, furthermore, even where Saltykov does not depict a crowd, and so his message there is even more forceful.

The Glupovians live in a world which remains, in the whole chronicle, sternly hierarchical. By imposing hierarchy even where it is not applicable (e.g., the area of psychological reaction), he ridicules the concept of hierarchy in general:

Градоначальник безмолвно обошел ряды чиновных архистратигов, сверкнул глазами, произнес: „Не потерплю!“ -- и скрылся в кабинет. Чиновники остолбенели; за ними остолбенели и обыватели.⁶

Here the Glupovians adhere strictly to the ethic; they are dumbfounded, as the officials are, but being of a lower rank (commoners) they react in a way proper to the table of ranks. This is an especially illustrative example of the interplay of the humorous and the satirical, based on the incongruity of the situation, with our knowledge of human reaction. One of the overtones (possibly not intended) is again the slower reaction of the Glupovians compared to that of the officials.

The governor (gradonachal'nik) is the sun of the Glupovian solar system, his authority unquestionable; but in order to be pleasing, the governor should have certain qualities about which the Glupovians are outspoken:

. . . ты по душе с нами поговори! ты лаской-то, лаской-то пронимай! ты пригрозить-то пригрозил, да потом и помилуй! -- Так говорили глуповцы, и со слезами припомали, какие бывали у них прежде началь-

ники, всё приветливые, да добрые, да красавчики -- все-то в мундирах!⁷

After this, the reader expects that an example of a governor who fulfills the above requirements will follow, but the governor they mention appears to be no different from any other governor. Here is what the mentioned governor, Baklan, says about his programme:

-- Натиск, -- сказал он, -- и притом быстрота, снисходительность, и притом строгость. И притом благоразумная твердость. Вот, милостивые государи, та цель или, точнее сказать, те пять целей, которых я, с божьей помощью, надеюсь достигнуть при посредстве некоторых административных мероприятий, составляющих сущность или, лучше сказать, ядро обдуманного мною плана кампании!⁸

After enumerating three sets of irreconcilable opposites (a parody of the notion which existed in Russia: batyushka-tsar was supposed to be the father of his people, and as a father, his paternal love should find expression in both discipline and love), which in themselves are sarcastic enough, Baklan shows his true colours: like all governors before him, he will flog the Glupovians, for no matter what other whims the governors of Glupov invented, the collecting of arrears and consistent flogging headed the list of priorities. The euphemism for flogging, here, is "administrative measures" ("административные мероприятия"), which are as far from flogging as ubornaya from nuzhnik.

The last quotation is noteworthy from another point of view: from the way Saltykov here uses the oratorical

cliche and officialese (calling the Glupovians "МИЛОСТИВЫЕ государи, . . . с божьей помощью, . . . ДОСТИГНУТЬ . . . цель . . . план кампании")⁹.

Saltykov's derision of the sentimental attitude of the people (illustrated by the expression batyushka-tsar) reaches its tenor in the chapter Fantasticheskiy puteshhestvennik,¹⁰ when the governor Ferdyshchenko travels around Glupov in the best tradition of his "patron" Potemkin,¹¹ and instructs his people to welcome him "as if he came from who-knows-where!"¹² This is what the Glupovians do:

Плакали тут все, плакали и потому, что жалко, и потому, что радостно. В особенности разливалась одна древняя старуха...

-- О чём ты, старушка, плачешь?-- спросил бригаир [Ferdyshchenko], ласково трепля ее по плечу.

-- Ох ты наш батюшка! как нам не плакать-то, кормилец ты наш! век мы свой всё-то плачем... всё плачем!-- всхлипывала в ответ старуха.¹³

The absurdity of all these tears is revealed by calling Ferdyshchenko kormilets, for it was under his governorship that Glupov suffered the worst hunger in its history.

The governor, on the whole, is for Glupovians only one of the elements which, if put together, would make up their world. Their struggle with the governor is a part of their total struggle for survival. Some of the obstacles in their way are: a bad crop, resulting in hunger and fire (discussed earlier); and "civilization" represented in the

chronicle by the enforced cultivation and use of mustard, olive oil, etc. The last is modelled on the actual "potato wars" of 1839-1840, when the government ordered out the troops to enforce the cultivation of potatoes which, at the time, the peasants considered "poisonous".¹⁴

In the description of hunger, Saltykov achieved great effect by the use of understatement and economy:

Базары опустели, продавать было нечего, да и некому, потому что город обезлюдел. „Кои померли, -- говорит летописец, -- кои, обеспамятев, разбежались кто куда.“¹⁵

To show how the town of Glupov was depopulated by a terrible famine, he first uses the image of an empty shop, and only then adds that there were no people left to patronize it. Once again Saltykov changes the narrator (presumably from an editor to a chronicler) and gives us a brief comment of the chronicler („Кои померли, -- говорит летописец, -- кои, обеспамятев, разбежались кто куда“). This combination of understatement and economy of expression, or, in other words, of the powerful image and simplicity, shows Saltykov's craftsmanship at its best. Here we can also note the absence of any irony, or derision of the Glupovians, on the part of Saltykov. The fierce mockery of the satirist is applied where he thinks it will help him to combat passivity or, as he called it, a commitment to the forms of life that are obsolete, a certain conservatism shared by both the

administration and the Glupovians. There, Saltykov does not hesitate to use his whip.

From time to time the Glupovian world was disturbed by some governor's desire to bring some "civilization" to Glupov. The governor Borodavkin tried to force mustard and olive oil on the Glupovians, and met with what appeared to be a strong "energy of inaction":

. . . глуповцы тоже были себе на уме. Энергии действия они с большою находчивостью противопоставили энергию бездействия.

-- Что хошь в нами делай!-- говорили одни, -- хошь -- на куски режь; хошь -- с кашей ешь, а мы не согласны!

-- С нас брат, не что возьмешь!-- говорили другие, -- мы не то что прочие, которые телом обросли! нас, брат, и уколупнуть негде!

И упорно стояли при этом на коленях.¹⁶

The target of the satirist's attack here is the slave mentality of the Glupovians, as he shows that the bravado of their dissent finds expression in kneeling down in front of Borodavkin. But Glupovians, opposed as they are to mustard, symbolize the attitude of people in general, their cautiousness when faced with a novelty. Saltykov expressed this with a touch of humour when he let the Glupovians think this:

Думают: станут они теперь есть горчицу, -- как бы на будущее время еще какую ни на есть мерзость есть не заставили; . . . Казалось, что колени в этом случае представляют средний путь, который может умиротворить и ту и другую стороны.¹⁷

Yet, peaceful as their reaction might seem to us, the

compromising attitude of the Glupovians was explained by Borodavkin as a rebellion (bunt). That these rebellions were many times only products of the governors' imagination is evident from a conversation between Borodavkin and an old Glupovian:

-- Стало быть, были бунты?-- спрашивал Бородавкин.

-- Мало ли было бунтов! У нас, сударь, насчет этого такая примета: коли секут -- так уж и знаешь, что бунт! 18

It is precisely because the satirist gives us a complex picture of the Glupovians (he shows their stupidity and cunning, their animal behaviour as a mob, and disarming and touchingly good-natured simplicity) that we begin to glimpse the reality behind the often absurd and grotesque facade, and at the same time feel that the author hit a substantial and universal issue when he concentrated upon the seemingly insignificant plight of the Glupovians. His treatment of the Glupovians' predicament, their situation, presents a problem which is still topical, as it most probably will be in the future, since it is the problem of the relationship between state and society. In an unsigned article, written for the occasion of the appearance of a new edition of the collected works of Saltykov,¹⁹ we read:

As a treatise on the relationship of state and society The History of a Town is important not only for the student of Russian history (for whom it should be required reading) but also for its relevance to twentieth-century totalitarianism: the

final chapter on the administration of the arch-leveller Ugryum-Burcheyev (a notable fore-runner of the 1984 school of political satire) had had fearsome echoes in Russia and elsewhere in modern times.²⁰

In many ways, then, The History is more closely related to the twentieth century (mainly its periods of totalitarianism) than to the nineteenth. This is very paradoxical, because we have seen that the subject of Saltykov's satire was by no means a ridiculing of the "old times". Yet Arsenev writes in 1888,²¹ that The History does not concern itself with contemporary Russian society:²² he believes it is concerned entirely with its past. Unfortunately for mankind, it was Russia's future (the period of Stalinism) that served as a model for George Orwell's 1984.

More terrible than fire, hunger, or campaigns for "civilization", was the gradonachal'nik Ugryum-Burcheyev. There were ways of escaping the former, but the governorship of Ugryum-Burcheyev put the Glupovians into a completely new position, one which made any attempt for a decent life superfluous, because Ugryum-Burcheyev changed the whole structure of Glupovian life in an unusual way.

He arrived in Glupov with detailed plans. These called for a Utopian city par excellence: from a square in the middle of the city the streets issued radially, each having the same number of houses. Each house in its turn accommodates two old people, two adults, two youngsters and

two little children. The sexes are mixed and are not ashamed of each other. Weak babies and old people not needed by the economy are exterminated (in Nazi Germany this was attempted under the "Euthanasia" programme), schools are abolished, and so is the past and the future, and so there is no need for a chronicler.

Each house has its commander and a spy. Ugryum-Burcheyev insisted especially on the spies. The Glupovians have to do everything together. Together they get up as ordered, meet in gymnasiums for morning exercise, and leave together for work. While working, they move in unison, and so they also sing Ukhnem! Dubinushka, ukhnem!²³ After sunset each gets a piece of bread and goes to bed. While they sleep, the spirit of Ugryum-Burcheyev hovers above the town and vigilantly guards the sleep of the Glupovians. There is no God, no idols, nothing:

В этом фантастическом мире нет ни страстей, ни увлечений, ни привязанностей. Все живут каждую минуту вместе, и всякий чувствует себя одиноким. Жизнь ни на мгновение не отвлекается от исполнения бесчисленного множества дурацких обязанностей, из которых каждая рассчитана заранее и она каждым человеком тяготеет как рок. Женщины имеют право рожать детей только зимой, потому что нарушение этого правила может воспрепятствовать успешному ходу летних работ. Союзы между молодыми людьми устраиваются не иначе, как сообразно росту и телосложению, так как это удовлетворяет требованиям правильного и красивого фронта.²⁴

With the coming of Ugryum-Burcheyev, the Glupovian world takes upon itself a significance which reaches far

into the future. What seemed to be a bad dream at the end of the nineteenth century now seems to be a prophetic account of the notorious political developments which held a large part of the world spellbound before World War II. We find here the indispensable spies whom Orwell replaced with the "telescreen",²⁵ the ever-present governor, the predecessor of the Big Brother of 1984, or the Well-Doer of E. Zamyatin. The governor's fascination with the straight line continues in Zamyatin's We: "To unbend the wild curve, to straighten it out to a tangent--to a straight line!"²⁵ This world is no longer "fantastic" after the storm of the totalitarian regimes of this century. Hannah Arendt's dictum about the totalitarian regime: "Totalitarian movements are mass organizations of atomized, isolated individuals",²⁷ was expressed by Saltykov in the passage, „Все живут каждую минуту вместе, и всякий чувствует себя одиноким" and one can only wonder at the accuracy with which the satiric Utopia of Saltykov characterized the future.

The accuracy with which Saltykov parodies Utopian socialism shows the extent of his understanding of the political process, the new ideas which this process produced and which are now termed variously as Utopian socialism, utilitarianism, egalitarianism (Saltykov himself used the term "nivellator" and "kantonist" for Ugryum-Burcheyev). The very fact that this final part of The History seems so

topical now shows to what extent modern politics and ideas are tributaries of the nineteenth century.

We can see that the governorship of Ugryum-Burcheyev has more in common with the satire of Utopia than with the military settlements advocated by Arakcheev. The grand design of Ugryum-Burcheyev, the total dictatorship and the striking similarities with the totalitarian rule of Hitler and Stalin, show again how the chronicle transcended the history of Glupov, or rather, how close to Glupov history has brought the rest of the world.

CONCLUSION

As stated in the introduction, the main body of this thesis was concerned with the development of The History and partly with the analysis of its satirical devices. The stress throughout this work was on those aspects of Saltykov's satire which have universal validity. This explains, among other things, why the conventional readings of The History were accorded a brief comment instead of more extensive treatment. Moreover, this course resulted from following the author's suggestions as expressed in the letters which he wrote after the publication of The History, and also from the impression that to indulge, if only briefly, in repeating the traditional interpretations would mean to go beyond the scope of this study. Instead, I have tried to show how Glupov developed from a little joke with ^W which < Saltykov wanted to pique his readers. With time, and political changes, this joke began to take on more and more body, and eventually grew into a group of stories which I have called the Glupovian cycle. From unidentifiable and vague characters, two basic types evolved: the Glupovian and the governor. Their characteristics, as well as their activities, were coloured by the prevailing atmosphere of konfuz: political instability marked by a temporary absence of firm control over Russian society after the Great Reforms. This

contemporary element was fused with the account of Russian history of the second half of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries, and the product of this fusion or combination was a hybrid satiric chronicle of both the past and the present. Saltykov found that this chronicle was an ideal platform from which he could conveniently satirize the phenomena which seemed incompatible with the ideals he shared with the progressive and liberal group of Russian intelligentsia. He took an extreme stand when he disowned the people who produce and tolerate tyrants, knowing that in this way he separated himself from the real people for the sake of the ideal ones. This misanthropic stance, reminiscent of that of Swift, with whom he is often compared, was a positive feature in a satirist who strove for the improvement of the lot of those who suffered most, the simple folk. Since everything depended on the whims of those who possessed power, Saltykov concentrated his attention on them in the chronicle, calling them governors. The actions of these characters are occasionally comic, but are always set against a broader background, the essentially tragic suffering of the people. Consequently, Saltykov's laughter--and the reader's laughter--comes through tears. The laughter through tears, produced by the incongruity between words and action, shows the gap between the ideal of the free man and his caricature as a mechanical contraption.

To stress the latter, Saltykov created puppets and puppet-like characters and let them act among the people to show the people's helplessness and to attack their passivity, which he likened to a state of unconsciousness. The depravity of the governors and the meek passivity of the Glupovians often reach a grotesque proportion, as we witness the gradual deterioration of the situation of the Glupovian world. The most powerful and adequate expression of this we find in the satire of Utopia which, for many reasons, is very close to the modern reader. We find here, among others, the spy as the complement of the governor (fortuitously close to the contemporary Soviet coupling of commander and commissar). This anti-Utopia antedates the important satirical works of the present century: Zamyatin's We, Huxley's Brave New World, and Orwell's 1984. It is here that the timeless message of The History is felt with the greatest vigour. The nightmare of the totalitarian regime is invoked here with the satirist's tour de force. Because Saltykov ridiculed such vices as the mechanical encrusted on the living--to borrow Bergson's phrase--and political corruption, his satire is still alive, inasmuch as these phenomena are a constant threat to modern man as well. Thus, The History of a Town manifests the universal application of its satire, and goes beyond the history of a particular age and nation while remaining, paradoxically, an anathema of the typically Russian situation.

FOOTNOTES

FOOTNOTES TO INTRODUCTION

¹Discussion of this commentary can be found in I. P. Foote, "Reaction or Revolution", Oxford Slavonic Papers, Vol. I, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1968.

²B. Eikhenbaum, "Istoriya odnogo goroda M. E. Saltykova-Shchedrina" (Kommentariy), in O proze, Khudozhesvennaya literature, Leningrad, 1969, p. 455.

³C. Kulešov, "Saltykov-Šchedrin, Istoriya odnogo goroda: an annotated edition with an introduction", Ph.D., Indiana, 1969.

⁴In his letter to Vestnik Evropy, M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin, Sobranie sochineniy, tom VIII (henceforth abbreviated as M. E. S.-Shch., Sobr. soch. VIII), p. 452: "Ya sovsem ne imel v vidu istoricheskoy satiry."

⁵I. P. Foote, "Reaction or Revolution", p. 105.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER I.

¹D. S. Mirsky, A History of Russian Literature, p. 293.

²This was pointed out by Skabichevsky in his editorial published in Iskra, reprinted in M. S. Goryachkina, red., M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin v russkoy kritike, p. 226.

³N. Strelsky, Saltykov and Russian Squire, p. 5.

⁴Mentioned in D. N. Ovsyaniko-Kulikovskiy, Istoriya russkoy literatury XIX v., p. 231.

⁵Turgenev's review in The Academy, II, London, March 1, 1871, pp. 151-152.

⁶M. S. Goryachkina, Op. cit., p. 193.

⁷N. Strelsky, Op. cit., p. 29.

⁸G. Lukacs, Probleme des Realismus II, p. 36.

⁹T. S. Lindstrom, Concise History of Russian Literature, p. 161. It is not the brevity which is questionable, but the lack of understanding of Saltykov's work.

¹⁰I. P. Foote, Op. cit., p. 105.

¹¹Saltykov expressed this wish in his letter to Vestnik Evropy, Sobr. soch. VIII, p. 451; L. Grossman's ideas were expressed in his article "Rossiya Saltykova", published in his book Borba za stil', p. 169.

¹²V. V. Gippius, Ot Pushkina do Bloka, p. 295.

¹³Ibid., p. 297.

¹⁴A. S. Pushkin, Polnoe sobranie sochineniy v 10 tomakh, p. 752 (Ostrovsky's play Goryachee serdtse, 1868, dealt with the gradonachal'nik and could have been of more substantial influence than Pushkin's fragment).

¹⁶Ibid., p. 175.

¹⁷M. S. Goryachkina, Op. cit., p. 223.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 191.

¹⁹In the Introduction to the 1970 edition of M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin, Istoriya odnogo goroda, p. 8.

²⁰M. S. Goryachkina, Op. cit., p. 159.

²¹This was demonstrated in the negative review of Fet's poetry, published in V. Y. Kirpotin, N. Shchedrin (M. E. Saltykov) o literature, p. 188.

²²M. S. Goryachkina, Op. cit., p. 223.

²³D. N. Ovsyaniko-Kulikovskiy, Op. cit., p. 247.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵F. Venturi, The Roots of Revolution, p. 323.

²⁶E. Zamyatin's words about Wells, from A. Voronsky, Evgeny Zamyatin, p. 173.

²⁷From Glupovskoe rasputstvo, M. E. S.-Shch., Sobr. soch. IV, p. 211.

²⁸From Pompadury i pompadurshy, M. E. S.-Shch., Sobr. soch. VIII, p. 7.

²⁹This cycle marks a change. Here, Saltykov's main concern is not a critique of the relationship of the main groups of society, as in the Glupovian cycle, but rather a critique of an ascendant class of parvenus in the wake of the industrialization of Russia.

³⁰Thus, talking about a character from The History, Saltykov says: "Paramosha sovsem ne Magnitskiy tol'ko, no vmeste s tem i graf D. A. Tolstoy. I dazhe ne graf D. A. Tolstoy a vse vooobshche lyudi izvestnoy partii . . ." (Sobr. soch. VIII, p. 456).

³¹R. Pletnev, Entretiens sur la littérature Russe des 18e et 19e siècles, p. 486.

³²D. N. Ovsyaniko-Kulikovsky, Sobranie sochineniy, Tom 8, Part 2, p. 1.

³³D. V. Grishin, "The Problem of Dictatorship in the Work of Dostoevsky and of S. Shchedrin", p. 85.

³⁴M. E. S.-Shch., Sobr. soch. IV, p. 249.

³⁵Ibid., p. 250.

³⁶Ibid., p. 234.

³⁷V. Kirpotin, Saltykov-Shchedrin, zhizn' i tvorchestvo, p. 281.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER II.

¹S. Vilinskij, O literarni činnosti M. Jev. Saltykova-Ščedrina, is the only work which discusses konfuz in detail.

²F. Venturi, Op. cit., p. 208.

³Y. Elsberg, Saltykov-Shchedrin, p. 106; the peasant disturbances mentioned in this paragraph occurred both before and after 1861.

⁴Quoted from Y. Elsberg, Op. cit., p. 67.

⁵This hate Saltykov shares with Swift. In a letter

to Alexander Pope (September 29, 1725), Swift wrote: "I hate and detest the animal called man, although I heartily love John, Peter, Thomas, and so forth." (Jonathan Swift, Gulliver's Travels and Other Writings, p. 494).

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER III.

¹E. Pokusaev, Revolyutsionnaya satira Saltykova-Shchedrina, p. 23.

²M. E. S.-Shch., Sobr. soch. III, p. 267.

³Ibid., p. 503.

⁴As in the nineteenth century, we again witness the division progressive-conservative; as before, the climate is controlled by dictatorship.

⁵E. Pokusaev, Op. cit., p. 30.

⁶Ibid., p. 31.

⁷M. E. S.-Shch., Op. cit., p. 475.

⁸Ibid., p. 516.

⁹E. Pokusaev, Op. cit., p. 126.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 125.

¹¹M. E. S.-Shch., Sobr. soch. VIII, p. 462.

¹²Ibid., p. 463.

¹³Ibid., p. 220.

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 429.

¹⁶M. E. S.-Shch., Sobr. soch. IV, p. 210; italics are mine. (Henceforth, whenever italics appear in quotations from Russian, they are mine.)

¹⁷K. K. Arsenev, Saltykov-Shchedrin, p. 87.

¹⁸M. E. S.-Shch., Op. cit., p. 281.

¹⁹V. Kirpotin, Op. cit., p. 281.

²⁰A. S. Bushmin, Satira Saltykova-Shchedrina, p. 75.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER IV.

¹M. E. S.-Shch., Sobr. soch. IV, p. 203.

²E. Pokusaev, Op. cit., pp. 31-32.

³V. Kirpotin, Op. cit., p. 282.

⁴F. Venturi, Op. cit., p. 199.

⁵M. E. S.-Shch., Sobr. soch. VIII, p. 265.

⁶Ibid., p. 549.

⁷Ibid., pp. 535-536.

⁸E. Pokusaev, Op. cit., p. 33.

⁹A. I. Efimov, Yazyk satiry Saltykova-Shchedrina, as well as C. Kulešov, Op. cit., discuss this feature in detail.

¹⁰M. E. S.-Shch., Op. cit., p. 265.

¹¹Ibid., p. 267; the interpretation of the quotation comes from B. Eikhenbaum, Op. cit., p. 464.

¹²B. Eikhenbaum, Op. cit., p. 465.

¹³M. E. S.-Shch., Op. cit., p. 269.

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵A. D. Stokes, Anthology of Early Russian Literature, p. 62.

¹⁶B. Eikhenbaum, Op. cit., pp. 465-467.

¹⁷V. Kirpotin, Op. cit., p. 291.

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹M. E. S.-Shch., Op. cit., p. 270.

²⁰Ibid., p. 452.

²¹Ibid., p. 453.

²²A detailed account of this is available in the commentary by G. V. Ivanov, in M. E. S.-Shch., Op. cit., p. 555.

²³M. E. S.-Shch., Op. cit., p. 271.

²⁴Ibid., p. 272.

²⁵Ibid., p. 275.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER V.

¹Ibid., p. 454.

²Ibid., p. 451 (letter to Vestnik Evropy), p. 455 (letter to A. N. Pypin).

³Ibid., p. 454.

⁴Ibid., p. 277.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER VI.

¹Bol'shaya sovetskaya entsiklopediya, Tom 12, p. 396.

²M. E. S.-Shch., Op. cit., p. 452.

³Ibid., pp. 278-279.

⁴Ibid., p. 79.

⁵T. S. Eliot, Use of Poetry, p. 153.

⁶M. E. S.-Shch., Op. cit., p. 456.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER VII.

¹C. Kulešov, Op. cit.

²W. F. Thrall and Hibbard, A Handbook to Literature, pp. 490-491.

³N. I. Sokolov, Russkaya literatura i narodnichestvo, p. 166, quoting P. N. Tkachev.

⁴B. Eikhenbaum, "Kak sdelana 'Shinel'' Gogolya".

⁵Ibid.

⁶C. Kulešov, Op. cit., p. 36.

⁷"Slonimsky in his study provides a discussion dealing with the serious philosophical element implicit in the Gogolian humour, his smekh skvoz slezy." C. Kulešov, Op. cit., p. 37.

⁸K. Sanine, Saltykov-Chtchedrine, Sa vie et ses oeuvres, p. 169.

⁹Karl D. Kramer elucidates the role of the invective in his article, "Satiric form in Saltykov's Gospoda Golovlevy".

¹⁰M. E. S.-Shch., Sobr. soch. VIII, p. 278.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 288-289.

¹²Ibid., p. 284.

¹³Ibid., pp. 333-334.

¹⁴A. I. Smirnitskiy, Russko-Angliyskiy slovar', p. 104.

¹⁵Petrov, red., Istoriya russkoy literatury XIX veka, Tom II, p. 423.

¹⁶M. E. S.-Shch., Sobr. soch. VIII, p. 336.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 423.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 323.

¹⁹M. E. S.-Shch., Sobr. soch. VI, pp. 382-383.

²⁰Ibid., p. 384.

²¹Ibid., p. 389.

²²M. E. S.-Shch., Sobr. soch. VIII, p. 423.

²³I. P. Foote, Op. cit.

²⁴Although Nietzsche lived approximately in the same time as Saltykov, he was younger; and by the time his philosophy became known Saltykov was no longer living. However, Nietzsche, in his philosophy, continued the work of Schopenhauer (see note 25; below) and so Nietzsche's Theory of Eternal Recurrence (an introduction to this theory is found in B. C. Van Fraassen, An Introduction to the Philosophy of Time and Space) is only a more up-to-date version of the cyclical theory known from Schopenhauer's widely-read work.

²⁵"Schopenhauer has written that history is an interminable and perplexing dream of human generations; in the dream there are recurring forms, perhaps nothing but forms." (italics are mine) quoted from J. L. Borges, Other Inquisitions 1937-1952, tr. R. Simms, pp. 155-156. This accurately expresses Saltykov's beliefs, mainly his ideas on forms and phantoms as expounded in Sovremennye prizraki, Sobr. soch. VI, pp. 382-383.

²⁶Such is the arrangement of Satire among other myths in N. Frye's Anatomy of Criticism.

²⁷M. E. S.-Shch., Sobr. soch. VIII, p. 424.

²⁸B. Eikhenbaum, "Kommentariy", p. 502.

²⁹H. Bergson, "Laughter", p. 63.

³⁰G. Cannan, Satire, p. 52.

³¹H. Bergson, Op. cit., p. 63.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER VIII.

¹A. Koestler, The Act of Creation.

²Ibid., p. 72.

³H. Bergson, Op. cit., p. 82.

⁴M. E. S.-Shch., Sobr. soch. VIII, p. 366.

⁵Ibid., p. 219.

⁶Ibid., p. 398.

⁷Ibid., p. 397.

⁸Ibid., p. 346.

⁹Ibid., p. 335.

¹⁰V. V. Gippius, "Lyudi i kukly v satire Saltykova".

¹¹Ibid., p. 305.

¹²I do not wish to suggest here that the grotesque is necessarily a part of the mechanization motif in general, but in some cases (as in the following excerpt about the governor Pryshch) it is. Also, I will abstain from treating the absurd as a category in itself, because it is inherent in the context of Saltykov's grotesque.

¹³K. S. Guthke, Modern Tragicomedy, p. 73.

¹⁴This critic traces the origin of the grotesque back to Romanticism (and ultimately to Roman architecture), where he discusses E. T. A. Hoffman as one of the writers who utilized the grotesque in that period, and shows how the Romantic writers drew their material from the Gothic novel (Castle of Otranto by H. Walpole, Vathek by William Beckford, etc.).

¹⁵V. V. Gippius, Op. cit., p. 304, mentioned Hoffmann's "Sandman" in connection with the puppet motif.

¹⁶M. E. S.-Shch., Op. cit., p. 369.

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 318.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 308.

²⁰N. Frye, Op. cit., p. 223.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER IX.

¹This partial list comes from C. Kulešov, Op. cit., p. 58.

²M. E. S.-Shch., Sobr. soch. VIII, p. 454.

³Ibid., p. 280.

⁴Ibid., p. 269.

⁵V. V. Gippius, Op. cit., treated as one of the satirist's motifs.

⁶M. E. S.-Shch., Op. cit., p. 281.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid., p. 282.

⁹V. V. Vinogradov, The History of the Russian Literary Language from the Seventeenth Century to the Nineteenth, discusses Saltykov from the point of view of the development of the literary language on pp. 236, 237, 239, 241, 253. Also A. E. Efimov, Op. cit.

¹⁰M. E. S.-Shch., Op. cit., p. 329.

¹¹Here Saltykov mentions Potemkin as being the patron of Ferdyshchenko (see the List) in order to suggest the parallel between the journeys of Catherine the Great and those of Ferdyshchenko, and also to hint at the arrangements, by Potemkin, of the "theatrical" villages built to please Catherine.

¹²M. E. S.-Shch., Op. cit., p. 330.

¹³Ibid., p. 332.

¹⁴B. Eikhenbaum, "Kommentariy", p. 482.

¹⁵M. E. S.-Shch., Op. cit., p. 311.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 338.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 339.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 337.

¹⁹"Coded Satire", Times Literary Supplement, August 18, 1966.

²⁰Ibid., p. 733.

²¹K. K. Arsenev, Kriticheskie etyudy po russkoy literature, Tom I.

²²Ibid., p. 36.

²³M. E. S.-Shch., Op. cit., pp. 404-406.

²⁴Ibid., p. 406.

²⁵G. Orwell, 1984.

²⁶E. Zamyatin, We, p. 4.

²⁷H. Arendt, The Origin of Totalitarianism, p. 323.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS:

Arendt, Hannah. The Human Condition. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1959.

_____. The Origins of Totalitarianism. Cleveland, Ohio: Meridian Books, 1966.

Arsenev, K. K. Kriticheskie etyudy po russkoy literature. Tom I. St. Petersburg: 1888.

_____. Saltykov-Shchedrin. St. Petersburg: 1906.

Aykhenvald, Y. Siluety russkikh pisateley. Berlin: 1923.

Baskakov, V. N. M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin v portretakh, illyustratsiyakh, dokumentakh. Leningrad: Prosveshchenie, 1968.

Bol'shaya sovetskaya entsiklopediy. Vvedenskiy, B.A., red. Tom XII. Izdanie 2-e, gos. nauch. izd. Moscow: Sovetskaya entsiklopediya, 1952.

Bushmin, A. S. M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin. Leningrad: Izd. Prosveshchenie, 1970.

_____. Satira Saltykova-Shchedrina. Leningrad: Izd. Akademii nauk SSSR, 1959.

Cannan, Gilbert. Satire. London: Martin Secker, [n.d.].

Dobrovol'skiy, A. M. Bibliografiya literatury o M. E. Saltykove-Shchedrine 1848-1917. Moscow-Leningrad: Izd. Akademii nauk SSSR, 1961.

Dossick, Jesse J. Doctoral Research on Russia and the Soviet Union. New York: New York University Press, 1960.

Efimov, A. I. Yazyk satiry Saltykova-Shchedrina. Moscow: Izd. Moskovskogo universitete, 1953.

Eliot, T. S. Use of Poetry. Cambridge, Mass.: 1933.

Elliott, Robert C. The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art. Princeton: 1960.

- Elsberg, Y. Nasledie Gogolya i Shchedrina i sovetskaya satira. Moscow: Sovetskiy pisatel', 1954.
- _____. Saltykov-Shchedrin. Moscow: Goslitizdat, 1953.
- Ershov, L. F. M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin o literature i iskusstve. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1953.
- Feibleman, J. K. In Praise of Comedy (Study in its Theory and Practice). New York: Horizon Press, 1970.
- Fraasen, Van, B. C. An Introduction to the Philosophy of Time and Space. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism. Four Essays. New York: Atheneum, 1968.
- Glicksberg, Ch. I. The Ironic Vision in Modern Literature. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1969.
- Gorelov, A. Podvig russkoy literatury. Leningrad: Sovetskiy pisatel', 1957.
- Goryachkina, M. S. M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin v russkoy kritike. Moscow: Gosizd. khud. lit., 1959.
- _____. Satira Saltykova-Shchedrina. Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 1965.
- Grossman, L. Borba za stil'. Moscow: Nikitinskiye Subbotniki, 1927.
- Guthke, Karl S. Modern Tragicomedy. An Investigation into the Nature of the Genre. New York: Random House, 1966.
- Highet, Gilbert. The Anatomy of Satire. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1962.
- Kayser, Wolfgang. The Grotesque in Art and Literature. V. Weisstein (trans.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Kernan, Alvin B. The Plot of Satire. New Haven: 1965.
- Kirpotin, V. M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin. Literaturno-kriticheskiy ocherk. Moscow: Sovetskiy pisatel', 1939.
- _____, red. N. Shchedrin (M. E. Saltykov) o literature. Moscow: Gos. izd. khud. lit., 1952.

- _____. Saltykov-Shchedrin, zhizn' i tvorchestvo. Moscow: Sovetskiy pisatel', 1955.
- Koestler, Arthur. The Act of Creation. A study of the conscious in science and art. New York: Dell Paperbacks, 1964.
- Kulešov, Catherine. Saltykov-Šchedrin, "Istorija odnogo goroda": An Annotated Edition with an Introduction. Ph.D. Indiana: 1969.
- Lindstrom, Thais S. A Concise History of Russian Literature. New York: New York University Press, 1966.
- Lukacs, G. Probleme des Realismus II. Berlin: Luchterhand, 1967.
- Makashin, S. Saltykov-Shchedrin: biografiya. Moscow: Gos. izd. khud. lit., 1951.
- Mirsky, D. S. A History of Russian Literature. New York: Vintage Books, 1958.
- Orwell, G. 1984. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1968.
- Ovsyaniko-Kulikovskiy, D. N. Istoriya russkoy literatury XIX veka. Tom IV. Moscow: 1910; [American Council of Learned Societies reprints: Russian Series N.6].
- _____. Sobranie sochineniy. Tom 8, Part 2. St. Petersburg: Izd. Prometey, 1909.
- Pares, Bernard. A History of Russia. New York: Vintage Books, 1965.
- Paulson, Ronald. The Fictions of Satire. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1967.
- Pletnev, R. Entretiens sur la literature Russe des 18e et 19e siècles. Montréal: Les Presses de L'Université de Montréal, 1967.
- Pokusaev, E. Revolyutsionnaya satira Saltykova-Shchedrina, Moscow: Gos. izd. khud. lit., 1963.
- Prozorov, V. O khudozhestvennom myshlenii pisatelya-satirika. Saratov: Izdatel'stvo Saratovskogo universiteta, 1965.
- Pushkin, A. S. Polnoe sobranie sochineniy. Tom VI. Moscow: Gos. izd. khud. lit., 1949.

- Riasanovsky, N. V. A History of Russia. London: Oxford Press, 1969.
- Saltykov-Shchedrin, M. E. Istoriya odnogo goroda. Moscow: Izd. detskaya literatura, 1970.
- _____. Sobranie sochinenii v 20i tomov. (Vols. 1-10). Moscow: Izd. khudozhestvennaya lit., 1965.
- M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin v vospominaniyakh sovremennikov. S. A. Makashin, red. Moscow: Gos. izd. khud. lit., 1957.
- Sanine, Kyra. Saltykov-Chtchedrine, Sa vie et ses oeuvres. Paris: Institut d'Etudes Slaves de l'Université de Paris, 1955.
- Schopenhauer, Arthur. The Essential Schopenhauer. London: Unwin Books, 1962.
- Shtein, A. Kriticheskiy realizm i russkaya drama XIX veka. Moscow: Gos. izd. khud. lit., 1962.
- Slonimsky, Aleksandr. Tekhnika komicheskogo u Gogolya. Petrograd: Academia, 1923.
- Sokolov, N. I. Russkaya literature i narodnichestvo. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta, 1968.
- Stokes, A. D. Anthology of Early Russian Literature. Letchworth: Bradda Books, 1963.
- Stone, Christopher. Parody. London: Martin Secker, [n.d.].
- Strelsky, Nikander. Saltykov and the Russian Squire. Columbia: 1941.
- Swift, Jonathan. Gulliver's Travels and Other Writings. L. A. Lauda, ed. Cambridge, Mass.: The Riverside Press, 1960.
- Thrall, W. F. and A. Hibbard. A Handbook to Literature. Revised and Enlarged by C. H. Holman. New York: The Odyssey Press, 1960.
- Turkov, A. Saltykov-Shchedrin. Moscow: Izd. Molodaya Gvardiya, 1964.
- Venturi, F. Roots of Revolution. New York: Knopf, 1964.

- Vernadsky, G. A History of Russia. New Haven: Yale University, 1959.
- Vilinskij, Sergij G. O literární činnosti M. Jev. Saltykova-Šchedrina. Brno: Fil. Fak. Masarykovy Univerzity, 1928.
- Vinogradov, V. V., and Lawrence L. Thomas. (Vinogradov) The History of the Russian Literary Language from the Seventeenth Century to the Nineteenth. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.
- Wren, M. C. The Course of Russian History. New York: MacMillan, 1963.
- Yakovleva, N. V. M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin, neizdannye pisma 1884-1889. Moscow: Academia, 1932.
- Zolotnitskiy, D. Shchedrin—dramaturg. Leningrad-Moscow: Gos. izd. Iskusstvo, 1961.

B. ARTICLES

- Bergson, Henri. "Laughter," Comedy, W. Sypher (ed.). New York: Anchor Books, 1956.
- Bushmin, A. S. "Iz istorii vzaimootnosheniy M. E. Saltykova-Shchedrina i Emilya Zolya," Russko-Evropeyskie literaturnye svyazi. Moscow: 1966.
- _____. "Roman v teoreticheskom i khudozhestvennom istolkovanii Saltykova-Shchedrina," Istoriya russkogo romana. Tom II. Moscow-Leningrad: Izd. 'Nauka', 1964.
- "Coded Satire," Times Literary Supplement, August 18, 1966.
- Eikhensbaum, B. "Istoriya odnogo goroda M. E. Saltykova-Shchedrina (Kommentariy)", O proze. Sbornik statei. Leningrad: Khudozhesvennaya lit., 1969
- _____. "Kak sdelana 'Shinel'' Gogolya", Ibid.
- Foot, I. P. "Reaction or Revolution? The ending of Saltykov's The History of a Town", Oxford Slavonic Papers, Vol. I. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Gippius, V. V. "Lyudi i kukly v satire Saltykova," Ot Pushkin do Bloka. Moscow-Leningrad: Izd. Nauka, 1966.

Grishin, D. V. "The Problem of Dictatorship in the Work of Dostoevsky and of S.-Shchedrin," Australian Quarterly, XXXI, iii, pp. 82-91.

Ivanov, G. V. "Kommentariy" to the text of Istoriya odnogo goroda, M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin, Sobr. soch. Tom VIII. Moscow: Khud. lit., 1969.

Kramer, Karl D. "Satiric Form in Saltykov's Gospoda Golovlevy," The Slavic and East European Journal, Winter 1970, Vol. XIV, No. 4.

Voronsky, Alexander. "Evgeny Zamyatin," P. Mitchell (trans.), Russian Literature Triquarterly, Number 2, Winter 1972.