

Yelena Y. Geimbukh
Moscow City University

SEMANTICS OF PERSONAL PRONOUNS IN NIKOLAI CHERNYSHEVSKY'S NOVEL *WHAT IS TO BE DONE?*

Introductory remarks

The pragmatic aspect of the study of the text - the relationship between the author and the addressee - is one of the central problems of contemporary linguistics. Thanks to the new approach, many works are receiving a new reading. To a large extent this applies to Nikolai Chernyshevsky's novel *What Is To Be Done?*, which has been studied for a long time mainly from the point of view of the author's ideological positions. This determines the novelty and relevance of the study. The purpose of the article is to investigate the system of personal pronouns, reflecting the multifaceted nature of the images of the author and the reader. The task of the work is to study the contextual semantics of the pronouns, to identify the nuclear and peripheral meanings of each. The main method of studying is the "shuttle" method, which presupposes the movement from the linguistic characteristics proper to their semantic significance and back.

Main part

Chernyshevsky's novel *What Is To Be Done?*, although not reflecting the ideological views of our era, nevertheless evokes interest as a unique work in terms of narrative structure. Philology undertakes the study of the actual artistic aspects of the work: the novel is now considered in the genre aspect as an example of utopia ([2]; 3); there are research studies devoted to the analysis of the text ([5]). The subject structure of the text is studied more deeply, the question of the specifics of the images of the author and the reader in the text, and the nature of their relationship is raised ([1]).

The most striking feature of the novel is the character of the narration, which is determined by the correlation of the author's different faces both with each other and with the readers.

One of the possible aspects of analyzing the complex relationship between all the subject structures is the study of the semantics of personal pronouns.

The author can talk about himself in the first, in the second, and in the third person; he addresses the public both as "you" and "they" presenting it as an outside observer:

"It's true, "I say (1st person)" ([6]; 31).

"But for us (1st person plural) to delve into the world history will be too much: if you are engaged in a story, stick to a story (2nd person)" ([6]; 94).

"The author is not in the mood for embellishing, good public (3^d person)" ([6]; 31).

And this is not a simple "juggling" of pronouns. Let us consider in greater detail the meaning and internal structure of each personal pronoun.

Behind the first person singular there hide different faces of the author changing masks sometimes even within a single paragraph: from the "writer" that sweeps out the obsolete canons of all the universally acknowledged "artistry", to the narrator who consistently registers "the way it was."

The contents of "the way it was" concept in the structure of the novel is as ambiguous as the character of personal pronouns. At first glance, "the way it was" creates the illusion of the reliability of what is described in the novel by including the narrator in the artistic world of the work. The author-narrator is next to his characters, in the same chronotope; he belongs to the same circle of "new people" as they do; he can talk to his own characters, as a result of which he takes the position of a "narrator", an observer, a listener:

"Who lives now on the dirtiest of the innumerable black staircases of the first courtyard, on the fourth floor; in the apartment to the right, I do not know ..." ([6]; 34).

"Verochka is now well. That's why I tell (with her consent) of her life, that, as far as I know, she is one of the first women to have settled well" ([6]; 71).

However, the author-"character" constantly violates the novel chronotope, turns into an all-knowing author who can tell the reader not only what has already happened, but also what will happen:

"... they expected that within four months or even sooner they would have already set up house (and so it happened)" ([6]; 154);

"... a few years after I tell you about her, she will have many such days, months, years: this will happen when her children have grown up, and when she sees them as people worthy of happiness and actually happy" ([6]; 235);

"- So what is it? Are you starting to talk about 1865?"

- I am.

- How can you? Have mercy!

"Why not, if I know? .." ([6], 431) (here the author tries to put the reader in the picture as to what will occur two years after the novel is completed, and not only within the artistic world of the novel, but also beyond it).

The author-narrator ("contemplator" and "writer") occupies in the novel a position on the borderline between the artistic and real worlds. Therefore, it is not

surprising that the second "the way it was" sphere is what refers to the author himself, autobiographical motifs:

"Marya Alekseyevna gave a try-out, as if she was learning "logic", which I was also learning by heart ..." ([6]; 97).

"It was only recently a fashionable expression among aesthetic writers with lofty aspirations: "aesthetic vein" maybe even now remains a fashionable expression among them - I do not know, I have not seen them for a long time" ([6]; 109).

In addition, "the way it was" sheds light on yet another aspect of reality: everyday life of "new people", among who the author thinks he belongs, and who are on both sides of the borderline "artistic world" - "reality":

*"He got indignant at some moderantist, **almost at me**, even though I was not here ..."* ([6]; 188).

*"... /Rakhmetov/ still has up to 3000 roubles income, no one knew it while he lived **with us**. We learned this later ... <...> It was not appropriate for **us** to show any curiosity in these things, was it?"* ([6]; 261).

The use of the personal pronoun of the first person singular separates the narrator's "I" from the characters and readers, emphasizes his individuality and "self-sufficiency". However, the pronoun of the first person plural denoting a group of persons, is used in the text not less often. Which communities does the author identify with? Who, why and what for does he ally himself with?

In the first chapter "we" means "**us men**" - and in the same paragraph - all contemporaries: *"I like to call rough things using straight names of rude and vulgar language, which **we** all almost always think and speak ..."* ([6]; 59).

"We" in the meaning "all of us" runs through the entire novel including the "I" into the undivided whole of the generation, the time to which the author belongs by birth.

However, the author's contemporary generation is represented not only as a single whole. "We" as opposed to "you" or "they" is much more often the case. This opposition is stated as early as the Preface, in the appeal to "new people": *"Recently **you** have begun to emerge among **us**"* ([6]; 31); *"This type /"they"/ has recently appeared in **our country**"* ([6]; 196).

Thus, "our generation" includes a "new" and "antediluvian" audience, who never merge with each other, but can be united with the author in a single "we". In order to characterize "dye-in-the-wool writers", the author uses ironic and familiar vocabulary (*"enlightened and noble novelists, journalists and other instructors of our public"*, *"so highly enlightened and noble writers"*, *"our writers, thinkers and instructors"*, *"lovers of beautiful ideas and defenders of lofty aspirations"* ([6]; 103-104), *"dye-in-the-wool literary judges"*, *"aesthetic writers with sublime strivings"*, *"the company of our aesthetic writers"* ([6]; 109)), as well as detailed descriptions in which irony borders on

sarcasm ("But does it not show to the discerning reader (it shows to the majority of the dye-in-the-wool literary judges – for they are discerning gentlemen), does it not show, I say, that Kirsanov and Lopukhov were dried-up men, lacking an aesthetic vein? Is it natural for young people, if they have a bit of taste and but a small piece of heart not to take an interest in the question of the face when talking about a girl? No doubt, these are people without an artistic feeling (aesthetic vein). And others, who studied the nature of man in circles, even richer in aesthetic sense than the company of our aesthetic writers, believe that young people in such cases will certainly discuss a woman even from the most plastic side" ([6]; 109)).

"We" often unites the "I" of the author who makes the narration, and the reader, with whom the narrator follows the story:

*"But **we** only saw half of this scene"* ([6]; 144);

*"**We** only see Lopukhov now "* ([6]; 75);

*"What did Marya Alexeyevna think about such a conversation, if she eavesdropped on it? **We**, who heard it all, from beginning to end, we shall all say that such a conversation during the quadrille is very strange"* ([6]; 84);

*"How this proof was found, **we** shall now see"* ([6]; 94).

The traditionally used "we", including the author and the reader, does not exhaust in Chernyshevsky's novel all relations between the creator and the recipient of the letter.

The author-narrator constantly changes his position in relation to the "public" and the characters. The relationship between the dramatic juxtaposition and opposition between the sender and the addressees (simply "readers" and other authors) is a separate story. The starting point of this plot is found at the very beginning, when an "unknown" writer tries to take his place both in the hearts of the readers and among his colleagues:

*"I am telling **you** my first story, **you** have not yet formed a judgment as to whether the **author** is gifted with artistic talent (after all, **you** have so many writers to whom **you** have ascribed artistic talent), **my** signature would not yet entice **you**, and I had to cast **you** a fishing rod with a bait of spectacularity. Do not blame **me** for it - **you** are to blame; **your** naive innocence forced **me** to stoop to this vulgarity. But now **you** have already fallen into **my** hands, and **I** can continue the story, as it suits **my** judgement, without any tricks. Further there will be no mystery, **you** will always see the denouement of each situation twenty pages ahead"* ([6]; 31).

So, the dialogue with the reader begins almost from the first lines of the novel. Therefore, it is not surprising that a relationship springs up quite quickly between the "communicants", a relationship typical of a real dialogue and reflected, in particular, in the system of pronouns: the speaker's "I" can be opposed to the "you" of the listener; "I" and "you" can be united in a single "we" (especially in relation to "third parties", most often characters).

But if a dialogue as such is limited to the indicated relations, the dynamics of interaction in Chernyshevsky's novel is much more complicated. The all-knowing author easily crosses the border between "I" and "you" and correlates his cues not only with what the character "speaks", but also with what he "thinks":

"... he /the reader/ says, "she /the reader/ probably thinks the same, but does not consider it necessary to share" ([6]; 31);

"Did it only seem to Verochka or was it real, who knows?" ([6]; 91);

*"Lopukhov **believes** that you are an amazing girl, this is so; but it is not surprising that he **believes** it - because he has fallen in love with you!" ([6]; 89);*

*"... this is not just her testimony, I also vouch for her: she saw them. Only **we** know that he did not have them; but he had a look that from Petrovna's viewpoint it was impossible not to see two stars on him – it was she who saw them; I am not joking: she did see them" ([6]; 161). The scene with Petrovna, apparently not related to the story in any way, gives a psychological portrait not only of man in general, but also the reader in particular. Raised on novels that are built on hackneyed stories and in which characters and writers utter commonplace truths, the readers see what is not in the work (for example, the exposing of materialism, the author's confession to immorality, his and that of his characters, etc.) but do not see what is in it. Moreover, these same vices are manifested in characters who are also readers of modern novels and who often form their attitude to life on the basis of these novels - sometimes embellishing reality because of naivety and inherent goodness, (Verochka's comments on Storeshnikov's "love"), but more often because of spiritual, moral blindness, prejudice, denying what is unusual, incomprehensible ("enlightened and noble novelists, journalists and other instructors of our public").*

The position of "registrator" of what is happening is fully understood and becomes the subject of the author's reflection: *"I'm not one of those artists whose every word hides a spring, I retell what people thought, nothing more" ([6]; 133).*

Chernyshevsky speaks ironically about the trust of the public in the written word, in "what is writ is writ". "Knowledge" of how the story will develop and how the characters should be treated, is presented by the writer as a preconceived opinion, which may not be justified:

"... the reader says: "I know that this man, who shot himself, did not shoot himself. "I clutch at the phrase "I know" and say: you do not know it, because you have not been told this yet, and you only know what they say to you; you yourself do not know anything, you are not even aware that the way I started the story, I insulted, humiliated you. You did not know this, did you? "Well, then you should know" ([6]; 31).

The reader's assumptions are countered by real life, which was reproduced in the novel in the form of "facts" and which brought "good" and "truth" to the narrative:

"I do not have a shadow of artistic talent. I do not even have a good command of the language. But it's still nothing: read, kind people! The reading will do you good. Truth is a good thing: it rewards the shortcomings of the writer who serves it. Therefore, I will tell you: if I had not warned you, it would seem to you that the story is written in an artistic manner, that the author has a lot of poetic talent. But I warned you that I have none, and now you will know that all the merits of the story are due to its being truthful" ([6]; 31).

It is hardly possible to take seriously the assertion about Chernyshevsky's "coquetry", which modern researcher Viktor Sonkin sees in the writer's arguments, and which, in his opinion, springs from the real inability to master the language ("stylistic absurdities", "literary hopelessness", "clumsy monologues," "writer's bravado," etc.) [4]. In the next paragraph, the writer, accustomed to talking with the "shrewd reader," responds to such attacks himself:

"When I say that I do not have a shadow of artistic talent and that my story is very weak in execution, don't you dare to conclude that I'm explaining to you that I am worse than those of your narrators that you consider great and that my novel is worse than their works. I mean a different thing. I am saying that my story is very weak in execution compared to the works of people who are really talented: as far as the glorious works of your famous writers are concerned, you can boldly place my narrative on a par with them in terms of the level of the execution, and even higher - you will not be mistaken! It still has more artistry than they: you can rest assured" ([6]; 31).

Such passages, which are many in the novel, cannot but shock the readers. In addition to the irony over readers and writers, whom the narrator himself inadvertently joins when turning to the literary career, self-irony also appears. "I" falls into "I" proper and "author", "novelist". The "novelist" can be the object of evaluation (at the beginning of the work: *"I used the usual trick of novelists"*), and its subject. In the second half of the novel, the author's "I am a novelist" image becomes more active and determines the attitude towards his creation from the point of view of the long-outdated classical aesthetics (contrasting high and low genres):

"But I do not tell the story the way I need in order to acquire the reputation of a masterful writer, but the way it was. I, as a novelist, am very upset that I wrote several pages that have the base character of vaudeville" ([6]; 102).

It seems that the author-narrator has two inseparable tasks: to "educate" the reader and draw the attention of writers - adherents of trite patterns perceived as the standard of art. It is this understanding of "artistry" that Chernyeshvsky opposes arguing with writers and readers:

"Yes, the first pages of the story reveal that I have a very low opinion of the public. I used the usual trick of novelists: I began the story with spectacular scenes torn from the middle or the end of it, and covered them with fog" ([6]; 31).

And yet the author thinks of only part of the "public". Among the readers, the author singles out *"a certain proportion of people - now a very large one - who I respect"* ([6]; 31).

The author's attitude to different kinds of the "public" is reflected in the choice of pronouns. He refers to *"a very large majority"* in an informal fashion while treating *"the good and strong, honest and able"* formally.

The description of the "public" is enriched throughout the whole novel: "you - the public" acquires a permanent epithet, "discerning", and later its composition is specified: "almost all literary men and literary hacks." But the author of the novel himself belongs to the "literary men". This might be the reason why the text includes experienced speech, in which behind the "I" of the author there hides the "I" of the reader. However, due to the explicit irony, the point of view of "enlightened and noble writers" is debunked. Such arguments concern, first of all, morality, materialists, "uninteresting characters":

"What kind of people are they?" <...> Some of them eat and drink; others do not fly into a rage for no reason: what uninteresting people!" ([6]; 409).

"... materialists ... low and immoral people, who cannot be pardoned, because pardoning them would mean pandering to materialism. So, it is impossible to pardon Lopukhov without justifying him. And it is impossible to justify him either; because lovers of beautiful ideas and defenders of lofty aspirations, who have declared materialists to be low and immoral, have recently established themselves as smart and strong-willed in the eyes of all decent people, be they materialists, or non-materialists, and as a result it has come to be considered unnecessary to protect anyone from their reprimands, and paying attention to their words is regarded indecent" ([6]; 104-105).

Conclusion

Having considering the semantics of personal pronouns in Chernyshevsky's novel *What Is To Be Done?* we come to the following conclusions:

The pronoun of the first person singular "**I**" includes different faces of the author, first of all that of a writer of the new generation asserting the principles of a new artistry, which is inextricably linked with "truth".

The author-narrator occupies a position on the borderline between the artistic world of the novel and reality, therefore the personal pronoun of the first person plural "**we**" can include a group of persons both in the novel chronotope and beyond, and sometimes both dimensions (textual and extra-textual). "We" embraces "I" and "new people", as well as "I" and the "reading public", most of whom are described as "antediluvian".

The pronoun of the second person singular and plural ("**you**") is associated, as a rule, with the designation of two types of the reading "public" and expresses the author's attitude: familiar-ironic to the "discerning" reader, and respectfully favourable to the "new" reader.

"**They**" are primarily "special people" who are opposed to "us" all, "us" meaning "new" people, those who are able at least to see and understand a "special" person, and "antediluvian" people, "whose eyes are not adapted" to see people like Rakhmetov.

References

1. Бударagina Е. И. Средства создания образа адресата в художественном тексте: Дис. ... канд. филол. наук. -М., 2006.
2. Лукин К. Л. Несостоятельность мечты о народном счастье // Литература в школе. - 2003. -№ 8. - С. 37-39.
3. Сердюченко В. Л. Футурология Достоевского и Чернышевского // Вопросы литературы. - 2001. - № 3. - С. 66-84.
4. Сонькин В. Н.Г. Чернышевский. Что делать? // Legens@bigfoot.com.
5. Степанов А. В. Язык и стиль в романе Н.Г. Чернышевского // Русский язык в школе. - 1998. - № 3. - С. 65-72.
6. Чернышевский Н.Г. Что делать? —М., 2002.

Semantics of personal pronouns in Nikolai Chernyshevsky's novel *What Is To Be Done?*

The article is devoted to unstudied questions of the language and style of Nikolai Chernyshevsky's novel *What Is To Be Done?*, first of all to the subject structure of the text.

The features of the narration connected with a parity of different faces of the author and the reader are considered in the work.

The main subject of research are means of creating (first of all personal pronouns) images of the sender correlating among themselves and the addressee of the letter. Significant attention is given to studying the functional orientation of text oppositions of the pronouns "I" - "you" - "you" - "they" for the designation of one person (group of persons).

Keywords: subject structure, pragmatical analysis; sender, addressee, image of the author, image of the reader; semantics of personal pronouns.