The Tower of Babel Undone in a Soviet Pentecost: A Linguistic Myth of the First Five-Year Plan

Author(s): Daniel E. Collins

Source: *The Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 42, No. 3 (Autumn, 1998), pp. 423-443
Published by: American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages
Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/309681
Accessed: 22-05-2019 00:59 UTC

THE TOWER OF BABEL UNDONE IN A SOVIET PENTECOST: A LINGUISTIC MYTH OF THE FIRST FIVE-YEAR PLAN

Daniel E. Collins, Ohio State University

The vision of a Holy Spirit that would unify humanity was prominent in Russian thought prior to the Revolution, particularly in the "Third-Testament Christianity" of the god-seekers and in the rival programs of the god-builders, who sought to adapt Christian doctrines—in this case, Orthodox pneumatology—to Marxism. Whereas the god-seekers believed that the pre-existing Word would become incarnate in mankind in the kingdom of the Holy Spirit, the god-builders argued that the only god was the collective will of the folk (or proletariat), which, triumphing, would fuse humanity into an immortal, eternal spirit and turn the earth into a New Jerusalem.[1] Like other god-building doctrines, the image of the Holy Spirit as the collective will of the laboring classes was appropriated by the mythopoeic Soviet culture of the 1920s and 1930s, despite Lenin's anathemization of god-building itself (see Clark 152; Masing-Delic 18). This transfer belonged to the general tendency of Soviet culture to emulate Christianity, seen, for example, in the cult of Lenin, who from the early 1920s was portrayed in images derived from the veneration of saints and latria of Christ (see Tumarkin).

One of the aspects of the god-building vision that came to the fore in Soviet culture of the 1920s and early 1930s was the advent of the Holy Spirit and the founding of the Church of the collective will. Whereas the god-seekers and god-builders had to project their kingdoms of the Holy Spirit into a desired future, the Soviet heirs of the god-builders could look for their Pentecost in actual events such as the beginning of the First Five-Year Plan, the putative ground-breaking for a classless society. In this Soviet version of the myth, party workers were the apostles (a pattern seen already in Blok's *Dvenadcat'* [*The Twelve*]), who, filled with the Holy Spirit, were building a society of god-men to fulfill the Great Commission of their departed but still immanent messiah.[2] As the antihero of *Den' vtoroj* (*The second day*,

SEEJ, Vol. 42, No. 3 (1998): p. 423–p. 443

Èrenburg 1932–33) observes with unintended accuracy, the Komsomol are " 'builders of a new life, apostles called to prophesy' " (45).

As will be shown below, an important component of the Pentecost model that was co-opted by Soviet culture during the First Five-Year Plan was the image of the Spirit overcoming communicative barriers and divisions. According to this myth, enthusiastic communists are able to achieve mutual understanding regardless of differences in linguistic form; conversely, unbelievers in the Spirit of collective labor are, in effect, deprived of their ability to communicate even with speakers of their native languages and lapse into frustrated silence. This double-sided picture of ideologically driven communicative success can be found, inter alia, in the highly mythopoeic production novels of the First Five-Year Plan, which pay considerable attention to details of language. The presentation of linguistic heterogeneity in these and other works of the period may be interpreted as a manifestation of a linguistic myth—the emergence of a pan-proletarian language, which would eventually embrace all humanity in the classless society of the triumphant collective spirit.

The Pentecost of the First Five-Year Plan

Pentecost, one of the twelve Great Feasts, is prominent in Orthodox thought as the commemoration of the beginning of the New Testament—that of the Holy Spirit (hence *Duxov Den'* "Day of the Spirit")—and the founding of the church. The holiday's liturgy emphasizes unity and shared life in the Holy Spirit (Schmemann 67–68; Ware 246). Among the readings are prophecies about how believers will gather from all nations, perform miracles, and be shown wonders in the earth (see *Triod' cvetnaja*)—events also promised by the spirit of collective labor in the mythopoeic thought of the First Five-Year Plan.

In production novels of that era, the tongues of flame that manifest the Spirit's presence appear in the zeal for labor, which unites party workers and proletarians regardless of their origin.[3] The most usual term for this is *enthusiasm* (*èntuziazm*)—a usage that goes back at least to the god-builders (cf. Laskovaja 67). In the prototype production novel, Gladkov's *Cement*, enthusiasm is the faith that moves mountains (3: 71, 6: 74; cf. Matthew 17: 20). Enthusiasm is the new religion, meant to supplant the signs of Orthodoxy, as the unbeliever Safonov in *Den' vtoroj* recognizes in spite of himself: "Volodja laughed: what, then, had changed? They said 'enthusiasm'; previously it was called faith. It was born in the same year in which icons were burned and relics were disemboweled" (Èrenburg 191). In the same novel, a passionate old Bolshevik justifies the unavailability of German machine parts to a foreign engineer by referring to this faith and the transformed life of its believers: "We have a different economy and

different nerves. But mainly we have—how can I explain it to you? Officially it's called enthusiasm" (146; cf. 11, 22, 35).

In this milieu, any true understanding, any successful act of communication depends on shared belief; enthusiasm is a religious mystery only the faithful can understand.[4] Thus the term *enthusiasm* is depicted in novels of the First Five-Year Plan as "an arena of the class struggle" (Vološinov 23), a sign whose meaning is contested.[5] Unbelievers misunderstand the concept and give the word connotations of naivete and excess, like the scoffers at Pentecost who think the apostles are drunk. In *Sot'*, a skeptic dismisses the factory planner Potemkin as a dreamer: " 'You are an enthusiast, a well-known enthusiast,' . . . he knew in advance that Potemkin had nowhere to get the money" (Leonov 1: 40). In Il'enkov's *Veduščaja os'* (*Leading axle* 1932), a bourgeois engineer sees enthusiasm as a journalistic cliche: "The masses, of course, have enthusiasm and all that, as Juzov [a reporter] writes in his leading articles." The Bolshevik Vartan'jan recognizes this as blasphemy against the Holy Spirit and retorts, "Pardon me—the enthusiasm of the masses is the greatest power. Why the sarcasm?" (107).[6]

The Soviet version of Pentecost confronts its Orthodox archetype explicitly in Leonov's *Sot'* (1930), which depicts party workers as apostles to the northern peasantry. In one of the central incidents in the novel, Komsomol members disrupt a Pentecost religious procession and drown out the chanting of a sottish priest by playing popular songs on concertinas (new signs for old). In the course of the holiday they win many peasants to the cause of collective labor—a vital event in a novel focusing on proletarianization. Among the converts is a young worker who has been carrying an ecclesiastical banner in the procession; he later becomes the leader of another kind of religious body, the *volost'* soviet (2: 39–40; 5: 19). On the evening of Pentecost (a traditional day for baptizing converts, cf. Bulgakov 145), the positive hero converts the alienated young monk Gelasij; he washes him of his monastic filth with the words, "There, the lad's baptized into the new faith" (Leonov 2: 52). Abandoning his old name (which he traces to the Greek for "laughing one"), the proselyte rechristens himself *Robert Èleonorov*—an internationalism chosen "to spite the Lord God" (5: 16). This new name is the antithesis of the ecclesiastical *Gelasij*, which alienated men of the new order (1: 15) and reflected the monk's divided self ("laughing one" as a sign for a wretch).

Pentecost as anti-Babel

As mentioned above, one of the ways in which the unifying power of the Holy Spirit was manifested in the pentecostal mythopoeia of the First Five-Year Plan was in overcoming problems posed by linguistic heterogeneity,

which had traditionally been taken as a sign of disunity. As recounted in Acts 2: 1–47, the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost miraculously enabled the followers of Christ to speak in foreign languages, so that everyone in the polyglot crowd of "Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites," etc., visiting Jerusalem "heard them speak in his own language."[7] In Orthodox theology (part of the cultural background of early Soviet thought), these events have generally been interpreted as a nullification of the Confusion of Tongues, which had been visited on humanity as punishment for building the Tower of Babel (Genesis 11: 1, 4–9)—e.g., in one of John Chrysostom's Pentecost sermons, "Just as in antiquity people, fallen into madness, aspired to build a tower that would reach into Heaven, and God destroyed their evil union by confusing their tongues, so now the Holy Spirit descends on the apostles as tongues of fire to unite the divided world . . . As in antiquity tongues divided the world and disrupted an evil union, so now tongues have united the world and brought the former division into unanimity" (2: 510).[8] In accordance with this reading, even though *human* languages are still sundered, the gift of *divine* language can undo the alienation and division caused by the confusion; the Holy Spirit, a token of the re-creation of mankind (cf. 2: 498–500), unites believers into a single community. The Gift of Tongues at Pentecost, which overcame national linguistic barriers, serves as an outward manifestation of inward unification (2: 502) and a condition for fulfilling the Great Commission (cf. 2: 510).

The pentecostal vision of language is evident in production novels of the First Five-Year Plan, which present a world where zeal for labor overcomes all obstacles to cross-linguistic understanding (at least in essentials) and where the apostles of the collective can speak, as it were, in other tongues (see below). In *Veduščaja os'*, Il'enkov exults that "the class energy of the [working] class . . . builds, creates, conquers, charging millions of people with its creative current . . . and explodes the age-old obstacle of language differences [*raznojazyčija*] with its current" (*Krasnaja nov'*, 1932, no. 10: 58).[9] Production novels characteristically depict motley crowds that are or will be unified by the collective spirit—e.g., the "Englishmen, Germans, Americans, Chinese, Blacks" that arrive for the Comintern in *Veduščaja os'* (Il'enkov 218; cf. Leonov, *Sot'* 2: 6–7; Èrenburg 8–9, 35). Il'in's *Bol'šoj konvejer* (*The big conveyor*) begins with a Soviet May 1 parade met with jubilation by a crowd of Germans, Blacks, and other foreigners, including one who turns to a Russian stranger and says "loudly and happily in English, " 'Hello [*Xèlou*]! Moscow is still Moscow!' " (10), obviously expecting to be understood. Representative groupings of this kind, in which people of different countries, nationalities, regions, or classes mix and fuse together, recall the "Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites," etc., who come together at the first

Pentecost. The Babel of voices is united into a single chorus by the workings of the sovietized Holy Spirit.[10]

The image of Pentecost was especially potent because Babel loomed large in the cultural context. The Tower had been invoked as a symbol of futile human efforts in the polemics between the god-seekers and the god-builders (e.g., in Bazarov's article "Christians of the Third Testament and builders of the Tower of Babel").[11] After the Revolution, Soviet culture initially appropriated the Babel image in a positive value, as a metaphor for conquest of the natural order. Tatlin's design for the Third Communist International building (1920) recalls Brueghel's paintings of the Tower. In "Bašnja" ("Tower" 1918), Gastev offered the Babel-like image of millions of workers constructing a skyscraper that conquers the heavens: "It has long since torn [and] scattered the clouds, it accompanies the moon through the nights . . . , it extinguishes it with its light, it quarrels with the sun . . . the steel spire soars above the world by triumph, labor, achievement" (104). In this tower, the workers of the world are fused into a single soul (106)—an echo of god-building dreams. In "Kran" ("Crane"), the proletariat prepares a crane so huge that it can haul loads across the ocean, move mountains, and shift the earth (109–12); Gastev invokes Babel as a precedent whose failure will not be repeated: "We shout to the Babylonian builders over a hundred centuries: again your impulses breathe in fire and smoke, the iron sacrifice is raised beyond Heaven, the proud idol of work again rages" (111). Likewise, the futurist Xlebnikov in "Ladomir" (1920) compares the new order approvingly to the building of a tower into the heavens ("Build your tower of values, Worker, . . . And, clinking glasses with the constellation Virgo, It will recall the wise tunes And voice of ancient strongmen"; 1: 185).

Despite these efforts, the negative symbolic value of Babel was never fully displaced. In Ivanov's *Bronepoezd 14,69* (*Armored train no. 14,69*, 1922), a distrustful Red partisan (not yet an inspired New Man) predicts that a "Tower of Babel" will be built in "Rasseja": "We'll be driven apart like chicks by a falcon, for sure, so that we won't be able to recognize each other. I'll say to you, 'Nikita Egoryč, you wanna little homebrew?' and 'yacketty-yak' you'll come back at me in Japanese! And Sin Bin U [a pidgin-speaking Chinese partisan] . . . will start singing in Russian" (80). The traditional image of Babel reappears in Leonov's *Barsuki* (*The badgers* 1924) in the tale of the giant Kalafat, who, in order to count the stars, builds a tower into heaven that sinks under his weight as he ascends it (249–51). In the novel an anti-Soviet peasant uses this parable to argue that science will not overcome nature (248); Leonov conceals his own evaluation. Platonov likewise evokes a negatively charged Tower of Babel in *Kotlovan* (*The foundation pit* ca. 1930), an allegorical critique of socialist construction.

Production novels of the First Five-Year Plan could potentially raise the specter of Babel, with all its negative connotations, by their emphasis on improbable construction projects heroically erected by a collective in spite of nature (cf. the litany *We are building a giant* in *Den' vtoroj*; Èrenburg 10, 21, 22, and passim). Prima facie this effect would be intensified by the constant hubbub, multiplicity of voices, and focus on accents and idiolects that is characteristic of these novels.[12] The Tower also loomed in such Soviet innovations as the policy of "indigenization" (*korenizacija*), which tried to empower regional languages at the expense of Russian as a way of disseminating communist ideology.[13] However, Soviet mythopoeic thought could not accept the ramifications of the traditional Babel model—the disunion and failure of the builders. This is the aspect of Babel that is invoked by the communist engineer Burago in *Sot'* in a moment of doubt: "I also remember the French Revolution, and Icarus' accident, and the biblical Tower, and the spine of a Neanderthal in a French museum" (Leonov 5: 15). Such failure had to be excluded; hence the Pentecost metaphor fit well into the mythopoeia of the First Five-Year Plan by undoing and redeeming the Tower of Babel. With the advent of the spirit of labor, the proletariat could fuse heaven and earth and build god-mankind without suffering the discord of a Confusion of Tongues. Enthusiasm would guarantee universal understanding regardless of language.

The ecumenical vision that "class energy" could enable communication in spite of previous language barriers was reflected not only in mythopoetic literature but also in the speculations of Soviet linguistic theories (see Abaev; Alpatov, *Istorija* 44, 48, 59). In particular, it was a ramification of N. Ja. Marr's belief that languages evolved from plurality to unity (not vice versa, à la "bourgeois" comparative-historical linguistics) in defined stages and that "glottogonic" shifts from one stage to another were caused by "new modes of thinking" resulting from revolutionary changes in material life, technology, or social structure (see Alpatov, *Istorija* 38–41, 44).[14] For Marr, all language was class-based; the languages spoken by a given class in different countries were more closely related than were those of different classes in the same country, formal similarity notwithstanding. This implied that the world proletariat spoke, if not yet in a common tongue, at least in tongues that were transcendentally linked and, by inference, mutually comprehensible to some extent on the level of meaning (40, 46).

This Pentecost was presented as a temporary state in the mythopoeia of the 1920s and early 1930s. Like any other source of human division, linguistic diversity was a vestige of earlier social stages of social evolution and would become obsolete after the final victory of communism, when all nations would be joined in a single society and the proletarian god-man would come into his kingdom. A united world would inevitably require a single means of communication, however that was to be realized; thus the rise of a form of

proletarian communication that transcended linguistic barriers could be seen as a necessary prelude to the development of a world language. In *Sot'*, Burago predicts the advent of a god-man with a new language and interpretation of the world: "A new Adam is coming and giving names to creatures that existed before him" (Leonov 5: 15; cf. 5: 20). This image (cf. 1 Corinthians 15: 22, 35–49) and the aspiration that it reflects hearken back to Futurist visions of the poet as creator of new words and a universal language, as in Kručenyx's 1913 "Declaration of the word as such" ("The artist has seen the world in a new way and, like Adam, gives everything names of his own devising"; Markov 63).[15] The dream of a new and universal harmony symbolized by a single human language is also a recurring theme in Xlebnikov's writings (e.g., in "Ladomir" and "Zangezi"). However, in the culture of the First Five-Year Plan, the creative linguistic force was not the individualistic poet but the collective will of the proletariat—a legacy of god-building doctrines. Here again there are parallels with contemporary linguistic theories. In the 1920s, Marr predicted that a single world language would be created by social engineering as humanity was transformed under true communism—"a root restructuring, a shift . . . onto the path of revolutionary creativity and the creation of a new language" (cited in Alpatov, *Istorija* 66; see also 41, 44, 59–60; *150 jazykov* 55).[16]

"Every man . . . in his own language"

One of the primary tasks of production novels of the First Five-Year Plan was to depict how the zeal for labor—the Soviet Holy Spirit—would prevail over the divisive individualism that lingered from the pre-Revolutionary and NÈP eras.[17] The unanimity achieved by workers in the course of a novel was to prefigure the concord of the communist New Jerusalem (cf. Sinjavskij 420). This harmony could only be attained through the transformation of the workers, who abandoned self-interest for enthusiasm or else found themselves mute and alienated.

Even though the authors of these novels depict the emergence of social homogeneity, they portray their positive characters communicating with one another in highly diverse ways, and they make no effort to show that language should change in token of ideological transformation. Philosophical unanimity is not reflected in unity of linguistic form, as might be expected. This was not mere realism; the novels describe not what *is* but what *should be.* What should be, in the mythopoeia of the First Five-Year Plan, was a sweeping away of linguistic barriers, which were made irrelevant by the unifying enthusiasm of collective labor (or would be so in the next stage of "glottogonic development").[18] This could be conveyed most effectively not by eliminating linguistic differences but by making them trivial—by showing believers achieving communicative success in the midst of a Babel of tongues, like the apostles at Pentecost.

Models for this anti-Babel can be found in earlier Soviet literature in depictions of apostolic endeavors. In Ivanov's *Bronepoezd 14,69*, Red partisans (speaking in a hubbub of Siberian dialect and Sino-Russian pidgin) are frustrated in their attempts to establish contact with a captured American soldier, whom they wish to convert; finally one of their leaders finds the proper password—"Lenin!" The American replies joyously in English, "There's a chap!" (given without gloss in Roman letters).[19] To "Sovetska [*sic*] respublika" he shouts, "That is pretty in deed [*sic*]" (again unglossed and untransliterated); subsequently he reacts to the Russian's evangelism with "Pro-le-ta-ri-at . . . We!" and "Imperializm, awy [*sic*]!" (with the first word in Cyrillic in both cases). The partisans are elated that "he understands" and say of their leader, "Pentja speaks American" (86); they release their prisoner, who has proven to be their spiritual brother.

Communist watchwords are also enough to establish meaningful contact in an encounter between Soviets and English sailors in Gladkov's *Cement*.[20] When the hero Gleb Čumalov identifies himself with a mixture of words and gestures as a Bolshevik, the seamen lustily shout, "Bol'ševik . . . orra . . . proletarija."[21] Noting "For the time being we understand one another successfully," Čumalov asks them what their most important word is; one sailor, obviously comprehending, replies, "Kom-in-tern!," which his comrades echo: "Kom-in-tern . . . ollrajt . . ."[22] At that Čumalov observes, "Correct, Englishmen! That's in our language . . . No need to expand on that; everything's understood" (273).

In the following sections I illustrate a few of the many cases of untrammeled communication among enthusiastic communists in production novels of the First Five-Year Plan. I focus on three varieties of linguistic heterogeneity—dialect mixing, foreigner talk, and macaronic appropriation of foreign languages by enthusiastic communists. I then examine a few examples of non-communication in order to illustrate the other aspect of the myth—the linguistic isolation of the scoffers who refuse to believe in the pentecostal teachings of the Soviet apostles.

Dialect mixing

Production novels of the First Five-Year Plan frequently depict dialect speakers communicating successfully, on an equal footing with speakers of the standard language, when they are inspired by collective zeal. The intention was evidently to show how enthusiasm transcended personal origin and to convey unity rather than Babel-like misunderstanding or alienation. This contrasts with the tendency in literature of the preceding periods to exploit the distancing effect of dialectal speech in order to condescend, convey negative evaluations, or parody the backwardness of social types. In novels of the First Five-Year Plan, there are numerous cases in which dialect users are fully enfranchised, proletarianized, positive characters;

their manner of discourse does not imply inferiority, nor does it hinder free interaction with speakers of the standard language or other dialects or with communist foreigners.[23] Given the serious problems caused by the influx of peasants into industry in the 1920s and early 1930s (one of the themes of Leonov's *Sot'*; see also Kuromiya 87–99), this depiction of unanimity within linguistic heterogeneity is clearly mythopoeic and represents an "ideal reality."

In *Veduščaja os'*, several of the main positive characters speak in South Russian dialect (as suggested by an admixture of non-standard features in their dialogue)—for example, the fervent communist Andrjušečkin, a cell-secretary and poet, when criticizing a slacker for failing to conform to the demands of society: "Ja potomu i znaju, čto èpoxa trebuet. Nado rabotat', a on devjatiletku okončil, a rabotat' ne xočet . . . Raz tebe nauka dadena—rabotaj! A on nadryzgalsja, nebos', i kverxu puzom" (Il'enkov 12).[24] Another "redeemed" ex-peasant, who foils the central sabotage of the novel, retorts, when accused of being drunk, that he is "očen' daže čerezvyj"; vindicated, he asks for a party card as an outward sign of his conversion (342, 349).[25] In *Sot'*, volunteers arriving at the construction site express their solidarity with one of the heroes, the communist engineer Burago, in northern dialect: "My i prošlo leto pod Buragoj rabotali. Nas odnová i sudit' vmeste sbiralis'!" (Leonov 3: 7).[26] In *Vremja vpered!* (*Time forward!* 1931–32), the communist official Svobodkin (whose language is otherwise standard) speaks out at a planning session "in a Volga accent, with *okan'e*": "Vót čtò tebe skažu, drug moj, Iščenkó. Tól'ko ty ne vólnujsja, ne vólnujsja" (Kataev 5: 20).[27]

Far from emphasizing the confusion or alienation of the represented speakers or writer, dialect mixing in novels of the First Five-Year Plan generally conveys a sense of rich pluralism within unanimity, with understanding and empathy depending on common communist ideology rather than shared linguistic codes. In *Vremja vpered!*, a shock-worker is depicted movingly singing a dialect song "in a village voice"; the other members of the brigade join in, their words represented in the standard language. The leader of the brigade is said to have a Tatar accent (Kataev 1: 16). In *Sot'*, Party members led the effort to overcome the natural obstacles of a heavily forested river bank to build a paper factory and, in so doing, create a proletarian island "amidst a great peasant ocean" (Leonov 1: 41–42; cf. 5: 14). Many of the workmen that assemble are natives of other regions: "sawyers and glaziers from Rjazan' . . . masons and stove-builders from Vjatka and Tver'. . . . plasterers from Vologda . . . painters from Kostroma . . . navvies from Smolensk . . . Permians, Pskovians, men from Vjatka and inhabitants of other surrounding provinces, where it had become difficult to be a peasant in accordance with ancestral precepts . . ." (2: 7)—the Parthians, Medes, and Elamites of Acts. In *Belomorsko-baltijskij kanal* (*White Sea-Baltic Canal*

1934), which resembles a production novel in its emphasis on life-transforming and unifying labor, the dialogue contains a mishmash of the standard language, dialects, criminal argot, and technical jargon; unfamiliar words are left uninterpreted, for the most part, as if the readers could understand them without difficulty. Speakers of diverse dialects and backgrounds also mingle cooperatively at the construction site in *Den' vtoroj.* Èrenburg contrasts their mutual understanding with the regionalism of peasants prior to the Revolution, which he depicts as a Confusion of Tongues: "They said of one another, 'People from Orel will split your head open'; 'Elec is the father of all thieves'; 'They spent the night with Vjatkans and got their shoes stolen'; 'Xlynovians shod a stolen cow in boots'; 'Valdaj Hills, Ljubany thieves'; 'Rževians swapped their father for a dog'; 'A Šujsk rascal will put a yoke on any old body'; 'A Nižnij Novgorodian is a thief, a spendthrift, or a drunk'; 'People from Kostroma have sticky fingers'; 'He fakes like a Kazan' orphan'; 'In Siberia they'd as soon kill a man as drink a pitcher of milk' " (58–59).

Novels of the First Five-Year Plan do contain Zoščenko-like passages that exploit the comic potential of dialect in juxtaposition with malapropos official rhetoric or bureaucratese in order to parody recently proletarianized peasants confused by the new cultural signs of the Soviet era (cf. Il'enkov 25; Leonov 4: 15–16). However, grotesque cases of this kind are comparatively rare; far more characteristic are passages meant to demonstrate the full enfranchisement of the speaker in Soviet life, regardless of sociolinguistic obstacles. In *Vremja vpered!*, a newly literate Stakhanovite brigade-leader applies successfully for party membership (Kataev 9: 40)—a sacrosanct subject in the cultural context; his letter is poorly spelled, virtually unpunctuated, and features startling juxtapositions of dialectalisms, official rhetoric, and technical language. The presence of satire here would have directly contradicted the intent of the novel and the goals of Kataev's literary movement. If any humor is intended, it is empathetic rather than distancing. "Political literacy" (ibid.) is more important for the believer than the niceties of grammar. Thus in *Den' vtoroj* the writer of a poorly-spelled sign is described approvingly as "hazy on orthography but . . . full of enthusiasm" (Èrenburg, 35).

Foreigner talk

Representations of foreigners speaking imperfect Russian tend to suggest the impossibility of understanding—communication inhibited by major differences in culture and mentality. Pre-Revolutionary Russian literature from the time of Fonvizin exploited the alienating effect of such "foreigner talk" (Mühlhäuser) in mordant satire, as in Dostoevskij's portrayal of the two Poles who accompany Grušen'ka in *The brothers Karamazov.* Pan Wrublewski, in particular, is characterized as speaking Russian "better than

he pretended": "If he used Russian words at all, he mangled them in a Polish manner" (Dostoevskij 523). Here foreignness is presented as a symptom of an intentionally uncommunicative attitude.

In novels of the First Five-Year Plan, foreigner talk undergoes a significant reevaluation. It appears in the dialogue of characters who are firm, empathetic, and communicative communists, and it promotes understanding and solidarity instead of antagonism and confusion.[28] For example, in *Veduščaja os'*, the Polish communist Loziński ("Lozinskij"), a Comintern delegate, enthralls the factory-workers with the story of his imprisonment for communist agitation. This apostle's reported speech contains numerous Polonisms of the same kind as in *Brat'ja Karamazovy*: *val'ka*, *tež*, *pžervy*, *naljane*, *sensu*, *mate*, *ale*, *oči*, *poveržxovnyx*, *sposubom*, *robili*, etc. (cf. Polish *walka*, *też*, *przerwy*, *nalane*, *sensu*, *macie*, *ale*, *oczy*, *powierzchowny*, *sposób/sposobem*, and *robili*). The communicative power of his declamation can be seen from its conclusion: "Tovažišče! Či to pravda?! . . A esli to gor'ka pravda, to uznaete, kak smeetsj'a vrag nad vašimi neudačami, kak èti nepoladki b'jut po našemu obščemu delu, po delu mirovoj revoljucii! . . Tovažišče! Davajte ž dobrye sovetskie parovozy! Šikujte ix dlja buduščix dnej, kogda vy pridete k nam snova" (cf. Polish *towarzysze*, *czy to*, *to* for Russian *èto*, *gor'ka*, and *dobry* for Russian *xorošij*).[29] Far from alienating the audience, this burst of Polonized Russian inspires unanimity, internationalist ardor, and renewed zeal for labor: "The crowd, as if they had reached an agreement, roared in reply, 'We'll come! We shall come!' " (Il'enkov 222–23). Though essentially the same sort of macaronic language as that of the Poles in Dostoevskij's novel, Loziński's linguistic behavior is depicted as a cooperative, successful way of communicating with Russians of communist ideology. Not all of Loziński's Polonisms are Russian words "mangled in a Polish manner"; some were presumably unfamiliar to the intended readers. Thus it is striking that they are neither glossed nor commented on in the course of the episode. There is no trace of irony or even humor in this passage, which includes grim descriptions of torture and hunger strikes and a call to excel in collective labor.

Nonstandard forms of language, including foreign accents, can serve as a medium for vital doctrine in the novels. For example, in *Veduščaja os'*, the positive hero Vartan'jan, a Bolshevik dispatched to solve problems at the factory, speaks with a Caucasian accent, conveyed by frequent use of *è* for *e* and by eye-dialect substitution of *a* for unstressed *o*, e.g., "Da ty nè verti mne, požalsta nè verti! Ja trebuju točnogo atveta . . . Bal'ševik dolžen otvečat' prjamo . . . Da ty gavari pa-bal'ševistski" (Il'enkov 57; see also 59, 107, 169, 283–84, 314).[30] This party apostle not only gives conversation lessons to speakers of standard Russian but also interacts unconstrainedly with ex-peasants speaking in the southern dialect, whom, indeed, he inspires with his zeal.

A more extreme instance of communication achieved over linguistic distance may be found in the Civil War novel *Kak zakaljalas'stal'* (*How the steel was tempered* 1932–34), in which a young Asian Bolshevik performs the apostolic function of initiating one of the central Russian characters into the Red Army: "Moja ego znaet . . . Ego klicala: 'Dlavstvuj, tovalisa!' Ego bol'sevika—nasa, molodoj, xolosaja . . ." (Ostrovskij 108).[31] Many features of this pidgin deviate drastically from standard Russian—replacement of *r* by *l* and hushers by hissers; consonant cluster simplification; loss of person and gender agreement; and collapse of the case system.[32] Nevertheless, they do not hinder understanding in the fictive world of the novel; indeed, the Chinese soldier's speech gives the Russian a feeling of in-group solidarity: "Sereža's heart beat joyfully. They had immediately received him as one of themselves" (Ostrovskij 108). What humor there is here is empathetic rather than ironic; the message of the reported speech is meant to evoke a positive response. In cases of this kind, the shared spirit of communist ideology serves as a common culture and a unifying mentality that enables communication regardless of linguistic boundaries.[33]

Macaronic language

The fusion of coequal languages in the collective Holy Spirit also motivates the felicitous appropriation of foreign speech by enthusiastic Russian communists (internationalist proletarians rather than old-world intellectuals)—a phenomenon that may be regarded as the converse of broken Russian. This demolition of "the age-old obstacle of language differences" (see above) is foreshadowed in *Cement*, where the leader of the worker's club "Comintern" exhorts his fellow members to read the German books in the club library: "We are obliged to read by the agenda of proletarian discipline, and, taking into account that we workers are an international body [*mežd unarodnaja massa*], we are obliged to master every language" (Gladkov 1: 74). This sentiment is fully in accord with the spirit of the 1920s, for all that it is expressed in Zoščenko-like "monkey language."

In novels of the First Five-Year Plan, macaronic language goes far beyond mere contact borrowing of terms for imported technology (a widespread phenomenon in Russian during the 1920s). In fact, many of the loanwords in the dialogue of the novels are unmotivated borrowings that have everyday Russian equivalents. In some cases they are used to establish contact with empathetic foreigners; in others they are adopted by Russians speaking among themselves—a form of internationalist language-creation. The resulting hodgepodge recalls Marr's 1926 prediction that the future language of the all-conquering proletariat would be an engineered amalgam of all languages—"a single artificial pan-human language . . . on a genuinely world-wide scale, with the inclusion of the linguistic skills and

interests not of some upper, fine strata but of the working masses of all languages and countries" (cited in Alpatov, *Istorija* 59–60; see also 41, 44).

In Il'in's *Bol'šoj konvejer* (*The big conveyor*, 1932), the communist engineer Bobrovnikov, a confirmed internationalist who has had two years of field experience in Detroit, habitually sprinkles his conversation with English words and phrases, many of them phatic and all given in Cyrillic without gloss: *oll-rajt*, *veri uèll*, *sèr*, *xèlou*, and *pliz*, as well as *prosperiti*, "*grosseri*", *avto*, *servis*, etc. (12, 14, 15, 31, 40, 46, 274, 366). Other characters acquire the same habit, including the protagonist of the novel, the party officer Gazgan: " 'Since there's a factory, there'll be everything else. *Veri uèll*!' (he had being learning Bobrovnikov's English exclamations)" (29; cf. 40, 65, 221, 331–32). In *Sot'*, the communist engineer Burago often speaks macaronically: " 'Ivan Abramyč, Potemkin is seriously *kranken* [*sic*], eh?' He knew that Uvad'ev was secretly studying German" (unglossed; Leonov 2: 148). He uses the German word *gut* (again unglossed) as a mark of approval—notably, when observing the courageous efforts of workers during an emergency (3: 19, 21; see also 2: 47). In *Veduščaja os'*, the octogenarian ex-peasant Kuz'myč, an ardent communist, is fascinated by German because of an inscription that a prisoner of war has written on one of his dead son's books. He appropriates the phrase "Afviderzej [*sic*]" (later distorted to "Af sidorej"), which he later uses to show empathy for a German Comintern delegate: "Afviderzejn, golub' " (Il'enkov 216–19).[34] While there is undeniable humor in this mixture of German and a stereotypical peasant expression of in-group solidarity, there is no element of satire. The fact of contact (or desire for contact) between the Russian and foreign workers is significant in itself; it is as if the differences between the two languages have become trivial and irrelevant within the ranks of the inspired International.

Unbelievers darkened by the shadow of Babel

If, in the mythopoeia of the First Five-Year Plan, the collective spirit creates a Pentecost that can overcome every linguistic barrier, unbelievers in this ideal must still be suffering from the effects of Babel. Soviet linguistic thought of the 1920s tended to be pessimistic about the possibility of effective communication between members of different social groups. In a 1928 article, the Marxist linguist E. D. Polivanov cautiously advanced the idea that "the language of an average person in 1913 and . . . that of a contemporary Komsomol" could be treated not as different dialects but as different languages (cited in Alpatov, *150 jazykov* 51). The influential and mythopoeic Marrists put a characteristically extreme interpretation on the doctrine that all languages were inherently class-based (advanced by N. I. Buxarin, among others); they declared that communication leading to un-

derstanding was only possible among members of the same class (and, by inference, only among the proletariat), who had a common mode of thinking (see Abaev 97; Alpatov, *Istorija* 40; *150 jazykov* 51). Marrists were known to claim that other linguists were unable to "understand" (sc. agree with) their dogmas because they had not arrived at the stage of the "new social thought" characteristic of communism in the making (Alpatov, *Istorija* 67–68; *150 jazykov* 56). Vološinov, who argued against the class basis of language, nevertheless regarded signs as "an arena of class struggle," since members of different socia gave them different ideological "accents" (23; cf. 19, 21, 106); in a 1926 article in *Zvezda*, he voiced the opinion that "every utterance in the business of life is akin to a password known only to those who belong to the same social purview" (cited in Holquist and Clark 209).

Similarly, in production novels of the First Five-Year Plan, individualists, alienated from Soviet society and unenfranchised in the collective, are portrayed as being unable either to understand or to make themselves understood.[35] Such outsiders are doomed to inarticulate frustration and silence, even when they ostensibly use the same language as fully enfranchised members of society, because the modes of thought that underlay their language no longer have a valid social basis. They are, as it were, without a speech community; they speak dead languages useless for any creative purpose—in Vološinov's words (23), "worn out ideological signs incapable of serving as arenas for the clash of live social accents." Thus a "bourgeois specialist" in Gladkov's *Èenergija*, observes that the old intellectual elite has lost both its ability to communicate and its identity: "[T]he intelligentsia is losing its form and its language . . . We don't have our own *I*." (2: 123). Whosoever will save his life shall lose it; paradoxically, the individualist must lose his identity because it is defined by interpersonal communication.

In *Sot'*, the incompetent engineer Renne, "a beclouded intellectual, for whom the light in the world had gone out at the beginning of the revolution" (Leonov 1: 55), is virtually an aphasiac; as his communist daughter tells him, he is so outdated that in ten years' time people will need a commentary to understand him (3: 24). Renne's style of discourse is fragmented and incoherent, conveyed by bursts of speech separated by dashes, often without any grammatical agreement. It is repeatedly mentioned that this odd manner of speaking has a disconcerting effect on the listeners (3: 16, 4: 5). In addition, a nonsensical snatch from a prerevolutionary song, " 'eroj-eroj, a u eroja emorroj," ("An 'ero, an 'ero, and the 'ero has an 'emorrhoid"), intrudes into Renne's speech at inopportune moments (1: 56, 62; 3: 14). Since *eroj* represents a substandard pronunciation of *geroj*, this scatological jingle serves as a signal of his disrespect for the "heroic" labor of the communists at the work site. These idiolectal peculiarities are iconic of Renne's fragmented and incoherent world-view as an alien in

Soviet society, "a puddle that hasn't managed to dry up yet" (3: 22): "From the beginning of the project, the builders had sensed him to be an outsider, who, even if he did no actual harm, would not do a sufficient amount of good; everything about him was hateful—from his dry, barking speech to his old, sharp-brimmed forage cap" (4: 5). In fact, it is Renne's negligence that causes the central catastrophe of the novel. Unmasked, he ends his socially meaningless life (4: 10).

In *Den' vtoroj*, the antihero Volodja Safonov, a student at Tomsk University, is a lonely individualist who acknowledges his isolation: "I am an islander" (Èrenburg 120). The articulate and intellectual Safonov's paradoxical inability to communicate is one of the central themes of the novel. When his Komsomol roommates show no interest in his conversational gambits, he begins a monologue in his diary[36] in which he tries to project onto them his own feelings of muteness: "I'm again convinced they are incapable of conversing . . . They don't know how to speak like *people* speak, that is, making mistakes, haltingly, with heat—to speak about their own personal concerns . . . They can't speak with one another, if only because they don't have anything to talk about; everything is known in advance—and without words, in the bargain" (44–45).[37] Ordinarily, speaking with "mistakes, haltingly" implies failed or troubled communication; in Safonov's inverted system of values, it is equated with success. Safonov fails to understand that the young communists around him, enlightened by the collective spirit, can indeed communicate—even about their personal concerns—with those who share their common faith (cf. 46 and passim), but not with their class enemy. They have no need of his verbosity; they are able to speak with authority, like the positive hero of Socialist Realism, who "knows firmly what is good and bad, says only 'yea' and 'nay,' and does not confuse black with white" (Sinjavskij 418). Safonov himself is incapable of speaking with authority; his language is often mocking, insincere, or duplicitous—the reflection of a divided self: "I said something other than I thought . . . I spoke that way at the meeting not because I am a coward but because I am a cripple" (Èrenburg 129; cf. also 52).

Although Safonov compares his roommates to chimpanzees, who "sometimes try to imitate human speech, but nothing comes out, and they break branches in their rage" (Èrenburg 45), in reality it is he who is unable to draw on the power of speech to communicate meaningfully with society: "Sometimes I feel like starting to howl, howl like wild animals howl, from sadness, from solitude . . . Perhaps once they've heard this bestial howl, they'll pause for a moment in confusion" (45; see also 47). This recalls, and may echo, the view expressed by Vološinov (22, 93) that, given the social basis of semiosis (12, 19, 21–22, 98), the only utterance that is truly individual is the "inarticulate cry of an animal," which has no communicative value because of its independence from the community.[38]

To justify himself before his own conscience, Safonov vaunts his impotent silence as superior to language (an echo of Tjutčev's "Silentium" and the silence theme in Symbolism and Acmeism). Quoting Pascal's "Man is a thinking reed," he notes, "Pipes are made of reeds. You can play anything on a pipe . . . It's a matter of taste. But the best thing is to press the pipe to your lips and not blow. 'Silence, you are better than anything I have heard . . .' " (Èrenburg 48; cf. 56). In this world of the First Five-Year Plan, preferring silence is tantamount to rejecting Soviet society, which is symbolized by the noise of the work site microcosm.[39]

Like an unplayed pipe, one who refuses to communicate has no social value; one who rejects the signs of society is a house divided against itself, since—to cite the contemporary view articulated by Vološinov (12, 13)—individual consciousness is determined by semiosis and is thus "a social-ideological fact," "a tenant lodging in the social edifice of ideological signs" (see also 93, 104; Holquist and Clark 209). One of Safonov's professors characterizes him as an *izgoj*, an archaism from the *Pravda russkaja* denoting bankrupts and others who have lost their proper position in society (Èrenburg 41–42, 121). As "a sign that has been withdrawn from the pressures of the social struggle . . . becoming the object not of live social intelligibility but of philological comprehension" (Vološinov 23), this term is appropriate for one who cherishes obsolete and inviable values.

Ultimately Safanov's loss of identity proves intolerable, and his beloved silence becomes threatening: "After his rift with Irina [an ardent Komsomol member], he couldn't utter a single word. Silence frightened him so much that at times he began to talk to himself, looking around to make sure no one was near; it seemed to him that he was going insane" (Èrenburg 122). As with Renne in *Sot'*, silence (non-communication with the rest of society) can lead only to suicide: " 'Silence, you are better than anything I have heard.' All around Volodja was the noise of a crowd, but it seemed to him that he was alone with the silence. He tried to understand what he was contemplating; then he guessed" (193). Driven by guilt at having inspired sabotage, Safonov hangs himself; his only epitaph is a few angry words mumbled by a drunken horse-trader in a tavern. In a final gesture of noncommunication, his tongue, the organ of speech among the living, is seen protruding silently and insultingly from his body (199).

Conclusion

Production novels and other works of the First Five-Year Plan appropriated the cultural model of Pentecost to convey a myth of the emergence of proletarian language. In this myth, the Holy Spirit of enthusiastic collective labor—itself a motif inherited from the god-builders—undid the Babel of the pre-revolutionary and NÈP periods by facilitating communication among communists, regardless of origin or linguistic differences; it thereby

unified believers in the teachings of Lenin into a single community. By contrast, individualists who scorned the enthusiasm of proletarian labor were befuddled and silenced, since there could be no communication or even identity outside of the ideology of the collective. Led by the apostles of the Party, enthusiastic proletarians were laboring to build a Church Universal by overcoming social, regional, and national boundaries; a new form of humanity was in the making and with it, à la Marr, a future language that would be shared by all the workers of the world. Infused with the spirit of collective labor and communicating without difficulty in many languages, the united workers of the sovietized Pentecost myth were given the power to carry out their Great Commission — to evangelize their country and the world at large with the values of the proletariat, to lay the foundation for the New Jerusalem of universal communism, where all would speak in a single tongue.

NOTES

I would like to thank Irina Paperno, Ludmila Yevsukov, and Irene Masing-Delic for their comments on previous versions of this article.

1 See Pachmuss, 104–9; Bryld; Sesterhenn; Masing-Delic, 19, 22, 42, 61, 130–54.

2 On belief in the posthumous immanence of Lenin, see Tumarkin.

3 Enthusiasm is often presented as energy (as in the title of Gladkov's *Èнergija*), fire, heat, or fever. Cf. Il'enkov, 59, 108, 359; Leonov, *Sot'*, 1: 40; Èrenburg, 22.

4 Thus in Gladkov's *Èнergija* (1932) the individualist Varvara Mixajlovna cannot understand her brother, a Bolshevik engineer: "[I]n youth she had known all Vikentij's revolutionary comrades . . . But some kind of elusive secret separated them from her, and it also hid her brother. This secret shrouded all of those people like some thick, transparent medium. Varvara Mixajlovna saw their faces, heard their voices, but the people seemed to her to be phantoms, who bore within themselves a life of some kind that was extraordinary and beyond her strength . . . They seemed to her to be creatures of some other kind of life . . ." (2: 38).

5 Conflict over the interpretation of *enthusiasm* can also be found in earlier Soviet works such as Gladkov's *Cement* (e.g., 3: 71). For further examples in novels of the First Five-Year Plan, see Il'enkov, 193; Èrenburg, 22; and Leonov, *Sot'*, 1: 74. Cf. also the debates on proletarian "energy" in Il'in, 221–22, 229, 231, 317, 318.

6 The eye dialect in Vartan'jan's reply ("Pazvol'!") illustrates how vital doctrine can be presented in a substandard form.

7 There has been considerable controversy over the nature of the "languages" in this episode. While sectarians such as the Xlysty viewed the linguistic miracle at Pentecost as glossolalia, Russian Orthodox theology of the pre-Soviet era generally interpreted it as xenoglossia (utterances in intelligible languages unknown to the speakers), in accordance with the teachings of Eastern fathers such as Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, and John Chrysostom (see Bulgakov 141–42; Cutten 16–17, 38, 41). In holding up sectarian "language of the Holy Spirit" as a model for transrational language, Futurists such as Kručenyx had in mind not only glossolalia but also xenoglossia (cf. his "New paths of the word" of 1913; Markov 67).

8 See also John Chrysostom, 12: 961–62; Gregory of Nazianzus, 584–85.

9 All of this passage except "the seething energy of the class" was omitted in the edition published as a separate book in 1932.

10 This contrasts with the depiction of disunited crowds in earlier literature (cf. Kručenyx 21, 23 on Vs. Ivanov's Civil War stories).

11 The god-seeker Merežkovskij himself viewed the Tower as an ambivalent symbol whose sense was "the unification of earth and heaven," Jacob's ladder; it raised the question, "With God or against God?" (229–30, 260–62).

12 Kručenyx saw this emphasis on variegated details of language as an innovation of Soviet writing in the 1920s; he spoke of "syntheses that sound almost transrational to the pre-Revolutionary ear" (1; cf. 18–25 and passim).

13 This policy, which Lenin articulated as early as 1914, was first implemented by the Nationalities Commissariat headed by Stalin from 1918–21 and adopted by the Tenth Party Congress in 1921; it was actively, if not fully consistently, pursued throughout the 1920s (see Alpatov, *150 jazykov* 34, 36–41, 44, 72).

14 Marr's ideas were discussed and supported by non-linguists such as Lunačarskij and the RAPP leader Averbax; they even appear in Brjusov's poetry ("ZSFSR," 1924; Alpatov, *Istorija* 29–30, 54, 55–56, 73, note 25).

15 In this connection, it is interesting to note that Kručenyx (18–25, 57) lauds the dialect mixing in Vs. Ivanov's writings as a form of transrational language.

16 Likewise, Marr's disciple A. A. Xolodovič argued in 1930 that classless society would use an international language, since national languages (in which Marr himself disbelieved) were characteristic of the capitalistic stage of development (cited in Alpatov, *Istorija* 41).

17 This agenda was inherited from earlier works such as Gladkov's *Cement* (cf. 3: 70–71).

18 These dreams evaporated after the mid-1930s, as the Party leadership, no longer expecting an imminent world revolution, adopted the policy of building "socialism within a single country" and, with it, russification strategies (see Alpatov, *150 jazykov* 79–94). The Internationalist pentecostal imagery found in production novels of the First Five-Year Plan largely disappears from subsequent works in the genre; it is replaced by the linguistic uniformity of an established but isolated church: "For thousands of years, people suffered from a difference of opinions; we Soviets are the first to agree among ourselves, speak in a single language that can be understood by all, think the same about the chief thing in life. This unanimity makes us strong, and in it lies our predominance over all the people of the world, who are torn apart, estranged, by a difference of opinions" (V. P. Il'enkov, 1949; quoted in Sinjavskij 420).

19 By contrast, a subsequent burst of Sino-Russian pidgin is glossed in a footnote. Despite its form, it conveys unimpeachable doctrine: "Rusiki resypubylika-a. Kytajsi resypubylika-a. Merikanysy resypubylikaa puxao. Niponsy, puxao, nado, nado resypubylika-a. Kyra-a-sna resypubylika-a nada-nada." (" 'Russia's a republic, China's a republic. The American republic's bad. The Japanese are bad, they need a republic. They need a Red republic' "; Ivanov 87.) There is no suggestion that the characters in the fictive world of the story fail to understand this.

20 This episode appears in the chapter "Vstreča pokajannyx" ("The meeting of the penitents"), which was written before the rest of the novel but omitted in the first journal edition. The text is cited here from an early reissue of the first book edition; I would like to thank Jared Ingersoll-Casey of the Ohio State University Library for locating this publication.

21 "Bolshevik . . . hurrah . . . proletaria [*sic*]."

22 "Comintern—all right!" Later the sailors acclaim Lenin in the same way (274).

23 The authors tend not to present consistent dialect but rather to sprinkle dialect forms into otherwise standard (colloquial) discourse in order to give the flavor of regional language without risking loss of clarity.

24 "I know just what the epoch demands—you have to work. He finished high school, but he doesn't want to work . . . If learning is given to you—work! But he got drunk, probably, and is on the tiles." Cf. his reported speech, Il'enkov, 44; and that of Tityč, Kuz'mič, and other enthusiastic workers in the same novel.

25 "I'm very sober, even."

26 "We worked under Burago last summer also. Once we almost got put on trial together."

27 "Here's what I'll tell you, Iščenko, my friend. Only don't you get upset, don't get upset." Cf. *natólknulis'*, *prixódit*, *vagón*, *tóže*, and *sóba-aka* in the same character's reported speech (Kataev 5: 20–21). The acutes are used to indicate the peculiar vowel quality of an *okan'e* dialect rather than stress—a convention inherited from earlier literary depictions of North Russian.

28 The novels also depict foreigners who fail to understand enthusiasm (e.g., Èrenburg 11–12, 65–66, 115–21; Leonov 2: 10–11). Here foreigner talk is used sparingly, since the empathetic overcoming of barriers is not at issue. Translators are only mentioned when one of the interlocutors—either the foreigner or the Russian—is an unbeliever (cf. Il'enkov 227; Il'in 38, 60–62, 149, 221–32).

29 "Comrades! Is that the truth? . . . And if it is the bitter truth, then you'll find out how the enemy laughs at your failures, how these defects strike against our common cause, the cause of world revolution! . . . Comrades! Let's have good Soviet trains! Show them off for the future, when you'll come to us again."

30 "A Bolshevik ought to answer directly . . . Speak in a Bolshevik way!" *Veduščaja os'* features speakers of both standard Russian and southern dialect. Hence it is the very graphic rendition of akan'e rather than the pronunciation so indicated that conveys Vartan'jan's otherness. Il'enkov's method of depicting a Caucasian accent follows the pattern seen in Gladkov's representation of the Georgian worker Cxeladze's speech in *Cement* (e.g., 5: 90–93, 6: 53–54).

31 "I know him . . . He shouted, "Hello, comrades!" He's a Bolshevik, ours, young, good." A similar case of pidgin Russian may be found in *Veduščaja os'* in the speech of a German Comintern delegate, who glorifies Soviet labor and has an apostolic effect on an acquisitive malingerer (Il'enkov 227, 310–11).

32 Cf. Nichols on stereotyped Chinese Russian. Many of the same features can be found in the pidgin of the self-sacrificing Red partisan Sin Bin U in Ivanov's *Bronepoezd 16,49*.

33 Contrast Èrenburg's depiction of Siberian tribesmen. Unresponsive to Soviet ideology, these shamanists are unable or unwilling to communicate with communist workers; significantly, they are frightened by machines, the fetishes of the era (21, 77, 79). This portrayal reflects official suspicion of ethnic groups who valued their traditional way of life over proletariatization (cf. Alpatov, *150 jazykov* 46).

34 "Af [sic] widersehen, my friend."

35 Many of them are portrayed as *unwilling* to make themselves understood—for example, the engineer Klejst prior to his conversion in Gladkov's Cement (2: 91). In *Sot'* an elderly peasant who wants to hinder the project speaks uncooperatively, à la Pan Wrublewski: "He intentionally distorted the words, attracting attention to his cleverly feigned ignorance" (Leonov 4: 16).

36 Diaries in production novels symbolize social isolation—the inability to achieve meaningful interactions (cf. Akatueva's diary in *Veduščaja os'*, Il'enkov 201–2).

37 As Volodja is writing these words, the other students, filled with the joy of collectivism, are singing a Komsomol tune: "[Rožkov] liked the fact that his voice fell into the general roar and that the roar was growing. It was good to walk in step with everyone; then you didn't feel fatigue! It was also good to sing in chorus . . . to know that you weren't alone, that everyone has the same muscles, the same breathing, the same will" (Èrenburg 44).

38 The opposition of animal cries to articulate human speech and understanding can be found in other contemporary sources, e.g., in *Kak zakaljalas' stal'*, in which a Red Army soldier compares the speech of bourgeois youths who spurn the Komsomol—thus abrogating the possibility of communication in the new society—to the neighing of stallions (Ostrovskij 115). In *Sot'*, the young monk Gelasij is reduced to a state of nonidentity and non-communication resembling an animal in pain before his conversion to communism: "Gelasij . . . was acting like a wild beast . . . He ran into the woods and lived there a week, eating and sleeping as animals do . . . He was still frightened by the human voice. In search of himself he roamed through the thickets, and at night . . . he shouted his blasphemies to the whole forest, but nothing happened" (Leonov 2: 22).

39 In Gladkov's *Èenergija*, a skeptic unwittingly hits upon the truth: "If a day suddenly passed without these [construction] explosions, it would be voiceless and insignificant" (2: 105–6). This symbolism is present in works of the earliest Soviet period, e.g., in Gastev's "Oratoru" (1918): "cheerful as the noises of a motor in the wilderness" (164; cf. 98); and in Brjusov's "Tol'ko russkij" (1919; 454).

WORKS CITED

Abaev, V. I. "N. Ja. Marr (1864–1934). K 25-letiju so dnja smerti." *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 1960, no. 1: 90–99.

Alpatov, V. M. *Istorija odnogo mifa: Marr i marrizm.* Moscow: Nauka, 1991.

———. *150 jazykov i politika 1917–1997: Sociolingvističeskie problemy SSSR i postsovetskogo prostranstva.* Moscow: IV RAN, 1997.

Bazarov, V. [V. Rudnev]. "Xristiane tret'ego zaveta i stroiteli bašni vavilonskoj." *Literaturnyj raspad* 2 (1909): 5–38.

Belomorsko-baltijskij kanal imeni Stalina: Istorija stroitel'stva. Ed. M. Gor'kij, L. Averbax, and S. Firin. Moscow: Istorija fabrik i zavodov, 1934.

Brjusov, V. B. 1955. *Izbrannye sočinenija v dvux tomax.* Vol. 1. Moscow: Xudožestvennaja literatura, 1955.

Bryld, Mette. "M. Gor'kijs *Mat'*. Eine mythische Wanderung." *Scando-Slavica* 28 (1982): 27–49.

Bulgakov, S. V. *Pravoslavie.* Moscow: Sovremennik, 1994.

Clark, Katarina. *The Soviet novel: History as ritual.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1981.

Cutten, George B. *Speaking with tongues historically and psychologically considered.* New Haven: Yale UP, 1927.

Dostoevskij, F. M. *Brat'ja Karamazovy.* Moscow: Goslitizdat, 1958.

Èrenburg, Il'ja. *Den' vtoroj.* Paris, 1933.

Gastev, Aleksej. *Poèzija rabočego udara.* 6th ed. Leningrad: Sovetskij pisatel', 1964.

Gladkov, Fedor. *Cement: Roman.* In *Krasnaja nov'* 1926, no. 1–6.

———. *Cement: Roman.* 11th ed. Moscow: Zemlja i Fabrika, 1928.

———. *Èenergija: Roman.* Books 1–2. In *Novyj mir* 1932, no. 1–10.

Gregory of Nazianzus. *Tvorenija iže vo svjatyx otca našego Grigorija Bogoslova, arxiepiskopa konstantinopol'skogo.* Vol. 1. Saint Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo P. P. Sojkina, 1912.

Holquist, Michael, and Katarina Clark. *Mikhail Bakhtin.* Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1984.

Il'enkov, V. *Veduščaja os'*. In *Oktjabr'* 1931, no. 10–12.

———. *Veduščaja os'*. Moscow: Xudožestvennaja literatura, 1932.

Il'in, Jakov. *Bol'šoj konvejer.* 3d ed. Moscow: Molodaja gvardija, 1934.

Ivanov, Vs. *Bronepoezd no. 14,69: Povest'*. In *Krasnaja nov'1922*, no. 1.

John Chrysostom. *Tvorenija svjatogo otca našego Ioanna Zlatousta, arxiepiskopa kon-*

stantinopol'skogo. 12 vv. Saint Petersburg: S.-Peterburgskaja Duxovnaja Akademija, 1906.

Kataev, Valentin. *Vremja vpered*! In *Krasnaja nov'* 1932, no. 1–9.

Kručenyx, A. *Novoe v pisatel'skoj texnike*. Moscow: Vserossijskij Sojuz Poètov, 1927.

Kuromiya, Hiroaki. *Stalin's industrial revolution: Politics and workers, 1928–1932*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988.

Laskovaja, M. *Bogoiskatel'stvo i bogostroitel'stvo prežde i teper'*. 2d ed. Moscow: Moskovskij rabočij, 1976.

Leonov, Leonid. *Sobranie sočinenij v devjati tomax*. Vol. 2: *Barsuki*. Moscow: Xudožestvennaja literatura, 1960.

———. *Sot'*: *Roman*. In *Novyj mir* 1930, no. 1–5.

Markov, Vladimir, ed. *Manifesty i programmy russkix futuristov*. Slavische Propyläen, vol. 27. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1967.

Masing-Delic, Irene. *Abolishing death: A salvation myth of Russian twentieth-century literature*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1992.

Merežkovskij, D. *Tajna trex: Egipet i Vavilon*. Prague: Plamja, 1925.

Mühlhäusler, Peter. "Stereotype foreigner talk in German literature." In *The Fergusonian impact: In honor of Charles A. Ferguson on the occasion of his 65th birthday*, vol. 2, ed. Joshua A. Fishman et al., 107–19. Contributions to the Sociology of Language, vol. 42. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1986.

Nichols, Johanna. "Pidginization and foreigner talk: Chinese pidgin Russian." In *Papers from the 4th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, ed. Elizabeth C. Traugott, 397–407. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, vol. 14. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 1980.

Ostrovskij, Nikolaj. *Kak zakaljalas' stal'*. Moscow: Molodaja gvardija, 1936.

Pachmuss, Temira. *Zinaida Hippius: An intellectual profile*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1971.

Schmemann, Alexander. *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*. Trans. Asheleigh E. Moorhouse. Portland, ME: American Orthodox P, 1966.

Sesterhenn, Raimund. *Das Bogostroitel'stvo bei Gor'kij und Lunačarskij bis 1909: Zur ideologischen und literarischen Vorgeschichte der Parteischule von Capri*. Slavistische Beiträge, vol. 158. Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner, 1982.

Sinjavskij, Andrej [Abram Terc]. *Fantastičeskij mir Abrama Terca*. Paris: Inter-Language Literary Associates, 1965.

Triod' cvetnaja. 1902. Reprint. Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1973.

Tumarkin, Nina. *Lenin lives! The Lenin cult in Soviet Russia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1983.

Vološinov, V. N. [1929] 1986. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. 1929. Trans. Ladislav Matejka and I. R. Titunik. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1986.

Ware, Timothy. *The Orthodox Church*. New York: Penguin Books, 1964.

Xlebnikov, V. V. *Sobranie sočinenij*. 5 vv. Reprint. Ed. Vladimir Markov. Slavische Propyläen, vol. 37. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1968.