

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOLZHENITSYN AND TOLSTOI:
A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SEVERAL WORKS

By

Elviera Klassen

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and
Research of the University of Manitoba through the Department
of Slavic Studies in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts

September, 1982

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOLZHENITSYN AND TOLSTOI:
A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SEVERAL WORKS

BY

ELVIERA KLASSEN

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

© 1982

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVER-
SITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to
the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this
thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY
MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the
thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

ABSTRACT

This thesis is a study of the influence of the work of L. N. Tolstoi on Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn. The study is based on Solzhenitsyn's four major novels, One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich, The First Circle, Cancer Ward, and August 1914; it consists of four chapters, each focusing on one of the novels and discussing the nature of Tolstoi's influence on Solzhenitsyn.

One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich recalls Tolstoi's short story "The Wood-felling." Both authors deal with one day in a camp. In Solzhenitsyn's case it is a concentration camp and in Tolstoi's-- a military camp. Both stories have similar themes; a number of Solzhenitsyn's characters resemble Tolstoi's. However, the narrators of the two stories are different. In both there are also textual similarities.

The theme of the awakening of conscience and moral resurrection in The First Circle is similar to that of Tolstoi's novel Resurrection. Solzhenitsyn's theme protagonist recalls Tolstoi's for both undergo a moral transformation. Solzhenitsyn's other protagonists, secondary characterisations, and some scenes are also reminiscent of other of Tolstoi's works.

The references to Tolstoi's works in One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich and The First Circle are sub-textual; there are direct references to Tolstoi and his works in Cancer Ward and August 1914.

In Cancer Ward the theme of Tolstoi's short story "What People Live By" forms the basis for the whole of Cancer Ward. Cancer Ward also bears resemblance to Tolstoi's The Death of Ivan Il'ich for both works deal with death, the purpose of life, disease, and both have

similar protagonists. However, Solzhenitsyn's novel differs from Tolstoi's works in that in Cancer Ward life conquers death and the future conquers the past.

In August 1914 the relationship with Tolstoi is more complex and contradictory. August 1914 is closely related to Tolstoi's War and Peace. Both novels are historical and both authors chose as their central subjects wars which engulfed Russia some fifty years before. Both Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoi interfuse their war sequences with scenes of peace. Here again many of Solzhenitsyn's characters are reminiscent of Tolstoi's. However, Solzhenitsyn, although he seemingly accepts Tolstoi's interpretation of history in War and Peace, believes that individuals not only can but must be responsible for what happens in life.

Thus, although Tolstoi has served Solzhenitsyn as an exemplar in many ways, Solzhenitsyn, in the four works studied here, shows himself increasingly more ready to engage in polemic with Tolstoi. In the end Solzhenitsyn is much more positive about the possibility of creating a better life and a better future than is Tolstoi.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
TRANSLITERATION SYSTEM	ii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ONE DAY IN THE LIFE OF IVAN DENISOVICH	7
III. THE FIRST CIRCLE	25
IV. CANCER WARD	47
V. AUGUST 1914	72
VI. CONCLUSION	93
APPENDIX	98
NOTES	106
BIBLIOGRAPHY	117

AKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank my advisor, Professor N. Aponiuk, for her encouragement and advice. I am also grateful to the members of my thesis defence committee, Professors J. Rozumnyj, I. Tarnawecy, and H. D. Wiebe of the Department of Slavic Studies and Professor J. M. Robinson of the Department of English, for their helpful comments.

I would also like to thank my sisters, Elsa and Lily, for their help.

The Library of Congress
Transliteration System

А а	А а	Р р	Р r
Б б	В b	С с	S s
В в	У u	Т т	T t
Г г	Г g	У у	U u
Д д	Д d	Ф ф	F f
Е е	Е e	Х х	Kh kh
Ё ё	Ё ё	Ц ц	TS ts
Ж ж	Zh zh	Ч ч	Ch ch
З з	Z z	Ш ш	Sh sh
И и	I i	Щ щ	Shch shch
Й й	I i	Ъ	" "
К к	К k	Ы ы	Y y
Л л	L l	Ь ь	' '
М м	М m	Э э	È è
Н н	N n	Ю ю	IU iu
О о	О o	Я я	IA ia
П п	P p		

* * *

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The main aim of this thesis is to study the influence of the works of Lev Tolstoi on Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn. The fact that Tolstoi served as a significant exemplar for Solzhenitsyn is obvious even from an initial reading of Solzhenitsyn's works, for some include direct references to Tolstoi himself and to specific novels and short stories by Tolstoi as well as to his characters. In other works by Solzhenitsyn, the relationship is less obvious since it is related to themes and ideas in Tolstoi's writing.

This relationship--both the overt and the less obvious--between Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoi will be explored in four of Solzhenitsyn's major novels, Odin den' Ivana Denisovicha (One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich), V krughe pervom (The First Circle), Rakovyi korpus (Cancer Ward), and Avgust chetyrnadtsatogo (August 1914). The study has been limited to these four works since they are his most significant works of fiction and because they best exemplify the links between Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoi.

The study is divided into four chapters, each dealing with one of Solzhenitsyn's novels and discussing the nature of Tolstoi's influence on that specific novel. Chapter II, One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich, and Chapter III, The First Circle, deal with two works in which the influence of Tolstoi is not obvious: neither Tolstoi nor any of his works or characters are mentioned. Chapter IV,

Cancer Ward, and Chapter V, August 1914, discuss two novels in which the influence of Tolstoi is most overt. In Cancer Ward Solzhenitsyn mentions both Tolstoi and some of his short stories and, in fact, one of Tolstoi's stories provides the main theme for the novel. In August 1914 Solzhenitsyn makes direct references to some of Tolstoi's ideas and engages in polemics with him on several issues.

A number of critics¹ have noted the relationship between Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoi, but the present work is the first to trace it in all its literary aspects through Solzhenitsyn's most significant fiction.

As already mentioned, Solzhenitsyn's preoccupation with Tolstoi is quite overt in some instances and less so in others; that preoccupation far outweighs Solzhenitsyn's concern with any other writer. It is interesting that this should be the case for, after all, Solzhenitsyn is (or was) a Soviet Russian writer whose literary career began with the publication of One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich in 1962, whereas Tolstoi, albeit one of the giants of world literature, gained prominence as a writer almost one hundred years earlier. Though the relationship is obvious, the reasons for it can only be suggested.

The literary tradition of the nineteenth century, particularly as exemplified in the large realistic novels of Tolstoi, Dostoevskii, and Turgenev, gave way prior to the Revolution and in the years immediately after to a relatively brief period of experimentation, a brief flirtation with the avant-garde, which was also evident in the other arts. The freedom to produce what one wished began to vanish even before Stalin came to power in 1924. By 1936 and the promulgation of Socialist Realism, literature was required to support the regime, serve the state, and be submissive to the govern-

ment; in short, it became the mouthpiece of Party propoganda. With the voluntary immigration, enforced exile, or death of such writers as Blok, Maiakovskii, Akhmatova, and Mandel'shtam and Pasternak's escape into translation, Soviet literature became the domain of the writer willing to submit to Party control. A literature which was socialist in content and realistic in form resulted in the abandonment of all experimental work and coincided with a renewed interest in novels on a large scale, such as Fedin's Goroda i gody (Cities and Years, 1924), Gladkov's Tsement (Cement, 1925), and Sholokhov's Tikhii Don (in English, And Quiet Flows the Don, 1928-1940). Pasternak's Doktor Zhivago (Doctor Zhivago, 1957) although unacceptable to the Soviet regime because of its theme, is also in this tradition. On the whole, therefore, Soviet Russian literature has become quite conservative; the experimental writers of the Revolutionary era are wholly ignored and the experimental ones of a more contemporary period, such as Abram Tertz, are vilified as much for the form as the content of their works.

Solzhenitsyn is a typical product of Soviet society. He was born in 1918, a year after the Revolution. He went through the Soviet secondary and post-secondary education system. While at the university he won a Stalin Scholarship and upon completion of his studies he taught mathematics in school. He fought in World War II and suffered, like millions of others, in Stalin's labour camps, where he spent eight years for criticizing Stalin in private letters to his friend.

Solzhenitsyn writes from his experience. The concentration camp and cancer ward are the subject matter of his works. In them Solzhenitsyn directs his attack at the Stalinist bureaucracy and

gives a broad picture of a cross section of Soviet society. Solzhenitsyn is thus a modern writer in the sense that his topics are the reality of modern times, specifically in the Soviet Union. But, like many novelists of the nineteenth century, Solzhenitsyn employs his personal experience as the centre of his literary work. The concentration camp and cancer ward are for him a reflection of the problems presented by an extreme situation as well as of the universal reality of good and evil. In his themes, however, Solzhenitsyn is not a complete innovator for many others have written about Stalin's labour camps; nevertheless, Solzhenitsyn is better able than others to observe and describe what he sees.² In his works Solzhenitsyn expresses ideas, feelings, emotions, and longings of his characters in a way that is understood and felt by readers. In portraying his characters, Solzhenitsyn manages to preserve their truthfulness.

Particular in his preoccupation with "large" questions, Solzhenitsyn is a traditional writer. Solzhenitsyn's respect for Truth is the most dominant feature that brings him back to the tradition of the nineteenth century Russian literature. As Deming Brown has written,

Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn is the most prominent literary heretic Russia has produced since Leo Tolstoy. Like Tolstoy, he is moved not only by a concern for spiritual values but also by a compelling corporeal interest in what is important for human fulfillment here on earth. He brings to Soviet literature a deep seriousness and reverence for humanity, a skeptical, exacting respect for truth, and a passion for full disclosure.³

At a writer's meeting in Riazan' in 1969, Solzhenitsyn quoted Tolstoi in discussing whether there was point in recalling the past:

"If I had a vile disease and I were cured and cleansed

from it, I would always be happy to talk about it. I would make no mention of it only if I still went on suffering and getting worse and I wanted to deceive myself. We are sick--all of us are sick too. The form of the sickness has changed but it is still the same disease; only it is called by a different name... The disease that we are suffering from is murdering of people... If we would recall the past and look it straight in the face - the violence we are now committing would be revealed."⁴

Solzhenitsyn then exclaims: "No! It will not be possible to keep silent indefinitely about Stalin's crimes or go against the truth. There were millions of people who suffered from the crimes and they demand exposure."⁵ Solzhenitsyn is

uncompromising in his attitude to truth and he restores to Russian Literature the moral universalism which had been lost during the Stalin era. His writing is philosophical in the traditional sense; with its complexity and sense of tragedy, it is the antithesis of the shallow optimism and vulgar sociologism which, under the sign of "social realism" has for so many years dominated Soviet prose writing.⁶

It is perhaps this sense of "involvement" which most closely links Solzhenitsyn to the nineteenth century.

In his Nobel Lecture on Literature in 1970, Solzhenitsyn pointed out that at various times and in various countries arguments have arisen about whether "art and the artist should live for their own sake or whether they must always keep in mind their duty towards society and serve it, albeit without bias."⁷ For Solzhenitsyn there is no such dilemma:

Indeed, Russian literature has for decades been disinclined to engage in excessive self-contemplation, or in flitting about in too carefree a matter--and I am not ashamed to continue this tradition to the best of my ability. Through Russian literature we have long ago grown familiar with the concept that a writer can do much among his people--and that he must.⁸

This thesis studies in detail Solzhenitsyn's relationship to the work of a writer whose views on this point at least were quite similar--Lev Tolstoi.

CHAPTER II

ONE DAY IN THE LIFE OF IVAN DENISOVICH

Odin den' Ivana Denisovicha (One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich) was Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's first published work. It appeared in Novyi mir (New World) in 1962. In an interview in 1967, the author was quite specific about his intentions in the novella:

I have always felt that to write about the fate of Russia was the most fascinating and important task to be performed. Of all the drama that Russia lived through, the fate of Ivan Denisovich was the greatest tragedy. I also wanted to expose the false image of prison camps. While still in the camp I made up my mind to describe one day of prison life. Tolstoi once said that a novel can deal with either centuries of European history or a day in one man's life¹

In One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich Solzhenitsyn has chosen to deal with a day in one man's life.

One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich takes place in a Siberian concentration camp during a single day in January, 1951. The novella is a plotless account of an ordinary day in a concentration camp during the Stalin era. The work records the routine behind barbed wire from reveille to retreat, including prisoners' meals, work, searches, free time, and the relationship of the prisoners to one another and to the authorities. The main character in the novel is Ivan Denisovich Shukhov, prisoner Shch 854. He is a Russian peasant, a carpenter, serving the eighth year of his sentence in this "special" penal colony. The story is told through his eyes, and through him is introduced a cross-section of Soviet society, individuals repre-

senting almost every class and many of the ethnic groups of the Soviet Union. The basic theme of One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich is an assertion of one man's will for survival and his ability to achieve and maintain dignity under incredibly inhuman conditions which constantly work against the possibility of survival. In a way this theme is existential; it strongly asserts a simple man's unceasing will to survive simply by making the best of and living for the present moment despite the difficult conditions. This theme combines both struggle for survival and for dignity.²

Although One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich is a unique work it has points in common with Lev Tolstoi's story Rubka lesa (The Wood-felling).³

"The Wood-felling" was the second of Tolstoi's Caucasian tales. Written between 1853 and 1855, it was completed in Sevastopol' and published in Sovremennik (The Contemporary) in 1855. The story takes place in the Caucasus in February 185-. The real concern of "The Wood-felling" is its examination of the soldierly milieu and the true meaning of the Caucasus. Like Solzhenitsyn, Tolstoi employs a narrator. Tolstoi's narrator, an officer cadet temporarily commanding a platoon in the North Eastern Caucasus, sets the scene without any preliminaries, just as the narrator of One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich does.

The time, the place, and the occasion are defined in both works. In Tolstoi's story, it is early morning and time to set off on a wood-felling expedition. In Solzhenitsyn's work, the 104th squad of zeks, after performing their everyday morning tasks, are assigned to build a wall on the second story of the TETs building. In both works the men involved have to make long marches away from their camps.

Although "The Wood-felling," like One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich, is a plotless account of a single day in a Caucasian camp, Tolstol describes not a concentration camp but an army camp.

The day as it is described in both works has been a rather good one. In One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich Shukhov, after a long and hard day, finally gets into bed and begins to review the day. He goes to sleep very satisfied because he had a lot of luck that day: he was not thrown in a punishment cell; his squad was not sent out to work at the settlement; at lunch time he managed to get an extra bowl of porridge; the squad leader had fixed the rates well; he had enjoyed working on that wall; the overseers had not found on him that piece of steel in the frisk; Tsezar' had paid him off that evening; he had bought some tobacco, and he did not get sick. Shukhov feels that the day has passed without anything spoiling it, and it has been almost a happy day.⁴ In "The Wood-felling" the narrator also finds their day has been successful: the Cossaks have made a successful attack and killed three Tatars; the infantry has laid in wood and only six of their men were wounded; in the artillery only Velenchuk and two horses became casualties; and they managed to fell wood over three versts and cleared the place so that it was difficult to recognize it. The narrator feels that on the whole the affair has been a happy one.⁵

In both works men of various classes are depicted. Among the characters in One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich are military men, police, peasants, workers, intellectuals, bureaucrats, Russians, Ukrainians, Estonians, a Latvian, a Moldavian, a gypsy. Tiurin, the 104th squad leader, has spent over twenty years in the camps simply because he is a kulak's son. Tsezar', an erstwhile film producer and intellectual, was arrested in the middle of a picture.

Alesha, a Baptist, was convicted for his religious beliefs. Buinovskii, a former naval captain and confirmed Communist, has served as a liason officer on a British cruiser; as a token of gratitude the British admiral had sent him a gift after the war. As a result Buinovskii was accused of spying for Britain and was sentenced to twenty-five years. Kolia Vdovushkin, a former university student of literature, has been allowed by the camp doctor to be a medical orderly so that he could write and produce the kind of work he was not permitted to at the university. Fetiukov, a former government bureaucrat, has been reduced to prisoner-jackal. An Estonian prisoner was arrested when he returned from Sweden, where his parents fled during the Revolution, to the Soviet Union to study at the university. Volkovoi was a lieutenant in the security police and a veteran chekist and now he is a guard in the camp.

Shukhov, the narrator and the main character in the novel, is a simple man, innocent of any crime and able to comprehend little beyond the day-to-day problems of survival. He is in the camp because he was convicted of high treason. He had been captured in February, 1942, when the Russian army had been surrounded by Germans, but had managed to escape and return to his own lines. The assumption was that anyone able to escape the Germans must have been a collaborator. By nature he is a timid man. It is easier for him to learn the necessary degree of servility than it is for some of the other prisoners. Shukhov feels that it is easier for a man in the camp if he grovels but submits, and hard for a stubborn man because the authorities break you. Shukhov is ready to run errands for his fellow prisoners and perform services which will bring him some advantage, but not at the sacrifice of his own sense of perso-

nal worth. He does not take on any old job. He keeps himself tidy and clean. He is prepared to scrounge a smoke but he never lowers himself like Fetiukov: he never looks at another man's mouth. He retains his dignity in any way he can. Observing Shukhov throughout the novel, we see that despite the inhuman conditions in the camp he has retained compassion and humanity. He feels genuine sorrow for Tsezar', when he risks having his parcel stolen, and for Bui-novskii, because he has been in the camp for only a few weeks and does not know how to survive, but, Shukhov feels, that he, too, will learn, though the hard way. Shukhov shares his cigarettes with the deaf Sen'ka and his biscuits with Alesha.

In "The Wood-felling" the various classes and ethnic groups are those of Tsarist Russia. The narrator's name is not mentioned in the story and nothing is known about his life; neither are the reasons for his being in the Caucasus. He is an officer-cadet and he is, unlike Shukhov, of noble background.⁶ From the narrator's conversation with Bolkhov, one learns that the narrator enjoys serving in the army where the real action is. He prefers it to sitting at a desk at military headquarters. The narrator is friendly with his men and cares about them. During the battle, when he hears the sound of a bullet flying by, his heart is torn by the thought that one of his men might have been shot. His fear is confirmed when he hears the heavy fall of a body and agonizing moaning of a wounded man.

The narrator of "The Wood-felling" and Shukhov do not have much in common besides the fact that they are both sincere and good men. As narrators, they are also different. One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich is narrated in the third person but the choice of detail

in Solzhenitsyn's picture of the labour camp is effectively Shukhov's. Things are presented as they appear to Shukhov. The language is colorful and rhythmic because it reflects cadences of Shukhov's own remarks; only in places does the author interrupt. The author's task is limited mostly to description of setting, nature, action, and reporting of conversations. Shukhov, however, constantly intrudes into the narrator's third person narrative by means of the "represented discourse."⁷ In this way Shukhov bares his own thoughts and feelings and his preoccupations with the conditions of the camp life. His subjective views emerge within the narrator's text. Therefore, there are two points of view in One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich, which are not opposing but converging and complementary. Shukhov is thus a subjective narrator who merges with the objective third person narrator-observer. Solzhenitsyn's use of the "represented discourse" technique throughout the novel creates the illusion that Shukhov is the only narrator and that the novel is a first-person one.

"The Wood-felling," on the other hand, is narrated in the first person. The narrator is the one who presents the whole story without any interruptions from the author. His language is different from Shukhov's, reflecting the nobleman-narrator's speech. The narrator, unlike Shukhov who is a subjective narrator, is an objective narrator-observer. However, the narrator, like Shukhov, participates in conversations and actions, but not to the same degree as Shukhov. Since Shukhov is a prisoner, he cannot leave prison; the narrator of "The Wood-felling" is only temporarily in this camp and he can leave at any time; he is merely an observer.

There are other characters in "The Wood-felling." Velenchuk,

a "little Russian" who has been serving in the army for fifteen years, is open, kind, zealous, and honest, to the extent that when some cloth from which he is to sew a uniform for an officer is stolen, Velenchuk pays the officer for the cloth. There is Maksimov, whom the other soldiers consider extremely rich and learned because he uses words which no one understands. The company commander Bolkhov is well-off. He used to serve in the Guards and he speaks French, but despite all these advantages, he has a "common touch" and gets along with soldiers. For the battalion adjutant, the son of the poor nobleman, a military career was the only one possible; he values his officer's rank above everything else. Captain Trosenko is "an old Caucasus man" (staryi kavkazets): the battalion has become his family, the fortress-headquarters, his homeland. Lance-corporal Antonov has been in the army for a long time; when sober he is a good soldier but useless when he drinks. Zhdanov, a peasant shoemaker, the oldest soldier in the battalion, never drinks, smokes, plays cards, or swears. During his free time he works and on holidays, when possible, he goes to church. With those of higher rank but younger than he, he is very cold but respectful; with his equals, as a non-drinker, he has very few occasions to get together; it is only with the young soldiers and recruits that he feels at ease, and it is to them that he is especially kind. Captain Kraft likes to talk about his promotions and trips to Russia, and wants to be liked by everyone.

Although both authors employ narrators, the narrators, as already mentioned, have little in common. Shukhov does, however, recall Velenchuk, the "little Russian" peasant, in some respects. For example, both are practical, hard working peasants. Shukhov

divides work into two types: "Work--it is like a stick, it has two ends: when doing for people--give them quality, when doing for superiors--give them eye-wash."⁸ When working under mandatory punishment, Shukhov works carelessly and sloppily, sloshing the buckets of dirty water onto the path which was used by the camp authorities. At the construction site, however, he works with vigour:

And Shukhov was no longer seeing either that distant view where sun gleamed on snow or the prisoners as they wandered from the warming up places all over the site.... Shukhov was seeing only his wall--from the junction on the left, where the blocks rose in steps higher than his waist, and to the right corner where his wall met with Kil'digsov's.

...The wall had previously been laid by some unknown mason who was either incompetent or had scamped the job, and now Shukhov tackled the wall as if it was his own.

The capable and efficient manner in which Shukhov goes about any task in the concentration camp recalls another peasant in Lev Tolstoi's Voina i mir (War and Peace), Platon Karataev.¹⁰ As a prisoner Platon Karataev skillfully sews slippers for his fellow prisoners and overseers. Karataev "knew how to do everything, he was always busy,"¹¹ while Shukhov knew how to manage everything.¹² Like Shukhov's, Karataev's speech abounds in proverbs and popular sayings. However, the parallel between the two does not go very far because Shukhov does not embody the spirit of truth which Pierre Bezukhov thought he had found in Karataev, and Shukhov is not in any meaningful sense a religious believer. The reason for this difference may be that Bezukhov goes through life searching for truth which Tolstoi embodies in Karataev, but Solzhenitsyn's purpose is to present a simple peasant trying to survive. As for the love of life,

passionate and self-centered, evident in Shukhov's every move, it is as evident in Karataev's. For example, when he eats the hot gruel, warmth "flows through his body--indeed, his very bowels quiver towards the gruel. Good! That's it, the brief instant for which the prisoner inmate lives!"¹³

The corruption in the camp is endemic. The greased palm is the order of the day because everybody wants some advantage or special privilege. Bribery, blackmail, and backscratching are a common occurrence: every service and almost every person has its price. Tuirin, for example, uses salt pork to bribe the official, who assigns work, to keep his squad from being sent to the site of a new settlement where the men could die of exposure on the unsheltered, snowcovered steppe. If a man wants a warm vest or a hat other than a prison hat, he bribes someone in the warehouse. Every squad is cheated on its bread ration first at the central supply depot and then, when the bread ration is divided among the prisoners, each individual is again shortchanged. The hardship of the zek's existence is shown in the description of his pitiful rations. The gruel does not change from day to day; it depends on a vegetable that is stored for the winter. Last year it was salty carrots, and the prisoners got gruel made of carrots all winter; this year it is black cabbage. The worst time is July when "they" put nettle in the pot. There is no meat; sometimes "they" use fish to make gruel and even then there are only bones or eyes floating in the gruel.¹⁴

Food, especially bread, means survival in the camp; thus it becomes a means of exchange. The lucky ones are those who receive parcels. The prisoners are forced to work under the harshest conditions. Shukhov and his squad are building a wall in weather so

cold that both men and mortar are in danger of freezing. But their cleverness and instinct for survival result in their stealing a roll of felt to seal the open windows to protect themselves from the cruel wind and burning lumber in a stove which Shukhov builds. Another squad is assigned to chop holes in the stone-hard frozen earth with picks, but the men are forbidden to build fires to thaw themselves or the earth, and it is natural that they do not accomplish anything. Another form of "corruption" is the doctoring of work reports, for only in this way can a squad leader keep his men alive. Informing, arbitrariness, and cruel punishment characterize the camp. There are informers in every squad, saving their own skin at the expense of their fellow-prisoners.

The prisoners, sent out to work in temperatures of 27 degrees below zero, are ordered to undress to make sure they are not wearing anything besides regular dress. Buinovskii protests and, as a result, is sentenced to ten days in solitary confinement. Prisoners can be sent to solitary confinement on the smallest pretext, for example, for not removing their hats. There is no refuge or sanctuary anywhere in the camp for even the camp infirmary seems to breathe hostility and smell of death. Even here there are rules to be obeyed: there are no consulting hours in the morning; only two prisoners a day can be freed from work because of illness; the rest must work, sick or not. Those patients who can still stand on their feet are also made to work.

If the guards are cruel to the prisoners, the prisoners are even more cruel to one another. Shukhov says that a zek's main enemy is another zek and if they were not at odds with one another life might be more tolerable. But the prisoners fight for bread, for porridge,

for soup, for warmth, for an extra piece of clothing, in a war of all against all to survive. One prisoner, working with the camp authorities, even beats the other zeks when they line up, hungry, to enter the mess hall. However, the prisoners do join forces to protect one of themselves from the authorities. They are furious when, at the end of the day, they are kept from returning to the barracks because one prisoner is missing. When he is discovered (he has been sleeping in a repair shop), the zeks unite against the authorities. A guard is about to slam him with his rifle butt, when his squad leader slaps him (thereby getting him away from the guard) and another zek kicks him in the behind. There is cruelty, but it is mitigated by the presence of the common enemy.

Moreover, Shukhov and his comrades realize that they may be condemned to spend the rest of their lives here. Shukhov, in fact, wonders whether he even wants to be free.

At first he had longed for it and every night he counted the days of his time--how many had passed, how many were coming. And then he got tired of counting. And then it became clear that men of his like would not ever be allowed to return home, that they would be exiled. And whether his life would be any better there than here--who could tell? All he wanted to continue to ask God was to go home.¹⁵

Alesha, however, accepts his fate and considers the camp a place of Christian trial where his beliefs and his faith can be tested. Alesha tells Shukhov that he must not pray for material or mortal things, only for his daily bread, and that he ought not even pray to be freed from the camp because in freedom his last grain of faith will be choked with weeds; he should rejoice that he is in prison because "here you have time to think about your soul."¹⁶ Shukhov is a simple even naive man whose perception of

the world is purely physical. He does not search for meaning or draw conclusions. He happily accepts the folkloric explanation of the behavior of the moon and stars. Shukhov does not want to contemplate his soul; for him freedom means going home to his wife and children. He protests at Alesha's thinking:

'You see, Alesha?' Shukhov explains to him, 'somehow it works out all right for you: Jesus Christ wanted you to sit in prison and so you are sitting here for His sake. But for whose sake am I here? Because we were not ready for war in forty-one? For that? But was it my fault'¹⁷

Although on the surface the setting of One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich and "The Wood-felling" are strikingly different, as the stories unfold we realize that for some of Tolstoi's characters, the Caucasus are as much a prison as the Siberian concentration camp is for all of Solzhenitsyn's.

In "The Wood-felling" Tolstoi was the first to expose the predominant romantic conception of the Caucasus which is strongly felt in the works of Pushkin and Lermontov, just as Solzhenitsyn exposed the true conditions in prison camp.

Bolkhov comments that a myth exists about the Caucasus in Russia: it is seen as a Promised Land for unhappy people, an escape, a refuge from frustrated love or financial difficulties. Bolkhov sees the Caucasus differently:

You know, in Russia they imagine the Caucasus somehow majestic, with eternal virgin ice, rapid streams, with daggers, felt cloaks, Circassian women--all this is somewhat frightening, but in reality there is no joy in it. If only they knew that we never go onto virgin ice, and even if we did, there is no joy in it, and that the Caucasus is divided into provinces: Stavropol'skaya, Tiflisskaya, and so on.¹⁸

Bolkhov decides he has been taken in by the myth:

Everything for which, according to the myth, I went to cure myself, everything came here with me; the only difference is that before everything was on a large scale but now it's on a small one, a small dirty one. At every step I find millions of little worries, filth, insults;....I feel how with every day I fall lower and lower morally, but the most important thing is that I feel that I'm not suited to service here; ¹⁹I cannot bear danger,...I'm simply not brave.

Bolkhov feels imprisoned by his vanity but is unable to shake it off; he explains that he remains in the Caucasus because it would be extremely embarrassing to return to Moscow or St. Petersburg without any medals and without the rank of major. The narrator, on the other hand, though he now sees the Caucasus for what they are, still likes them very much.²⁰

In order to obtain rewards and advancement one must have courage. The officers, therefore, must hide their fear at dangerous moments, and such dissembling passes for courage among them. The narrator notices that in this respect the soldiers differ from their officers. As he and Bolkhov, inwardly trembling, fake indifference to enemy fire, he hears Antonov openly curse it and remarks: "All of my attempts to seem cool and all of our clever phrases suddenly seemed unbearably stupid to me after this artless exclamation."²¹ Antonov and the other soldiers know what it is to be afraid of enemy bullets. Unlike the officers they cannot escape from this leading fact of soldier's life. They feel that the officers live in Russia even as they follow their careers in the Caucasus, expecting rewards back home for their achievements in war. Most of the soldiers, however, have neither homes nor families. They serve because they must. And those who have families cannot go home. Zhdanov, for example,

like many other soldiers, is trapped in the Caucasus. He cannot go home even on leave because his family is too poor to feed another mouth. He does not even know if his family is alive for he has received no replies to the few letters he has written. In this respect he is reminiscent of Shukhov who, earlier in his sentence, told his wife to forget about him and not send him any more parcels. He knew how very difficult it was for the families on the outside to send prisoners such parcels, knew that his family would not be able to afford it for the ten years of his sentence, so he stopped his wife from even trying. Nevertheless, each time Shukhov hears the call for parcels, his heart leaps in the hope that someone will come and tell him that he, too, has received a parcel.

Just as the prisoners in One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich are faced with death from the inhuman conditions of the camp, so are the soldiers and officers of "The Wood-felling" faced with death from enemy bullets. Soldiers and officers alike are exposed to sudden death, but even on a campaign the comforts of an officer's life help him to forget the experiences of the day. The narrator moves from the gloomy encampment of the soldiers, where everything reminds him of Velenchuk's death and leads him to dwell on it, to Bolkhov's cheerful shelter, where the atmosphere is so pleasant that he completely forgets about the damp, the darkness, and Velenchuk's wound.²² The officers talk about Moscow and other subjects that have nothing to do with war. Meanwhile, around the campfire of the soldiers, to which the narrator returns later and expects the soldiers to be discussing Velenchuk, the soldiers are boosting their spirits by avoiding conversation about their wounded fellow-soldier. However, the cheerful jokes that Chikin is

telling are as much a reaction to Velenchuk's injury as a conversation about it would be.²³

The account of Velenchuk's wound and reaction to it, therefore, becomes the central episode of "The Wood-felling" for it shows how the soldier's awareness of his own mortality forces itself upon him. Here they are faced with terrible reality. Velenchuk, like the other soldiers, did not expect to be shot. He was a man who naturally loved and served others, and he entered fully into the spirit of the army. He did not think about death because he did not think about himself. When he is shot, he is brought back abruptly and completely to himself. He becomes a physical being in pain and mortally wounded. And those around him are naturally recalled to their own vulnerability with shock and terror. Everyone present at the scene sees not the man Velenchuk but "some sort of unclear mass and hideous amount ... of blood."²⁴ The thought that passes through each man present is not the death of Velenchuk; instead, each has found himself for a moment in Velenchuk's place. He then returns to himself and plunges into vehement activity in order to ward off the horrid premonition of his own death.²⁵

The atmosphere among soldiers and officers is much more pleasant than that among the prisoners of One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich. Unlike the zeks, they do not have to fight for food, their rations are good and they have enough clothing.

In addition to the similarities in the theme and content between One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich and "The Wood-felling," there are textual similarities. These are primarily concerned with the descriptions of nature and the passage of the day. In both works the story begins early in the morning and ends late

at night in moonlight, with the position and the heat of the sun used to define the forward movement both of the day and of the two stories. The following examples illustrate this:

One Day in the Life of

Ivan Denisovich

At five o'clock in the morning, as usual, reveille was sounded by the blows of the hammer on a length of rail hanging near the staff barrack. ... Outside the window everything was just as it was in the middle of the night when Shukhov got up to go to the bucket; it was pitch dark except for the yellow light cast on the window by three lamps. ...²⁶

The hazy cold made Shukhov gasp. Two powerful searchlights swept the camp from the farthest watch-towers. The border-lights, as well as those inside the camp, were on. There were so many of them that they completely outshone the stars.²⁷

It was still dark, though in the east the sky was beginning to glow with a greenish tint. And a light but piercing breeze was coming from the rising sun.²⁸

Far in the distance, on the other side of the site, the sun, red and enormous, was rising in haze, its beams cutting obliquely through the gates, the entire building-site and the fence.²⁹

The sun rose red and hazy over the deserted area.³⁰

The sun had risen higher, dispersing the haze; the two columns had gone - and it was reddish inside the room.³¹

"The Wood-felling"

At three o'clock in the morning, when it was still completely dark, the warm sheepskin was pulled off me and the crimson flame of a candle unpleasantly irritated my sleepy eyes.³⁸

It was dark, misty and cold. The night campfires, shining here and there in the camp, lighting up the figures of the sleepy soldiers lying about near them, increased the darkness with their crimson light.³⁹

The mist began to get noticeably white in the east; the damp was becoming more perceptible, and the surrounding objects began, little by little, to emerge out of the darkness.⁴⁰

The bright circle of the sun, shining through the milky-white mist, had already risen quite high; the greyish-lilac horizon was slowly broadening and, though much farther away, it was delineated just as sharply by the deceptive white wall of the mist.⁴¹

The mist had completely risen and, taking the shape of clouds, was slowly disappearing in the dark blue of the sky. The uncovered sun shone brightly and threw joyful gleams on the steel bayonets, on the copper of the guns, on the thawing

Shukhov looked up at the sky and gasped: the sky was clear, and the sun had climbed almost to the dinner-hour.³²

The sun was very bright, it made you blink.³³

Shukhov looked about. Yes the sun was beginning to set. It had a greyish appearance as it sank in a red haze.³⁴

The top rim of the sun dipped below the horizon.³⁵

While Shukhov was recovering his breath he looked up, the moon had risen and was frowning crimsonfaced.³⁶

The moon rode high now! As high again, and it would be at its zenith. The sky was greenish-white, the rare stars shone brilliantly. The snow gleamed white, the barrack walls were also white. The lamps had little effect.³⁷

ground, and on the sparkle of the hoarfrost. The freshness of the morning frost and the warmth of the spring sun were heard in the air.⁴²

It was getting dark. Whittish-blue clouds crawled across the sky. The mist, which had turned into drizzly damp haze, was wetting the earth and the soldier's overcoats. The horizon was narrowing, and the whole area was taking on gloomy shadows.⁴³

It was already dark night and only the campfires dimly lit up the camp....The smell of the mist and the smoke from the damp wood, spreading through all the air, ate the eyes, and the same raw haze was falling from the gloomy sky.⁴⁴

In conclusion, there is a direct relationship between Solzhenitsyn's One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich and Tolstoi's "The Wood-felling." Both authors chose to deal with one day in a camp. In Solzhenitsyn's case it is a Siberian concentration camp and in Tolstoi's it is a military camp in the Caucasus. The day in both works ends happily. In both works men of various classes are depicted. In One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich there are military men, police, peasants, workers, intellectuals, bureaucrats, Russians, Ukrainians, Estonians, a Latvian, a Moldavian, a gypsy; In "The Wood-felling" the classes and ethnic groups are those of Tsarist Russia. The narrators of both stories, however, do not have much in common besides the fact that they are both sincere and good men. As narrators they are also different because Shukhov

is a subjective narrator and the narrator of "The Wood-felling" is objective narrator-observer. Both stories also have similar themes. Solzhenitsyn exposes the false image of the prison camp by showing the hardship of the zek's life; Tolstoi exposes the false romantic conception of the Caucasus, then prevailing in Tsarist Russia. For some of Tolstoi's characters, the Caucasus are as much a prison as the Siberian concentration camp is for all of Solzhenitsyn's. The basic theme in One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich is an assertion of one man's will for survival and his ability to achieve and maintain dignity under inhuman conditions. And, just as the prisoners are faced with death from inhuman conditions, so are the soldiers and officers of "The Wood-felling" faced with death from enemy bullets. And finally, there are textual similarities in both works. Both stories begin in the early morning and end late at night, and the position and the heat of the sun is used to define the forward movement both of the day and of the two stories.

Thus, although it is not overt, there is a direct relationship between Solzhenitsyn's One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich and Tolstoi's "The Wood-felling."

CHAPTER III

THE FIRST CIRCLE

The setting of V krug pervom (The First Circle), unlike that of One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich, is not confined to one place or one particular group of characters. The main setting, however, remains an isolated area, a small privileged prison camp, on the outskirts of Moscow. In both works the events occur within very brief periods of time. In One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich, it is one day; in The First Circle, between December 24 and December 27, 1949.

The title of the book is explained in the third chapter of the novel. The sharashka is a special technical prison in the Marfino Institute which was set up in July, 1946, as an institute to exploit the talents of some of the highly qualified scientists and technologists who were among the millions sentenced to the labour camps. The conditions of life and work of the prisoners in Marfino are far better than those described in One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich. One of the newly arrived prisoners says:

I have never been as blissfully happy as I am today!
Where am I? Tomorrow I won't be driven into the ice
cold water! Forty grams of butter!! Black bread on
the tables! Books aren't forbidden! You can shave
yourself! The guards don't beat the zeks! What a
great day this is! What a shining summit! Maybe
I've died? Maybe I'm dreaming? I think I'm in
heaven!!¹

But one of the old-timers gives a totally different opinion:

No, dear sir, you are in hell, just as before, but you have risen to its best and highest circle--the first. You ask, what is a sharashka? Dante, if you like, thought up the sharashka. He racked his brains trying to figure out where to put the sages of aniquity. His Christian duty commanded him to throw them into hell. But the conscience of the Renaissance man couldn't become reconciled to the idea of mixing these brilliant men with other sinners and condemning them to the torments of the flesh. So Dante thought up a special place for them in hell.²

The sharashka is Dante's vision transformed into reality by the Soviet regime.

In The First Circle Solzhenitsyn is concerned with presenting life as it is both outside Marfino and inside Marfino where the prisoners, as in One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich, are struggling for survival despite better conditions of life and work. The basic theme of The First Circle is that of human morality.

The novel begins not in prison, but in the office of a diplomat, Innokentii Volodin, through whom Solzhenitsyn brings out an important theme of the novel - moral resurrection. In the late afternoon of Saturday, December 24, 1949, Volodin, State Counselor in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, is still in his office even though the working day is over. He is deciding whether to warn a foreign embassy that a Soviet agent is to receive in a New York radio shop instructions on how to construct an atomic bomb. Volodin knows that it is dangerous for him to make this call, since all phone calls to foreign embassies are recorded, but he wonders: "If we are always afraid of something, can we remain human beings?"³ Finally Volodin decides that he must warn the embassy because he believes that the Soviet people do not need an atomic bomb which will threaten the whole world. Volodin proceeds very cautiously: he takes a taxi (instead of his car) to the busiest part of Moscow

and makes the call from a public telephone booth in a crowded subway station. Volodin intends to speak briefly and leave immediately, but the attache who answers does not understand Russian very well and does not believe what Volodin tells him. The next day a tape of Volodin's segment of conversation is delivered to the acoustical laboratory of the sharashka and the prisoners are given the task of identifying the voice. The following day the prisoners receive a tape of the voices of four suspects, among them is Volodin's. On Monday evening, December 26, Volodin is arrested, although his guilt has not been proven. The next three chapters describe Volodin's arrest and imprisonment in Liubianka Prison: the promising diplomat becomes a prisoner whose suspenders are removed and whose buttons are cut off.

Volodin and his wife Dontara, the daughter of prosecutor Makarygin, had seemed perfectly happy and well matched when they were married six years earlier. They belonged to the highest social circle. Volodin and his wife believed that life was given only once, and, as a result, everything possible should be taken from life. However, in the sixth year of their marriage, Volodin had begun to feel dissatisfied with their self-indulgent life. This unfamiliar feeling frightened Volodin and he tried to struggle with it, hoping that, like all illness, it would soon disappear. At twenty-eight, Volodin felt that his life had come to a dead end. Everything and everyone disturbed him, even his friends and his beautiful wife. The high social circle, of which he was a part, had also ceased to interest him for now Volodin found it to be false. The problem, however, centered on Volodin himself.

One day going through his mother's belongings, Volodin found

her books, diaries, and letters, and reread something he had long ago forgotten:

What is the most precious thing in the world? It seems to be realizing that you are not participating in injustice. Injustice is stronger than you are, it always was and always will be, but let it not be because of you!⁴

Volodin spent several days learning about the ten years immediately preceding the revolution, about which he knew nothing and which he had been taught to consider the most shameful and most insignificant period in the whole history of Russia. However, he found that it was a most interesting period and that he had been robbed of the past; he realized that just as he had been lied to about the past he may have been lied to about other things. In talking to his mother's brother, whom he had not seen for a very long time, and in going through old newspapers, which his uncle had saved, Volodin discovered the truth about his commissar-father and his father's world, which until then he considered sacred. As a result, Volodin underwent a moral transformation: previously he had believed that "Life is given to us just once;"⁵ now he realized that "conscience is also given to us just once."⁶

Volodin's act of warning the embassy is, therefore, not the result of an impulse; rather, it is the final link in the process of the awakening of his conscience and in his acquiring a new understanding of life. As he contrasts his old comfortable ways of life with his new circumstances, he concludes that he would give up all his former pleasures in exchange for justice.

Yes, he had had so many blessings--but never the priceless one: the freedom to speak what you think, the freedom to associate freely with people of the same intellectual level. ... And how pitiful to die without having exchanged

ideas with them!⁷

Solzhenitsyn, therefore, brings out through Volodin the theme of the novel--the awakening of conscience and moral resurrection.

The theme of moral resurrection in The First Circle is similar to that in Tolstoi's Voskresenie (Resurrection). The main character in Resurrection is Prince Dmitrii Nekhliudov, who seduces a young girl brought up by his aunts and leaves her, brokenhearted and with child. At the outset, Nekhliudov's relationship with Katiusha is innocent and friendly, but when he visits his aunts three years later he is a man of the world. His feelings for Katiusha have not changed; he still believes that he is in love with her. Three years earlier his love for Katiusha had been secretive, but now Nekhliudov does not hide his feelings; he freely admits that he is in love and knows what can come out of it. Nekhliudov is now two people: the spiritual part of him seeks only that happiness for himself which would bring happiness to others; the bestial part seeks happiness only for himself and for that happiness he would sacrifice everything in the world.⁸ These two facets of his character struggle for two days. Finally, the bestial conquers the spiritual and he seduces Katiusha. In order to redress the wrong, he gives Katiusha a hundred rubles before he leaves. Nekhliudov knows that this act will offend Katiusha, and he knows in the very depth of his soul that he has behaved badly and cruelly and that it will be impossible for him to look into anyone's eyes, let alone to think of himself as the magnanimous young man he had thought himself to be.⁹ However, he soon forgets the incident and continues to live a dissolute life.

Ten years later Nekhliudov sees Katiusha again, but this time

it is as a member of the jury at her trial. Katiusha Maslova has been accused of robbing and murdering a rich merchant, who had visited the brothel where Katiusha worked. When she is sentenced to four years of penal servitude, Nekhliudov's conscience begins to bother him and he begins to blame himself for Katiusha's terrible life. He believes that had he not seduced her, her life would have been different. Nekhliudov visits Katiusha in prison and promises to help her. In order to redress the wrong he believes he has committed and to clear his conscience, he decides to marry her and, believing her innocent, he begins to appeal her conviction. Initially he was concerned only that other people not find out about his earlier connection with Katiusha, but later he fully admits that he alone is responsible for what has happened to Katiusha. Society, however, does not consider Nekhliudov guilty of anything since the seduction of young girls is considered quite acceptable.

While he is trying to help Katiusha, a new world opens up for Nekhliudov. For example, when he visits Katiusha in prison, he sees the harsh life of the prisoners and the injustice which has brought them there. Like Volodin, he begins to feel disgust toward the social class to which he belongs and which he once loved; he sees how false this society is and he can no longer stand the silly conversations, the conquettishness, and the pretence. Nekhliudov begins to be critical of his friends, acquaintances, and relatives, and he suddenly realizes that he is also disgusted with himself. This admission, though painful, soothes him.¹⁰

In addition to realizing his own responsibility for another person's life, Nekhliudov also begins to realize his responsibility

for the lives of people generally. Realizing that the privation experienced by the majority of the people results from their not owning their own land, Nekhliudov gives his land to the people. He finds peace in the thought that, having given up his land, he will be able to follow Katiusha to Siberia, where, if Katiusha continues to refuse to marry him, he will still be able to make her life easier. On the way to Siberia, a new feeling of tenderness towards Katiusha awakens in Nekhliudov. This feeling opens up a stream of love in Nekhliudov's soul which is directed towards all the people he meets. Thus by the end of the novel, Nekhliudov has moved away from his dissolute life and has been morally transformed. From preoccupation with himself, he has moved to love and concern for another individual (Katiusha) and, finally, love and concern for all humanity.

The parallel between Volodin and Nekhliudov, therefore, is close. Both characters are representatives of high society. Volodin is a State Counselor in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, a position highly respected in Soviet Russia; Nekhliudov is a prince and a landowner in Tsarist Russia. Both enjoy the privileges their position offers and both undergo experiences, though different in nature, which result in a moral transformation which leads them to a better understanding of life.

On the way to Siberia Nekhliudov goes through another experience. He meets a group of revolutionaries and realizes that, though he has heard many bad things about them, they are simply ordinary people, among whom, as everywhere else, there are the good, the bad, and the average.¹¹ From the beginning of the revolutionary movement in Russia, especially after March 13, 1881, when Alexander II was assassinated, Nekhliudov had

loathed revolutionaries. He despised them because of the methods they used to fight the government, particularly the cruelty of their common characteristic of self-importance. Now Nekhliudov learns that many of them have suffered at the hands of the government, though they are innocent of any crimes. They are held in prison for years where they either become ill, go mad, or commit suicide. simply because there is no reason to let them out and someday they may be needed for some kind of questioning. The fate of these prisoners hinges on the police officer, the court inspector, the governor, or the minister. This explains to Nekhliudov how very meek people can prepare quite calmly to commit murder. The use of terror as a political weapon was their self-defence and the only way, they thought, to accomplish their mission of common weal. The importance, which they assigned to their affair and, in consequence, to themselves was the natural result of the importance which the government had attached to them and of the cruel punishment which the government had inflicted on them. They had to have a high opinion of themselves in order to be strong enough to survive.¹²

There is a similar occurrence in The First Circle. Klara, the daughter of Prosecutor Makarygin, works at the sharashka. She has been warned about the dangerous criminals who populate the sharashka, but when she meets and talks to these "criminals," she recognizes the real essence "of the monsters in blue overalls" (chudovishch v sinikh kombenezonak).¹³ She begins to question why these people are imprisoned and whether those in control really do anything they want.¹⁴ This question is similar to that raised by Nekhliudov in Resurrection when he wonders why and according

to what law some people lock up, torture, and kill other people when they themselves are no different from those they torture, beat, or kill.¹⁵

There is at least a suggestion that Klara's conscience is also being awakened. The process begins when Klara sees a poorly dressed woman washing a staircase in the house in which the Makarygins are getting a new apartment. Klara, who will be unable to forget the woman's expressive and intelligent face, sees that the woman despises her. Klara, ashamed wants to give something to this woman but dares not. In the words of another character, Roitman, a major in the MGB, "'From whom does one begin to reform the world? From others? Or from oneself?'"¹⁶

Klara, therefore, is also reminiscent of Nekhliudov because she is, like Nekhliudov, going through a moral transformation, although in her case the process is just beginning. Nevertheless, it is likely that like Volodin and Nekhliudov she will, eventually, reach the final stage of moral resurrection and acquire a new understanding of life. Also, both Klara and Nekhliudov raise a crucial question of why those in control govern the lives of other people.

The prisoners of Marfino are also presented with a moral dilemma. The zeks in labour camps, as described in One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich, work only to fulfill their norms and to qualify for their rations. They can even console themselves with the thought that whatever they build is of direct benefit to the community. The prisoners in Marfina, however, know that in exchange for their much better living conditions they must work at the projects designed to make the repression of their fellow country-

men even more efficient. Those who cooperate stay, those who will not are returned to the hard labour camps. Each of the prisoners has a choice. During the three days which Solzhenitsyn describes in The First Circle, four of the main characters are confronted with this fateful choice for all four are offered the opportunity to earn an early release simply by devising a new tool of evil. The two, Nerzhin and Gerasimovich, who have the most to lose, reject the proposition. Both men recognize and listen to the voice of conscience; they are unable to make a moral compromise. In rejecting the opportunity Gerasimovich states,

"No! This isn't in my line! to put people in prison - not in my line! I am not a hunter of human beings! It's enough that we were put here."¹⁷

On the other hand, both Sologdin and Rubin agree to compromise, Sologdin, because the idea of early release appeals to him, and Rubin, because he believes that no man should betray his country and agrees to identify the voice on the tape.

Nerzhin, before his arrest, never stopped to think about what life and happiness really meant. In prison he begins to learn to think for himself. In an argument with another inmate, Rubin, Nerzhin insists that happiness depends on one's attitude towards life.¹⁸ Before his arrest Nerzhin did not have a high opinion of peasants, but in the camp he sees that the people to whose world he had belonged had become traitors and beggars. He then decides that only those people are important and useful who work with their hands, and it is from such people that Nerzhin tries to learn the craft and the philosophy of life. Nerzhin thus returns to the philosophy, fashionable at the turn of the

century, that of khozhdenie v narod, "going back to the people."¹⁹ However, Nerzhin soon realizes that the peasants are no more stoic, no firmer of spirit, no more farsighted than he and that they are more susceptible to the tricks of informers and the blandishments of the authorities.

Nerzhin's only alternative is "to be himself" (samim soboi), to develop his own "point of view, which becomes more precious than life itself."²⁰ He attains a level of spiritual independence and maturity which allows him to insist that every person forges his own soul and that one must forge for oneself a soul which will allow one to become a human being.²¹

Solzhenitsyn, in presenting Nerzhin's sceptical view of the peasants, therefore, contradicts Tolstoi's belief that just as a child is more perfect and closer to ideal harmony than the grown man, so is the simple peasant closer to it than people of his (Tolstoi's) own circle.

However, like Pierre Bezukhov in War and Peace, Nerzhin finds his ideal in a peasant, Spiridon. Nerzhin meets Spiridon in the sharashka and he is attracted by the vigor that distinguishes Spiridon from the others. Spiridon's life, from the time of the October Revolution, when he was seventeen, is a tale of being thrown about by chance, from the Whites to the Reds, from fortune to misfortune, from positions of leadership and trust to imprisonment. Nerzhin has no doubt that Spiridon is that representative of the people, from whom one can learn. Nerzhin considers Spiridon a kind and hardworking person, who never lies and never steals, except from the government, who fought only for his bride and killed only at war. Spiridon's values center on his family:

"His homeland was his family. His religion was his family."²² Even now, at fifty years of age, a prisoner and almost blind, Spiridon does not blame anyone for his fate but continues to work hard. His concern for his family has not lessened. When Nerzhin asks Spiridon whether he thinks any human being can really tell who is right and who is wrong, Spiridon answers with a proverb, "The wolfhound is right and the cannibal is wrong!" (volkodav - prav, a liudoed - net!).²³ He thus emphasizes that the oppressors of human lives, human values, and peace are wrong and those who destroy the oppressors are right. Both wolfhound (volkodav) and cannibal (liudoed) exemplify killing and violence, but Spiridon approves of killing and violence only when they serve to protect human life, human values and peace. As a result, Spiridon's reply seems to manifest the philosophy of living in harmony with nature where life is balanced out.

The conversation between Nerzhin and Spiridon recalls the conversation in Tolstoi's Anna Karenina between Levin and the peasant, Fedor, about the God-fearing old man Fokanych.²⁴ Fedor tells Levin that there are many different types of people. For instance, Mitiukha, a well-off peasant, lives only to satisfy his needs, but Fokanych, also well-off, is a righteous old man who lives for his soul and remembers God.²⁵ Levin realizes that he has been told something important, although the meaning of what he has heard is not clear to him.

Levin's ethical-religious problem of "how to live" becomes in Nerzhin's case the problem of how to conduct oneself under the conditions of all-penetrating violence in society. Does one interfere or not?²⁶ Both Nerzhin and Levin find their answers in

a peasant. Levin learns that one must live for one's soul by peace and love; Nerzhin, by refusing to cooperate with the authorities, decides to fight the oppressors of human life and values even if it means losing his life.

Nerzhin also recalls Pierre Bezukhov (in War and Peace), who is also trying to make sense of perplexing historical events,²⁷ and to find inner peace. When Bezukhov and many other Moscow citizens are arrested as alleged members of a conspiracy to assassinate Napoleon, they are led to Devichii Field for execution. However, when Bezukhov's turn comes, the executions are stopped. Bezukhov's witnessing of the executions is traumatic, bringing him to near spiritual death. From the moment he had witnessed these murders committed by people who had no wish to commit them, Bezukhov felt as if his soul had been pulled out of him and, though he was not even aware of it, his faith in a "well-ordered universe" (blagoustroistvo mira), in humanity, in his own soul, in God, had been destroyed.²⁸

The restoration of Bezukhov's soul begins in a French prison where, like Nerzhin, he is forced to think about life and happiness. In the prison he meets a peasant, Platon Karataev, who talks to him about his family and grieves that Bezukhov has no parents, especially a mother, and offers him food. Bezukhov tells Platon Karataev of the torment which the killings have caused him, but the latter hastily brushes aside Bezukhov's concern about the executions with a few words about sin and turns the conversation towards more concrete everyday questions. He is philosophical about Bezukhov's misfortune, telling him that all things balance out in life. This view reflects Spiridon's

philosophy of living in harmony with nature where life is balanced out. Karataev tells Bezukhov his life's story and the latter is overwhelmed by Karataev's love for all humanity and animals and his patience and humble acceptance of suffering and death. Bezukhov accepts Karataev's wisdom and gradually begins to forget about his moral ache.²⁹ Platon Karataev forever remains for Bezukhov what he had seemed that first night: an unfathomable, and eternal personification of the spirit of simplicity and truth.³⁰

Nerzhin, therefore, is like Bezukhov. It is only in prison that either begins to think about the meaning of life and happiness. Both are trying to solve the puzzling sense of historical events and find inner peace. Both meet in prison a peasant whose wise philosophy of life helps to resolve their question.

Tolstoi was a significant exemplar for Solzhenitsyn not only in theme and protagonists but also in a number of other important characterisations. For example, Kondrashev-Ivanov in The First Circle is reminiscent of Mikhailov in Anna Karenina in the function and the construction of the scenes in which he appears.³¹ Kondrashev-Ivanov is kept in the sharashka as a kind of court painter, required to produce one painting a month on edifying historical themes. Nevertheless, Kondrashev-Ivanov paints what he feels but the opinion of others is important to him, though he is reluctant to admit it. Kondrashev-Ivanov shows Nerzhin his life's work - a sketch of a rider, above a mountain gorge, perplexed and amazed, looking into the distance where a reddish-gold light floods the sky from behind the castle standing on the crest of the mountain - not clearly real, as if made of clouds, vibrant, vague yet visible in detailed unearthly perfection, the aureate-violet

castle of the Holy Grail.³² When confronted with "unearthly perfection," the ideal, a rider does not even notice the depth of the mountain gorge or the "hostile" bushes. The sun, "perhaps something purer than the sun,"³³ indicates that there is danger ahead. Yet for the rider there is no question as to which direction must be taken. Kondrashev-Ivanov believes that every man has in him an image of perfection which in rare moments suddenly emerges before his spiritual gaze.³⁴ For Kondrashev-Ivanov, this perfection is symbolized by the castle of the Holy Grail.

Mikhailov, a painter in Anna Karenina, like Kondrashev-Ivanov, paints what he feels, but for Mikhailov, too, the opinion of others is important, though he is also reluctant to admit it. When Mikhailov shows his religious work, "Christ before Pilate," to Anna Karenina, Vronskii and Golenishchev, they are bored by it but feel constrained to say something intelligent about it and express their appreciation by means of the word "talent." But when they suddenly catch a sight of Mikhailov's picture of two boys fishing, Anna and Vronskii are completely won over by it. The painting is simple and yet breathtaking - two boys fishing in the shade of the broom. The oldest has just cast his line and is trying diligently to lead out the float from behind the bush, completely absorbed by what he is doing; the younger is lying on the grass with entangled blond head resting on his hands and looking with thoughtful blue eyes into the water. What was he thinking about?³⁵ Anna Karenina's and Vronskii's bogus appreciative vocabulary is extinguished by spontaneous delight at the sight of this painting, which Mikhailov has forgotten about, just as he has forgotten all the sufferings and delights he went through

while painting it.

Neither Solzhenitsyn nor Tolstoi are concerned with whether the paintings are good art, but rather with the pleasure people derive from them and the viewers' immediate recognition of real genius in the work, the genius resulting from the fact that the artists were experiencing and depicting true feelings in their works. "The two authors' diffident, even humble, mystically idealized conceptions of art are expressed by an interplay of three elements: what the visitors see, what the paintings show, what the artists think."³⁶

Another scene which is reminiscent of Tolstoi's is that depicting the Makarygins in The First Circle in their luxurious apartment entertaining guests who include the famous writer-laureate and their son-in-law, Galakhov; Major General Slovuta, another very important prosecutor; a young man in the government; and the reference consultant at the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. Solzhenitsyn's description of the guests - their groupings, movements, arguments, and remarks - is reminiscent of the description of Anna Pavlovna Sherer's soiree with which War and Peace opens. In Solzhenitsyn's novel the hostess, Alevtina Nikanorovna is ashamed of two of her guests. One is her plain, provincial friend and the other Dushan Radovich, her husband's "friend." She is concerned that the important Slovuta will think that the Makarygins receive rabble.³⁷ Anna Pavlovna Sherer also has a guest she is ashamed of, Pierre Bezukhov. She is worried that Bezukhov will say something improper to her guests and, in order to prevent an unpleasant situation, she follows him everywhere.

In The First Circle one of Klara Makarygin's friends has come

to the party with a purpose. She wants to ask the reference consultant, whom she could not get through to at the Supreme Soviet, to help release her sick father from labour camp; the consultant refuses to help. However, in War and Peace Anna Pavlovna Sherer's uninvited guest, Princess Drubetskaia, is more fortunate in her plea to Prince Vasilii concerning her son's promotion.

The Makarygin family's dinner party also resembles the Rostovs' birthday party in War and Peace.³⁸ The Prosecutor takes his male guests to his study to show them his tobacco altar³⁹ just as the count takes his male guests to his study to show them his collection of Turkish pipes.⁴⁰

In addition to these similarities, Solzhenitsyn's portrait of Stalin in The First Circle is reminiscent of Tolstoi's portrait of Nicolas I in "Khadzhi-Murat."⁴¹ Khadzhi-Murat was one of the leaders of the mountain tribesmen, who, under Shamil', fought against the Russian conquest of the Caucasus in the 1850's. In breaking with Shamil', who had declared a Mohammedan holy war against a colonizing Russia, Khadzhi-Murat offered to lead his own followers against Shamil' in return for Russia's help in buying the freedom of his family, whom Shamil' was holding as hostages. In the novella Tolstoi shows imperial Russia of the 1850's as a ruthless power bent on assimilating or exterminating the relatively primitive culture of the Chechens. In the scene where Khadzhi-Murat's terms are presented to Nicolas I, Tolstoi satirizes the ruler, his bureaucrats, and court life in general, and thus shows the essence of the state. Nicholas I stands at the top of the hierarchy as the embodiment of cruel, self-aggrandizing bureaucratic power. He appears "as a repulsive, dissipated

figure whose senile sensuality emerges as the truth behind a mask of religious rectitude and the dignity of the statesman."⁴²

Nicholas I regards himself as the saviour of Russia, asking himself what Russia would be without him; indeed, he wonders, what would Europe be without him?⁴³ Nicholas I despises the people surrounding him, who discuss not only science and poetry but also the governance of men, imagining that they could rule themselves better than he, Nicholas, ruled them. He knows that however much he crushed these people, they would again come to the surface, they would keep crawling out.⁴⁴

Solzhenitsyn's portrayal of Stalin in The First Circle is similar to Tolstoi's of Nicholas I. Stalin "is like Nicholas in his senility, gloom, intellectual pretensions, capriciousness, sensuality, malice, and above all his egomania."⁴⁵ Like Nicholas I, Stalin regards himself as the savior of the Soviet Union. Vexation burns inside Stalin when he remembers Tito, who proposed a different variant of socialism; "Better socialism! Different from Stalin's! Snot! Socialism without Stalin - that's Fascism!"⁴⁶ All his life Stalin has been chopping and cutting off the sprouting heads of the hydra, but they still kept proposing some kind of new, better socialism.⁴⁷ In addition both Stalin and Nicholas consider themselves to be leaders of genius chosen by God. Stalin, though he was not sure God existed, felt that there was someone higher than he. He promised God that if the danger to Stalingrad passed by and he retained his position, he would restore the church in Russia and would not persecute or put away people because of their religious beliefs. And when Stalingrad survived, Stalin carried out his promise. He decides that God exists and

that he should accept the existence of God before it is too late, for he feels that he is surrounded by emptiness, that there is no one near him, and that the all humanity is somewhere beneath him. Perhaps God is the only one who is close to him and perhaps God, too, is lonely. During the last few years it pleases Stalin that prayers proclaim him to be the leader chosen by God.⁴⁸ Nicholas I believes that God, through his servants and also through the people, greets and eulogizes him, and he, Nicholas, even though he has grown tired of it, continues to accept these greeting and eulogies. This should be so, he thinks, since the prosperity and happiness of the whole world depends on him.⁴⁹ Also, in Tolstoi's description, Nicholas I tries to fill the space of his existence with sexual escapades, while Solzhenitsyn's Stalin longs for immortality.⁵⁰

However, the similarity in the depictions does not end here for both Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoi give detailed descriptions of both leaders' domains, their appearances, and their moods on the day they are seen. Also, Stalin's and Nicholas' subordinates display similar behavior towards their leaders.⁵¹ They can read the exterior signs to determine their leaders' mood and behave exactly as their leaders want them to.

Therefore, both Solzhenitsyn in The First Circle and Tolstoi in "Khadzhi-Murat" portray leaders, in Solzhenitsyn's case of Soviet Russia and Tolstoi's of Tsarist Russia, who stand at the top of the hierarchy as the embodiments of cruel, self-aggrandizing bureaucratic power, who share senility, gloom, intellectual pretensions, capriciousness, sensuality, malice, and egomania.

Both Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoi also share several similar attitudes. Sologdin in The First Circle, for instance, recalls young

Tolstoi in the way that he punishes himself with "fault-marks" for violating his intellectual or sexual rules.⁵²

Another attitude that both authors share is that whatever the circumstances, love cannot survive if a woman sets aside faithfulness and purity.⁵³ In War and Peace, for example, in a conversation with Pierre about Natasha, Prince Andrei tells Pierre that he cannot forgive Natasha for being unfaithful. Pierre reminds Prince Andrei that previously he had believed that one should forgive a fallen woman, but Prince Andrei insists: "I said that one should forgive; I cannot."⁵⁴ Rubin in The First Circle comments on Nerzhin's belief that if a man can be forgiven for being unfaithful, so can a woman, saying that theoretically Nerzhin is right, but "to put my arms around my wife, after someone else has embraced her? ... biologically I cannot!"⁵⁵

The pleasure in physical labour is also common to both authors. In The First Circle both Nerzhin and Sologdin enjoy physical labour when they are helping Spiridon to chop wood. They work with that special fervour and enjoyment which voluntary labour gives.⁵⁶ This scene is reminiscent of Levin in Anna Karenina when he is mowing with his peasants, even though Solzhenitsyn remarks that even the bravest of correspondents differ from the front line soldiers just as a count, ploughing the earth with peasants, differs from the peasant-plougher.⁵⁷ Levin thinks that he needs physical movement or his character will deteriorate. He mows with his peasants despite what anyone might think. Like Sologdin and Nerzhin, Levin works with fervour and enjoyment.⁵⁸

"Tolstoian" structural features are also apparent in The First

Circle. Solzhenitsyn, like Tolstoi, uses an extremely large cast of characters. If in Tolstoi's novels they are brought together by a family relationship, war, or social gatherings, then in Solzhenitsyn's novel they are brought together by the common extraordinary situation of the sharashka.⁵⁹ Each of Solzhenitsyn's characters, like Tolstoi's, plays an important role in the novel. In his letter to Komoto Sedze, Solzhenitsyn wrote: "The literary form that attracts me most is that of the 'polyphonic' novel (with no main hero, the most important character in any chapter being the one whom the narrative 'catches up' with at that point), which accurately portrays the time and place of the action."⁶⁰

As a whole The First Circle is a unique novel; nevertheless, Tolstoi has served Solzhenitsyn as an exemplar in many ways. The most significant is the theme of the awakening of conscience and moral resurrection with which Solzhenitsyn deals in The First Circle and with which Tolstoi dealt in Resurrection. Solzhenitsyn's theme protagonist Volodin is reminiscent of Tolstoi's theme protagonist Nekhliudov for both undergo a moral transformation. Both authors reveal the true substance of prisoners. Klara in The First Circle finds that "the monsters in blue overalls" are good and harmless people just as Nekhliudov finds that revolutionaries are simply ordinary people, among whom there are the good, the bad, and the average. Klara and Nekhliudov also raise a similar question of why and according to what law those in control do anything they want. Solzhenitsyn's other important protagonist Nerzhin is also reminiscent of Tolstoi's Levin in Anna Karenina and Pierre Bezukhov in War and Peace. Nerzhin searches for an answer on how to conduct oneself in the conditions of all-penetrating violence in society,

while Levin wants to know how to live; both find their answer in a peasant. Like Bezukhov, Nerzhin is also trying to make sense of bewildering historical events and to find inner peace.

Solzhenitsyn, however, through Nerzhin, contradicts Tolstoi's view that one must learn from peasants. For Nerzhin the peasants are no more stoic, no firmer of spirit, and no more farsighted than any other people. Nevertheless, Nerzhin finds his answer in a peasant. Tolstoi was a significant exemplar for Solzhenitsyn not only in theme and protagonists but also in a number of other important characterisations. Tolstoian structural features are also apparent in The First Circle and, finally, both authors share several similar attitudes, for example, those regarding women and sex.

CHAPTER IV

CANCER WARD

Rakovyi korpus (Cancer Ward) is Solzhenitsyn's second long novel. He began writing it after One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich but while still working on The First Circle. Like The First Circle, it was never published in the Soviet Union.

The main setting in Cancer Ward is again an isolated area, however, the action takes place not in prison, as in One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich and The First Circle, but in the cancer wing of a hospital in Tashkent. The action spans about two months in 1955. For the most part the action is confined to the men's ward where there are a total of thirteen patients, who, at one time or another, occupy the nine beds. There are bureaucrats, communists, peasants, ex-prisoners, and young boys. Closest to the door is Demka, a teenage school student with cancer of the leg. When Demka is released from the hospital, Shulubin occupies his bed. The next two beds are occupied by a Kazakh and an Uzbek, who speak only their native languages. Later the third bed is occupied by Chalyi. The fourth bed is Rusanov's, a Party member and a representative of the worst element of the Party bureaucracy. Next to Rusanov is Kostoglotov, a former inmate of the concentration camps. Opposite Kostoglotov is Azovkin, who, later in the novel, is sent home to die; the bed is then occupied by Vadim Zatsyrko, a young geologist. Next to his bed is Efrem Podduev's. When Podduev is

released, the bed is occupied by Federau, a Party member exiled because of his German background. Next is Akhmadzhan, an Uzbek in the armed services. The last bed by the door is occupied by Proshka. There is also a fourteenth patient, Sibgatov, a Crimean Tatar, who, due to lack of room in the ward, is placed in the corridor. All these patients differ in character, but they are all drawn together because of their common illness. Cancer Ward, however, is not confined to the patients only, but it also deals with several doctors, who have been seeking a cure for cancer for many years; one of them finds herself suffering from the disease.

The main focus of Cancer Ward is the people and the different ways in which the characters in the novel react to the knowledge that they suffer from cancer. Every character reacts differently to the same problem: he either struggles with the idea of death, thinks about it, is afraid of it, rebels against it, or accepts his fate. The theme of Cancer Ward is "the conflict of life against death", with all the attendant moral ramifications".¹

The relationship between Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoi is even more overt in Cancer Ward than it was in the two novels already discussed. In Cancer Ward there are specific references to Tolstoi and to Tolstoi's works. His stories are read and one of them, which leaves a deep imprint on some of the patients, is discussed by them. At first only the titles of some of Tolstoi's stories are mentioned: Trud, smert' i bolezni (Work, Death and Sickness), Glavnyi zakon (The Main Law), Istochnik (The Source), Upustish'

ogon' - ne potushish (A Fire Neglected Consumes the Home), Tri startsa (Three Elders), and Khodite v svete, poka est' svet (Walk in Light While There is Light).² Kostoglotov is the one who first learns about Tolstoi's book of short stories and he forces it upon Efrem Podduev, who grumbles but reads them. One story in particular, Chem liudi zhivy (What People Live By), impresses Podduev. He is so taken with it that he retells it to his roommates and thus a discussion on the ultimate meaning of life and death begins. The question has never before occurred to any of the patients. Under any other circumstances they would have found it silly, but now as they face death, which they are terrified of, this question does not seem unnatural to them. Every patient, depending on his background, offers his own answer to Tolstoi's question. Among the "answers" are water and food, pay, professional skill, and homeland. Rusanov has replied, by "the interests of society",³ and he is closest to the answer Tolstoi gives in his story. In his story, however, Tolstoi stated, by love for others.⁴ Rusanov is shocked at what Tolstoi has stated but to the rest of the patients, Tolstoi's answer makes sense.

"What People Live By" is a story about a poor shoemaker, Semen, who one day on his way home finds a half-frozen naked young man. Semen feels sorry for the young man and takes him in. At first Semen's wife is angry for they can barely feed their own family let alone a stranger, but then she, too, feels sorry for him. The young man, Mikhailo, works very hard and soon becomes a much better shoemaker than Semen. As the story unfolds it becomes evident that Mikhailo is a fallen angel, punished by God for

failing to take the soul of a woman, who, having given birth to twin girls, begged the angel for her life, believing that children cannot live without a mother and a father. Mikhailo is sent back to earth to take the woman's soul and to remain until he learns three elements of human life: "What there is in people, what is not given to people, and what people live by".⁵ When Semen and his wife take Mikhailo in, he gets his first answer - people have love in them. When a rich landowner comes to Semen and orders a pair of boots, Mikhailo goes to work, but instead of boots he makes slippers. Semen is horrified by what Mikhailo has done but the latter thinks that "a man plans for himself a year ahead but doesn't know that he will not live to see the evening".⁶ Sure enough, on his way home the landowner dies and Mikhailo learns that people do not know what their true needs are. Finally, when a woman asks Semen to make shoes for her twin adopted girls, and Mikhailo recognizes them as the children whose mother's soul he had taken, Mikhailo learns that it is by love for others that people live. People who love have God in them for God is love.⁷

Tolstoi's question "what people live by" forms the basis for the whole of Cancer Ward. The novel is "a drama of morality, a race with time, not for life but for an understanding of life".⁸ All the characters of Cancer Ward are confronted by this ultimate question, which is raised throughout the novel in different versions and environments and evokes different responses from different individuals, depending on the experience of their generation.

Efrem Podduev, the man who first read Tolstoi's story and began the discussion of it, had been proud of his physical strength

and independence. His life had been filled with work and rough pleasures and he never stopped to think about right and wrong or about what sort of a man he had become. When cancer unexpectedly strikes him, he is unable to cope with it, and the man who, his friends said, was not afraid of anything became afraid of death. After reading "What People Live By," Podduev, to his astonishment, finds that he has begun to think about what life is and what his own life has been. Podduev also questions his personal morality and eventually realizes both the falseness of his way of life and the true meaning of his life; at the same time he knows that it is too late to do anything to change his past.

Pavel Nikolaevich Rusanov, with whom the novel begins, is a self-important bureaucrat. He offers a different version to Tolstoi's question. When Rusanov learns that people live by love he exclaims: "'Love! ... No, this is not our morality!'"⁹ He demands the name of the author who wrote the story. Lev Tolstoi, however, means nothing to him. Rusanov is a shallow, unpleasant, frightening, and sinister character. He is supposed to be a public servant but instead he has served himself by denouncing people who stood in his way and who, he thought, were a threat to him. He justifies his actions by saying that what he did was his civic obligation and in the interest of the people. However, Rusanov fears the people. The ideology he and his family profess turns out to be false: the Rusanovs loved "The People", served them and were ready to give their lives for them, but as the years went by they found themselves less and less able to tolerate actual human beings, those obstinate creatures who were always

resistant, refusing to do what they were told and demanding something for themselves.¹⁰ To Tolstoi's question "what people live by", Rusanov replies that people live by their ideological principles and by the interests of society; however, he does not abide by what he professes, for his principles are the slogans which he reads in the newspapers. To people like Rusanov love means nothing; it has nothing to do with the present state of society. Not love but survival at all costs is what history taught them, and Rusanov is trying to survive.

In the hospital, Rusanov finds himself in the company of people he hates. He does not like being treated like everyone else and is appalled at having to use the common facilities of the hospital. He demands special treatment, a separate room, and food, which is brought by his wife.

Rusanov refuses to accept the truth about his illness. He is terrified of death and tries to keep death and the dead out of his mind. Rusanov simply cannot comprehend the meaning of death. He avoids discussing it with his wife for they are completely unprepared for it and have no immediate plans for dealing with it. There is nothing in Rusanov's ideology that would help him to meet death. He regards death's onset as illegal, and there is not even one among his bureaucratic rules that will help him to prevent it.

One day Rusanov's wife visits him and tells him the news of the rehabilitation of certain people he has denounced. Rusanov is shaken by the news. The following night he cannot sleep, the shadows of Rodichev and Gurun, the two men whom he denounced for

his own benefit, haunt him. Rusanov reviews his past. However, unlike Podduev, Rusanov's look at his past is forced on him not only by the fear of death but also by the fate which awaits him if he survives. The review of his life is not due to self-awareness, but self-justification. In his inner monologue Rusanov reassures himself of his job's social importance and the harmony of his private life. He comforts himself with the thought that his actions, which led to the arrest of the people whose return so terrifies him now, were correct.¹¹ The fear, however, does not leave him.

Finally, when Rusanov feels very low, his daughter, Avieta, comes from Moscow to visit him. She brings Rusanov the happy news that the new law refers to offences committed during the last two years. She reassures Rusanov that he has nothing to worry about since it is absurd to think that someone would sue him for false testimony and that Rodichev will certainly not even open his mouth.¹² Rusanov is relieved by the news, he breathes more freely, and his anxieties are put to rest. Rusanov, therefore, unlike Podduev, is far from moral resurrection since love for all humanity is alien to him. His "I" is of much greater importance to him than are other people.

Rusanov's ally is Vadim Zatsyrko, a brilliant young geologist who is entirely devoted to geology. He confidently tells Podduev that people live by creative work. Vadim has cancer of the leg and he knows that he will die before too long. Unlike Rusanov who fears death, Vadim feels angry that his life must be cut short. In the few months that are left to him he plans to give his time

to working out a new method for discovering ore deposits. Thus he will compensate for his early death and die reconciled. Vadim is a much more attractive person than Rusanov; nevertheless, there are also moral inadequacies in him. When he hears about Podduev's death he feels "no sympathy for him" because he "had not been a valuable member of society".¹³ Vadim is unconsciously selfish; he lacks human feelings like love; all his feelings are directed towards his work. He has a girl who wants to marry him, but now that he does not have much time to live Vadim forgets about her and spends all his time working.

Vadim is contrasted to another young cancer victim, Demka, who also has cancer of the leg. Demka wishes to study history and literature. Even before he could read or write, Demka had been taught that religion is a drug. He wants to believe that a man's well-being in life depends on himself, but the facts seem otherwise. His aunt Stefa, however, knows that "it depends on God ... God sees everything", and she urges Demka to submit to God.¹⁴ Demka is not satisfied by this answer. He wonders, "'If he sees everything, why does he pile up everything on one person? He should spread it somehow.'" ¹⁵ Nevertheless, he sees no other alternative than to submit to God - "If not to God," he wonders, "then what?"¹⁶

Demka, unlike Vadim, possesses love for people. In the hospital he becomes friendly with a young girl, Asia. Learning that she must have a mastectomy, she decides that no one will look at her anymore. Demka comforts her by saying that he will marry her.

In the second part of the novel a new patient, who becomes the most pitiful character in the novel, arrives. Shulubin is an old Bolshevnik who had fought in the Civil War. Despite this, although, like Rusanov, he has helped to convict innocent people, Shulubin did not agree with Stalinism but could not voice his opinion because the life of his family was too precious to him. However, unlike Rusanov, Shulubin was aware of his guilt but kept quiet and did what he was told. Now in the hospital facing death, for the first time in twenty years he honestly exposes his own cowardice. Shulubin realizes his guilt and that of many others in not standing up for justice and human values. He explains to Oleg Kostoglotov:

"Do you remember what they used to write in the papers? 'The whole Soviet nation rose as one man on hearing of the unprecedented, heinous crimes of ...' Do you know what 'as one man' meant for us? We were individuals, and then suddenly 'as one man'!"¹⁷

Shulubin can no longer believe that those mass vilifications in which he participated were sincere. He cannot comprehend how "our whole people suddenly became weak in the head".¹⁸ It was just that even intelligent people wanted most of all to survive. Shulubin is bitter because like millions of others he, too, remained silent. The worsening of his physical condition, the death of his wife, and the heartlessness of his grown children free Shulubin from his responsibility for the family and, as a result, from his submissiveness to the authorities.

At the end of his life Shulubin, like Podduev, comes to the conclusion that people ought to live by love. For Shulubin, as for Podduev, this realization comes too late and both know that

there will be no second chance for them. Both Shulubin and Podduev are brought to terms with their past by cancer, which they come to accept as a form of natural justice.

Although all the characters in Cancer Ward play an important role, Oleg Kostoglotov is the main character; we follow him from the beginning of the novel to the end, and most of what action there is in the novel tends to revolve around him. He is outspoken, independent, thinks of himself as an individual and not just a tool of society, and symbolizes the quest for truth. Through him Solzhenitsyn brings out most of his own beliefs; through him Solzhenitsyn shows that there is hope for the future.

Oleg Kostoglotov is different from everyone in the room. He is first seen through Rusanov's eyes. As one learns more about him one begins to admire his personality in spite of his rough appearance. Kostoglotov is a former inmate of the concentration camps. He is intelligent, inquisitive, wants to read and know more. He knows mathematics well and in prison he even starts to learn Latin. In the hospital Kostoglotov reads medical books in order to learn about his illness, x-rays, and the injections he is receiving. Like all the other characters in the novel, Kostoglotov is faced with the same Tolstoian ultimate question, "what do people live by?" Kostoglotov is not present when the discussion on this topic takes place, but he has his own views on it.

Kostoglotov learns that the injections he is receiving will destroy his tumor and prevent the formation of secondaries, but that the injections, because they are hormonal, will also destroy

his virility. He wonders what life is worth without sexual fulfillment.¹⁹ For Kostoglotov sex and the ability to procreate are essential to happiness, which he equates with a wife and children, who will carry his name. Kostoglotov feels that his dream of marrying and having a family are being destroyed along with his tumor. He is angry because he was not consulted, and he decides that he prefers to live a few months as a man rather than ten years as half a man. When he resists the treatments, the doctors are unable to conceive that their sacred duty to prolong a life at any cost can be questioned. Doctor Dontsova is convinced that any harm to the body is justified if it saves life. Kostoglotov, however, has learned in a war and in prison that the value of life is limited: life which cannot offer at least some happiness and fulfillment is not worth living. Kostoglotov believes that no one has the right to make decisions for any human being. He feels that any person is entitled to know the truth and make his own decisions. Kostoglotov is angry with Dr. Dontsova and other doctors for keeping the truth from him. Dr. Dontsova, however, does not agree with Kostoglotov; she strongly believes that patients should not be told the truth. When she discovers the symptoms of cancer in her own body, she undergoes examinations but refuses to stay and listen to the doctor's discussion.²⁰ However, Kostoglotov, though he believes in telling the truth, fails to live up to his own principle when he is unwilling to tell Proshka the real meaning of the Latin on his discharge certificate. He feels that he has no right to deprive Proshka of the last months of a possibly happy life.²¹

In the hospital Kostoglotov meets two young women to whom he is attracted. The first is the nurse Zoia and the second Dr. Vera Gangart, whom Kostoglotov calls Vega. Vega is a spinster who, though she is attracted to Kostoglotov, leads him to believe that she is married. Kostoglotov, though, is not fooled. Zoia, unlike Vega, makes herself available; she finds Kostoglotov more interesting than the young men she has been seeing. Zoia is a beautiful girl and Kostoglotov is attracted to her sexually. Vega, however, holds a different attraction for him. He is attracted to her because of her manner, gesture, grace, gentleness and brightness. To Kostoglotov Vega embodies the purity and innocence of a child.²²

Zoia is the one who tells Kostoglotov the truth about the injections he is receiving, and, although this will renew his suffering and shorten his life, she stops giving him these injections not only because he asks her to but also for her own selfish reasons. For Zoia a relationship with a man without sex is meaningless. In this respect Vega is different from Zoia. When Kostoglotov tells Vega his feelings about the injections she herself approved she is astonished, for to Vega a man means much more than just a tool of sensual pleasure. She tells Kostoglotov that desire is not everything in love and that abstinence is sometimes more noble. Although Vega also dreams of happiness with Kostoglotov, unlike Zoia, she is willing to live with Kostoglotov on purely spiritual terms. She believes in two people loving each other without having sexual desire. Vega's view uplifts Kostoglotov.

At the end of the novel when Kostoglotov is leaving the hospital both women invite him to stay with them. Kostoglotov, although at first he hesitates, chooses to go to Vega but she is not home. Later Kostoglotov decides that by marrying Vega he would ruin her life. Vega, a virgin who has lived an extremely lonely life, does not realize, as Kostoglotov does, what it would mean for them "to be together and yet not together".²³

Kostoglotov himself, when he finally agreed to hormone injections, had come to terms with the fact that a man does not live only for sex. However, he refuses to sacrifice another person's happiness because of his own inadequacy. Although Vega asked him to come, Kostoglotov decides that he cannot take advantage of her generosity and inexperience; his conscience does not allow him to see Vega again.²⁴ Instead he writes Vega a letter, telling her for the first time of his feelings for her and that it is because he loves her that he is going away. "Kostoglotov's decision is rational and magnanimous. It is a measure of his love and the crowning instance of the human ideal toward which the whole book has been directed, recalling all its discussions about the meaning of happiness and the purpose of life and all the dramatic examples of these."²⁵

At the end of the novel we find Kostoglotov in the train stretched out on the luggage rack in the same manner as on the bench in the hospital at the beginning of the novel. "His boots are dangling toes down over the corridor like a dead man's."²⁶ The similarity in posture brings the story around full circle. However,

between the beginning and the end, between the bench and the luggage rack, a whole society has passed through Oleg's mind, a whole world has been appraised He is far from dead. He has been resurrected both physically and spiritually, has come to a clear understanding of his role as a man His posture now represents an act of will, a high-minded, responsible choice.²⁷

The moral that Tolstoi presents in his story "What People Live By", therefore, forms the basis for the whole of Cancer Ward. Each character is confronted with the ultimate question of "what people live by", and each offers a different response depending on personal experience.

The relationship between Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoi, however, is evident in Cancer Ward not only because of the story "What People Live By". The questions Solzhenitsyn deals with in Cancer Ward - death, the purpose of life, disease - are also dealt with in Tolstoi's Smert' Ivana Il'icha (The Death of Ivan Il'ich).²⁸

Both Cancer Ward and The Death of Ivan Il'ich are preoccupied not only with moral and spiritual matters, but both also share an interest in cancer. Solzhenitsyn had suffered from cancer and had first-hand experience of cancer treatment. But Tolstoi, also, even though the disease is not mentioned by name, had cancer in mind in writing The Death of Ivan Il'ich.²⁹

Tolstoi was motivated to write The Death of Ivan Il'ich by a true event. In July, 1881, Tolstoi's acquaintance, Ivan Il'ich Mechnikov, a public prosecutor of Tula district court and a brother of the famous biologist, died from cancer of the stomach. Tolstoi learned the details of the death; most important was the fact that Mechnikov had undergone a deep change in outlook during his last months and had come to regard his life as wasted.³⁰

The Death of Ivan Il'ich describes the decline and death of a public prosecutor. Ivan Il'ich is an ordinary, mediocre man, a typical member of the professional bourgeois. He is ambitious careerist, concerned only with money and position. He climbs the ladder of success and wishes nothing more than a quiet, comfortable life. He commits some indiscretions in his youth, but there is nothing bad or unkind about him. In fact, he is a plain snob who lives what seems to him a perfectly normal respectable life. He marries, has children and, though his domestic life is aggravated by quarrels with his wife, he enjoys his work and a game of cards in the evening. Ivan Il'ich is at the apex of his career when he is struck by illness. Ironically, the illness is caused by a fall from a ladder while decorating his house. After a while Ivan Il'ich learns that he is dying from an incurable disease. The approach of death terrifies him. His prolonged suffering is accompanied by even greater mental despair, intensified by his sense of utter loneliness. He finds comfort only in his patient servant, Gerasim, who shows him genuine compassion and understanding. Ivan Il'ich, realising the falseness and superficiality of all the people around him, begins to question the values he had earlier accepted and he eventually realizes that the decent, pleasant life he has lived is even more terrible than death itself. Then, at the climax of his suffering, only a few hours before he dies, he experiences spiritual illumination which reveals to him the supreme importance of loving other people. He becomes filled with love and forgiveness, his pain and fear are gone, and at last he finds peace. What he experiences is similar to what Podduev

goes through before his death.

In describing the deaths of Podduev and Ivan Il'ich, Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoi describe them as going through five stages which Dr. Elizabeth Kubler-Ross in her book On Death and Dying (published in 1969) lists, as follows: 1) denial and isolation; 2) anger, rage, envy and resentment; 3) bargaining; 4) depression; and 5) acceptance. These stages last for a different period of time, they replace each other, at times exist side by side, and at times overlap.

The following discussion will illustrate how both Efrem Podduev and Ivan Il'ich go through these five stages.³¹

I) Denial and Isolation

All his life Efrem Podduev has been a generally unpleasant man who lied, swore, and told dirty stories; now he has cancer of the tongue. When he learns that he has cancer and that death is possible, he reacts with shock and denial. The thought of dying terrifies him, and so he tries to convince himself that the swelling will go away. The swelling does not go away; nevertheless, Podduev keeps going to work and works twice as hard as before. He puts on a facade and people praise his willpower, but willpower has, in fact, been replaced by blind, cold terror. Podduev puts off the operation as long as he can, but finally submits. After the operation he is told to come back in three months for the second, but he refuses to go back. He thinks that he is cured and does not need any more operations. However, the clinic demands his appearance and so he goes back. After the second operation Podduev does not enjoy his dissolute life any longer: his work, parties,

women, drinking, and smoking no longer interest him. The swelling continues to grow bigger and harder. Podduev goes to the clinic for the third operation, after which he cannot lie to himself any longer. He admits that he has cancer.³²

Efrem Podduev has never in his life thought of his own death. The prospect of dying terrifies him, but he recalls the dignified equanimity with which old people back home faced death:

They didn't puff themselves up or fight against it or brag that they were not going to die - they accepted death calmly And they departed easily, as if they were simply moving into another house. And you couldn't have scared any of them with cancer.³³

But Efrem cannot understand how and why it is happening to him. He asks himself, "'How can it be happening to him, to Efrem? How will it be? And what must one do?'"³⁴

When Ivan Il'ich learns that the injury to his side has resulted in a fatal disease and he is facing death, he reacts with shock and denial like Efrem Podduev. Death is something that happens to others but not to him. He says to himself, "'It can't be. It's impossible, but here it is. How is this? How is one to understand it?'"³⁵

At the beginning, like Efrem, Ivan Il'ich does not take his illness seriously. He ignores his pain and keeps saying to himself that his condition is not serious, that everything will go back to normal soon. The pain does not lessen, but Ivan Il'ich forces himself to think that he is getting better and he is able to fool himself until something unpleasant happens and again he feels all the strength of his illness. Deep down Ivan Il'ich knows that he is dying, but he cannot bear to think of death. Like most people,

Ivan Il'ich has always thought that he was immortal. He thought of death occasionally; he knew that some day everyone would have to go, but he never thought of his own death. As the pain grows worse and more incessant, Ivan Il'ich's denial grows weaker. Pain and suffering drive him to recognize the fact of his own impending death. This recognition drives him to isolation; he does not want to see anyone. His wife and daughter irritate him. He wants to be left alone and at the same time he wants someone to understand him and his suffering; he wants to be pitied and yet he does not like it when someone does.³⁶ Ivan Il'ich feels that his friends and his family are hypocrites, because they know that he is dying, but no one wants to face this fact. Everyone keeps telling him that he will get better. Sometimes Ivan Il'ich feels like telling them to stop lying but does not have enough courage to do so. Ivan Il'ich feels that something terrible, new, and more important than anything that has previously happened in his life is taking place within him and that he alone is aware of it. He knows that those about him do not understand it, but think that everything in the world is going on as usual. That torments Ivan Il'ich because no one understands or pities him, and he has to live all alone on the brink of an abyss.³⁷

2) Anger, Rage, Envy, and Resentment

Recognition of death fills Efrem Podduev with feelings of anger, rage, envy, and resentment. Efrem accepts the fact that he has cancer and that he shall die, but he thinks of death with anger.³⁸ Efrem transfers his grief to other patients. He ridicules every hope they cling to as he tries to relieve his own loneliness

and convince himself that they will all share his fate.³⁹

Ivan Il'ich is also angry with his family, for their life is still full of laughter. His life at home becomes unbearable. His quarrels with his wife become more explosive and more frequent. Ivan Il'ich blames his wife for his pain. When she tries to tell him about Petrishchev's marriage proposal to their daughter, the look he gives her expresses such animosity that she is unable to finish what she is saying. Ivan Il'ich says, "'For Christ's sake, let me die in peace.'"⁴⁰

Ivan Il'ich's irritability often gives way to envy and resentment. Every show of health and cheer, whether by his wife, doctor, or his daughter, brings out resentment in him. He hates his wife with his whole soul as he looks at the whiteness, plumpness, and cleanness of her hands and neck, the gloss of her hair, and the sparkle of her vivacious eyes.⁴¹ He hates his doctor, fresh, hearty, plump, and cheerful, with a look on his face that seems to say "'there now, you are in a panic about something, but we will arrange everything for you'".⁴² He does not even like his daughter's display of youthful flesh. One day hearing the distant sound of a song, he chokes with anger: "'It is all the same to them, but they will die, too! Fools! Me first, and then they, but it will be the same for them. And there they are - being happy. Animals!'"⁴³

3) Bargaining

The fear of death forces Efrem Podduev to think about the purpose of life. After reading "What People Live By", Efrem becomes greatly interested in the idea of man's guilty conscience

as a direct cause of physical illness. For the first time in his life he begins to question his past and the morality of his actions. He remembers the women in his life and realizes that he never considered their feelings or thought of them as whole human beings. He also remembers when, ten years earlier as a foreman supervising convict labour, a young prisoner said to him, "'And you will die too'"⁴⁴ Now in the hospital the memory disturbs Podduev.

Podduev now realizes that his whole life has been wrong and he knows that it is too late for him to do anything about it. In a conversation about spontaneous healing, he decides that such a thing is possible only for men of pure conscience. In a discussion about cures effected by a birch mushroom, Podduev realizes that he does not have anyone close enough to him to send for it. He is even attracted to the Hindu belief that a person does not die entirely for his soul moves into animals or other people. He would agree to anything as long as he could "carry through death a part of himself".⁴⁵

A few days before he dies Ivan Il'ich attempts to make a promise in order to postpone his death. When he realizes the terrible truth that his whole life has been wrong, he bargains with God although he is not at all religious.⁴⁶ He reviews his life and decides that the whole of it has been a terrible and huge deception which had hidden both life and death from him. Next morning every movement and every word of his servant, his wife, his daughter, and the doctor confirm for him the terrible realization that came to him during the night. The realization increases his suffering to the point that he agrees to his wife's suggestion that he take

communion.⁴⁷ After his confession, Ivan Il'ich feels a lessening of his doubts and his sufferings, and for a moment a ray of hope comes to him again as he begins to think about an operation, which was suggested to him. "'To live, I want to live,'"⁴⁸ he says to himself.

4) Depression

The stage of depression is "a time of mourning" over things already lost and of grieving over "impending losses".⁴⁹ During this stage of depression Podduev wants to be left alone; he simply lies "unconscious like a block" and does not take his eyes off the ceiling, not seeing or hearing anything about him.⁵⁰ One day Efrem is especially unusually quiet, thinking of his wasted life. His roommates try to talk him into having breakfast, but Efrem only replies, "'If you haven't had enough to eat already, you will never have enough.'"⁵¹

Like Podduev, during this stage Ivan Il'ich also wants to be left alone. Mostly he lies in bed or on the sofa staring into space and reminiscing about the past. He begins to weep because of his helplessness, his terrible loneliness, the cruelty of man, the cruelty of God, and the absence of God.⁵² His weeping and screaming continue during his last three days.

5) Acceptance

In Cancer Ward the details of Podduev's death are omitted. His former roommates learn of his death (like Tolstoi's) at the railway station from a cleaning lady. When leaving the hospital Efrem had said to Kostoglotov: "When you're born, you wriggle; when you grow up, you run wild; when you die, that's your lot."⁵³

There is bitterness in his voice; nevertheless, he probably does accept death as a natural process just as he accepted Tolstoi's philosophy of moral regeneration through love for others.

Ivan Il'ich reaches the stage of acceptance an hour before his death. After three days of screaming in agony, his schoolboy son comes up to his dying father, catches his hand, and kisses it. At that very moment "some power pushed his chest, his side, suffocated his breathing even more, he fell into a hole, and there, at the end of the hole he catches the sight of the light".⁵⁴ It is revealed to him that, though his whole life had not been what it should have been, this fact can still be rectified. This is the moment of truth for Ivan Il'ich. He opens his eyes, sees his wife and son and feels sorry for them. He does not have strength to speak. Besides, he thinks, "Why speak?"⁵⁵ Whatever has been disturbing Ivan Il'ich has suddenly left him. In his final moments Ivan Il'ich does not give up saying "what's the use?", but he shows a new understanding and acceptance. As a result his fear of death and the pain leave him and he finds peace at last.⁵⁶

Thus, as Ivan Il'ich Golovin's condition deteriorates, the suspicion grows in him that his fatal disease is somehow an inevitable consequence of his whole selfish way of life. Efrem Podduev, after reading Tolstoi's story undergoes the same experience.

Both Cancer Ward and The Death of Ivan Il'ich employ the threat of death as the means for moral exploration, and both have similar protagonists, who on their deathbed must grapple with the meaning of life. However, Solzhenitsyn's Cancer Ward is a much broader study. In The Death of Ivan Il'ich Tolstoi centers only on one

character, whereas Solzhenitsyn's cast of characters is large, with each portraying his own problem and offering his own version of "what people live by". Both writers show that a physical or mortal sickness cannot be healed as long as one brushes aside the true nature of the disease. Solzhenitsyn shows that there is no compromise, that each individual must examine his conscience and expiate his own guilt because, as some of them realize, there can be no recovery.

Both authors' task is to tell people truthfully how things are and what awaits them. "But Tolstoi uses his medical situation to scare, to flagellate, and to preach; Solzhenitsyn uses his to observe and surely to criticize, but mainly to analyze in a less threatening, more compassionate manner."⁵⁷ Furthermore, Tolstoi believes that people should live by love for others and in The Death of Ivan Il'ich he illustrates that not all people are aware of this and that they realize the true meaning of life only when brought face to face with death. It is a solution to which Solzhenitsyn gives serious consideration in Cancer Ward and through Podduev confirms Tolstoi's belief. However, through people like Zatsyrko, Rusanov, and Shulubin, Solzhenitsyn gives a shattering refutation to this belief for Rusanov and Zatsyrko, although facing death, do not accept that people live by love for others. Shulubin, on the other hand, has always realized the falseness of his life but he does nothing about it until he faces death. Kostoglotov, who has been aware all along of what people live by, does not actually come to terms with the promise until his experience with Vega Gangart. In his depiction of Kostoglotov,

Solzhenitsyn presents the theme of the novel--"life conquering death, the past conquered by the future".⁵⁸ Through his love for Vega and by placing her happiness before his own, Kostoglotov embodies the principle of loving other people and he thus conquers death. Tolstoi's question is thus the basis for the whole of Solzhenitsyn's novel.

In Cancer Ward, therefore, the relationship between Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoi is more overt than in One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich and The First Circle. There is a specific discussion of Tolstoi's views as embodied in a specific work, "What People Live By", which is dwelt on at length by the characters in Solzhenitsyn's novel. There is also an exploration by Solzhenitsyn of Tolstoi's views as presented in The Death of Ivan Il'ich, although this work is not mentioned by name in Cancer Ward.

Although Cancer Ward and Tolstoi's The Death of Ivan Il'ich are joined thematically in dealing with death and the purpose of life and in having similar protagonists, Cancer Ward, as already mentioned, is a much broader study since Solzhenitsyn deals with a large cast of characters and Tolstoi only with one man. The resolution in Solzhenitsyn's novel and in Tolstoi's The Death of Ivan Il'ich also differs for Solzhenitsyn, instead of frightening the reader, wishes to inform the reader not only of what awaits him but also that change is possible. In The Death of Ivan Il'ich a man realizes the meaning and the purpose of life only on his deathbed when it is too late to do anything about it. In Kostoglotov, however, Solzhenitsyn shows that it is never too late to realize

and seek to rectify one's mistakes and that life can conquer death and the future can conquer the past.

CHAPTER V

AUGUST 1914

The novel Avgust chetyrnadtsatogo (August 1914), as Solzhenitsyn points out in the epilogue, marks a return to a long-cherished literary project that first came to Solzhenitsyn in 1936; the book is only the first part of a twenty-year project.¹ Therefore, August 1914 is only the first part of a novel at least on the scale of Tolstoi's War and Peace. August 1914 is, nevertheless, a complete entity.

August 1914 is a historical novel devoted primarily to the Battle of Tannenberg in World War I, in which Russia hastily and unpreparedly invaded Germany. The crucial event in the unsuccessful invasion was the surrounding and destruction of the Russian Second Army under the command of General A.V. Samsonov. For Solzhenitsyn this Russian defeat is of great importance. August 1914 centers on a national military catastrophe and explores its causes. The major theme of the novel is Solzhenitsyn's quest for truth. August 1914 concludes with the epigram: "Lies did not begin with us; nor will they end with us."² The truth which Solzhenitsyn is especially after in this novel is the truth of history and its meaning.³

In August 1914 Solzhenitsyn abandons his customary subject matter. In this novel he has created a new fictive "world;" all his other fiction belongs to the same fictive world. Despite this

difference, however, August 1914 displays a continuity with the rest of the Solzhenitsyn corpus, for it follows the same general principle of polyphony which dominates The First Circle and Cancer Ward.⁴ the time of the action is short, about eleven days in August, 1914; there is a large cast of characters which includes people from all the social and also the military strata and each character becomes the hero when the narrative centers on him; the action for the most part takes place at the war front in eastern Germany and the remaining scenes, which also play an important role, are set behind the line in Russia in the North Caucasus area, Rostov, Moscow and Petrograd.

But there is also an important difference between August 1914 and the other two polyphonic novels. In The First Circle and Cancer Ward only one character stands out as the closest to the outlook of the author. In The First Circle it is Gleb Nerzhin and in Cancer Ward it is Oleg Kostoglotov. In August 1914, however, the situation is different for here there are two such major figures: General Samsonov and Colonel Vorotyntsev.⁵

August 1914 recalls Tolstoi's War and Peace in many ways.⁶ First of all both authors chose as their leading subject crucial wars. Tolstoi deals with the Napoleonic war of 1812 and Solzhenitsyn with an episode of World War I in 1914. In August 1914 Solzhenitsyn tells what happens both from the viewpoint of the soldiers, commanders in the field and the staff officers in the rear. As a result one gets a highly comprehensive view of war and in this respect Solzhenitsyn is reminiscent of Tolstoi, who in War and Peace also tells what happens from the viewpoint of ordinary sol-

diers and of the commanders.⁷ Both authors interfuse their war scenes with scenes of peace.

However, the relationship between Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoi in August 1914 is complex and contradictory. In War and Peace Tolstoi was concerned with the universals of human behaviour and the complicated laws of history. Tolstoi believed that historians were wrong in thinking that "great men" create history. He believed that even though the laws of history exist, they were unknown. Furthermore, a man, no matter how great his authority, was powerless to change the course of events, which were predestined, for history was governed by much greater powers. All people were blind tools of some kind of power, a power that was unknown to them.⁸ Thus, neither Napoleon nor any other great commander could have made any difference to the result of the battles he thought he was directing. And Tolstoi saw General Kutuzov as a genius because the latter recognised this fact and relied on his natural instinct to tell him when nothing could be done.

In August 1914 Solzhenitsyn, it seems, accepts Tolstoi's interpretation of history as illustrated in War and Peace. His most candid views on history, expressed by Varsonof'ev, an old man Isaakii and Kotia meet in Moscow, and Andozerskaia, a professor of history, who have nothing to do with the battles of 1914, are not at odds with Tolstoi's. Varsonof'ev, in reply to Isaakii's question about what governs history, replies that history is irrational and is not directed by reason. He compares history to a river with its own laws. When Isaakii asks Varsonof'ev where the laws regulating the stream can be found, Varsonof'ev replies that it is a riddle which

man may not be able to solve.⁹

However, at the same time Solzhenitsyn distances himself from Tolstoi's philosophy of history and from his explanation of war. Solzhenitsyn does not agree with Tolstoi's belief that an individual, regardless of his authority, cannot influence the course of events but at best can only go along with them. He believes that individuals not only can but must be responsible for what happens. Both Solzhenitsyn and his protagonist, Colonel Vorotyntsev, consider war a complex and difficult undertaking which demands skill, technology, and initiative. In the novel Solzhenitsyn illustrates that in 1914 the Russian Army lacked all three. He feels that the defeat of General Samsonov's army at Tannenberg was avoidable and that the disaster was the result of stupidity, inability, and irresponsibility on the part of the Russian military leadership.¹⁰ Solzhenitsyn very clearly shows this in the passages where a military commander, General Blagoveshchenskii, thinks of himself as Kutuzov:

General Blagoveshchenskii had read about Kutuzov in Tolstoi and at sixty years of age, gray-haired, fat, and stiff, he felt himself to be like Kutuzov Like Kutuzov, he was deliberate, cautious and sly, and like Tolstoi's Kutuzov he knew that it was never necessary to make any drastic or decisive moves, that a battle launched against its will would produce more confusion that there was an inevitable course of events and the best general was one who refused participation in these events.¹¹

It is obvious that Blagoveshchenskii's "wise" Tolstoian passivity and his intentions not to interfere with historical events contribute to the disaster at Tannenberg. Furthermore, Blagoveshchenskii keeps sending General Samsonov military dispatches full of

false facts which become more crucial to the Russian Army than the German artillery. In Solzhenitsyn's opinion, therefore, General Blagoveshchenskii was chiefly responsible for Russia's defeat. These constant lies and accusations finally drive Samsonov to suicide and his army to virtual destruction.

Solzhenitsyn does not question the bravery of the soldiers, he shows them brave enough, but they are continuously being betrayed by the irresponsibility and corruption of their leaders. The loss of many divisions is due to the inefficient modes of communication as well as contradictory and confusing orders. Furthermore, the situation is complicated by a series of uncoded messages which are continuously intercepted by the Germans. Solzhenitsyn believes that the inefficiency of the Russian leaders is not a historical accident but "a major symptom of the tsarist regime, which 'granted no power or influence to anyone not fortunate enough to be close to the throne.'"¹²

Solzhenitsyn also points out that the Russian invasion of East Prussia only a few weeks after the declaration of war was a terrible mistake, because the Russian Army was not ready to undertake such an action.

In August 1914 Solzhenitsyn very openly enters into a polemic with Tolstoi not only in the fiction itself, but in passages of commentary as well. In reference to the Russian defeat, for instance, Solzhenitsyn comments:

there might appear to be some consolation in Tolstoi's conviction that it is not generals who lead armies, ...not presidents or leaders who run states or political parties - were it not that all too often the twentieth century has proved to us that it is precisely they who do these things.¹³

Both Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoi are in agreement that the spirit of the nation and its army is crucial to the war. However, both authors understand that spirit differently. Tolstoi feels that the actions of those in command do not directly influence the army's morale and that the spirit of the army is due to some mysterious and irrational power. But Solzhenitsyn sees a direct connection between those in command and the morale of their troops, though, like Tolstoi, he recognizes the crucial role played by spirit in actual warfare.¹⁴

Another point on which Solzhenitsyn disagrees with Tolstoi is whether one should join military service. In his later years Tolstoi believed in ascetic Christianity, non-resistance to evil, non-recognition of state power, love as the only law. It may be that Solzhenitsyn is angry with Tolstoi because of the effect Tolstoi's belief had on young men of the 1914 War generation, convincing them that it was wrong to undertake military service.¹⁵ In Solzhenitsyn's opinion it is not a question of approving of war, few people do, but it is a question of personal responsibility. He is not trying to distinguish justified war and unjustified war, but "he is picturing the war that, unjustified on either side, was nevertheless endured and suffered by the masses, from whose blood sacrifice, in his opinion, nobody, once it began, should have held himself aloof."¹⁶ Isaakii Lazhenitsyn accepts this responsibility, though he considers himself to be a true Tolstoian. On the way to join military service Isaakii meets another Tolstoian, a girl whom he has known in school and corresponded with. She accuses Isaakii of going against his Tolstoian beliefs when she guesses that he is

going to volunteer for military service. When she asks him what Lev Tolstoi would say about it Isaakii can only reply: "'I feel sorry for Russia.'"¹⁷

Unlike Isaakii, Roman Tomchak, a rich landowner, does not want to serve. He only lives for himself. His wife, Irina, tries to convince him to enter military service for she feels that Russia is going through hard times, but Roman refuses to help, pretending to be Tolstoi's follower. He considers himself a great admirer of Tolstoi and has several oil paintings of him; he explains to his father that "to admire Tolstoi was the thing to do among educated people, that he was a great national figure and a count."¹⁸

The novels differ radically in the actual treatment of warfare itself.¹⁹ In War and Peace, as in Tolstoi's short military tales, Tolstoi expresses his horror and revulsion at the barbarous slaughter of human beings. Suffering and death are dwelt on in agonizing detail. In August 1914, however, Solzhenitsyn abstains from scenes of bloodshed. There is not a single description of serious individual injury or death. However, Solzhenitsyn also expresses his horror and revulsion at the barbarous slaughter of human beings by illustrating it in a number of short film scenarios. In one of them he depicts a battlefield after the slaughter has ceased and man's brutality is viewed through the eyes of a suffering horse.²⁰

Milton Ehre in his article "On August 1914" states that Solzhenitsyn's August 1914 is Tolstoi's 'War' without the 'Peace' - the historical novel minus the full rendering of the rhythms of social, familiar, and private life."²¹ However, this is not the

case. Although the greatest part of the text is devoted to the military operations of the Russian Army in east Prussia, the "Peace," too, is depicted in August 1914. These scenes take place in the Northern Caucasus, on the Tomchak family estate, in Moscow, in St. Petersburg and in Rostov-on-the-Don. The novel concludes with two chapters which describe what was going on at the Russian Army Headquarters in Mogilev following the defeat at Tannenberg. These chapters are set immediately behind the front line.

The novel starts out in the Northern Caucasus where Solzhenitsyn introduces a young Moscow student Isaakii Lazhenitsyn, later referred to as Sania, who has decided to volunteer for the army and is on his way back to Moscow in order to enroll in a military school. Later Isaakii reappears but this time with his friend Kotia who is also volunteering for the service. In the same chapter Solzhenitsyn introduces Varsonof'ev who is known as Zvezdochet (Stargazer). Isaakii and Kotia do not know Varsonof'ev but have seen him in the Moscow Public Library many times. They decide to make his acquaintance; they help him with his books and he invites them to the beerhouse where they enter into a philosophical conversation.

The opening chapters about Isaakii are followed by chapters about the rich Tomchak family, describing their life on the estate. Here an important part is played by Tomchak himself, his son Roman, and his daughter-in-law, Irina; however, they never reappear. Tomchak's daughter, Ksen'ia, went to a private boarding school in Rostov-on-the-Don run by a Mme. Kharitonov, whose son Iaroslav we meet at the front. Ksen'ia reappears again almost at the end of the novel in the chapters set in Rostov.

In the St. Petersburg chapters we meet students of the University and of the Higher Courses for Women. One of the girls, Varia, is a friend of Isaakii's, and she had appeared at the beginning of the novel in the scene where she meets Isaakii at the railway station. Some of the other girls are connected with Sania Lenartovich whom we met at the front line. Lenartovich is an officer who strongly opposes the War. Here Solzhenitsyn also introduces a faculty member, Professor Ol'da Andozerskaia, a professor of history.

The Rostov-on-the-Don chapters deal with the Kharitonov family. Here we see Ksen'ia Tomchak visit Mme Kharitonov, her former headmistress and learn about the complicated relations that have arisen within Kharitonov family. In other Rostov-on-the-Don chapters we are introduced to the Arkhangorodskii family. Il'ia Isaakovich Arkhangorodskii is a prominent engineer. He was briefly mentioned at the beginning of the novel. He is referred to by Ksen'ia Tomchak's father as "a most intelligent Jew" and "an honorable man."²² Tomchak meets Arkhangorodskii when he goes to Rostov to seek advice about his daughter's schooling. Arkhangorodskii suggests that Tomchak send Ksen'ia to Mme Kharitonov's boarding school, where his own daughter boarded. Ksen'ia appears again in the house of Il'ia Arkhangorodskii as a dinner guest. The guest of honour at this party is Il'ia Isaakovich's friend-engineer Sviatoslav Iakinfovich Obodovskii. The chapters on Arkhangorodskii's family are interesting for they throw a light on some aspect of Russian society of the period.

The last two chapters of the novel are set at the Russian Army Headquarters behind the front lines. As a result, these scenes are related to the scenes which are devoted solely to war and to peace.

Thus the theme of "Peace" does exist in August 1914. As mentioned, it involves several families as well as individuals, most of whom take no part in the war then beginning, but whose lives are all affected in various measure.

In War and Peace the scenes of peaceful life, as in August 1914, are set in more than one place, mostly in Moscow and St. Petersburg. Like Solzhenitsyn, Tolstoi deals with a number of civilians - families and separate individuals, many of whom do not participate in the war but are affected by it. The action mainly revolves around four families, the Rostovs, Bolkonskiis, Bezukhovs, and Kuragins. However, in Tolstoi's epic the "Peace" is much more developed than in August 1914, for in Solzhenitsyn's novel "Peace" occupies only about one fifth of the novel, and the civilians are seen once or, at the most, twice, and the relationship among them is minimal. In War and Peace "Peace" is equal in size to "War;" it, unlike in August 1914, intervenes with the scenes of war, and all the families and separate individuals have a close relationship with each other. For instance, Natasha Rostova and Prince Andrei fall in love, Pierre Bezukhov and Ellen Kuragin marry, Nikolai Rostov and Princess Mary Bolkonskaia are attracted to each other and later marry, Natasha Rostova is attracted to Anatolii Kuragin, Pierre Bezukhov divorces his wife and at the end of the novel he marries Natasha Rostova, and so on.

Thus, even though War and Peace is a much larger book with a far greater number of characters than August 1914, "Tolstoy controlled his cast much better and he orchestrated his portrayals of war and peace, his many settings and themes, into a structure far more harmonious and satisfying."²³

In August 1914 Solzhenitsyn has given several interesting characters but none of them, with the exception of General Samsonov and Colonel Vorotyntsev, are not as memorable as Tolstoi's characters of War and Peace are; Solzhenitsyn's characters appear briefly and they are not sufficiently developed. Nevertheless, many of them are reminiscent of Tolstoi's characters.

First, there is Isaakii (Sania) Lazhenitsyn, who is following in Tolstoi's footsteps. Isaakii, like Pierre Bezukhov, goes through life trying to resolve constant inner struggles in his search for truth, and, like Pierre, he is a character with an open "Russian" nature.²⁴ He considers himself a Tolstoian and confines himself to Tolstoi's way of life and thinking, but he constantly runs into conflicts with his beliefs. On leaving school Sania visits Tolstoi at Iasnaia Poliana in order to hear from Tolstoi himself an explanation of the purpose of life. Tolstoi answers: "To serve the good. And through goodness, to create the Kingdom of God on earth."²⁵ Isaakii wants to know how one serves and Tolstoi replies that one must serve "through love." Isaakii tells Tolstoi that it is an impossible ideal; Tolstoi does not argue with him but insists, "only by love."²⁶ Although Isaakii's Tolstoian beliefs are strong, he, nevertheless goes to war as a volunteer because he feels sorry for Russia. We meet Isaakii

again in Moscow. He and his friend Kotia are preparing to go to war but Isaakii is still disturbed about doing the right thing. He is unhappy over his betrayal of his pacifist principles. In answer to Isaakii's question, Varsonof'ev tells him that to go to war is the right thing to do; he cannot explain why, he only feels that "when the trumpet blows - a man must be a man. At least for himself."²⁷

Ksen'ia Tomchak, Roman Zakharovich's little sister, is a spirited and vivacious girl. Her adolescent charm is strongly reminiscent of Natasha Rostova.²⁸ Ksen'ia does not want to get married, her dream is to become a dancer. When her brother tells her that she will probably marry a landowner, Ksen'ia exclaims that she will do nothing of the sort. She feels that to become a famous dancer is all she wants out of life.²⁹ The lively, young Natasha Rostova also dreams of becoming a dancer. "I will never marry anyone, but I will become a dancer," she says to her brother Nikolai.³⁰

Irina Tomchak, Roman Zakharovich's wife, is reminiscent of Princess Mary in her spiritual patriotism and mystical religiosity.³¹ Irina always dreamed of a pilgrimage to Jerusalem and in War and Peace Tolstoi describes the appeal of the simple "God's folk" to Princess Mary and her wish to set out on a pilgrimage:

She pictured herself...dressed in coarse rags, walking with a staff, a knapsack on her back, along the dusty road, directing her wanderings from one saint's shrine to another, free from envy, earthly love, or desire, and reaching at last the place where there is no more sorrow or sighing, but eternal joy and bliss.³²

Irina is an intelligent and sensible person; she disapproves of the books that Ksen'ia reads and suggests that Ksen'ia read something Russian and useful.³³ Princess Mary, like Irina, does not approve of her friend Julie's reading list for she feels that romances are useless and that there are more useful books.³⁴ Irina displays submission towards her immature and selfish husband just as Princess Mary is submissive to her father. Despite these similarities Irina Tomchak is portrayed as a stronger and more willful person than Princess Mary. This is shown in the way she handles her bossy and stern father-in-law, who, like the old Bolkonskii, keeps the whole family under his thumb.

In August 1914, as in Solzhenitsyn's other fiction, there is a central hero, Colonel Vorotyntsev. Vorotyntsev has greeted the war as an escape from his boring life and his wife whom he ceased to love without any cause. Now at war he finds himself free and happy again.³⁵ He is a brilliant young officer who is not only ambitious but also embodies integrity, patriotism, and a sense of honour. His staff appointment allows him to move freely from one military position to another. Although he is an intellectual theoretician of war, he does not want to stay in military offices, finding it more satisfying to lead ordinary soldiers in a real field of danger.

Vorotyntsev first appears at Samsonov's headquarters as a messenger from the Grand Duke at the Army Headquarters. He has been sent to investigate the development of Samsonov's army. At first Samsonov is suspicious of this staff officer but is soon won over by Vorotyntsev's frankness and rapid understanding of Samsonov's

difficulties; and he hopes that through Vorotyntsev he will be able to bring to the attention of the authorities the practical obstacles to accomplishing the operation planned for the Second Army.

Vorotyntsev appears to be, unlike the generals, a fictive character, and he is "the intelligence of the novel."³⁶ Vorotyntsev is aware of the corruption of the generals and he does his best to remedy the situation. After the German forces begin to attack the Russian army, Vorotyntsev attempts to save the campaign by acting as a liaison officer between units, desperately encouraging, warning and urging. At one time he succeeds in persuading an exhausted regiment to return to the front line and he does it not by a command, threats, or appeals to patriotism but by explaining the necessity for this further sacrifice.³⁷

Later, when Vorotyntsev realises that the Russian army is fated to be defeated, he leads a group of soldiers through the encircling German troops back to Russia. Then in the last chapter, at the conference in the Army Headquarters, Vorotyntsev, though he is very proud, humiliates himself and endangers his career in order to explain the real military and human situation to the commanders. All the generals put all the blame for the Russian defeat on the dead Samsonov, but Colonel Vorotyntsev is determined to tell the truth. When he is given a chance to speak, Vorotyntsev, with evident logic, begins to describe the true facts and refutes every excuse with which the generals try to defend themselves. Vorotyntsev refuses to be silenced and says he, as well as all the officers of the Russian army, is responsible for Russian history and that they are not allowed to lose campaign after the campaign.³⁸ Vorotyntsev

is dismissed from the meeting for his last outburst but he does not regret anything he has said. In fact he feels relieved and free, "as if a hot arrow had been taken out of his chest, even if with the meat."³⁹

Colonel Vorotyntsev is reminiscent of Andrei Bolkonskii.⁴⁰ Like Vorotyntsev, Prince Andrei is disenchanted with his past and is bored with his life. His pretty little wife Lise, the paragon of all social graces and cliches necessary for a man in his position, loves him, but Prince Andrei does not love her in return. It is possible that he loved her at first and this love, like Vorotyntsev's for his wife, has faded with time. Like Vorotyntsev, Prince Andrei finds his escape in war and there he again finds his happiness. At war Prince Andrei changes radically; there are no longer any traces of boredom, pretence, and tiredness in his face, walk, or movement:

he had the look of a person who does not have time to think what effect he has on others and is busy with pleasant and interesting matters. His face showed a great satisfaction with himself and those surrounding him, his smile and his gaze were happier and more attractive.⁴¹

Like Vorotyntsev, Bolkonskii is scornful of the military establishment and finds his greatest satisfaction when leading ordinary soldiers in a real field of danger. When Kutuzov offers to have Prince Andrei stay with him, he refuses. He is inspired with the same integrity, patriotism, and sense of honour as Vorotyntsev. Both Vorotyntsev and Bolkonskii possess analytical minds, and both reveal at critical moments that calm, assured leadership which inspires confidence in those around them. But both are "fundamen-

tally unsuited to a professional military career. It can only be a matter of time before their uncompromising honesty and keen intelligence will bring them into conflict with their superiors."⁴²

While at Samsonov's headquarters Vorotyntsev chooses as his orderly a peasant-soldier Blagodarev, who accompanies Vorotyntsev on his most dangerous military operations. Blagodarev is reminiscent of Tolstoi's Platon Karataev, a soldier of peasant stock whom Pierre Bezukhov meets while in French prison.⁴³ From Platon Karataev Bezukhov learns that the true values in life are simplicity, goodness, and truthfulness. Vorotyntsev, however, does not seek anything of the kind in Blagodarev. Vorotyntsev and Blagodarev are simply an officer and a soldier who have in common values of respect and responsibility. Blagodarev's surname--derived from the Russian word for 'thanks, gratitude'--speaks for itself. He is cheerful, modest, and kind. Bezukhov sees Karataev as "an unfathomable, round and eternal personification of the spirit of simplicity and truth,"⁴⁴ while Vorotyntsev sees Blagodarev as "never obliging but always willing, benevolent even to indulgence, not cruel, but living by a sensible separate will."⁴⁵ Blagodarev, in turn, also has a high opinion of Vorotyntsev.⁴⁶

If Vorotyntsev is the central hero in the book, Samsonov is a central figure, who has been urgently summoned by the Tsar in order to take command of the Second Army. Samsonov is a cavalry general with a distinguished record in military administration. However, at the time of his new appointment, Samsonov has been out of touch with operation duties for seven years. He, in fact, has never at any time commanded a corps in battle and now he is

entrusted with a whole army. Samsonov feels honoured by the confidence that the Tsar has shown in him and he is eager to perform his duties well. Samsonov has always taken his work seriously and performed any assignments as well as he could.⁴⁷ But the sudden nature of his new appointment and the pressure now disrupt his normal working methods.

The original plan was for Samsonov's Army to join the neighbouring army of General Rennenkampf. Samsonov's Army was supposed to be moving northeast and thus to cut off the anticipated line of German retreat. Samsonov, however, for both logical and strategical reasons, wants to direct his army northwest. His proposal, along with his repeated request for a rest period to restore the hard-pressed troops, are rejected by the Group Commander, General Zhilinskii. Nevertheless, he disobeys and slowly directs his troops northwest where the German forces have actually appeared just as Samsonov anticipated, and Zhilinski reluctantly consents to a compromise axis. However, this compromise involves a dangerous lengthening of the front. At the same time two corps are taken away from Samsonov. As a result the Second Army extends the line in a fanshaped front as it advances; units become isolated, supplies disappear, and communications deteriorate. And despite the heroic efforts of the troops and of many field commanders, disorganization and lack of direction lead to a disaster.

Thus General Samsonov becomes by will of Providence at once the perpetrator and a victim of the disaster. He is a victim of the jealousies and incompetence of the army command from the Minister of War, Sukhomilov, down to the corps commanders who serve under

him. Solzhenitsyn portrays Samsonov as a brave, pious, and a good Russian; as a general he is conscientious, reasonable, modest, and honest. Samsonov has made operational errors, but from the beginning of the war he has never been given a chance. He has been let down by the directives and taunts from the front headquarters and has been especially hurt by Zhilinskii's accusation that it was cowardice which prevented Samsonov from advancing more rapidly. Samsonov feels betrayed by his commanders and even more hurt by Zhilinskii's accusation. The feeling that he has given the Tsar bad service disturbs him and during the days of the battle he, like his army, gradually disintegrates. Solzhenitsyn shows how Samsonov strips himself of everything he has accumulated during his long military career. He sinks deeply into himself, to his childhood memories. However, a final humiliation reaches Samsonov when, in order to avoid identification in case of capture, the officers bury their insignia. Samsonov is outraged and accuses them of betraying their oath of allegiance, but does not resist when the officers take off his general's epaulettes and decorations. Shortly after Samsonov commits suicide in the woods. The scene where he kneels in prayer before his death is touching and sympathetic. His last words display the pain of an honourable and well-meaning human being who is destroyed by a situation which is beyond his comprehension and control: "'O, God! If You can - forgive me and accept me. You see: I couldn't and can't do any differently?'"⁴⁸

General Samsonov's fate, therefore, symbolizes the meaning of Tannenberg for Russia. He is devoted to his Faith, his country and the Tsar. His officers seem to respect him for when he bids farewell

to the troops he has directed to failure no one is angry with him and there is no sign of hatred. Samsonov and his army have been let down by the selfish and incompetent generals with whom, as we see, the Tsar has surrounded himself. At the end of the novel Vorotyntsev points out to Zhilinskii that when Russia committed herself to deliver assistance, she did not promise to commit suicide.⁴⁹ Solzhenitsyn believes that the death of Samsonov at Tannenberg symbolized the suicide of Russia herself.⁵⁰

Several critics have pointed out that Samsonov is Tolstoi's Kutuzov; however, this is not the case; Tolstoi's Kutuzov is different in character and he is portrayed differently.⁵¹ Like Samsonov, Kutuzov is a simple and a good Russian but, unlike Samsonov, he is portrayed as a wise and successful commander-in-chief. Kutuzov's simplicity, intuitive wisdom, lack of hypocrisy and his strong belief in the impossibility of controlling events place Kutuzov in the category of simple and patriotic members of gentry and peasantry; he is that representative of the unconscious spirit of the nation which Tolstoi believed to be a true historical force at a national critical point. Kutuzov embodies Tolstoi's theory of war, for his strategy is based on the belief that in war everything comes to him who waits. Kutuzov states that "patience and time" are the things that win wars.⁵²

Kutuzov, unlike Samsonov, does not draw into himself when he feels that the battle will be lost. As a matter of fact he is very calm. Kutuzov feels that in order to justify oneself in war one must submit to the larger law of life, surrender one's will to fate, and thus acquire success. For instance, before Austerlitz Kutuzov

knows that everything is bound to go wrong because the generals are trying to work it out beforehand, but he knows that there is nothing he can do to stop them and so at the council he simply goes to sleep, submitting to defeat before defeat has occurred.⁵³

Throughout the whole war Kutuzov appears calm and in control. It is impossible to see him committing suicide from despair at his own or even his country's failure, as does Samsonov. And slowly it becomes clear that Samsonov "is not Kutuzov of August 1914, that he could not be presented in Tolstoy's sharp swift moments of carefully stylized delineation, because he is not, like Kutuzov, the personification of the intellectual principle of passivity. Samsonov lives and dies and suffers an individual fate."⁵⁴

In conclusion, Solzhenitsyn's August 1914, is closely related to Tolstoy's War and Peace. Both novels are historical and both Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoy choose as their central subject crucial wars which engulfed Russia. Solzhenitsyn deals with an episode of World War I of 1914 and Tolstoy with the Napoleonic war of 1812, and both interfuse their war scenes with scenes of peace. Both Solzhenitsyn's and Tolstoy's narratives of war tell us what happens from the viewpoint both of the commanders and of common soldiers. Both authors also introduce a large cast of characters and many of Solzhenitsyn's characters are reminiscent of Tolstoy's. However, the relationship between August 1914 and War and Peace is more complex and contradictory than these similarities would indicate. In War and Peace Tolstoy was concerned with the universals of human behaviour and the inscrutable laws of history. He believed that "great" men do not create history because, although there are laws

of history, they are for the most part unknown. Furthermore, man is powerless to change the course of events, which is predestined, for history is governed by much greater powers. Although Solzhenitsyn, through Varsonof'ev, seemingly accepts Tolstoi's interpretation of history as expressed in War and Peace, he, in fact, disagrees with Tolstoy. He believes that individuals not only can but must be responsible for what happens, for war is a complex and difficult undertaking demanding skill, technology, and initiative, all of which, Solzhenitsyn feels, the Russian army lacked in 1914.

Thus in August 1914, as in other of Solzhenitsyn's fiction, the relationship between Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoi does exist but here it is much stronger than in One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich, The First Circle, and Cancer Ward, for here Solzhenitsyn openly enters into a polemic with Tolstoi in fiction as well as in passages of commentary.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

That there is a relationship between Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoi is self-evident but the nature of that relationship is, on the whole, complex and sometimes contradictory. Tolstoi has served Solzhenitsyn as an exemplar in many ways. There are similarities between the two writers in characters, settings, themes, and actual text. The relationship becomes progressively more complex and, indeed, polemical in nature in the works discussed in this thesis.

One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich is reminiscent of Tolstoi's short story "The Wood-felling". Both authors deal with one day in a camp: Solzhenitsyn with a Siberian concentration camp and Tolstoi with a military camp in the Caucasus. Both pursue similar themes: Solzhenitsyn exposes the false image of prison camp and Tolstoi the false romantic conception of the Caucasus. For some of Tolstoi's characters, the Caucasus are as much a prison as the Siberian concentration camp is for all of Solzhenitsyn's. Solzhenitsyn's novella is an assertion of one man's will for survival and his ability to maintain dignity under the inhuman conditions of the camp. Just as the prisoners are faced with death from inhuman conditions, so are the soldiers and officers in "The Wood-felling" faced with death from enemy bullets. Both works depict men of various classes and some of Solzhenitsyn's characters are reminiscent of Tolstoi's. However, the narrators

of the two works have very little in common, except that both are sincere and good men. They differ in that Shukhov is a subjective narrator and the narrator of "The Wood-felling" is an objective narrator-observer. In addition, both works have textual similarities. Both begin in the early morning and end late at night; the position and the heat of the sun are used to define the forward movement both of the day and the two works. The day, as described in both works, ends happily; Shukhov is happy with how his day has gone and the narrator of "The Wood-felling" is pleased with the successful accomplishments of his.

In The First Circle the relationship between the two authors is more apparent. The theme of awakening and moral resurrection in The First Circle is identical to that of Tolstoi's Resurrection. Both novels raise similar question of why and according to what law those in control do anything they want. Solzhenitsyn's theme protagonist, Volodin, is reminiscent of Tolstoi's theme protagonist, Nekhliudov, for both undergo a moral transformation. Solzhenitsyn's other protagonists in The First Circle also recall certain of Tolstoi's characters in works other than Resurrection. For instance, Solzhenitsyn's Nerzhin is reminiscent of Levin in Anna Karenina and Pierre Bezukhov in War and Peace. Nerzhin searches for an answer to how to conduct oneself in the conditions of all-penetrating violence in society, while Levin wants to know how to live. Like Bezukhov, Nerzhin is also trying to make sense of bewildering historical events and to find inner peace. Nerzhin, like both Levin and Bezukhov, finds his answer in a peasant, although he believes that the peasants are no more stoic, no firmer of spirit, and no

more farsighted than any other people. In Spiridon, however, Nerzhin sees a human being one can learn from. Tolstoi was also a significant exemplar for Solzhenitsyn in a number of other important characterisations and scenes.

In One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich and The First Circle, the relationship between Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoi is evident, although in neither work is there a direct reference to Tolstoi or to any of Tolstoi's works. However, in Cancer Ward and in August 1914 the relationship between the two authors is overt with direct references by Solzhenitsyn to some of Tolstoi's works and ideas.

In Cancer Ward Solzhenitsyn mentions several of Tolstoi's stories and one, "What People Live By," forms the thematic basis of the novel. Each of Solzhenitsyn's characters is confronted with Tolstoi's ultimate question and each offers a different response depending on the experience of his generation. However, the relationship between Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoi in Cancer Ward is not restricted to "What People Live By" for there is also a relationship between Solzhenitsyn's novel and Tolstoi's The Death of Ivan Il'ich. Both Cancer Ward and The Death of Ivan Il'ich deal with disease, and the purpose of life; both have similar protagonists who undergo similar experiences before their death. However, Solzhenitsyn's novel is a much broader study: it deals with a large cast of characters whereas Tolstoi's story deals only with one person. Though the conclusions reached in The Death of Ivan Il'ich and Cancer Ward are similar, they, nevertheless, differ in that Tolstoi frightens the reader by showing what lies ahead of him, whereas Solzhenitsyn shows what awaits him in a simple and less threatening

manner. In The Death of Ivan Il'ich death conquers life; in Cancer Ward life conquers death and the future conquers the past.

In August 1914 there are similarities with Tolstoi's work in characters, settings, and themes, and the references to Tolstoi are direct. The polemic with Tolstoi, already evident in Cancer Ward, comes to the fore in August 1914. This novel is closely related to Tolstoi's War and Peace. Both novels are historical with central subjects of both being wars which engulfed Russia. Solzhenitsyn deals with an episode of World War I of 1914 and Tolstoi the Napoleonic war of 1812, and both interweave war sequences with scenes of peace. Both narratives tell what happens from the viewpoint both of the commanders and officers and of the common soldiers, thus presenting a comprehensive view of war. Both authors introduce a large cast of characters and many of Solzhenitsyn's characters are reminiscent of Tolstoi's. The relationship between the two authors, however, is complex and contradictory. In War and Peace Tolstoi was concerned with the universals of human behavior and the inscrutable laws of history. Tolstoi believed that "great" men do not create history for, although there are laws of history, they are for the most part unknown. A man, in Tolstoi's view, is powerless to change the course of events, which is predestined, because history is governed by much greater powers. Solzhenitsyn, although he seemingly accepts Tolstoi's interpretation of history as expressed in War and Peace, in fact disagrees with Tolstoi. Solzhenitsyn believes that individuals not only can but must be responsible for what happens.

There is thus a relationship between the works of Solzhenitsyn

and Tolstoi, for Tolstoi has provided models for Solzhenitsyn in several ways. Although Solzhenitsyn creates his own unique world, both Tolstoi and Solzhenitsyn have similar themes and raise similar questions. However, as Solzhenitsyn has progressed in the writing of the novels discussed here, it is evident that though the themes and the questions are similar, Solzhenitsyn becomes increasingly more ready to engage in polemics with Tolstoi. Perhaps because of temperament and biography, the "answers" which Solzhenitsyn provides, resting ultimately as they do on a belief in the possibility of man's creating a better life and a better future, are in the end more positive than Tolstoi's.

APPENDIX

Russian Text of Quotations

Chapter II

P. 14, n. 8:

Работа — она как палка, конца в ней два: для людей делаешь — качество дай, для начальника делаешь — дай показуху.

P. 14, n. 9:

И не видел больше Шухов ни озора дальнего, где солнце блеснило по снегу, ни как по зоне разбредались из обогривалок работяги.... Шухов видел только стену свою — от развязки с лева, где кладка поднималась ступеньками выше пояса, и направо до угла, где сходились его стена и Кильдигсова. Стену в этом месте прежде клал неизвестный каменщик, не разумея или холтура, а теперь Шухов обвыкал со стеной, как со своей.

P. 15, n. 13:

Разлилось по его телу — аж нутро его всё трепьхается навстречу баланде. Хор — рошо! Вот он, миг короткий, для которого и живёт эк.

P. 17, n. 15:

По началу очень хотел и каждый вечер считал, сколько дней от срока прошло, сколько осталось. А потом надоело. А потом проясняться стало, что домой таких не пускают, гонят в ссылку. И где ему будет житуха лучше — тут ли, там — неведомо. Толькоб то и хотелось ему у Бога просить, чтобы домой.

P. 17, n. 16:

"Здесь тебе есть время о душе подумать."

P. 18, n. 17:

"Вишь, Алёшка," — Шухов ему разъяснил, — "у тебя как-то ладно получается: Христос тебе сидеть велел, за Христа ты и сел. А я за что сел? За то, что в сорок первом к войне не приготовились, за это? А я причём?"

Р. 18, п. 18:

"Ведь в России воображают Кавказ как-то величественно, с вечными девственными льдами, бурными потоками, с кинжалами, бурками, черкешенками, — всё это страшное что-то, а в сущности ничего в этом нету весёлого. Ежели бы они знали по крайней мере, что в девственных льдах мы никогда не бываем, да и быть в них ничего весёлого нет, а что Кавказ разделяется на губернии: Ставропольскую, Тифлискую и т.д."

Р. 19, п. 19:

"Всё то, отчего я, по преданию, поехал лечиться на Кавказ, всё приехало со мной сюда, только с той разницей, что прежде всё это было на большой лестнице, а теперь на маленькой, на грязненькой, на каждой ступеньке я нахожу миллионы маленьких тревог, гадостей, оскорблений; чувствую, как я с каждым днём морально падаю ниже и ниже, и главное, что чувствую себя не способным к здешней службе: я не могу переносить опасности, просто я не храбр."

Р. 19, п. 21:

"Всё моё старанье казаться хладнокровным и все наши хитрые фразы показались мне вдруг невыносимо глупыми после этого простодушного восклицания."

Р. 21, п. 24:

какую-то неясную массу и ужасно много крови.

Р. 22, п. 26:

В пять часов утра, как всегда, пробило подъём — молотком об рельс у штабного барака. За окном всё также, как и среди ночи, когда Шухов вставал к параше, была тьма и тьма, да попадало три жёлтых фонаря

Р. 22, п. 27:

Мороз был со мглой прихватывающий дыхание. Два больших прожектора били по зоне наперекрест с дальних угловых вышек. Светили фонари зоны и внутренние фонари. Так много их было натыкано, что они совсем засветляли звёзды.

Р. 22, п. 28:

Всё ещё темно было, хотя небо с восхода зеленело и светлело, и тонкий, злой потягивал с восхода ветерок.

Р. 22, п. 29:

Напересек через ворота проволочные, и через всю строительную зону, и через дальнюю проволоку, что по тот бок, — солнце встаёт большое, красное, как бы во мгле.

Р. 22, п. 30:

Солнце взошло красное, мглистое над зоной пустой.

Р. 22, п. 31:

Солнце выше подтянулось, мглицу разогнало, и столбов не стало — и алым заиграло внутри.

Р. 23, п. 32:

Шухов поднял голову на небо и ахнул: небо чистое, а солнышко почти к обеду поднялось.

Р. 23, п. 33:

Солнце яро блещет глаз не раскроешь.

Р. 23, п. 34:

Оглянулся Шухов. Да, солнышко на заходе. С краснинкой заходит и в туман вроде бы седенький.

Р. 23, п. 35:

Солнце и закрытком верхним за землю ушло.

Р. 23, п. 36:

Отпыхался Шухов пока, оглянулся — а месяц-то, батюшка, нахмурился багрово, уж на небо весь вылез.

Р. 23, п. 37:

Высоко месяц вылез! Ещё столько — и на самом верху будет. Небо белое, аж с сузеленью, звёзды яркие да редкие. Снег белый блестит, бараков стены тоже белые — и фонари мало влияют.

Р. 22, п. 38:

В три часа утра, когда ещё было совершенно темно, с меня сдёрнули обогретый тулуп, и багровый огонь свечки неприятно поразил мои заспанные глаза.

Р. 22, п. 39:

Было темно, туманно и холодно. Ночные костры, светившиеся там и сям по лагерю, — освещая фигуры сонных солдат, расположившихся около них, увеличивали темноту своим багровым светом.

Р. 22, п. 40:

Туман заметно начинал белеть на востоке, сырость становилась ощутительнее, и окружающие предметы постепенно выходили из мрака.

Р. 22, п. 41:

Светлый круг солнца просвечивающий сквозь молочное — белый туман, уже поднялся довольно высоко; серо — лиловый горизонт постепенно расширялся и хотя гораздо дальше, но также резко ограничивался обманчивой белой стеною тумана.

Рр. 22-3, п. 42:

Туман уже совершенно поднялся и, принимая формы облаков, постепенно исчезал в тёмно — голубой синеве неба;

открывшееся солнце ярко светило и бросало весёлые отблески на сталь штыков, медь орудий, оттаивающую землю и блески инея. В воздухе слышалась свежесть утреннего мороза вместе с теплом весеннего солнца;

Р. 23, п. 43:

Начинало смеркаться. По небу ползли сине — беловатые тучи. Туман, превратившийся в мелкую сырую мглу, мочил землю и солдатские шинели; горизонт суживался, и вся окрестность принимала мрачные тени.

Р. 23, п. 44:

Уже была тёмная ночь, и только костры тускло освещали лагерь, Запах тумана и дыма от сырых дров, распространяясь по всему воздуху, ел глаза, и та же сырая мгла сыпалась с мрачного неба.

Chapter III

Р. 25, п. 1:

"Никогда я не был так блаженно счастлив, как сегодня! Куда я попал? Завтра меня не погонят в леденную воду! Сорок грамм сливочного масла!! Чёрный хлеб на — столах! Не запрещают книг! Можно самому бриться! Надзератели не бьют эжов! Что за великий день? Что за сияющая вершина? Может быть, я умер? Может быть, мне это снится? Мне чудится, я — в раю!!"

Р. 26, п. 2:

"Нет, уважаемый, вы по-прежнему в аду, но поднялись в его лучший высший круг — в первый. Вы спрашиваете, что такое шарашка? Шарашку придумал, если хотите, Данте. Он разрывался — куда ему поместить античных мудрецов? Долг христианина повелевал кинуть этих язычников в ад. Но совесть возрожденца не могла примириться, чтобы светлоумных мужей смешать с прочими грешниками и обречь телесным пыткам. И Данте придумал для них в аду особое место."

Р. 26, п. 3:

Чего-то всегда постоянно боюсь, остаётся ли мы людьми?

Р. 28, п. 4:

"Что дороже всего в мире? Оказывается, сознавать, что ты не участвуешь в несправедливостях. Они были и будут, но пусть — не через тебя."

Р. 28, п. 5:

жизнь даётся нам только раз.

Р. 28, п. 6:

совесть тоже даётся нам один только раз.

Рр. 28-9, п. 7:

Да, у него было столько благ! — но никогда не было самого бесценного блага: свободы говорить, что думаешь, свободы явного общения с равными по уму людьми. И как обидно умереть, не обменявшись с ними умом и душой.

Р. 33, п. 16:

С кого начинать исправлять мир? С других? Или с себя?

Р. 34, п. 17:

"Нет! Это не по моей специальности!" — звеняще пискнул он, — "сажать людей в тюрьму — не по моей специальности! Я — не ловец человеков! Довольно, что нас посадили."

Р. 35, п. 20:

Быть самим собой точку зрения, которая становится дороже самой жизни.

Р. 36, п. 22:

Его родиной была — семья.
Его религией была — семья.

Р. 42, п. 46:

"Лучший социализм! Иначе, чем у Сталина! Сопляк! Социализм без Сталина — это готовый фашизм!"

Р. 44, п. 54:

"Я говорил, что падшую женщину надо простить, но я не говорил, что я могу простить. Я не могу."

Р. 44, п. 55:

"Но обнять свою жену после того, как её обнимал другой? — бр - р! биологически не могу."

Chapter IV

Р. 50, п. 5:

что есть в людях, и чего не дано людям, и чем люди живы.

Р. 50, п. 6:

Припасает себе человек на год, а не знает, что не будет жив до вечера.

Р. 51, п. 9:

"Лю - бо - व्यю!?!.. Не - ет, это не наша мораль!"

Р. 54, п. 13:

не почувствовал сожаления Поддуев не был ценным для общества человеком.

Р. 54, п. 14:

От Бога зависит, ... Богу всё видно.

Р. 54, п. 15:

"если ему всё видно — зачем же тогда на одного валить? Ведь надо же распределять как-то."

Р. 54, п. 16:

А если не покориться — так что другое делать?

Р. 55, п. 17:

"Помните как в газетах писали: 'как один человек всколыхнулся весь русский народ, узнав о беспримерно-подлых злодеяниях.' Вот это 'как один человек' вы знаете чего стоит? Люди мы все-все разные, и вдруг 'как один человек?'"

Р. 55, п. 18:

народишка наш весь умом оскудел.

Р. 59, п. 23:

вместе — и не вместе.

Р. 59, п. 26:

сапоги Костоглотова, как мертвые побалтывались над проходом носками вниз.

Р. 63, п. 33:

Не пьжились они, не отбивались, не хвастали, что не умрут, — все они принимали смерть спокойно И отходили облегчённо, будто просто перебирались в другую избу. И никого из них нельзя было бы напугать раком.

Р. 63, п. 34:

"Как же так может с ним, с Ефремом? Как же это будет? И что надо делать?"

Р. 63, п. 35:

"Не может быть. Не может быть, а есть. Как же это? Как понять это?"

Р. 65, п. 40:

"Ради Христа, дай мне умереть спокойно."

Р. 65, п. 42:

"что вот вы там чего-то напугались, а мы сейчас вам всё устроим."

Р. 65, п. 43:

"Им всё равно, а они также умрут. Дурачьё. Мне раньше, а им после; и им тоже будет. А они радуются. Скоты!"

Р. 66, п. 44:

"И ты будешь умирать."

Р. 66, п. 45:
Хоть что-нибудь своё пронести бы через смерть.

Р. 67, п. 48:
"Жить, жить хочу!"

Р. 67, п. 51:
"Не наелся — не налижешься."

Р. 67, п. 53:
"Родится — вертится, растёт — бесится, помрёт — туда дорога."

Р. 68, п. 54:
какая-то сила толкнула его в грудь, в бок, ещё сильнее сдвинуло ему дыхание, он провалился в дыру, и там, в конце дыры, засветилось что-то.

Chapter V

Р. 72, п. 2:
"Не нами неправда сталась, не нами и кончится."

Р. 75, п. 11:
Генерал Благовещенский читал у Льва Толстого о Кутузове и сам в 60 лет при седине, полноте, мало-подвижности чувствовал себя именно Кутузовым Как Кутузов, он был осмотрителен, и осторожен, и хитёр. И, как толстовский Кутузов, он понимал, что никогда не надо производить никаких собственных решительных резких распоряжений; что ИЗ СРАЖЕНИЯ, НАЧАТОГО ПРОТИВ ЕГО ВОЛИ, НИЧЕГО НЕ ВЫЙДЕТ, КРОМЕ ПУТАНИЦЫ; что ЕСТЬ НЕИЗБЕЖНЫЙ ХОД СОБЫТИЙ и лучший полководец тот, кто ОТРЕКАЕТСЯ ОТ УЧАСТИЯ В ЭТИХ СОБЫТИЯХ.

Р. 76, п. 13:
И тут бы утешиться нам толстовским убеждением, что не генералы ведут войска, ... не президенты и лидеры правят государствами и партиями — да слишком много раз показал нам XX век, что именно они.

Р. 78, п. 17:
"Россию жалко"

Р. 78, п. 18:
у людей образованных так, что великий человек России и граф.

Р. 82, п. 25:
"Служить добру. И через это создавать Царство Божие на земле."

Р. 83, п. 27:

"Когда трубит труба — мужчина должен быть мужчиной. Хотя бы — для самого себя."

Р. 83, п. 30:

"Никогда ни за кого не пойду замуж, а пойду в танцовщицы."

Р. 83, п. 32:

Она уже видела себя в грубом рубище, шагающей с палочкой и котомочкой по пыльной дороге, направляя своё странствие без зависти, без любви человеческой, без желаний, от угодников к угодникам, и в конце концов туда, где нет печали, не вздыхания а вечная радость и блаженство.

Р. 86, п. 39:

.... стрела калёная вынута из груди. Хоть и с мясом.

Р. 86, п. 41:

он имел вид человека, не имеющего времени думать о впечатлении, какое он производит на других, и занятого делом приятным и интересным. Лицо его выражало больше довольства собой и окружающими; улыбка и взгляд его были веселее и привлекательнее.

Р. 87, п. 44:

непостижимым, круглым и вечным олицетворением духа простоты и правды.

Р. 87, п. 45:

никогда не услужливое, а всегда достойноготовое, доброжелательное даже до снисходительности, не дерзкое, но живущее осмысленной отдельной волей.

Р. 89, п. 48:

"Господи! Если можешь — прости меня и прими меня. Ты видишь: ничего я не мог иначе и ничего не могу."

NOTES

CHAPTER I

¹ For example, see articles by K. Feuer, M. McCarthy, and M. Ehre in Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn: Critical Essays and Documentary Materials, ed. John B. Dunlop, Richard Haugh, and Alexis Klimoff (Belmont, Massachusetts: Nordland Publishing Company, 1973).

² Helene Zymoyska, "Solzhenitsyn and the Grand Tradition," in Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn: Critical Essays and Documentary Materials, pp. 203-204.

³ Deming Brown, "Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn," in Soviet Russian Literature since Stalin (Cambridge: University Press, Cambridge, 1979), p. 310.

⁴ Leopold Labedz, ed. Solzhenitsyn: A Documentary Record, 2nd ed. (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1974), pp. 218-219.

⁵ Ibid., p. 219.

⁶ Ibid., p. 23.

⁷ Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, "Nobel Lecture," in Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn: Critical Essays and Documentary Materials, p. 489.

⁸ Ibid., pp. 489-490.

CHAPTER II

¹ Leopold Labedz, ed. Solzhenitsyn: A Documentary Record, 2nd ed. (Baltimore: Penquin Books, 1974), p. 40.

² Richard Luplow, "Narrative Style and Structure in One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich," Russian Literature Triquarterly, 1 (1971), p. 399.

³ Kathryn b. Feuer, "Solzhenitsyn and the Legacy of Tolstoy," in Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn: Critical Essays and Documentary Materials, ed. John B. Dunlop, Ricahrd Haugh, and Alexis Klimoff (Belmont, Massachusetts: Nordland Publishing Company, 1973), p. 310.

⁴ Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, "Odin den' Ivana Denisovicha," in Rassakzy, vol. III of Sobranie sochinenii (Vermont-Paris: YMCA PRESS, 1978), p. 55. All translations are my own. E.K.

⁵ L.N. Tolstoi, "Rubka lesa," in Proizvedeniia 1852-1856 gg,

vol III of Polnoe sobranie sochinenii (Moscow, 1932; rpt. Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus-Thomson, 1972), p. 60. All translations are my own. E.K.

⁶ Ibid., p. 54.

⁷ The material on Ivan Denisovich as narrator is based on Vladimir J. Rus', "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich: A Point of View Analysis," Canadian Slavonic Papers, 13, No. 1 (1971), pp. 165-178.

⁸ Solzhenitsyn, "Odin den' Ivana Denisovicha," p. 14.

⁹ Ibid., p. 66.

¹⁰ Christopher Moody, Solzhenitsyn (Edinburg: Oliver and Boyd, 1973), p. 40.

¹¹ L.N. Tolstoi, Voina i mir, vols. IX-XII of Polnoe sobranie sochinenii (Moscow, 1932; rpt. Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus-Thomson, 19), XXII, p. 50. All translations are my own. E.K.

¹² Solzhenitsyn, "Odin den' Ivana Denisovicha," p. 7.

¹³ Ibid., p. 101.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 16.

¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 117-118.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 117.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 118

¹⁸ Tolstoi, "Rubka lesa," p. 54.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 55.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 54.

²¹ Ibid., p. 56.

²² Ibid., p. 61.

²³ Ibid., p. 70.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 58.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Solzhenitsyn, "Odin den' Ivana Denisovicha," p. 7.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 11.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 23.

- 29 Ibid., p. 33.
- 30 Ibid., p. 35.
- 31 Ibid., P. 45.
- 32 Ibid., p. 47.
- 33 Ibid., p. 65.
- 34 Ibid., p. 73.
- 35 Ibid., p. 75.
- 36 Ibid., p. 76.
- 37 Ibid., p. 113.
- 38 Tolstoi, "Rubka lesa," p. 40.
- 39 Ibid., pp. 40-41.
- 40 Ibid., p. 42.
- 41 Ibid., p. 51.
- 42 Ibid., p. 57.
- 43 Ibid., p. 61.
- 44 Ibid., p. 70.

CHAPTER III

¹ Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, V krughe pervom, vols. I-II of Sobranie sochinenii (Vermont-Paris: YMCA PRESS, 1978), I, 24. All translations are my own. E.K.

- ² Ibid.
- ³ Ibid., p. 15.
- ⁴ Ibid., II, 72.
- ⁵ Ibid., p. 69.
- ⁶ Ibid., p. 76.
- ⁷ Ibid., pp. 352-353.

⁸ L.N. Tolstoi, Voskresenie, vol. XXXII of Polnoe sobranie sochinenii (Moscow, 1932; rpt. Nendeln-Liechenstein: Kraus Thomson, 1972), p. 53. All translations are my own. E.K.

- ⁹ Ibid., p. 65.
- ¹⁰ Ibid., p. 102.
- ¹¹ Ibid., p. 374.
- ¹² Ibid., pp. 373-374.
- ¹³ Solzhenitsyn, V krughe pervom, I, 350.
- ¹⁴ Ibid., p. 353.
- ¹⁵ Tolstoi, Voskresenie, p. 313.
- ¹⁶ Solzhenitsyn, V krughe pervom, II, 182.
- ¹⁷ Ibid., p. 281.
- ¹⁸ Ibid., I, 52-53.
- ¹⁹ Ibid., II, 132.
- ²⁰ Ibid., p. 133.
- ²¹ Ibid.
- ²² Ibid., pp. 142-143.
- ²³ Ibid., pp. 148.
- ²⁴ Leonid Rzhnevsky, Solzhenitsyn: Creator and Heroic Deed, trans. Sonja Miller (Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1978), p. 61.
- ²⁵ L.N. Tolstoi, Anna Karenina, vols. XVIII-XIX of Polnoe sobranie sochinenii (Moscow, 1932; rpt. Nendeln-Liechtenstein: Kraus-Thomson, 1972), XIX, p. 376. All translations are my own. E.K.
- ²⁶ Rzhnevsky, Solzhenitsyn: Creator and Heroic Deed, p. 61.
- ²⁷ Christopher Moody, Solzhenitsyn (Edinburg: Oliver and Boyd, 1973), pp. 119-120.
- ²⁸ L.N. Tolstoi, Voina i mir, vols. IX-XII of Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, (Moscow, 1932; rpt. Nendeln-Liechtenstein: Kraus-Thomson, 1972), XII, p. 4. All translations are my own. E.K.
- ²⁹ Ibid., XII, p. 48.
- ³⁰ Ibid., XII, p. 50.
- ³¹ Kathryn B. Feuer, "Solzhenitsyn and the Legacy of Tolstoy," in Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn: Critical Essays and Documentary Materials, ed. John B. Dunlop, Richard Haugh, and Alexis Klimoff (Belmont, Massachusetts: Nordland Publishing Company, 1973), p. 133.

- 32 Solzhenitsyn, V krughe pervom, I, 370-71.
- 33 Ibid.
- 34 Ibid., p. 369.
- 35 Tolstoi, Anna Karenina, XIX, p. 44.
- 36 Feuer, "Solzhenitsyn and the Legacy of Tolstoy," p. 133.
- 37 Solzhenitsyn, V krughe pervom, II, 92.
- 38 Feuer, "Solzhenitsyn and the Legacy of Tolstoy," p. 134.
- 39 Solzhenitsyn, V krughe pervom, II, 94.
- 40 Tolstoi, Voina i mir, IX, p. 70.
- 41 Feuer, "Solzhenitsyn and the Legacy of Tolstoy," p. 134.
- 42 Susan Layton, "The Mind of the Tyrant: Tolstoi's Nicholas and Solzhenitsyn's Stalin," Soviet and East European Journal, 23, No. 4 (1979), p. 482.
- 43 L.N. Tolstoi, "Khadzhi -Mural," in Proizvedeniia 1902-1904, vol. XXXV of Polnoe sobranie sochinenii (Moscow, 1932; rpt. Nendeln-Liechtenstein: Kraus-Thomson, 1972), p. 69. All translations are my own. E.K.
- 44 Ibid.
- 45 Feuer, "Solzhenitsyn and the Legacy of Tolstoy," p. 134.
- 46 Solzhenitsyn, V krughe pervom, I, 145.
- 47 Ibid.
- 48 Solzhenitsyn, V krughe pervom, I, 167.
- 49 Tolstoi, "Khadzhi-Murat," p. 74.
- 50 Layton, "The Mind of the Tyrant: Tolstoy's Nicholas and Solzhenitsyn's Stalin," p. 483.
- 51 Ibid., pp. 482-483.
- 52 Feuer, "Solzhenitsyn and the Legacy of Tolstoy," p. 140.
- 53 Ibid.
- 54 Tolstoi, Voina i mir, X, p. 371.
- 55 Solzhenitsyn, V krughe pervom, II, 43.
- 56 Ibid., I, 201.

- 57 Ibid., II, 116-117.
- 58 Tolstoi, Anna Karenina, XVIII, p. 266-267.
- 59 Feuer, "Solzhenitsyn and the Legacy of Tolstoy," p. 130.
- 60 Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, The Oak and the Calf, trans. by Harry Willets (New York: Harper and Rod, 1980), p. 458.

CHAPTER IV

- 1 Christopher Moody, Solzhenitsyn (Edinburg: Oliver and Boyd, 1973), pp. 138-9.
- 2 Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, Rakovyi korpus, vol. IV of Sobranie sochinenii (Vermont-Paris: YMCA Press, 1979), p. 102. All translations, unless otherwise indicated, are my own. E.K.
- 3 Ibid., p. 106.
- 4 Ibid., p. 107.
- 5 L.N. Tolstoi, "Chem liudi zhivy" in Proizvedeniia 1880-kh godov, vol. XXV of Polnoe sobranie sochinenii (Moscow, 1932; rpt. Nendeln-Liechtenstein: Kraus-Thomson, 1972), p. 23. All translations are my own. E.K.
- 6 Ibid., p. 24.
- 7 Ibid., p. 25.
- 8 Helen Muchnic, "Cancer Ward: of Fate and Guilt," in Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn: Critical Essays and Documentary Materials, ed. John B. Dunlop, Richard Haugh, and Alexis Klimoff (Belmont, Massachusetts: Nordland Publishing Company, 1973), p. 279.
- 9 Solzhenitsyn, Rakovyi korpus, p. 107.
- 10 Ibid., p. 189.
- 11 Ibid., pp. 184-185.
- 12 Ibid., p. 273.
- 13 Ibid., p. 252.
- 14 Ibid., p. 124.
- 15 Ibid.
- 16 Ibid.
- 17 Ibid., p. 407.

- 18 Ibid., p. 408.
- 19 Ibid., p. 237.
- 20 Ibid., p. 420.
- 21 Ibid., p. 120.
- 22 Ibid., p. 322.
- 23 Ibid., p. 486.
- 24 Helen Muchnic, "Cancer Ward: of Fate and Guilt," p. 289.
- 25 Ibid.
- 26 Solzhenitsyn, Rakovyi korpus, p. 501.
- 27 Helen Muchnic, "Cancer Ward: of Fate and Guilt," p. 290.
- 28 Ludmila Koehler, "Eternal Themes in Solzhenitsyn's The Cancer Ward," The Russian Review, 28 (1969), p. 63.
- 29 Ibid., p. 64.
- 30 Michael Beresford, ed., Introd., Smert' Ivana Il'icha, by L. N. Tolstoi (Letchworth, Hertfordshire: Bradda Books, 1976), p. 7.
- 31 The material on Ivan Il'ich is based on Y. J. Dayananda, "The Death of Ivan Ilyich: A Psychological Study on Death and Dying," Literature and Psychology, 22, no. 4 (1972), pp. 191-198.
- 32 Solzhenitsyn, Rakovyi korpus, p. 99.
- 33 Ibid., p. 101.
- 34 Ibid., p. 100.
- 35 L. N. Tolstoi, "Smert' Ivana Il'icha," in Proizvedeniia 1885-1889, vol. XXVI of Polnoe sobranie sochinenii (Moscow, 1932; rpt. Nendeln-Liechtenstein: Kraus-Thomson, 1972), p. 93. All translations are my own. E.K.
- 36 Ibid., pp 98-99.
- 37 Ibid., p. 88.
- 38 Solzhenitsyn, Rakovyi korpus, p. 100.
- 39 Ibid., p. 99.
- 40 Tolstoi, "Smert' Ivana Il'icha," p. 109.

- 41 Ibid., p. 101.
- 42 Ibid., p. 100.
- 43 Ibid., p. 91.
- 44 Solzhenitsyn, Rakovyi korpus, p. 199.
- 45 Ibid., p. 200.
- 46 Tolstoi, "Smert' Ivana Il'icha," p. 100.
- 47 Ibid., p. 111.
- 48 Ibid.
- 49 Dayananda, "The Death of Ivan Il'ich: a Psychological Study on Death and Dying," p. 196.
- 50 Solzhenitsyn, Rakovyi korpus, p. 195.
- 51 Ibid., p. 197.
- 52 Tolstoi, "Smert' Ivana Il'icha," p. 105.
- 53 Solzhenitsyn, Rakovyi korpus, p. 202, quoted from Cancer Ward, trans. by Nicholas Bethell and David Burg (New York: Bantam Books, 1972), p. 206.
- 54 Tolstoi, "Smert' Ivana Il'icha," p. 112.
- 55 Ibid., p. 113.
- 56 Ibid.
- 57 Deming Brown, "Cancer Ward and The First Circle," Slavic Review, 28, no. 2 (1969), p. 305.
- 58 A. Solzhenitsyn, Bodalsia telenok s dubom: ocherki literaturnoi zhizni (Paris: YMCA Press, 1975), p. 514.

CHAPTER V

- 1 Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, Avgust chetyrnadsatogo, Knot I, 2nd ed. (Paris: YMCA Press, 1971), p. 572. All translations are my own. E.K.
- 2 Ibid., p. 571.
- 3 Edward E. Ericson, Jr., "Solzhenitsyn and the Truth of History," The Intercollegiate Review, 8 (Spring, 1973), p. 178.

- ⁴ Edward E. Ericson, Jr., Solzhenitsyn: The Moral Vision, with a Foreword by Malcolm Muggeridge (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980), p. 121.
- ⁵ Ibid.
- ⁶ Kathryn B. Feuer, "August 1914: Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoi," in Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn: Critical Essays and Documentary Materials, ed. John B. Dunlop, Richard Haugh, and Alexis Klimoff (Belmont, Massachusetts: Nordland Publishing Company, 1973), p. 357.
- ⁷ Philip Rahv, "In Dubious Battle," in Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn: Critical Essays and Documentary Materials, p. 357.
- ⁸ L. N. Tolstoi, Voina i mir, vols. IX-XII of Polnoe sobranie sochinenii (Moscow, 1932; rpt. Nendeln-Liechtenstein: Kraus-Thomson, 1972), XI, pp. 264-270; XII, pp. 66-69. All translations are my own. E.K.
- ⁹ Solzhenitsyn, Avgust chetyrnadtsatogo, pp. 376-377.
- ¹⁰ Victor Erlich, "Solzhenitsyn's Quest," in Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn: Critical Essays and Documentary Materials, p. 353.
- ¹¹ Solzhenitsyn, Avgust chetyrnadtsatogo, pp. 463-464.
- ¹² Rahv, "In Dubious Battle," p. 358.
- ¹³ Solzhenitsyn, Avgust chetyrnadtsatogo, p. 350.
- ¹⁴ Andrei Kodjak, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1978), p. 132.
- ¹⁵ Mary McCarthy, "The Tolstoy Connection," in Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn: Critical Essays and Documentary Materials, p. 348.
- ¹⁶ Ibid., p. 336.
- ¹⁷ Solzhenitsyn, Avgust chetyrnadtsatogo, p. 18.
- ¹⁸ Ibid., p. 32.
- ¹⁹ T. M. Rickwood, "Theme and Style in Solzhenitsyn's August 1914," Slavic and East European Studies, 17 (1972), p. 23.
- ²⁰ Solzhenitsyn, Avgust chetyrnadtsatogo, pp. 487-492.
- ²¹ Milton Ehre, "On August 1914," in Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn: Critical Essays and Documentary Materials, p. 367.
- ²² Solzhenitsyn, Avgust chetyrnadtsatogo, p. 45.
- ²³ Feuer, "August 1914: Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoy," p. 378.

- 24 Ibid., p. 374.
- 25 Solzhenitsyn, Avgust chetyrnadtsatogo, p. 23.
- 26 Ibid.
- 27 Ibid., p. 378.
- 28 Feuer, "August 1914: Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoy," p. 373.
- 29 Solzhenitsyn, Avgust chetyrnadtsatogo, p. 39.
- 30 Tolstoi, Voina i mir, X, p. 9.
- 31 Feuer, "August 1914: Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoy," p. 373.
- 32 Tolstoi, Voina i mir, X, p. 237.
- 33 Solzhenitsyn, Avgust chetyrnadtsatogo, p. 41.
- 34 Tolstoi, Voina i mir, IX, p. 114.
- 35 Solzhenitsyn, Avgust chetyrnadtsatogo, p. 118.
- 36 Rahv, "In Dubious Battle," in Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn: Critical Essays and Documentary Materials, p. 359.
- 37 Solzhenitsyn, Avgust chetyrnadtsatogo, p. 330.
- 38 Ibid., p. 571.
- 39 Ibid.
- 40 Feuer, "August 1914: Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoy," p. 374.
- 41 Tolstoi, Voina i mir, IX, p. 151.
- 42 Rickwood, "Theme and Style in Solzhenitsyn's August 1914," p. 28.
- 43 Kodjak, Alexander Solzhenitsyn, p. 133.
- 44 Tolstoi, Voina i mir, XII, p. 50.
- 45 Solzhenitsyn, Avgust chetyrnadtsatogo, p. 245.
- 46 Ibid., p. 234.
- 47 Ibid., p. 265.
- 48 Ibid., p. 430.
- 49 Ibid., p. 570.

- 50 Christopher Moody, Solzhenitsyn (Edinburg: Oliver and Boyd, 1973), p. 175.
- 51 Feuer, "August 1914: Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoy," p. 374.
- 52 Tolstoi, Voina i mir, XI, p. 172.
- 53 Ibid., IX, p. 319.
- 54 Feuer, "August 1914: Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoy," p. 374.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Solzhenitsyn

Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr. Avgust chetyrnadtsatogo, Knot I. Paris: YMCA PRESS, 1971.

----- . V krughe pervom. Vols I-II of Sobranie sochinenii. Vermont-Paris: YMCA PRESS, 1978.

----- . "Odin den' Ivana Denisovicha." In Rasskazy. Vol. III of Sobranie sochinenii. Vermont-Paris: YMCA PRESS, 1978. Pp. 7-122.

----- . Rakovyi korpus. Vol. IV of Sobranie sochinenii. Vermont-Paris: YMCA PRESS, 1979.

----- . Bodalsia telenok s dubom: ocherki literaturnoi zhizni. Paris: YMCA PRESS, 1975.

----- . Cancer Ward. Trans. by Nicholas Bethell and David Burg. New York: Bantam Books, 1972.

----- . The Oak and the Calf. Trans. by Harry Willetts. New York: Harper and Row, 1980.

Tolstoi

Tolstoi, L.N. Anna Karenina. Vols. XVIII-XIX of Polnoe sobranie sochinenii. Moscow, 1932; rpt. Nendeln-Liechtenstein: Kraus-Thomson, 1972.

----- . "Chem liudi zhivy." In Proizvedeniia 1880-kh godov. Vol. XXV of Polnoe sobranie sochinenii. Moscow, 1932; rpt. Nendeln-liechtenstein: Kraus-Thomson, 1972. Pp. 7-25.

----- . "Khadzhi Murat." In Proizvedeniia 1902-1904 gg. Vol. XXXV of Polnoe sobranie sochinenii. Moscow, 1932; rpt. Nendeln-Liechtenstein: Kraus-Thomson, 1972. Pp. 5-120.

----- . "Rubka lesa." In Proizvedeniia 1852-1856 gg. Vol. III of Polnoe sobranie sochinenii. Moscow, 1932; rpt. Nendeln-Liechtenstein: Kraus-Thomson, 1972. Pp. 40-74.

- . "Smert' Ivana Il'icha." In Proizvedeniia 1885-1889 gg. Vol. XXVI of Polnoe sobranie sochinenii. Moscow, 1932; rpt. Nendeln-Liechtenstein: Kraus-Thomson, 1972. Pp. 61-113.
- . Voina i mir. Vols. IX-XII of Polnoe sobranie sochinenii. Moscow, 1932; rpt. Nendeln-liechtenstein: Kraus-Thomson, 1972.
- . Voskresenie. Vol. XXXIII of Polnoe sobranie sochinenii. Moscow, 1932; rpt. Nendeln-Liechtenstein: Kraus-Thomson, 1972.

Secondary Sources

Solzhenitsyn

- Allback, Steven. Alexander Solzhenitsyn. New York: Taplinger Publishing Company, 1978.
- Atkinson, Dorothy G. "Solzhenitsyn's Heroes as Russian Historical Types." Russian Review, 30, No. 1 (1971), 1-16.
- . "August 1914: Art and History." Russian Review, 31, No. 1 (1972), 1-10.
- Belikov, A. V. "Alexander Solzenicyn i bol'nye rakovogo korpusa." Novyi Zurnal, 93, (1968), 209-20.
- Bolen, Val G. "Language and Style in Solzenicyn's August 1914." Slavic and East European Journal, 21 (1977), 344-53.
- . "Ob obraznosti v Avuguste chetyrnadcatogo !" Russian Language Journal, 106 (1976), 161-70.
- Brown, Deming. "Cancer Ward and The First Circle." Slavic Review, 28, No. 2 (1969), 304-13.
- . "Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn." In Soviet Russian Literature since Stalin. Cambridge: University Press, Cambridge, 1979, 310-330.
- Brown, Edward J. "Solzenicyn's Cast of Characters." Slavic and East European Journal, 15, No. 2 (1971), 153-66.
- Christesen, Nina. "Alexander Solzhenitsyn's August 1914." Journal of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association, 36 (1971), 153-56.
- Clement, Oliver. The Spirit of Solzhenitsyn. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1976.
- Dowler, Wayne. "Echoes of Pochvennichestvo in Solzhenitsyn's August 1914." Slavic Review, 34, No. 1 (March, 1975), 109-22.

- Dunlop, John B., Richard Haigh, and Alexis Klimoff, eds. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn: Critical Essays and Documentary Materials. Belmont, Massachusetts: Nordland Publishing Company, 1973.
- Ericson, Edward., Jr. "Solzhenitsyn and the Truth of History." Intercollegiate Review, 8 (1973), 177-82.
- . Solzhenitsyn: The Moral Vision. Foreword by Malcolm Muggeridge. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980.
- Fanger, Donald. "Solzhenitsyn: Ring of Truth." The Nation, 7 October 1968, 341-42.
- Feuer, Kathryn, ed. Solzhenitsyn: A Collection of Critical Essays. Englewood Cliffs. N. J. : Prentice-Hall, 1976.
- Glenny, Michael. "Alexander Solzhenitsyn and Epic Tradition." Harper's, 245 (August, 1972), 50-52.
- . "A New Russian Epic--Solzhenitsyn's August 1914 ." Survey, 18, No. 2 (1972), 112-22.
- Harari, Manya. "Solzhenitsyn's Cancer Ward: Part II." Survey, 69 (1968), 145-49.
- Hayward, Max. "Solzhenitsyn's Place in Contemporary Soviet Literature." Slavic Review, 23, No. 3 (1964), 432-36.
- Jordin, Martin. "One Step Forward, Two Steps Back: The Logic of Cancer Ward." New Zealand Slavonic Journal, 2 (1976), 85-98.
- Kaschkurevich, Tamara. "Nekotorye mysli po povodu Rakovogo korpusa." Russian Language Journal, 34, No. 117 (1980), 135-43.
- Kern, Gary. "Solzhenitsyn's Portrait of Stalin." Slavic Review, 33, No. 1 (1974), 1-22.
- Kisseleff, Natalia. "Literary Allusions and Themes in The First Circle." Canadian Slavonic Papers, 13, No. 1 (1971), 219-34.
- Kodjak, Andrej. Alexander Solzhenitsyn. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1978.
- Koehler, Ludmila. "Alexander Solzhenitsyn and the Russian Literary Tradition." Russian Review, 26, No. 2 (1967), 176-84.
- . "Eternal Themes in Solzhenitsyn's The Cancer Ward." Russian Review, 28 (1969), 53-65.
- Kohan, John. "The Writer as a Cameraman: Pictorial Narrative in August 1914." Modern Fiction Studies, 23 (1977), 73-87.
- Kovaly, Pavel. "Problems of Anti-Humanism and Humanism in the Life and Work of Alexander Solzhenitsyn." Studies in Soviet Thought, 11, No. 1 (1971), 1-18.

- Labeledz, Leopold, ed. Solzhenitsyn: A Documentary Record. 2nd ed. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1974.
- Laksin, V. "Ivan Denisovic, ego druz'ja i nedrugi." Novyi mir, 40, No. 1 (1964), 223-45.
- Luplow, Richard. "Narrative Style and Structure in One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich." Russian Literature Triquarterly, 1 (Fall, 1971), 399-412.
- Mamantov, I. A. "Religioznye motivy u Solzenicyna." Novyi Zurnal, 114 (1974), 220-24.
- Matthews, Irene J. "A. Solzhenitsyn's One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich." The Humanities Association Review, 23, No. 2 (1972), 8-13.
- . "The Struggle for Survival in A. Solzhenitsyn's One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich." Russian Language Journal, 28, No. 100 (1974), 32-39.
- Medvedev, Zhores. Ten Years After Ivan Denisovich. Trans. by Hilary Sternberg. London: Macmillan Ltd, 1974.
- Moody, Christopher. Solzhenitsyn. Edinburg: Oliver and Boyd, 1973.
- Muchnic, Helen. "Solzhenitsyn's The First Circle." The Russian Review, 29 (1970), 154-66.
- Obolensky, A. "Solzhenitsyn in the Mainstream of Russian Literature." Canadian Slavonic Papers, 13, No. 1 (1971), 131-40.
- Pervushin, N. V. "Preliminary Remarks on the Literary Craft of Solzhenitsyn." Canadian Slavonic Papers, 13, No. 1 (1971), 141-46.
- . "The Soviet Writer Solzhenitsyn, His Critics and the Classical Russian Literature." Slavic and East European Studies. 10, No. 1-2 (1965), 141-46.
- Pomerancev, K. "Dobro i zlo u Solzenicyna." Novyi Zurnal, 95 (1969), 149-53.
- Pritchett, V. S. "War and the Futility of War." The New Statesman, 22 September 1972, pp. 391-92.
- Rea, Natalie. "Nerzhin: A Sartrean Existential Man." Canadian Slavonic Papers, 13, No. 1 (1971), 209-18.
- Rickwood, T. M. "The Theme and Style in Solzhenitsyn's August 1914." Slavic and East European Studies, 17 (1972), 20-38.
- Rostov, V. "Rakovyi korpus." Novyi Zurnal, 94 (1969), 91-100.
- Rothberg, Abraham. Alexandr Solzhenitsyn: The Major Novels. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1971.

- . "One Day--Four Decades: Solzhenitsyn's Hold on Reality." Southwest Review, 56 (Spring, 1971), 109-25.
- Rus, Vladimir J. "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich: A Point of View Analysis." Canadian Slavonic Papers, 13, No. 1 (1971), 165-78.
- Rzhevsky, Leonid. Solzhenitsyn: Creator and Heroic Deed. Trans. by Sonia Miller. Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1978.
- Siegel, Paul N. "Cancer Ward: A Stage in Solzhenitsyn's Political Evolution." Modern Fiction Studies, 23 (1977), 31-45.
- Slonim, Mark. "Alexander Solzhenitsyn: The Great Challenger." In Soviet Russian Literature: Writers and Problems 1917-1977. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977, pp. 363-75.
- Sosnovich, Lawrence Louis. "Alexander Solzhenitsyn's One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich in the Light of Socialist Realism." M.A. thesis, University of Manitoba, 1972.
- Weissbort, Daniel, "Solzhenitsyn's Cancer Ward." Survey, 68 (1968), 179-85.
- Windle, Kevin. "Symbolism and Analogy in Solzhenitsyn's Cancer Ward." Canadian Slavonic Papers, 13, No. 1 (1971), 193-208.
- . "The Theme of Fate in Solzhenitsyn's August 1914." Slavic Review, 31, No. 2 (1972), 399-411.
- Tolstoi
- Bartell, James. "The Trauma of Birth in the Death of Ivan Ilyich: A Therapeutic Reading." Psychocultural Review, 2 (1978), 97-117.
- Benson, Ruth Crego. Women in Tolsoy: the Ideal and the Erotic. Urban, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1973.
- Birman, Ju. "O xaraktere vremeni v Vojne i mire." Russkaja literatura, 9, No. 3 (1966), 125-131.
- Bocarov, S. "Mir v Voine i mire." Voprosy literatury 14, No. 8 (1970), 76-90.
- Carden, Patricia. "The Expressive Self in War and Peace." Canadian-American Slavic Studies, 12, No. 4 (1978), 519-34.
- Cate, Hollins L. "On Death and Dying in Tolstoy's The Death of Ivan Il'ich." Hartford Studies in Literature, 7 (1975), 195-205.
- Chirkov, P. "Voina i mir L.N. Tolstogo kak khudozestvennoe celoe." Russkaja literatura, 9, No. 1 (1966), 43-66.

- Dayananda, Y. J. "The Death of Ivan Il'ich: A Psychological Study on Death and Dying." Literature and Psychology, 22, No. 4 (1972), 191-98.
- Edgerton, William B. "Tolstoy, Immorality, and Twentieth-Century Physics." Canadian Slavonic Papers, 21 (1979), 289-300.
- Feuer, Kathryn. "The Book that Became War and Peace." The Reporter, 20, (14 May, 1959), 33-36.
- Halperin, Irving. "The Structural Integrity of The Death of Ivan Il'ich." Slavic and East European Journal, 5, No. 4 (1961), 334-340.
- Jackson, Robert Louis. "The Second Birth of Pierre Bezukhov." Canadian-American Slavic Studies, 12, No. 4 (Winter, 1978), 535-42.
- Jahn, Gary R. "A Structural Analysis of Leo Tolstoy's God Sees the Truth, but waits." Studies in Short Fiction, 12 (1975), 261-69.
- Kurljandskaja, G. B. "Dialektika dusi i problema svobodnoi voli v Vojne i mire." Russkaja literatura, 22, No. 2 (1979), 73-91.
- Layton, Susan. "The Mind of the Tyrant: Tolstoy's Nicholas and Solzenicyn's Stalin." Soviet and East European Journal, 23, No. 1 (1979), 79-90.
- Lednicki, Waclaw. "Tolstoy between War and Peace." California Slavic Studies, 4 (1967), 73-91.
- Matlaw, Ralph E., ed. Tolstoy: a Collection of Critical Essays. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967.
- Olney, James. "Experience, Metaphor, and Meaning: The Death of Ivan Ilych." Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, 31, No. 1 (1972), 101-14.
- Pachmuss, Temira. "The Theme of Love and Death in Tolstoy's The Death of Ivan Il'ich." American Slavic and East European Review, 20 (1961), 72-83.
- Sampson, Ronald Victor. The Discovery of Peace. New York: Pantheon Books, 1973.
- Schaarschmidt, Gunter. "Time and Discourse Structure in The Death of Ivan Il'ich." Canadian Slavonic Papers, 21 (1979), 356-66.
- Shklovsky, V. "M.I. Kutuzov i Platon Karataev v romane Voina i mir." Znamya, 5 (1948), 137-45.
- Smyrniw, Walter. "Tolstoy's Depiction of Death in the Context of Recent Studies of the Experience of Dying." Canadian Slavonic Papers, 21, No. 3 (1979), 367-79.

States, Bert O. "The Hero and the World: Our Sense of Space in War and Peace." Modern Fiction Studies, 11, No. 1 (1965), 153-64.

Thale, Jerome. "War and Peace: The Art of Incoherence." Essays in Criticism, 16, No. 4 (1966), 398-415.

Wasiolek, Edward. Tolstoy's Major Fiction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

----- . "Tolstoy's The Death of Ivan Il'ich and Jamesian Fictional Imperatives." Modern Fiction Studies, 6, No. 4 (1960), 314-324.