

# RUSSIAN LANGUAGE JOURNAL

РУССКИЙ ЯЗЫК

The *Russian Language Journal* is funded in part by Brown University, Michigan State University (Office of the Dean Alan M. Hollingsworth), Ohio State University, Purdue University, and University of Iowa .

Winter-Spring 1982  
Volume XXXVI

Numbers  
123-124

Ellen Chances\*

## ČEXOV AND XARMS: STORY/ANTI-STORY

Čexov was certainly not aware of the works of Daniil Xarms as Xarms was born in 1905 (or 1906, depending on the source).<sup>1</sup> Whether or not Xarms was familiar with Čexov's works is open to question. On one hand, it is difficult to conceive of an educated Russian who had *not* read him. On the other hand, the sparse biographical material that does exist on Xarms—some correspondence, diaries, a few articles, George Gibian's introduction to the English translation of some of Xarms' creations, a book in progress, and a dissertation<sup>2</sup>—does not include Čexov's name in the constellation of literary stars who served as models for Xarms.

Dostoevskij is not mentioned either, yet I would find it surprising if *Pres-tuplenie i nakazanie* had not inspired Xarms's short story *Staruxa*. The scene is Leningrad. The first-person narrative mimics the mood and style of Raskol'nikov's feverish thoughts and frenetic actions. After the death of the titular old woman, the narrator often wanders through the city. People gaze at him because he looks so strange. Common Dostoevskij words such as "vdrug" often pop up. Lying on the couch in his squalid room, the narrator has a dream. The line between dream and reality is blurry. At one point, the narrator thinks that the old woman resembles a "mertvaja lošad'." The bright sunshine irritates his eyes. Someone in his apartment building is holding some kind of rag. He and a friend discuss the existence of God. He meets a kind woman who helps him. In an epilogue-like section, the narrator declares that he is only temporarily ending his manuscript. When he gets beyond the confines of the city into the purity of the countryside, he prays.

Is it purely coincidental that these incidents also grace the pages of Dostoevskij's novel? I think not. In like fashion, though scholarly study of Xarms has unearthed no direct evidence linking the Soviet writer to Čexov, there *are* certain parallels. Both worked in the same genres—short story and the drama. Both wrote parodies. Both occasionally chose major nineteenth-century writers as the brunt of their parodies. Čexov dedicates his 1880 short story *Tysjača odna strast', ili strašnaja noč'* to Victor Hugo. He mocks the Frenchman's florid language, saturated with metaphors. After moving his hero and heroine off to America, he makes the scene vanish. "Vtoroj moj mal'čiska," says the narrator, "protjagivaet ručki k čitateljam i prosit ix ne verit' ego papaše, potomu čto u ego papaši ne bylo ne tol'ko detej, no daže i ženy. ... Ničego ètogo nikogda

\*Ellen Chances is an Associate Professor of Russian, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.



share for each other. The bleak life of the steppe sheds its drabness as two ephemeral visions of beauty light up the landscape for one brief moment.

Turning to Xarms, we see the same kind of thing. In *Elizaveta Bam*, Ivan tells Elizaveta that she looks good. She asks why. The response—because you are a forget-me-not... whereupon he hiccups loudly, destroying the loveliness of the image.<sup>14</sup> Xarms's *Skazka* contains an episode in which a king and queen are drinking tea with apples. One would then conjure up a happy story about love and glittering fairy tale kingdoms. No such luck. Instead, the scene deteriorates into a violent fight between the king and queen, ending with the king falling into the oven and burning. A blatant instance of ugliness confronting beauty appears in Xarms's *Načalo očén' xorošego letnego dnja*, subtitled "Simfonija." A rooster crows, and we expect what the title promises us. Instead, we witness people being beaten up, hiccuping, and eating out of a spittoon. And then comes the final sentence: "Takim obrazom načinalsja xorošij, letnij den'."<sup>15</sup>

Except for repetition and the dramatic structure of the short stories, the devices I have been discussing seem to fit into one pattern. One can connect the dots and form a picture of two people who work in similar ways. In his parodies, each pokes fun at larger than life literary heroes. In his themes, each deflates the lofty hopes, fantasies, and dreams of adults and children alike. In his structures, each discards the "Hero," the "Plot," the "Adventure," and the "Climax"—witness the inconsequential details that punctuate the prose; the non-endings, the disconnected exchanges, insignificant or non-conversations. Given the evidence, I believe that Xarms could easily claim Čexov as his spiritual father.

Yet even in the face of these parallels, I still think that it is valid to ask the question, "Why compare the two?" After all, many people wrote and write parodies. Not just Čexov and Xarms wrote short stories and drama. Many fairy tales are built on a series of repetitions—a man making three wishes, each of three sisters attempting to become the beloved of the handsome young prince from the kingdom down the road, three knights in turn trying to rescue the beautiful golden-tressed princess from the fire-breathing dragon, and so on... Why, then, compare Čexov and Xarms? I would think that it *does* make sense to do so. Moreover, I believe that by placing the two back to back, one can illuminate the works of each that much more. One can also learn more about the evolution of the short story form. I have argued elsewhere, for example, that although Mark Twain and Čexov probably did *not* know each other's works, an analysis of their short story techniques helps us to understand something about the development of the short story genre. Both wrote frame stories. Twain kept using the form he had inherited whereas Čexov took off from that point and went on to do much more creative things with the form. In his mature period, Čexov thrusts—before and after a scene of action—a few descriptive words or a paragraph of "nastroenie." In addition to the beginning and end "frame," he intersperses in the action brief, mood-creating interludes. Čexov

builds upon the device of the frame, shaping it into new patterns, rather than working within the old structures, which he also sometimes did.

Both Twain and Čexov occasionally utilized dramatic devices in creating their short stories. After 1886, Čexov often preserved the dramatic scene model of his earlier period, but also included other elements. Again, Twain never went beyond the original dramatic structure. H. E. Bates has plotted the development of the short story, explaining that in its pre-modern examples, it resembled drama more than lyric poetry. This account applies to Twain and to the early Čexov. With the advent of the modern short story, Bates writes, the genre is more closely aligned with lyric poetry. If we agree with this assessment, we can dub Čexov a transitional figure, shifting from the traditional short story to a more modern unfolding of the genre.<sup>16</sup>

...All of which brings us back to Čexov and Xarms. In this connection, before turning to Čexov, I would like to resurrect for a moment the Xarms story *Staruxa*, where Dostoevskij's presence was so keenly felt. In first speaking of the story, I purposely confined my discussion to the obvious parallels to *Prestuplenie i nakazanie*. Yet something else is going on as well. It seems to me that what Xarms is doing here is providing a commentary to the novel. In a sense, he is rewriting the masterpiece according to his own formula. Let me illustrate. The stranger, the "staruxa," came to the narrator's room and promptly died. The narrative attention is shifted away from the focus of Dostoevskij's novel. After all, in *Prestuplenie i nakazanie*, Raskol'nikov *does* kill the pawnbroker and *therefore* undergoes punishment. Here, there *is* no crime, no murderer; *therefore*, there should be no punishment. Wrong. The narrator is worried that he will get caught, but there was no crime. He thinks that the corpse is moving, is pursuing him. And he tries to kill a *dead person*. He attempts this "murder," not with an ax, but with a croquet mallet. The conversations devoted to the existence of God lead nowhere; the question is posed and that is all. The "damočka" who helped him (not save his soul, but buy bread in a bakery) disappears; he does not even know her last name. The narrator wants to get rid of the old woman's body, so tucks it into a valise. On the train out of the city, the valise is stolen. The body *has* been disposed of, but the narrator still feels anxious, even though he has accomplished his goal. He gets out of the train and goes behind some bushes—to relieve himself. He again goes into the woods, the reader suspects for the same reason—but wrong again. This time, he prays. At one point, the narrator wants to write a story about a miracle-worker who can work miracles, but who chooses not to. Within *Staruxa* as a whole, the same thing happens. No savior. No faith. The reader's expectations are led astray. Everything leads to a dead end.<sup>17</sup> Xarms defies the laws that Dostoevskij sets up in his novel.

The same methodology distinguishes Xarms's short story *Svjaz'*, which, it seems to me, can be interpreted as a rewriting of *Brat'ja Karamazovy*, squeezed dry of philosophy. Here, everything is connected to everything, but we see only the connections, without the underlying philosophical and religious

ideas.

We have already noted that it is common practice for Xarms to invert fairy tales.<sup>18</sup> We have observed that he rewrites the biography of an important literary figure. We have seen his recasting of Dostoevskij's novels. In the same way, the more I read Xarms, the more it seemed to me as if his works were, perhaps unconsciously (whether or not it was a question of influence is not really important), serving as a commentary on certain Čexov short story and drama techniques. It is almost as if Xarms had taken certain elements embedded in Čexov's *oeuvre* and had followed each to its logical conclusion, as though guided by the words of the underground man: "Čto že sobstvenno do menja kasaetsja, to ved' ja tol'ko dovodil v moej žizni do krajnosti to, čto vy ne osmelivalis' dovodit' i do poloviny..."<sup>19</sup>

What exactly do I have in mind? Let us examine some of the evidence. First of all, with regard to repetition—Čexov bases some of his stories on a series of repeated actions. The pitiful cab driver in *Toska* keeps trying to tell each new passenger his tragic tale. The story's finale underscores his loneliness. The recurring incidents fit into the larger thematic concerns of the story. *Dušečka* is designed according to the same model—one action (Olen'ka's attachment to a new man) is repeated several times. By the last sentence, though, the reader has learned more about her than he had known at the beginning, for the "dušečka" has become a "podušečka," smothering each object of her affections. In Xarms, the repetition becomes "povtorenie radi povtoreniija." With Čexov, as with Dostoevskij, Xarms uses the same building blocks as does his antecedent, but he does not create a building out of them. Blocks remain blocks. He isolates one Čexov feature and then exaggerates it. Six women (one at a time) fall out of a window in the story *Vyvalivavšajasja staruxa*. What does it mean? Nothing. What have we learned? Nothing. All we are left with is a broken-record effect. The same is true of scores of other Xarms works as well. In fact, in *Matematik i Andrej Semenovič*, one has repetitions of repetitions. The mathematician says, four times in a row, "Ja vynul iz golovy šar." His interlocutor Andrej replied, four times, "Polož' ego obratno"—and the whole dramatic sketch goes on like this.<sup>20</sup> But so what? What has Xarms proved? What is he saying? And who cares?

Both Xarms and Čexov use zero endings, but the effect is different. The sentence "Misjus', gde ty?" at the end of *Dom s mezoninom*, at once evokes episodes from the rest of the story. We think of the love that might have been, of the narrator's loneliness, of the irretrievable nature of time, and so on. Xarms offers no such possibilities to build bridges to the rest of the text. His final sentences dangle in midair, totally divorced from the rest of the action. Thus, in the story *Vyvalivavšajasja staruxa*, after the sixth old woman has tumbled out the window, the narrator, out of the blue, says that he went to Mal'cevskij Market where a blind man had been given a knitted shawl.

Next we come to the floating conversations so familiar to readers of Čexov. While it is true that his characters make non-sequitur comments, those snatches

of conversation that seem to drift by another character serve to emphasize some personality trait or to reinforce some vague theme or mood. After a while, the audience realizes that Gaev's bizarre billiards comments play a symbolic role. They are not gratuitously thrown in. The official in whom Gurov attempts to confide his love for Anna interrupts with his remarks about the fish. The comment, disassociated from what has immediately preceded, is nevertheless there for a reason—in order to highlight Gurov's isolation, to show people's lack of communication, etc. What does Xarms make of this? He uses the skeletal framework of the technique, but adds no flesh. The apparently unmotivated conversation does not become, as in Čexov, an integral part of the artistic structure. The conversation just sits there. The short playlet *Tjuk* centers around one character repeating the word "tjuk." We do not know why, nor, by the end, do we really care, for the "conversation" has never gone beyond "tjuk."<sup>21</sup> *Elizaveta Bam* contains a plot-line, but a number of the statements that are sprinkled through the text are not affixed to the main plot. They are merely disembodied phrases that float around in a vacuum. One feels that any one of them could be interchanged with any other—or one could fill in the blank oneself—with the first image that comes to mind<sup>22</sup> and it would not really make any difference. Black prunes, shoulders like the sun, a fire burning in a little house, mice twitching their whiskers... Anything goes. There is text, but no context.

In his literary "commentary" on Čexov, Xarms absorbs another Čexovian trait—the interweaving of beauty and ugliness, of hopes and disillusionment. As with the inverted fairy tale, his impulse is always to destroy any hope of magic, good, or beauty. Recall *Načalo očen' xorošego letnego dnja/Simfonija*, where the author repeatedly offers the possibility of a beautiful day, only to go back on his offer every chance he gets. The title suggests a soothing, cheerful denouement. And the last sentence—"Takim obrazom načinalsja xorošij, letnij den."<sup>23</sup>—reinforces the hope that is held out. Everything in between, though, involves the destruction of beauty. There are elements which could contribute to the creation of a sparkling, happy day. A rooster crows. A little boy, a small dog, and a plump young mother take part in the action. Yet in each case, the hope held out in one part of a sentence is quickly crushed by the end of the phrase. The rooster crows in the same sentence in which Timofej jumps onto a roof and frightens the pedestrians below. The "malen'kij mal'čik" is eating some horrible substance out of a spittoon. The "malen'kaja sobačka" breaks its "tonen'kaja nožka" and rolls on the pavement. A "molodaja tolsten'kaja mat'" rubs the face of a "xorošen'kaja devočka" against a brick wall. Notice, too, the diminutives, so incongruous.

The drive to tear down marks the fictive world of Xarms. Think, for instance, about the episode from his *Iz zapisnoj knižki*: "Iz parovoznoj trubicy šel par, ili tak nazываемyj dym. I narjadnaja ptica, vletaja v ètot dym, vylotala iz nego obsosannoji pomjatoj."<sup>24</sup>

Čexov, too, as singer of unrelenting gloom and bard of hopelessness, also

painted equally dismal pictures. There are instances of hopes forever crushed in Čexov; the man whose escorts trampled upon his illusions in the story *Mečty* will never be happy again. Yet more often, Čexov does not take this tendency to such an extreme. In fact, sometimes beauty, although not attainable, at least occupies some important small part of the human being's life. And even if hopes have been crushed, there still remains that encapsulated memory of the transitory beauty or hope, as for example, in *O ljubvi*. Life is *pošlyj*, but perhaps one can escape (as in *Dama s sobačkoj*), or even if one cannot, at least thinking about the past or future will provide a temporary, if brief and illusory, respite from the drab present.

The detail which seems to have no direct relation to the major thread of the work abounds in the works of Čexov. As we all know, he has been hailed as the father of the modern short story for loosening the form, for adding the seemingly "irrelevant" touch. When Petr Sergeič, in *Rasskaz gospoži NN*, declares, "...čto...kogda zimoju eš' svežie ogurcy, to vo rtu paxnet vesnoj,"<sup>25</sup> the detail is not so irrelevant after all. It serves as a symbolic signpost, pointing out, in microcosm, the movement from spring to winter in nature, in Natal'ja Vladimirovna's life and the fading of her hopes. Nature descriptions that do not seem relevant strike a certain melancholy or happy chord in the heart of the reader of Čexov. The breaking string in *Višnevyyj sad*, although not specifically attached to the action, adds a dimension to the play. In *Nesčast'e*, the detail of Il'in's cravat pin, a red snake with diamond eyes, contributes to the picture Čexov is drawing of Il'in's and Sof'ja's feelings toward one another, signalling the potential sexual overtones of the relationship. The short story *Šutočka* contains a dramatic scene and a descriptive atmospheric frame including an additional dimension created by the use of memory, and the words producing a vagueness ("kak by," etc.). There is also the delicate web of symbols evident, for example, in the image of the fence with nails, the detail of the setting of the action in March—containing the hope of what will be (spring) as well as the bleak reality of what is, paralleling Naden'ka's own fate.

Čexov's works loosened the form of the short story and drama. Yet despite all his modernism, he remains grounded in reality. The vague symbols, the "accidental" details, the delicate touches which do not quite fit into the story, the words creating atmosphere are not quite so accidental, as Soviet scholar Čudakov demonstrates in *Poètika Čexova*, when he speaks of Čexov's method. Each seemingly irrelevant feature sends reverberations throughout the rest of the Čexov work.

Once again, Xarms uses the "irrelevant" detail, but instead of at least vaguely fastening it to the story as a whole, he makes the detail truly irrelevant. For example, in *Anekdoty iz žizni Puškina*, though he repeats the image of a wheel, the fact that he has chosen a wheel is in itself insignificant. One story, *Poteri*, ends with the protagonist's dream of losing a toothbrush and therefore brushing his teeth with a candlestick. This detail has absolutely nothing to do with anything; it hangs suspended in midair.

Finally, in delineating the Čexov techniques that Xarms takes to the extreme, we come to the nonplot. If one attempts to recount certain Čexov plots, one can sound pretty silly, for sometimes, almost nothing happens. In *Šutočka*, for instance, a man whispers as he and Naden'ka go down a hill on a sled. He later recalls the incident. And that is the end of the story.

Again, Xarms is ready to take the technique to its extreme. The movement is from non-action to anti-action, from non-plot to anti-plot. He ends up by undermining the very form of the short story—and leading literally to the blank page. Let me quote *Golubaja tetrad' No. 10* in its entirety:

Был один рыжий человек, у которого не было глаз и ушей.  
У него не было и волос, так что рыжий его назвали условно.  
Говорить он не мог, так как у него не было рта. Носа тоже у него не было.

У него не было даже рук и ног. И живота у него не было, и спины у него не было, и хребета у него не было, и никаких внутренностей у него не было. Ничего у него не было! Так что не понятно, о ком идет речь.

Уж лучше мы о нем не будем больше говорить.<sup>26</sup>

We begin with something and by the close, end with nothing. Literature has become anti-literature. Or take another extreme to which Xarms reduces a plot. Čexov had talked about the ideal of brevity, or conciseness. Well, look at the story *Vstreča*, written by Xarms: "Vot odnaždy odin čelovek pošel na službu, da po doroge vstretil drugogo čeloveka, kotoryj, kupiv pol'skij baton, napravljajsja k sebe vosvojasi. Vot, sobstvenno, i vse."<sup>27</sup>

In a manifesto, Xarms and his fellow OBERIUTY group state that they are not concerned with subject matter, that they seek a new concept of life, a new approach to things. "The world," they say, "covered by the rubbish of the tongues of a multitude of fools bogged down in the mire of 'experiences' and 'emotions' is now being reborn in all the purity of concrete, bold forms." Xarms announces that he is broadening the meaning of the object, that he is peeling away the layers of literary and everyday skin from the concrete object. Plot, he announces, is not important. And he goes on to say that he has endowed *objects* in his art with a status equal to that of characters and plot.<sup>28</sup>

Xarms obviously thought that his innovations in literary form were a positive contribution to the history of art. His "correction" of previous literature had freed literature from its dependence on old assumptions. Dostoevskij had written about *something* and had emphasized the philosophical importance of the irrational. Xarms has characters do things, but for no reason. He has taken one feature in Dostoevskij—the concept of the irrational—and has taken it to its extreme, making it the central focus in *Staruxa*. What Čexov merely hints at, Xarms approaches boldly. As with the Dostoevskij example, he selects certain features in Čexov and then in his own work, carries them to their extreme.

I do not, however, approach these Xarms "corrections" of Čexov so positively. It seems to me that Xarms's works illustrate the dangers of breaking open the short story and drama too widely, of taking these tendencies too far. The seeds for leading literature to a dead end *are* present in some of Čexov's innovations, in those very innovations that make Čexov the father of the modern short story. Thus, we get, in Xarms, the free-floating objects and images, arising out of the Čexovian "mood," vague, "superfluous" detail. We go from non-action to collapsed plots, stories reduced to nothing; from zero endings to endings that are reduced to zero significance. And the result, as I have tried to demonstrate, can be the destruction of literature.

I do not want these remarks to be construed as a condemnation of the avant-garde movement in general. Certain Absurdist, Dadaists, modernists—Kafka, etc.—did not end up in a dead end; they could and did do very creative things. Thus, in an analogy in art, Cezanne, like Čexov, was inching away from, but still grounded in, reality. Malevič, like Xarms—but in my mind, more successful in his attempts—, went further than Cezanne by working with free-floating geometric shapes. I am just stating that in the case of Xarms, this is the way it turned out. In fact, what is so intriguing is that often, cultural history produces a new element which opens up different possibilities (as with Cezanne and Malevič). In the case of Čexov and Xarms, it was interesting for me to see the process leading to a dead end.

Near the end of *Nevesta*, Nina Ivanovna says, "...nado, čtoby vsja žizn' proxodila kak by skvoz' prizmu..., ...nado čtoby žizn' v soznanii delilas' na prostejšie elementy, kak by na sem' osnovyx cvetov; i každyj element nado izučat' v otdel'nosti."<sup>29</sup> Čexov succeeded, in his works, in placing individual elements—detail, for example—through the prism and coming out with isolated colors. However, he did not stop there. At the same time, he succeeded in placing these individual elements back through the prism to come out with richer colors. Xarms does not take the second step. The result is often not a story, but an anti-story.

#### NOTES

1. George Gibian, editor of the Russian and English editions of Xarms's works, gives 1905 as Xarms's birth date (Daniil Xarms, *Izbrannoe* [Würzburg: Jal-Verlag, 1974], p. 12). R. R. Milner-Gulland agrees with this dating ("Left Art" in Leningrad: The Oberiu Declaration," *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, New Series 3 [1970], p. 65). In an unpublished manuscript on Xarms and Vvedenskij, Alice Stone Nakhimovsky states the year of birth as 1906, as does Soviet scholar Anatolij Aleksandrov (*Den' poëzii*, 1965 [Moscow, 1965], p. 290).

2. Especially illuminating are Alice Stone Nakhimovsky *Op. cit.*; also, her article "The Ordinary, the Sacred, and the Grotesque in Daniil Kharm's 'The Old Woman,'" *Slavic Review*, No. 2 (June 1978), pp. 203-16; George Gibian's introductory essay in *Russia's Lost Literature of the Absurd. A Literary Discovery. Selected Works of Daniil Kharm and Alexander Vvedenskij*, trans. and ed. George Gibian (New York: W. W. Norton and

Company, Inc., 1974), pp. 3-38; Aleksandr Flaker, "O rasskazax Daniila Xarmsa," *Československá rusistika*, 14 (1969), 78-84.

3. *Tysjača odna strast'*, in A. P. Čexov, *Sočinenija* (Moscow, 1974), I, 38.

4. Daniil Xarms, *Izbrannoe*, p. 110. Flaker writes that Xarms was probably mocking the worship of Puškin in the 1930s. Flaker, p. 80. Gibian's comments support this interpretation (Gibian, *Russia's Lost Literature*, p. 30).

5. *Repka (Perevod s detskogo)*, in A. P. Čexov, *Sočinenija* (Moscow, 1975), II, 64.

6. *Naivnyj lešij (Skazka)*, in A. P. Čexov, *Sočinenija* (Moscow, 1975), II, 344-46.

7. Xarms, *Izbrannoe*, p. 122. Nakhimovsky's manuscript contains a valuable discussion of Xarms's use of the inverted fairy tale.

8. Xarms, *Izbrannoe*, pp. 89-90.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 179.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 186.

11. *Tajnyj sovetnik*, in A. P. Čexov, *Sočinenija* (Moscow, 1976), V, 130.

12. Xarms, *Izbrannoe*, p. 101.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 86.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 178.

15. *Ibid.*, pp. 96-97.

16. Ellen Chances, "And Never the Twain Shall Meet? Some Thoughts on Anton Chekhov and Mark Twain," in *Problemy izučeniya Čexova v SSSR i SŠA*, ed. Gromova, Kataev, Maxwell, Opul'skaja (Moscow: AN SSSR, -forthcoming).

17. For a completely different interpretation of the story, see Nakhimovsky's article "The Ordinary." Incidentally, in bringing the reader's expectations to naught, in leading him to a dead end, Xarms shares much common ground with Gogol'. Think, for example, of *Mertvye duši*, where Čičikov's very task is to search for what does not exist.

18. Nakhimovsky speaks of this in connection with Xarms's acquaintance with Vladimir Propp. Unpublished manuscript.

19. F. M. Dostoevskij, *Polnoe sobranie sočinenij* (Moscow, 1973), V, 178.

20. Xarms, *Izbrannoe*, pp. 87-88.

21. *Ibid.*, pp. 59-60.

22. However, it is important to take into account Nakhimovsky's insightful approach to *Elizaveta Bam*. In her manuscript on Xarms and Vvedenskij, she explains that the nonsense passages in the play, inserted in meaningful passages, create a parody of style. Moreover,

she points out the great variety of shifts in language norms throughout the play—from blank and rhymed verse to literary and not-so-literary prose.

23. Xarms, *Izbrannoe*, p. 97.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 120.

25. A. P. Čexov, *Sočinenija* (Moscow, 1976), VI, 451.

26. Xarms, *Izbrannoe*, p. 47.

27. *Ibid.*, p. 94.

28. "The Oberiu Manifesto," in Gibian, *Russia's Lost Literature*, pp. 194-202, *passim*.

29. A. P. Čexov, *Sočinenija* (Moscow, 1977), X, 218.