

JACOB EDMOND

Drawing Conclusions on Pushkin's *Evgenii Onegin* and
'Stantsionnyi smotritel' from *Povesti Belkina*

'Stantsionnyi smotritel' from *Povesti pokoinogo Ivana Petrovicha Belkina* and *Evgenii Onegin*¹ despite their striking differences in length (4000 words as opposed to 20,000), and in form (short story as opposed to 'novel in verse'), share certain characteristics, which reflect not only the proximity of their dates of completion (14 and 25 September 1830 respectively), but also the character of Pushkin's poetics. Pushkin finished them, apart from a few later, minor alterations, during a period of intense productivity, the Boldino autumn of 1830, which marks a turning point in his work. In concluding these two works, the writer solved two problems that had long been troubling him: the problem of how to end *Evgenii Onegin* and the problem of writing an entire work of prose fiction. 'Stantsionnyi smotritel' is probably the most successful piece to come out of his first published book of prose fiction.

The fates of the heroines of these two works bear some striking similarities. In the final chapter of *Evgenii Onegin* Tat'iana is:

Не этой девочкой несмелой,
Влюбленной, бедной, и простой,
Но равнодушною княгиней,
Но неприступною богиней
Роскошной царственной Невы.
(VIII, 27)

Dunia in her final appearance in 'Stantsionnyi smotritel' has undergone a similarly surprising transformation from the daughter of a stationmaster, an official of fourteenth and lowest rank, to a *barynia* who returns to her father's former residence "v karete v shest' loshadei, s tremia malen'kimi barchatami i s kormilitsei, i s chernoii mos'koiu" [74, 7-9]. The reference here to the number of horses recalls a passage from the introduction, where "Priezhaet general; drozhashchii smotritel' otdaet emu dve poslednie troiki". This tells the reader of the rank and power required to command six horses and suggests that Dunia may, like Tat'iana, have married a general. Given that Saint Petersburg is the city to which Vyrin follows his daughter, what evidence there is hints that Dunia, like Tat'iana, ends 'Stantsionnyi smotritel' as a society lady and the wife of a general in the Russian capital. These changes in Dunia and Tat'iana form an important part of the

concluding dramatic moments in 'Stantsionnyi smotritel' and *Evgenii Onegin* respectively.

The similarities extend beyond outward appearances to the role these transformations of character play in confounding the reader's expectations as to how the two works will end. The role of intertextuality is partly responsible for this effect in both texts. There is of course a huge range of literary reference in *Evgenii Onegin*, but two kinds of literature are particularly important. Bocharov asserts that the "theme of the 'novel' within Pushkin's novel functions on four levels". According to him, firstly, there are the sentimental novels, such as those of Rousseau and Richardson, which "Ei [Tat'iane] rano nrazilis'" (II, 29). Secondly, there are Onegin's novels:

В которых отразился век
И современный человек
Изображен довольно верно
(VII, 22)

These books come closer to the novel *Evgenii Onegin*, from which in the "staircase-like construction of the concluding stanza", the reader emerges into "the novel of Life" through a final simile:

Кто не дочел ее [жизни] романа
И вдруг умел расстаться с ним,
Как я с Онегиным моим.²
(VIII, 51)

The first two kinds of novel are explicitly linked to Tat'iana and Onegin. The novels that the younger Tat'iana reads both delude her and provide the source for her character. Similarly, although Onegin's novels are not revealed until Chapter VII, Onegin is compared with a Byronic hero, Childe Harold, in the first chapter (I, 38). Furthermore, Bakhtin identifies an "Onegin-Byronic world view and style" in passages such as the following:³

Кто жил и мыслил, тот не может
В душе не презирать людей;
Кто чувствовал, того тревожит
Призрак невозвратимых дней:
Тому уж нет очарований,
Того змия воспоминаний
Того раскаянье грызет.
(I, 46)

The novel also contains the naively romantic poetry associated with the young poet Lenskii, who as a character resembles a typical young romantic, and thus such poetry not only comes from his lips, but also describes him, in this case, singing:

Он пел те дальные страны
Где долго в лono тишины
Лились его живые слезы;
Он пел поблеклый жизни цвет.
(II, 10)

However, as Bocharov points out, the characters cannot be seen as mere parodies, described in parodic language, for the act of debunking this clichéd poetry by concluding the stanza with the line: "Bez malogo v os'mnadsat' let." also provides additional, more 'objective' information about his life. Lenskii's "poetic *expression* of his life" remains valid, though subject to parody, and synthesises with the final line to create a fuller description of the character, just as these two lines combine to make a rhyming whole.⁴ Significantly, the Byronic style, which lends itself to the debunking of naive, idealistic writing and people, naturally parodies and derides both the sentimental style of Tat'iana's novels and Lenskii's romantic style. In this sense the Byronic style is much closer to the style of *Evgenii Onegin* and, therefore, forms an intermediary step in Bocharov's 'staircase'. As Bakhtin notes of the 'Byronic' passage quoted above, "the author is considerably closer to the 'language' of *Onegin* than to the 'language' of *Lensky*".⁵

The main characters in *Onegin* are not mere parodies. Their genre-bound behaviour and attitudes are given a complex psychological explanation: they suffer from delusions, caused by the literature they read and, in Lenskii's case, write. Sentimental and romantic literature is associated not only with particular styles, but also with particular narrative expectations, while the Byronic hero and the main characters in these genres have certain behaviours and actions that are typical of them. By presenting the characters thus, the novel invites the reader to anticipate the courses of action of its characters and of the novel as a whole. Lenskii fulfils the expectations of his genre by dying before his time in defence of his love's honour. Tat'iana falls deeply in love. *Onegin*'s lack of interest in this love, his flouting of social norms and his seeking to remove himself from society all fall within the field of normal behaviour for a Byronic hero. The major narrative developments before *Onegin* leaves his estate can broadly be seen as the playing out of these genres. The rejection of Tat'iana and the duel are natural outcomes of the incompatibility of the Byronic world view with the other genres. The transformation of Tat'iana in Chapter VIII is, therefore, part of a confounding of genre expectations, which the novel previously seemed to fulfil so reliably.

Dunia's appearance in the final part of 'Stantsionnyi smotritel'' plays a very similar role in debunking narrative expectations. Debrezency identifies the main narrator of the story, A G N, as standing for "eighteenth-century and early nineteenth-century sentimentalism".⁶ He sees the prologue as conforming "in style and spirit" to well-known introductions to works in the sentimentalist genre, such as those of Karamzin and Radishchev, while O'Toole examines in detail its indebtedness to the "eighteenth-century

polemical essay” in the style of these same authors among others.⁷ Van der Eng also draws a comparison between Radishchev and A G N.⁸ Furthermore, a number of critics discuss the contrasting parallel between Karamzin’s *Bednaia Liza* (1792) and ‘Stantsionnyi smotritel’.⁹

A G N strives to touch the reader’s heart at every step like Karamzin, often addresses the reader, asks rhetorical questions, bursts into exclamations, uses anaphora to achieve poetic effects, and—what brings him closest to the early sentimentalists—favors archaic forms.¹⁰

Debreczeny convincingly demonstrates that the most obvious literary reference is to *Bednaia Liza*, and claims that the

Russian reader of the 1820s would notice these parallels and expect Dunia’s downfall. So sure is A G N himself of the analogous fates of the two heroines that he keeps calling Dunia ‘bednaia Dunia’.¹¹

The second significant point of intertextuality in ‘Stantsionnyi smotritel’ is reference to the Bible, in particular, to the parable of the Prodigal Son, which appears on the wall of Vyryn’s cottage, and which A G N describes at length, creating a story within a story. This story acts in a similar way to the younger Tat’iana’s novels in that it informs Vyryn’s views and, especially, his response to Dunia’s being whisked away by the hussar, Minskii. It is clear from the Biblical imagery he uses that Vyryn is under the influence of the parable when he thinks: “privedu ia domoi zabludshuiu ovechku moiu.” (Debreczeny notes that in Luke 15 “the parable of the Prodigal Son immediately follows—and indeed elucidates—that of the lost sheep.”¹²) Although his interpretation is not borne out by events—it is Vyryn who seeks out his daughter to beg for her return and he, not his daughter, goes bad, drinking himself to an early grave—“the old station-master cannot grasp that events in real life do not follow the traditional pattern of the moral law and the scriptures”.¹³ Here the relationship of the parable of the Prodigal Son to the sentimental tale is functionally similar to the relationship in *Evgenii Onegin* of the sentimental or romantic world view to the Byronic. “The convention—not only of sentimentalism, but eventually of romanticism—demanded that the victim of seduction perish,”¹⁴ but Vyryn, under the influence of the parable, clings to the belief that Dunia will return. Thus A G N’s view does not coincide with Vyryn’s, but is aware of it, and it is this awareness of Vyryn’s story-induced ‘delusion’, which heightens the narrator’s sympathy. Similarly, the Byronic view would lack meaning without ‘naïve’ sentimental and romantic views for it to undermine. This then is why Dunia’s final appearance has such a striking effect: because it follows neither the parable of the Prodigal Son, which would have Dunia returning impoverished to her father’s open arms, nor *Bednaia Liza*, in which the heroine, after her love betrays her, tragically takes her own life. In this way both genres are deflated and yet at the same time combined and inverted into something that is more moving and unexpected. The daughter really does return home to her father, but too late, and as a seemingly wealthy woman. Likewise, Karamzin’s tale is not

completely absent from the ending. Dunia's visit to her father's grave simultaneously recalls and subverts the conclusion of *Bednaia Liza*, in which Liza's former lover, now married pays repeated visits to her grave.

This technique of subverting and inverting the reader's expectations is also present in *Evgenii Onegin*, particularly in the final chapter, in which Tat'iana's transformation occurs. One may approach the controversial question of Tat'iana's position and motivations in her reply to Onegin in Chapter VIII in the light of the novels of her girlhood, which form an important part of her initial characterisation. Kelley assesses these literary influences in some detail and, while conceding that the lessons of Rousseau and Richardson regarding "respect and fidelity in the marriage relationship ... could be expected ... to have had a lasting influence on her character",¹⁵ she concludes:

Vis-à-vis earlier literary heroines, it is not Tat'iana's faithfulness that is distinct, but her manner of accepting marital fidelity as part of her destiny without seeking to attenuate the pain of 'missed happiness' through the hope of a future reward or a transcendental change of a decision that has been made in her lifetime.¹⁶

Here the conventions of the genre are both maintained and subverted. Kelley offers a particularly good parallel with the intertextuality in 'Stantsionnyi smotritel', when she compares this final scene with the conclusion to Goethe's *Die Leiden des jungen Werthers* (1774). While the visual imagery of the scene, Werther's throwing himself at Lotte's feet, and the heroine's sudden exit, is repeated in *Evgenii Onegin*, Tat'iana's calmness contrasts sharply with Lotte's passion and hysteria.¹⁷ Perhaps the most controversial example of the deflating of genre-based expectations is the apparent transformation of Onegin in Chapter VIII from an uncaring Byronic hero into a lovesick wreck.¹⁸

Despite the similarities in the use of intertextuality in *Evgenii Onegin* and 'Stantsionnyi smotritel', the use of different stylisations, genres and stories manifest themselves in ways that are, structurally, markedly different. Indeed, the whole range of techniques, such as parody, irony, inconsistency and ambiguity, that keep the reader guessing by encouraging and frustrating interpretation of the text, are subject to the constraints that the form of narration imposes. The differences in the form these techniques take, therefore, reflect the contrast between the use of a multi-faceted lyric persona in the novel and the 'chinese-box' of framed narrators, who have single points of view, in the work of prose. The contrast itself is indicative of the distinction between poetry and prose in Pushkin's work, and, in particular, of the way these techniques are 'translated' from *Evgenii Onegin* into 'Stantsionnyi smotritel'. This is, perhaps, what Victor Terras is pointing to, when he suggests:

It may be asked whether the isomorphism of content ('life') and literary form, which some critics have observed in so much detail in *Evgenii Onegin* ..., extends to Pushkin's prose ...¹⁹

In *Evgenii Onegin* the narrator does not limit himself to one stylistic level but moves freely between them. Bocharov's detailed analysis of the continual switching between 'prosaic' and 'poetic' language bears witness to this.²⁰ On the other hand, the main characters in the novel have a limited stylistic range and a genre, a literary form or type, which, to an extent, controls them. In order to counter the two-dimensionality that this might otherwise give to the text, the narrator continually plays with the reader's perceptions and expectations by means of methods such as sudden changes in style, parody, self-contradictions, suggestions of different possible future developments, self-effacement, digressions and, importantly, different interpretations of the characters and their actions.²¹ The debunking of genres, narrative patterns and other literary conventions, which affect both the reader and the characters to varying degrees, is just one of the ways in which this effect manifests itself in *Evgenii Onegin*.

'Stantsionnyi smotritel' has in A G N a first-person narrator who exhibits the same characteristics of bias, for example, through friendship with the main character. He refers to Vyrin at the beginning of the narrative with "est' u menia priiatel'" [59,16] and again at the end of Vyrin's story with "takov byl rasskaz priiatelia moego" [72,11]. This parallels the introduction: "Onegin, dobryi moi priiatel'" [1,2]. However, unlike the narrator in *Evgenii Onegin*, A G N's point of view and style remain within the single genre of sentimentalism. In this respect A G N resembles the main characters and not the narrator of *Evgenii Onegin*. The narrators of 'Stantsionnyi smotritel', A G N, Vyrin, and Van'ka all perform this dual function, as they are all narrators with a single style and point of view. However, A G N's style, being the most literary, dominates (since "Pushkin did not like to burden his prose with class speech,"²² apart from short passages at the beginning and end, A G N narrates Vyrin's story in the third person), while Vyrin's narrative expectations are subservient to his. Within this structure the techniques of defamiliarisation appear unintentionally through the narrators' speech. A G N's general reliability but ultimate failure as a guide to developments in the plot is just one example of this unconscious teasing of the reader.²³ The irony inherent in the comment: "V samom dele, chto bylo by s nami, esli by vmesto obshchedobnogo pravila: *chin china pochitai, vvelos' v upotreblenie drugoe, naprimer: um uma pochitai?*" [60,9-12], and the black humour of the fact that a brewer now occupies the former residence of Vyrin, who drank himself to death, both appear external to A G N's conservative, sentimentalist point of view. Equally, A G N's inexpert use of quotations and language helps reveal him as a parody of a literary type. His stylistic misuse of the high-style word 'trapeza' in the context of a pigs' trough [61,16], and his apparent forgetting of the context of the reference he makes to Dmitrev's 'Karikatura' [72,14-15] are just two examples of this.²⁴ The incongruity in dates and time between 'Ot izdatelia' [3-8] and 'Stantsionnyi smotritel' deflates the superficial realism of both stories,²⁵ just as Vyrin's turning back for Minskii's money deflates his presentation as a martyr [69,25-27]. Another cross-reference to 'Ot izdatelia', which occurs when A G N says

that "liubopynyi zapas moikh nabliudeni nadeius' izdat' v neprodolzhitel'nom vremeni" suggests a streak of plagiarism in the compiler of the entire book, which has itself been subject to an editor who is inconsistent even in his own introduction. The editor promises that he is publishing the letter: "bezo vsiakikh peremen i primechani" [3,15-16], but then proceeds to make both an omission [6,32-35] and a comment [7,16-23]. The same devices of irony, parody, and inconsistency that characterise the lyric persona's speech in *Evgenii Onegin* also permeate this elaborate 'chinese-box' structure and, here too, raise the same questions of authorship and interpretation. These cracks and holes in the narrative box have the same disconcerting effect upon the reader as the twists and turns of the lyrical narrator on his stylistic staircase.

The final dramatic acts in both *Evgenii Onegin* and 'Stantsionnyi smotritel'' frustrate the reader's expectations and further increase this effect of defamiliarisation. The ambiguity and mystery surrounding the characters Tat'iana, Onegin, and Dunia enhances the reader's confusion, and, when the final pages do not in the end resolve the uncertainty, the reader must reassess the texts for further enlightenment. However, since these texts contain devices of irony and contradiction that only reveal themselves through close analysis, such a striving for greater understanding has only the opposite effect of increasing uncertainty.

The gap in the reader's knowledge about the dramatic changes in Tat'iana and Dunia is just one example of the "refusal to tell the story", which Stephanie Sandler sees as part of Pushkin's poetics of exile.²⁶ How exactly Dunia came to the position in which she appears on her return, and what exactly that position is, remain mysteries. As Debreczeny, once again, astutely points out, the question of whether Dunia is married "is asked twice, yet conspicuously left unanswered to the very end".²⁷ While Tat'iana's social status at the end of *Evgenii Onegin* is clear, "the narrator omits all that intervenes between her first being seen by a general at the end of Chapter VII and her later appearance as the wife of a prince in Chapter VIII".²⁸

Onegin's transformation in Chapter VIII becomes even less explicable following the removal of 'Otryvki iz puteshestviia Onegina' from the main text in the final version of *Evgenii Onegin*. This is part of the deliberate and explicit removal of lines and stanzas of text, which further contributes to the ambiguity, in what Sandler also sees as part of a poetics of renunciation.²⁹ The excision of ornaments that surround the pictures of the parable of the Prodigal Son in early versions of 'Stantsionnyi smotritel'' adds to the parable's impact upon the reader and, thus, to the confusion that it causes.³⁰

The ambiguity that the reader finds at the end of these final scenes encourages re-evaluation of the texts and their characters. Since the texts offer no conclusive answers, the characters are susceptible to different interpretations.³¹ This is borne out in the wildly varying critical views of

Tat'iana, such as those of Belinskii and Dostoevskii, and in the way other critics avoid offering a solution, Briggs, for example, sees Tat'iana as the "one really complicated and mysterious character" in the novel, while Mirsky sees the inconsistency in her transformation as unresolvable.³² Pushkin himself hinted at the goal of this ambiguity in relation to *Kavkazskii plennik* (1820–21), when he wrote: "there is no need to spell it out—this is the secret of arousing interest."³³

Beyond acting as a trigger for the reader to look back at what has come before, the final scenes achieve their impact through Tat'iana's and Dunia's own 'looking back'. Furthermore, it is through their brief backward glances that certain thematic similarities between *Evgenii Onegin* and "Stantsionnyi smotritel'" reveal themselves.

In Tat'iana's final speech her memory of her past love for Onegin and of his rejection of her leads her to recall her life in the country from the point of view of her present position:

А мне, Онегин, пышность эта,
Постылой жизни мишура,
Мои успехи в вихре света,
Мой модный дом и вечера,
Что в них? Сейчас отдать я рада
Всю эту ветошь маскарада,
Весь этот блеск, и шум, и чад,
За полку книг, за дикий сад,
За наше бедное жилище,
За те места, где в первый раз,
Онегин, видела я вас,
(VIII, 46)

This Pushkinian theme of the contrast between the country and the city is also present in "Stantsionnyi smotritel'", where Dunia's move from country to city is, like Tat'iana's, a passage from girlhood to womanhood.³⁴ The innocence of the kiss Dunia gives the narrator on his first visit contrasts with the maturity of motherhood. Likewise, Tat'iana's doubting of Onegin's motives displays a similar maturity, which was previously lacking ("... v miloi prostote/Ona ne vedaet obmana" [III, 24]). In both works the narrators favour the country, yet in both the most tragic events (Lenskii's and Vyryn's deaths) occur there. Tat'iana's rejection of Onegin is also a rejection of her old life in the country, which she misses dearly. (The exact nature of her feelings on this point is the subject of endless debate.) Likewise, Dunia's return to the country is only momentary, but her accompanying emotion, while unclear (whether Dunia feels nostalgia for her girlhood, is regretful of her actions, remorseful of the consequences they had for her father, or simply mourns his passing remains a mystery), expresses itself in a powerful, yet simple, image, through the unsentimental voice of Van'ka:

—Вот могила старого зрителя, —сказал мне мальчик, вспрыгнув на грудь песку, в которую врыт был чёрный крест с медным образом.
 —И барыня приходила сюда? —спросил я.
 —Приходила, —отвечал Ванька; —я смотрел на неё издали.
 Она легла здесь и лежала долго.
 (74,19–75,1)

Just as it does for Dunia, Tat'iana's glance back to the country and the past leads through the grave of a loved one to that other Pushkinian theme—mortality:

Да за смиренное кладбище,
 Где нынче крест и тень ветвей
 Над бедной нянею моей ...
 (VIII, 46)

The two heroines' departures are swift and matter-of-fact, allowing no time for sentimentalisation or dilution of emotion. After Dunia's momentary loss of control, Van'ka describes the rest of her business-like actions in simple perfective verbs: "A tam barynia poshla v selo i prizvala popa, dala emu deneg i poekhala ..." [75,1-3]. When the narrator describes Tat'iana's departure upon finishing her speech, he is at his most laconic: "Ona ushla" [VIII, 47].

The departure of the two heroines mirrors the equally quick withdrawal of the two stories' narrators. As Kelley points out, the narrator of *Evgenii Oegin*, who is usually quick to offer a response or a series of responses to the characters' actions, makes no comment on this final, crucial speech and nor does Onegin offer any reply.³⁵ Equally, A G N makes no direct comment on what Van'ka tells him. He expresses no regret at Vyrin's sad demise. Instead he tells the reader what he does not regret: "... i ne zhalel uzhe no o poezdke, no o semi rubliakh, mnoiu istrachennykh" [75,5–6].

The themes of city and country, of womanhood and girlhood, of life and death, which these two conclusions have in common, emphasise distance in space and time. Dunia and Tat'iana bridge these gaps, but only for a moment. These points of contact are surrounded by a sea of ambiguities and ironies, which might trap the unwary reader. Sandler identifies this key aspect of Pushkin's poetics, when she writes of an autobiographical reference: "evacuation of detail save the single moment of self-consciousness ... is itself the signifying textual moment."³⁶ Here it is rather at the characters' moments of emotion that the stripping of detail occurs. The quick renunciation of emotion that follows permits these moments of intense feeling. This pleasure in denial is what the narrator of *Evgenii Oegin* uses to explain his own withdrawal and hence the ending of the novel itself.

Блажен, кто праздник жизни рано
 Оставил, не допив до дна
 Бокала полного вина,
 Кто не дочел ее романа
 И вдруг умел расстаться с ним,
 Как я с Онегиным моим.
 (VIII, 51)

Pushkin in the later part of his life “would experience extraordinary bursts of productivity during times of solitude”. Pushkin’s Boldino autumn of 1830 was just such a time.³⁷ The two endings’ themes of distance and loss reflect, perhaps, this isolation. Ambiguity is also “particularly pronounced” in the works of this autumn and in ‘Stantsionnyi smotritel’ and *Evgenii Onegin* in particular. This quality, a “concomitant of Pushkin’s highest artistic achievements”, should come as no surprise, for it functions to estrange, just as surely as the themes of temporal and physical displacement distance the reader.³⁸ The debunking of genre expectations is only one of many ways in which the endings act to defamiliarise. Whether these techniques appear in many voices or one, in the structure of the ‘chinese-box’ or the ‘staircase’, they, nevertheless, defy the reader’s attempts to draw any lasting conclusions. This lack of closure offers and, indeed, demands endless readings. Thus these endings realise pleasure without end.

Notes

- 1 The editions of Pushkin’s works to which this essay refers to are: *Evgenii Onegin* with an introduction by Briggs, A D P and vocabulary by Sobotka, Frances, F, Bristol Classical Press: Bristol, 1993 and *Povesti pokoinogo Ivana Petrovicha Belkina*, ed and introduction by Briggs, A D P, notes and glossary by Unbegaun, B O, Bristol Classical Press: Bristol, 1994. All references to the novel are given with roman numerals for chapter nos and Arabic numerals for stanza nos, while references to the short stories use Arabic numerals for both page and, following that, line nos.
- 2 Bocharov, Sergey, ‘The Stylistic World of the Novel’ in Hoisington, ed Sona Stephan, *Russian Views of Pushkin’s “Eugene Onegin”*, Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1988, 167.
- 3 Bakhtin, Mikhail, ‘Discourse in *Eugene Onegin*’ in Hoisington, ed, Sona Stephan, *Russian Views of Pushkin’s “Eugene Onegin”*, Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1988, 117.
- 4 Bocharov, 160.
- 5 Bakhtin, 117.
- 6 Debreczeny, Paul, *The Other Pushkin: A Study of Alexander Pushkin’s Prose Fiction*, Stanford, California: Stanford UP, 1983, 120.
- 7 O’Toole, L Michael, *Structure, Style and Interpretation in the Russian Short Story*, London: Yale UP, 1982, 101–105.
- 8 Van der Eng, Jan, ‘Les récits de Belkin: Analogie des procédés de construction’ in *The Tales of Belkin’ by A S Pushkin*. The Hague: Mouton, 1968, 31.
- 9 Van der Eng, 31–32. O’Toole, 108. Bayley, John, *Pushkin; A Comparative Commentary*. Cambridge UP, 1971, 311. Debreczeny (317) also cites Gippius, V V, *Ot Pushkina do Bloka*. Moscow: Nauka, 1966 and Blagoi, D D and Kirpotin, V Ia,

- eds, *Pushkinrodonachal'nik novoi russkoi literatury: Sbornik nauchno-issledovatel'skikh rabot*, Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1941, 147–154.
- 10 Debreczeny, 23–124.
- 11 Ibid, 130.
- 12 Ibid, 129.
- 13 Bayley, 311–312.
- 14 Ibid, 130.
- 15 Kelley, Geraldine, 'The Characterization of Tat'iana in Puskin's *Evgenij Onegin*', PhD dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1976, 177–178.
- 16 Ibid, 180.
- 17 Ibid, 178–179.
- 18 See, for example, Briggs, A D P, *Alexander Pushkin, Eugene Onegin*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992, 62–63 and Dalton-Brown, S, *Pushkin's 'Evgenii Onegin'*, Bristol Classical Press: Bristol, 1997. Briggs sees the change as "another *non sequitur*", while Dalton-Brown sees Onegin and Tat'iana as becoming the opposites of their initial selves.
- 19 Terras, Victor, 'Pushkin's Prose Fiction in a Historical Context' in Bethea, David M, ed, *Pushkin Today*, Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1992, 218.
- 20 Bocharov's entire essay (Bocharov 122–168) focuses on this dualism in language.
- 21 There many discussions of these techniques, for example, see Lotman, Iurii in Hoisington, Sona Stephan, ed and trans, *Russian Views of Pushkin's 'Eugene Onegin'*, Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1988 for irony and manipulation of point of view. For a detailed example of parody see Hoisington, Sona Stephan, 'Parody in *Evgenii Onegin*: Lenskii's Lament', *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, XXIX (1987), nos 2–3, 266–278. For a look at the interpretive nature of the text see Goscilo, Helena, 'Multiple Texts in *Eugene Onegin*: A Preliminary Examination', *Russian Literature Triquarterly*, 23 (1990), 271–285.
- 22 Debreczeny, 124.
- 23 Ibid, 124–125.
- 24 Ibid, 128–129 and 131–132.
- 25 Ibid, 119–120 discusses this temporal incongruity.
- 26 Sandler, Stephanie, *Distant Pleasures: Alexander Pushkin and the Writing of Exile*, Stanford, California: Stanford UP, 1989, 206.
- 27 Debreczeny, 135–136, offers a rebuff to the assumptions of some critics that Dunia is married.
- 28 Kelley, 170.
- 29 Sandler, 199–202 discusses one excision in detail.
- 30 Debreczeny, 127–128.
- 31 Ibid, 131.
- 32 Briggs, 79. Mirsky, D S, *Pushkin*, London, 1927, 151. Dalton-Brown, 76–77 summarises a wide range of critical opinions.
- 33 Shaw, J Thomas, *The Letters of Alexander Pushkin*, 3 vols in 1, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967, 110.
- 34 Kelley, 173 sees this rite of passage in Tat'iana's dream and her soliloquy of farewell to the countryside [VII, 28].
- 35 Ibid, 176.
- 36 Sandler, 210–211.
- 37 Ibid, 8–9.
- 38 Debreczeny, 136–137.