GRINEV THE TRICKSTER: READING THE PARADOXES OF PUSHKIN'S *THE CAPTAIN'S DAUGHTER*

Polina Rikoun, Ohio State University

Petr Grinev, the young Russian nobleman who must navigate the chaos of Pugachev's popular uprising in Alexander Pushkin's historical novel *The Captain's Daughter*, is one of the most closely scrutinized, yet poorly understood characters in Russian literature.[1] Numerous scholars have researched Grinev's origins and evolution, producing detailed accounts of the character's historical prototypes, literary cousins, and the many successive permutations he underwent in Pushkin's drafts.[2] Even more critics have taken part in the continuing dispute about the nature of Grinev's character, expressing sharply polarized opinions. Some think that Petr is a guileless loyalist who candidly upholds his oath to the throne, while others believe that he is a cunning dissenter who secretly wavers between the reigning empress and the rebel leader. Both arguments can be supported by the text, but only at the cost of playing down evidence to the contrary. These one-sided interpretations fracture Grinev's persona in two, leaving the reader to wonder who he really is. But a cohesive image of Petr's character emerges if we accept his contradictions. Paradox is the defining element of Grinev's character; he is a mediator who can bridge any two diametrically opposed qualities or phenomena. Among his many feats, language play is especially important. His knack for joining truth with lies, the literal with the figurative, the straightforward with the equivocal enables Petr to talk his way out of seemingly inescapable traps. Acknowledging Grinev's fluid persona and forked tongue, we can explore his complexity as a character and narrator more fully than ever before.

1. I would like to extend my deepest thanks to everyone who commented on this paper's various drafts, offering their insights, support, and constructive criticism: W. M. Todd III, S. Sandler, J. Buckler, K. Dianina, A. Slayman, and my anonymous reviewers. I would also like to thank Harvard's Davis Center for Russian Studies and Ukrainian Research Institute for funding my doctoral thesis research, on which this article is based.

2. For the evolution of Pushkin's drafts, see Oksman. For a discussion of literary allusions and prototypes at play in *The Captain's Daughter,* see Gillelson and Mushina's commentary. For an illuminating analysis of Pushkin's experiments with narrative voice, see Debreczeny.

Grinev's key aspects—mediator, guileful sweet-talker, escape artist—identify him as a trickster, a character type that is well known in anthropology and folklore studies. Before turning to *The Captain's Daughter*, I will outline the most important characteristics of this elusive figure. The word "trickster," used since the eighteenth century "to designate morally one who deceives or cheats," was adopted by anthropologists as a value-neutral term in the 1860s (Hynes and Doty 14). Since then, scholars from around the world have used this term to describe a wide range of mythic and folkloric characters, who can be gods, like the Norse Loki, the Greek Hermes, and the West-African Eshu and Legba; animals, like the African-American Brer Rabbit and the Native American Coyote; or humans, like the Greek Odysseus.[3] Even though these characters vary greatly, they perform a similar range of vital services for their cultures, and share a number of traits that enable them to play their part. Tricksters are irreducibly "ambiguous and anomalous"; they are mediators who can bridge diametrically opposed realms of experience, "such as sacred and profane, life and death, culture and nature, order and chaos, fertility and impotence, and so on" (Lévi-Strauss 226; Hynes 34).[4] Tricksters are also patrons of boundaries, able to manipulate any threshold, "sometimes drawing the line, sometimes crossing it, sometimes erasing or moving it" (Hyde 7–8). Thanks to their fluid, boundary-crossing nature, tricksters can perform many impossible feats: they slip out of inescapable traps, topple the most stable hierarchies, establish communication between irreconcilably divided realms, and even alter the fabric of language, mixing up literal with figurative, truthful with mendacious, meaningful with nonsensical (Hynes 34; Hyde 7–8, 56, 74; Pelton 242–43). Far from heroic, tricksters lie, cheat, steal, brag, make fools of themselves, and wreak endless havoc on gods and humans alike, but their disruptiveness is vital. Personifying the power to redefine even the most immutable-seeming categories and remake even the most firmly established rules, tricksters imbue social and cosmic orders with the flexibility necessary

3. Paul Radin's *The Trickster* is a classic study that focuses on a single character, the Native-American Wakdjunkaga. A theoretically sophisticated comparison of tricksters from neighboring West-African cultures belongs to Robert Pelton. William J. Hynes and William G. Doty edited an indispensable collection of essays, covering a variety of approaches to the trickster. Lewis Hyde has written an insightful exploration of the trickster in modern art. Henry Louis Gates, Jr., explores the trickster's central role in African-American literature and criticism.

4. Virtually every scholar who has studied the trickster notes this figure's contradictory nature; this baffling characteristic is typically approached in two ways. Earlier scholars tend to discount the trickster's contradictions as an archaism, destined to disappear (Jung, Radin 1956), while their successors argue that contradiction is essential, serving some important purpose. Among the first to suggest what this purpose might be is Lévi-Strauss, who argued in 1963 that the trickster functions as a mediator of opposites, with such mediations located "at the root of mythical thought" (224). Most subsequent studies build on this insight, even while contesting Lévi-Strauss's structuralist method (for an overview of approaches to the trickster, see Pelton 223–84).

to accommodate creativity, adapt to change, and cope with contradiction, absurdity, and chaos (Hyde 9; Kerényi 185; Pelton 252).

Like most oral cultures, Russian folklore has characters who can be interpreted as tricksters, some based on historical figures, others purely fictional.[5] Among the latter are the folktale Sister Fox and Ivan the Fool, also known as Balda. Pushkin learned about Balda from his nanny's tales, and even turned one of them into verse in the poem "The Tale of a Priest and His Worker Balda." Like many tricksters, Balda must serve as a messenger-mediator between two inimical realms, a priest and the sea devils, and force the latter to pay a fee to the former. To rid themselves of Balda, the devils challenge him to impossible contests, all of which Balda wins through guile. When the devils want to see who can throw a stick the farthest, Balda brags that he will send it beyond a passing cloud, scaring away his opponent. Because Balda's bluff secures his victory, it turns lies into truth and exaggeration into a statement of fact—a trickster's signature linguistic play. When the devils suggest another test, a race around the sea, Balda calls upon braggadocio again. If the devils hope to defeat him, they should try first to outrun his "younger brother," the hare. While the devil circles the sea with supernatural speed, Balda's hare runs back to his wood. But at the finish line, the exhausted devil finds that Balda's "younger brother" is already there! Just like tricksters from many different cultures, who win a race by confusing the identity of the runner, Balda passes off another, identical hare as the winner of the contest (Pushkin 4: 418–25).[6]

Pushkin was also familiar with the folk tricksters who had real-life prototypes—royal impostors. Plaguing Russia for as long as it had a monarchy, pretenders to the throne inspired numerous oral legends where they appear as fluid mediators, connecting royalty and peasantry, divinely ordained authority and demonic illegitimate rule. Among these figures is Pugachev, whose history Pushkin wrote before *The Captain's Daughter* and who appears in folksongs and legends that Pushkin heard while doing research in the region of the uprising. Readers familiar with Russian impostors or with trickster characters from other cultures might fairly readily recognize that Pushkin's

5. Several Slavists other than myself study tricksters. Sheila Fitzpatrick recently published an article reading Ostap Bender and other Soviet con-men as tricksters. Irina Reyfman invokes the trickster to set the stage for her study of Vasily Trediakovsky's image as the fool of Russian literary mythology (1990, 11–12; 104–24). Furthermore, Reyfman suggests that these cultural myths reserve the role of the trickster for Pushkin himself (253–54). Eleazar Meletinsky focuses on Norse, Native American, African, and Melanesian trickster myths, but does not identify any tricksters in the Russian oral tradition (1994, 37–39). Comparing Ivan the Fool to widely recognized tricksters, Meletinsky does not place him in the same category with them (1958, 222–24). Though Meletinsky shows the trickster's influence on some Russian novels, including Gogol's *Dead Souls*, he denies that this figure plays any part in *The Captain's Daughter* (1994, 71).

6. See, for instance, the race between Brer Terrapin and Brer Rabbit in Joel Chandler Harris's collection of African-American tales, or the Russian tale "Ivanko-Medvedko" in Permiakov (48).

cunning, flexible, smooth-talking Pugachev fits the type.[7] But what is surprising about the novel is that Grinev fits it as well. Not content to simply adapt ready-made folk characters like Balda and Pugachev, Pushkin creates a trickster of his own and places him at the novel's center.[8]

Petr Grinev is a fictional figure whom Pushkin plunges into the upheaval of the 1773–74 popular uprising against Catherine II, led by the royal impostor Emelian Pugachev, a Cossack who pretends to be Catherine's deposed and murdered husband Peter III. Narrated by Grinev himself, the novel is the old man's account of his youthful exploits. After a terse description of his childhood, Grinev narrates his coming of age: his initiation into army service, his life in the remote Belogorsk fortress under the lackadaisical command of Captain Mironov, whose daughter Masha he comes to love, and most importantly, Pugachev's uprising and its immediate aftermath. This narrative is punctuated by Grinev's four meetings with Pugachev: a year before the rebellion, Grinev meets the still-anonymous future impostor by chance in a steppe blizzard; during the uprising, the officer and the rebel leader meet twice, initially as mortal enemies, later as unlikely friends. Finally, Pugachev and Grinev see each other from a distance at Pugachev's execution. Though Grinev plays the trickster almost continually throughout this narrative, his guile undergoes an ultimate test during his second meeting with Pugachev. Confronting the young officer, Pugachev the impostor demands that he choose between an honorable death and a traitor's life. But Grinev preserves both his life and his honor by acting as a trickster: by using linguistic play to

7. In this brief article, I cannot fully examine the royal impostor, but in my doctoral thesis, "The Trickster's Word: Oral Tradition in Literary Narrative," I analyze extensively how these figures functioned as tricksters in Russian oral lore and how one of them, Pugachev, appears as a trickster in *The Captain's Daughter*. Sheila Fitzpatrick, whose work came to my attention after I completed my thesis, also argues that royal impostors, along with various other kinds of confidence men and pretenders, are Russian tricksters (536). For an extensive treatment of the impostor legends, see Chistov. For the interplay of divine and demonic elements in Russian royal imposture, see Uspenskij.

8. The trickster is one of many folkloric elements in *The Captain's Daughter*; numerous scholars have examined how Pushkin uses Russian folk songs, sayings, and fairy tales in the novel (e.g. Tsvetaeva, Terts, Smirnov, Skvoznikov, Shklovskii, Orlov). Analyzing the novel through the fairy-tale lens, scholars particularly focus on plot structure and characters' "functions." Smirnov even goes so far as to argue that the entire plot of the novel is built from fairy-tale narrative elements, classified by Propp in *Morfologiia skazki*. Like a fairy-tale hero, Grinev is tested by many "trials," and, as in fairy tales, he is aided by several "helpers," the most important of them being Pugachev (308). Marina Tsvetaeva also interprets Pugachev as a fairy-tale villain-wolf who has unexpectedly turned into a helper (499), and so does Abram Terts (454–58). As for Grinev, Terts identifies him with the Russian folktale fool (439). All of these interpretations can quite happily coexist with Pugachev's and Grinev's roles as tricksters. Tricksters often function as helpers or givers of magical gifts; they also often act as antagonists before being appeased and turned into helpers, and as often they blunder and play the fool. Without contradicting these analytical categories, "trickster" brings an additional benefit, helping explain Grinev's many paradoxes and helping us to gain insight into his covert linguistic play.

slip a seemingly inescapable trap. It is this episode that I will analyze most extensively, while referring to first and third meetings to set the stage for reading this key encounter.

If one takes a superficial glance at the plot, Grinev appears uncomplicated, even boring. Marina Tsvetaeva finds him so unworthy of attention that she would expunge him from the novel altogether (506). But despite this verdict, Grinev has elicited numerous and intriguingly polarized interpretations. Some say Petr is stupid, others praise his quick wits; some admire Grinev's honesty and sincerity, others are fascinated by his craftiness; some believe he never matures, others argue that his growth is the spring that makes the novel "tick"; some think Grinev is a model loyalist, others a quintessential rebel. Even more remarkably, all of these readings are supported by the text—but only partially. Each argument rests on some evidence, while discounting other, contradicting pieces of the puzzle.

Let us, for instance, examine the debate as to whether Grinev is stupid or smart. Tsvetaeva argues that Grinev's upbringing has made him an irredeemable fool. Reared in a house with no books other than *The Court Calendar* (a list of ranks and promotions awarded to the nobility each year) and no pastimes more instructive than flocking pigeons, Grinev cannot help but be simple-minded (Tsvetaeva 506). To support this view, Tsvetaeva cites Grinev's inability to interpret the prophetic dream he has about Pugachev and also his failure to recognize Pugachev when they meet for the second time, when the steppe vagabond assumes a royal guise (499, 501). Modeled on the fool Mitrofanushka from Denis Fonvizin's comedy *The Minor* [1782], Grinev is simply "not the understanding type," Tsvetaeva concludes (499, 506). Echoing Tsvetaeva's assessment, albeit in a softer form, a recent interpreter of the novel calls Petrusha "naive" and "impulsive" (Vol'pert 272). But after young Grinev recognizes Pugachev, he goes on to outsmart the impostor in two contests of wits that no ingénue could win. When Pugachev attempts to press Grinev into his service, Grinev sweet-talks the impostor into letting him rejoin the government army instead. When the young officer and the impostor meet for the third time, Grinev tries to persuade Pugachev to repent and save himself, while Pugachev wants to justify his rebellion. To make his violence appear noble, Pugachev compares himself to a folk-tale eagle, who prefers to feast on freshly killed game, even though he could prolong his life tenfold by switching to carrion, like the long-lived raven (Pushkin 8: 508). Grinev responds by inverting the meaning of the tale: "To live by murder and robbery, to my mind, is to feed on dead flesh" (508). With his clever reply, Michael Finke argues, Grinev beats Pugachev at his own game and proves himself to be the wily rebel's match: both men are poets "engaging in Aesopian play" with language (Finke 186, 188). Considering these contradictory pieces of evidence and conflicting arguments, the reader remains unsure whether Grinev is a fool incapable of interpretation or an artful poet who excels in linguistic play.

Another unresolved problem in Grinev's character is whether he matures in the course of the novel or remains unchanged. Abram Terts argues that even though Grinev starts out as a fool, he gains wisdom thanks to his love for Masha and friendship with Pugachev (439–40). Caryl Emerson offers a detailed account of Grinev's maturation, reading the novel as his "quest" for an "adult self" (65). In this quest, Grinev overcomes his authoritarian father and his mothering caretaker Savelich, both of whom prefer to keep Grinev under their parental control (64–65). Struggling to break out of his infantile subordination, Grinev benefits from the example of Pugachev, who (even while acting as Grinev's surrogate father) offers the young man a radically different, egalitarian model for relating to other adults (66). Emerson shows convincingly that Grinev not only becomes Pugachev's equal, but even "plays the father" himself, "rescuing [Savelich] from Pugachev's bandits" and "adopt[ing] the orphaned Masha" (66). Emerson's and Terts's accounts of Grinev's maturation would be entirely persuasive if it were not for the precipitous pace of Petr's growth, first pointed out by Tsvetaeva (506). Petrusha leaves home at sixteen (Pushkin 8: 396), and on his way to Belogorsk acts like an inexperienced, strong-headed child, getting swindled out of a hundred rubles by a seasoned gambler (400) and blundering into a blizzard despite his coachman's warning (406). But only a year later, Grinev proves himself Pugachev's match, talking his way out of the impostor's clutches after the fall of Belogorsk. To explain this psychological incongruity, Tsvetaeva suggests that in his dealings with the impostor, Grinev ceases to be a character in his own right, becoming the author's mouthpiece (506). Several striking similarities between Grinev's and Pushkin's biographies that Tsvetaeva cites support her view (503, 506). And so the question of whether Grinev is a complex, developing character or a flat, static figurehead remains unresolved.

It is equally unclear whether Grinev is a rebel or a loyalist. On one hand, Grinev seems to personify Pushkin's hidden yearning for revolt. As Irina Reyfman argues, Pushkin has always questioned "the extent of a nobleman's loyalty to the throne" and was fascinated with the figure of "a renegade nobleman" (475). In many respects, Grinev is the quintessential rebel who crosses boundaries set by family, tradition, and law. A recalcitrant son, Petr continues courting Masha even after Grinev senior bans their alliance—a courtship that also defies the Russian tradition of matchmaking, where parents choose their children's spouses.[9] A disobedient officer, Grinev flouts his commander's orders and the strict eighteenth-century anti-dueling laws, fight-

9. For detailed analyses of Petr's rebellion against his father, see Emerson and Debrezceny. Arranged marriage persisted among the Russian nobility until the late nineteenth century; Tolstoy documents the breakdown of this tradition in *Anna Karenina*, narrating the bewilderment of Kitty Shcherbatskaya's mother, who feels that it is equally impossible to either resort to traditional match-making or allow her daughter to choose her husband freely (40–41).

ing a forbidden duel with Shvabrin.[10] Most importantly, even while professing to serve Catherine II, Grinev rubs shoulders with the royal impostor Pugachev and does not even try to conceal his affection for the insurgent. But, as Richard Gregg points out (442), Grinev can also be read as an exemplary loyalist, a character who is richly rewarded for conforming to the status quo and who thus personifies Pushkin's deep-seated desire to make peace with the establishment. Even threatened with death, Grinev refuses to betray his nobleman's oath to the throne and join Pugachev. When Grinev is falsely convicted of treason and his reputation as a loyal subject and honorable gentleman seems to be shattered, the "sovereign *personally intercedes* on his behalf," restoring his good name and even awarding his bride a generous dowry (Gregg 442). As we weigh both sides of the matter, Petr seems to suffer from a personality split, appearing to be neither a full-blown renegade, nor a "true-blue patriot," as Gregg dubs him (442).

Plunging into these endless debates, a reader can unearth ever more fragments of text that support one side or the other, while the whole picture still escapes from grasp. If we try to resolve Grinev's contradictions, we merely get tangled in conflicting pieces of evidence. But what if we *accept* contradiction as the backbone of Grinev's character? If we do, a cohesive pattern emerges: Grinev's character is consistently paradoxical. Throughout the novel, he bridges seemingly incompatible characteristics, such as foolishness and wisdom, naïveté and savvy, stasis and change, conformity and rebellion. Furthermore, these paradoxes make perfect sense if we read Grinev as a trickster—a character whose function is to mediate between all opposites.

Grinev's mediations encompass a wide range of phenomena, covering three major aspects of human experience: daily behavior, social class, and culture. In his everyday conduct, Grinev mediates between opposing modes of speech (truthful and mendacious, literal and figurative, unambiguous and equivocal), as well as conflicting moral codes. This fleet footwork saves Grinev from a bloody class war, helping him navigate between enemy camps—the nobility, loyal to the reigning empress, and the rebellious commoners, led by the self-proclaimed tsar Pugachev. While transcending class boundaries, the young man also manages to reconcile Russia's two competing cultural identities, one shaped by Western European letters, the other eastward-looking and rooted in Russia's indigenous oral tradition. I will briefly examine each mediation indi-

10. One might object that duels were fought routinely by the Russian nobility, and therefore Grinev's challenge to Shvabrin is not particularly rebellious, but such an objection is anachronistic. In the late eighteenth century, when the novel is set, duels were uncommon, as Reyfman shows in her erudite history of Russian "ritualized violence" (1999, 46, 50–51). This was partly because duels were punishable by death, with the penalty softened in 1787, about fifteen years after Grinev's and Shvabrin's fictional confrontation (51–52). Keenly aware of his novel's historical setting, Pushkin very likely took this fact into account when crafting Grinev's character.

vidually, and then continue with a detailed analysis of how all of these mediations come together in a single episode, central to Grinev's character.

We first encounter Grinev's linguistic play in the opening chapter, when he introduces himself to the readers. Describing his upbringing, Grinev weaves together the literal and the figurative, the straightforward and the equivocal, the sincere and the manipulative. From the start, we are struck by Grinev's sincerity: he does not try to conceal either the meagerness of his education or his own scatterbrained indolence. He narrates his early life simply, in straightforward chronological order: At the age of five, he is entrusted to the barely literate groom Savelich; at twelve, Grinev is handed over to a drunken, womanizing French barber-turned-tutor Beaupré. When the fraudulent instructor is fired, Petr finds himself unsupervised, "flocking pigeons and playing leap-frog with the servant-boys" until he turns sixteen (393–95). Grinev summarizes his life thus far: *ia zhil nedoroslem*, "I lived like a minor" (395). The narrator's tone seems so guileless, that we are tempted to take this confession at face value, especially because *nedorosl'* is a technical term for a home-schooled young nobleman (Gillelson and Mushina 73). But this seemingly unequivocal word is also a literary allusion. It names Denis Fonvizin's comedy, whose main character, the "minor" Mitrofanushka Prostakov, appears to be young Grinev's mirror image: lazy, infantile, and badly educated by a fraudulent foreign tutor.[11] So, in addition to describing his social standing, Grinev compares himself to a literary character, but the meaning of this comparison is equivocal. On one hand, the parallel underscores young Petr's ignorance, but this very same allusion showcases the older Petr's erudition. Unlike Mitrofanushka, Petrusha eventually learns; several other, more obscure references to Fonvizin testify to Petr's knowledge of this author's works (393, 394, 402).[12] And so Grinev the narrator speaks with a forked tongue: he confesses his folly in a way that reveals his intelligence. Furthermore, Grinev's allusions to Fonvizin are deviously manipulative. Feigning foolishness, Grinev puts his audience off guard, while actually testing its mettle. Readers can see through Grinev's doltish mask only if they themselves boast enough savvy and education to recognize the Fonvizin subtext. If they brand Grinev an ignorant simpleton, they unknowingly pass judgement on themselves as well. This sly trap epitomizes the paradoxes and ironies of Grinev's narration. Crafting his self-portrait, Grinev mediates between two-faced manipulation and sincerity, equivocation and straightforward narrative, literal terminology and figurative speech.

11. The link between Pushkin's Grinev and Fonvizin's Mitrofan is discussed by many critics, most of whom either accept or dispute these characters' similarity. I am aware of only one interpreter, Larisa Volpert, who points out, as I do, that Petrusha-Mitrofanushka parallel is paradoxical, both accurate and misleading at the same time. But Volpert explains Grinev's contradictions as Pushkin's "intrusion into the voice" of young Petrusha, echoing Tsvetaeva's idea that young Grinev is sometimes Pushkin's mouthpiece (273).

12. See Gillelson and Mushina for an analysis of Pushkin's allusions to Fonvizin (69, 73, 81).

Grinev negotiates conflicting moral codes just as adroitly as opposing discourses. Sending the sixteen-year-old Petr to serve in the army, Grinev's father admonishes him always to follow rules to the letter. "Farewell, Petr," his father says. "Serve faithfully those to whom you pledge your allegiance. Obey your superiors; do not seek their favor; neither volunteer for service nor evade it, and remember the proverb: guard your clothing while it is still new, and your honor while you are still young" (398).[13] This moral code leaves no room for creative maneuvers: Grinev may neither re-think his allegiances nor take back a sworn oath. He must follow orders as closely as possible, doing no more and no less than what his commanders demand. He must also *be* exactly what he seems: his internal state (honor) ought to correspond to his outer shell (clothing). But the chaotic world into which the young officer is propelled does not allow for such a simplistic code of conduct, demanding instead that he break all rules to escape dishonor and death. His father's orderly world is swept away by a wild blizzard; lost on the steppe en route to Belogorsk, Grinev would have frozen to death if a mysterious vagabond had not materialized out of the "murky chaos" and led him to safety (406–9). Grinev is eager to repay this favor with money, but must heed the protests of his servant-guardian Savelich, because earlier he had promised to spend nothing without Savelich's consent. The young man seems to be trapped in a bind: either breaking his word to Savelich or defaulting on his debt to the stranger would bring dishonor. But in a flash of inspiration, Grinev manages to honor both men: instead of giving out money, Grinev repays the poorly dressed stranger with a warm hare-skin coat (412–13). By creatively manipulating the rules, Grinev manages to satisfy two conflicting moral imperatives, two mutually exclusive obligations.[14] While keeping his promise to Savelich and thereby respecting his father (whom Savelich represents and who has commanded Grinev not to break oaths), Grinev also pays dues to his new acquaintance and benefactor whom his father would have certainly scorned.

Grinev's precarious balancing act between his noble-born father and a nameless tramp is only one of many instances when the young man mediates between the high and the low social classes. Even though Grinev is a born nobleman and is proud of his class,[15] his position in the social hierarchy is often unstable. In his relationship to Savelich, for instance, Petr is, oddly, a master and a subordinate. Frequently, Grinev asserts himself over his serf: "*Ia tvoi gospodin, a ty moi sluga* [I am your master, and you are my servant]" (402),

13. For an in-depth analysis of the nobility's honor code and the ways that honor and class identity became linked to serving the monarchy, see Reyfman 1999.

14. This episode nicely illustrates Hyde's insight that "[w]here someone's sense of honorable behavior has left him unable to act, trickster will appear to suggest an amoral action, something right/wrong that will get life going again" (7).

15. "I am a born nobleman [*ia prirodnyi dvorianin*]," Grinev staunchly declares to Pugachev even though these words may cost him his life (476).

he says, ordering the reluctant Savelich to pay the hundred roubles to Zurin. But having settled his gambling debt, Petr submits to Savelich's authority, yielding him control of all his money (405). Grinev's relationship to his fiancée Masha Mironova is marked by similar reversals of power. When the young people first meet, Masha is the poorer of the two, a fact that her mother points out to the embarrassment of both young people (422). Moreover, Masha's father was not born a nobleman, but attained this status through service (299); Grinev's father even denies Masha a noblewoman's status altogether in an earlier version of the novel (Ospovat 264). It seems that Grinev supersedes Masha in wealth and prestige, but the tables are turned when Masha receives a rich dowry from Catherine II. In addition, the Empress honors Masha as a martyrs' daughter (her parents were brutally murdered by Pugachev for their loyalty to the throne) and praises her personal qualities, while Grinev is simply recognized as innocent of blame and earns no august praise (540). Expecting to marry down, Grinev actually marries up. In his relationship to Masha and Savelich, Grinev plays a metaphorical class leap-frog, as he did in childhood, when he and his servants' children jumped over each other in their games of *chekharda* (395).

In addition to bridging the class divide between nobility and commoners, between rich and poor, Grinev accomplishes an even broader mediation between Russia's competing cultural orientations, westernized and eastward-looking. Compelled by the reforms of Peter I to embrace Western European education and life-style, Russian nobility hired French, English, or German tutors for their children, donned European fashions, and often spoke French better than Russian. Meanwhile, the country's vast numbers in the lower classes remained untouched by European influences, followed Russia's own indigenous traditions, and allied in their rebellion with eastern semi-nomadic peoples, like the Bashkirs and Kalmyks. Historically, this cultural rift exacerbated class conflict between nobility and commoners; that Catherine II hailed from Europe did not help, especially since Pugachev (in history as in Pushkin's novel) styled himself after the *tsar'-batiushka* of Russian folklore, a redeemer long awaited by the common folk, who believe that the *true* tsar loves them like a father and will eventually redress all the wrongs that the rich and the powerful have done to the simple people.[16]

Grinev bridges this divide not only by mediating between the warring cultures during the rebellion, but also long before the uprising breaks out. Finding himself frequently suspended between east and west, Grinev shuttles between the two realms as a translator of sorts. In his childhood, Petrusha learns

16. Chistov provides a comprehensive study of the ways that Pugachev and other royal impostors exploited oral legends of the benevolent tsar. Field analyzes the central role that these legends played in two peasant uprisings of the nineteenth century. For a detailed reading of the ways this cultural rift structures *The Captain's Daughter*, see Lotman.

both from the Russian peasant Savelich and the Frenchman Beaupré; his passage into adulthood also begins at the east-west crossroads. Though at first his father intends to send Grinev to Russia's most westernized city, St. Petersburg, he changes his mind at the last moment, dispatching his son eastward instead. Grinev ends up serving in the frontier fortress of Belogorsk, a ramshackle little village with semi-nomadic insurgents, Bashkirs and Kalmyks, roaming just outside the walls (393, 415). But even in this backwater, steeped in Russian folk culture, Grinev discovers French books and "tries his hand at translation" (427). Moreover, Grinev acts as a translator in a much broader sense. Poised between east and west, he sometimes helps Europeans make inroads into the Russian world, all the while keeping a sly eye on his own advantage. He teaches Russian to his tutor Beaupré in order to avoid learning the French language, focusing instead on the much more exciting French art of fencing (394, 442). Meeting another foreigner, the German-born Russian General R*, Grinev interprets idiosyncrasies of the Russian language for him. Anxious to teach his son discipline, Grinev senior has written to the general, asking him "to hold [Petr] in hedgehog gloves [*derzhat' v ezhovykh rukavitsakh*]." This turn of phrase puzzles the general, whose Russian is shaky, but Grinev is eager to "translate" (414). Turning the idiom's actual meaning on its head, Grinev announces with feigned innocence that it means "to treat gently, not very sternly, to give a lot of freedom" (414). Grinev's lie turns a clever verbal somersault, "translating" severity into lenience—but because his father spells out his meaning later in the letter, this time Grinev is chastened. Smuggling a new meaning into an old saying and playing Russian teacher to his French tutor, Grinev acts as a trickster-mediator of opposites, and like any trickster, sometimes he falls flat.

Grinev's three fields of operation—behavior (including language and ethics), class, and culture—all depend on each other. Language serves to articulate standards of behavior; together they form two cornerstones of social and cultural identity. Grinev's ability to manipulate language is the key skill that enables him to become a mediator in the other three spheres. Thanks to his mercurial tongue, the young man manages to satisfy opposing moral codes, which in turn allows him to bridge the gap between warring classes and competing cultures. More than any other episode in the book, Grinev's encounter with Pugachev in Belogorsk, in which the impostor tries to recruit the nobleman into his army, brings together all of these layers and illuminates the connections between them.

Shortly after the uprising breaks out, the rebels surround Belogorsk and easily defeat its tiny army regiment. Taken prisoner, Grinev and his fellow officers helplessly watch the warm welcome that the fortress's Cossacks and civilians show their new "Tsar." The insurgents immediately build a gallows in front of the Commandant Mironov's house, and Pugachev presides over a gruesome ceremony, in which everyone must either pledge allegiance to him

or hang. Grinev's commanders are promptly executed, while the young officer is unexpectedly spared, owing (as it turns out later) to his friendly meeting with Pugachev a year before. In the evening of the same day, Pugachev summons Grinev to a feast for his closest associates and tries to make the young nobleman his ally in their ensuing one-on-one conversation. Knowing that his life is still in danger, but also unwilling to sacrifice his honor, Grinev launches a brilliant verbal game that wins him freedom. Placated by Petr's guileful and charismatic talk, Pugachev lets the young officer leave Belogorsk unharmed. The following morning, Petr and Savelich travel to the city of Orenburg, to help defend it from the rebel siege.

This second meeting with Pugachev is the ultimate test of Grinev's ability to mediate between seemingly irreconcilable opposites. As in the incident with the hare-skin coat, the young man must once again reconcile his dual allegiances, split between Grinev senior and Pugachev, two father figures who represent conflicting moral codes, classes, and cultures.[17] But Pugachev's rebellion against Catherine II seems to make such a reconciliation impossible, while simultaneously raising the stakes radically. If Grinev had disappointed either of his fathers before the uprising, he would have suffered private embarrassment, but now the price of failure is public disgrace or even death. When the Belogorsk fortress falls to the rebels, Grinev is quite literally forced to choose between his father, who has enjoined him to keep the nobleman's oath, and Pugachev, who demands that Grinev break his oath to Catherine II and enter his service. If Grinev remains loyal to his father and his class, he faces execution; if he accepts Pugachev's offer, he buys life at the price of disgrace. Led to the gallows where his comrades already hang, Grinev must choose sides this time; to walk the tightrope between the enemy camps seems impossible. But even when backed into a corner, tricksters are famous for slipping away. Grinev proves his mettle as a trickster, escaping Pugachev's noose with his honor and his neck intact.

Still, one might object that Grinev does choose sides. Recounting the executions of Belogorsk officers who refused to serve Pugachev, Grinev brags that he was ready to bravely emulate their defiance (465). But unlike his comrades, Petr does not get a chance to reject the impostor with an unequivocal and heroic public gesture. With Pugachev poised to request his submission, Petr's enemy Shvabrin whispers something to the rebel leader, who then signals the hangman to string Grinev up with no questions asked. In a split second, Grinev is saved through his servant's intercession: when Savelich prostrates himself

17. Pugachev is identified as Grinev's surrogate parent in a dream that the young man has when he is guided through the blizzard by Pugachev. Grinev dreams that his father is dying, but approaching his deathbed for a blessing, the young man finds a merry peasant with Pugachev's features. Grinev's mother calls the peasant Petr's "surrogate father [*posazhennyi otets*]." Analyzing Petr's dream, Caryl Emerson develops the idea that Grinev Senior and Pugachev are Petrusha's competing father figures.

before the impostor, Pugachev recognizes his old acquaintances, and spares the young officer. Another trial quickly follows: Pugachev demands that Grinev kiss his hand in gratitude and submission. While Petr doesn't comply, he does not speak out against the impostor either, nor does he try to get up when forced to kneel at Pugachev's feet; thus Grinev's inaction appears ambiguous enough that Pugachev can conclude that the officer is dazed rather than defiant (465–66).[18] Thus Grinev manages to get condemned and reprieved without uttering a syllable or unequivocally displaying his allegiance in any other way. His turn to speak comes in the evening, when Pugachev invites his potential new ally to a feast for his inner circle. After the others disperse, the impostor tries to recruit Grinev one-on-one. Having no weapons save for his wit and his tongue, Grinev challenges Pugachev to a verbal battle, a game of wits. Though one might wonder what could be the use of "play[ing] with language when lives are at stake,"[19] manipulating language is Grinev's only hope. During the public executions, Pugachev has laid down rules according to which Grinev cannot win: he must forfeit either his honor or his life; he cannot keep both. But Grinev's verbal game aims to destabilize the meaning of the terms that make up these rules and to charm Pugachev into seeing things differently—to remake the rules in Grinev's favor.

Readers who argue that the young Grinev is simple and naive might ask whether he is capable of such involved and crafty calculations. It also seems unlikely that the adolescent Petr could discern any rules whatsoever in the terrifying chaos around him—his first battle, the execution of his comrades in arms, and the executioners' drunken feast. To top it all off, Grinev the narrator asserts that he approached Pugachev straightforwardly and was saved by his sincerity (476–77). But even while portraying himself as a guileless youth, Grinev the narrator drops clues that tell a very different story. Though Pugachev's taking of Belogorsk appears chaotic, Grinev is keenly aware that the rebel is in fact enacting a well-ordered ritual whose participants are subject to set rules, or, in other words, can only play certain roles.[20] Petr's narrative highlights the staged character of the events. Dubbing the executions a "terrible comedy," Grinev underscores that they ritually inaugurate and showcase Pugachev's power (466). Having secured the fortress, Pugachev imme-

18. I am grateful to W. M. Todd III, who pointed out this ambiguity to me.

19. This apt formulation belongs to Finke, who argues that Pugachev and Grinev are kindred spirits, poets who respond to danger by playing with language (187–88). Finke's argument, which somewhat resembles my own, came to my attention only after I had analyzed Grinev and Pugachev's contest of wits. While we both argue that Grinev saves himself through evasiveness and language play, I trace these strategies to trickster myths and folktales, while Finke identifies them with a different genre, the Aesopian fable (Finke 182, 186).

20. My analysis of Pugachev's spectacle and of his private conversation with Grinev is inspired by Erving Goffman's view of social interaction as a theatrical game, a calculated exchange of information, whose participants strive to "define the situation" and thus control it (1–8).

diately organizes a public spectacle where all inhabitants must either display their loyalty or lose their lives. Grinev points out all the props that Pugachev uses to display his royalty: the rebel leader wears gold-trimmed clothes, positions himself in a throne-like armchair at the fortress's seat of power (the former commandant's house), and places the fortress's priest by his "throne," to indicate that his authority is God-given (464). Casting himself as "tsar," Pugachev also defines the two roles available to all others—the loyal subjects who are protected and the defiant subjects, *gosudarevy oslushniki*, who are hanged (464). Pugachev summons each inhabitant to the gallows individually, so that everyone is forced to act out his chosen role for the entire audience. Grinev's description of the inhabitants' responses reads like a script. The loyal subjects all act alike: to show that they recognize the impostor as their tsar, they "approach one by one, kissing the crucifix [held by the priest] and bowing" to Pugachev (466). The defiant officers also behave uniformly, repeating the same phrase, "you are not a sovereign to me, you are a thief and an impostor" (465). The only person who escapes this script is Grinev himself; though he has not committed to serve Pugachev, he is spared. This temporary reprieve tells Grinev that the available roles are not as rigid as they seem, and the impostor's private feast confirms his hopes. Seated amidst Pugachev's closest associates, Grinev is struck that all treat each other as equals; in private, Pugachev casts off his royal guise (473). This indicates that an alternative is available to the role of "loyal" vs. "defiant" subject—an "insider" is allowed to acknowledge that Pugachev is no tsar at all. Grinev must win the same privilege without becoming one of the impostor's henchmen.

Grinev's task is eased a bit because Pugachev exposes chinks in his armor: unwittingly slipping between his conflicting roles, he signals that his identity is, in fact, negotiable. At first, Pugachev greets Grinev as an old friend, laughing and joking about his narrow escape at the gallows, and even making the young man burst into laughter along with him (475). But then, as if to remind the officer that he is not yet safe, Pugachev begins playing tsar again. Assuming a "haughty and mysterious mien," the impostor tries to corner Grinev into acting as a reverent subject: "Well, your excellency, could you have guessed that the man who guided you to the steppe inn was the great sovereign himself? [...] Do you promise to serve me zealously?" (475). In an attempt to restore an informal mood (and play a different role), Grinev chuckles, but he finds himself sternly rebuked: "'What are you grinning at?' [Pugachev] asked [...] with a frown. 'Don't you believe that I am the great sovereign? Answer truthfully'" (475). Knowing that his life depends on his answer, Grinev pauses to collect his wits, and then launches one of the slyest verbal games in the Russian language. While professing to speak the simple truth, Grinev invites Pugachev to question what truth is, and to redefine his position.

Petr answers Pugachev:

"Listen; I will tell you the whole truth. Think about it, how can I recognize you as a sovereign? You are a smart man: you would see for yourself that I was insincere."
—Then who am I, according to your understanding?
—God only knows, but whoever you are, you are playing a dangerous jest.
Pugachev glanced at me quickly. "So you don't believe," he said, "that I am the sovereign Petr Fedorovich? Well, all right." (467)

On the surface, Grinev seems to obey Pugachev in the most straightforward way: the rebel asks for the truth, and Grinev obliges, "*skazhu tebe vsiu pravdu* [I will tell you the whole truth]." But these words—though invariably read as an outflow of sincerity—are not literal but figurative, not guileless but manipulative.[21] Grinev doesn't simply speak his mind; he cites Pugachev's favorite folk song, which he had heard at the rebels' feast. The song "Do not rustle, mother green grove," sung at the impostor's request, narrates a richly figurative, ironic conversation between a tsar and a robber (474). In the folksong, the tsar demands that the robber name his accomplices; his prisoner feigns compliance, "I will tell you the whole truth [*Vseë pravdu skazhu tebe*]," but proceeds to evade the question, naming "the dark night," "the damask steel knife," "the fine horse," and "the tight bow" as his only partners in crime (474). The tsar plays along, responding with another metaphor: he will reward the robber's confession with a tall mansion, made of two posts and a crossbeam (i.e. the gallows).

Grinev cites the song with several goals in mind: to placate the frowning Pugachev, to restore the informal tone of their conversation, and to initiate a contest of wits that could potentially redefine their relationship to Grinev's advantage. First, Grinev tries to soften Pugachev with flattery: the song offers a clear parallel to their conversation; evoking the song, Grinev implicitly compares Pugachev to a genuine tsar. Second, Grinev hopes that the song will evoke the friendly atmosphere of the feast, where all treated Pugachev as an equal. Finally, Grinev signals to Pugachev that he is switching the register of their conversation: like the song's robber, he will speak in metaphors. Making the word "truth" turn a somersault and mean "fiction" (because it now refers to the song), Grinev challenges Pugachev to outdo this verbal trick. In this context, Grinev's words "think about it" do not just appeal to Pugachev's reason, but entice him to enter Grinev's contest of wits. Addressing the impostor, "you are a smart man," Grinev offers one final piece of bait. Pugachev can hardly deny this flattery, but on the other hand, if he accepts this premise, he must also accept its conclusion. As a smart man, he can see through false reverence; if Grinev tried to play "loyal subject," he would insult Pugachev's intelligence. Thus Grinev implies that if he called Pugachev "tsar," it would in fact mean "fool"—turned inside-out by the trickster, a pledge of allegiance becomes an affront.

21. For statements about Grinev's sincerity, see Emerson (71) and Terts (457).

But Pugachev is not easy to stump. Signaling that he accepts Grinev's challenge, the impostor parodies Grinev's appeal to reason and parries riddle with riddle: "Then who am I, according to your understanding?" Once again, Grinev evades the question by shifting his rhetoric: Why rely upon human reason if one can appeal to the omniscient one instead? "*Bog tebia znaet*," Grinev responds. Uttering this idiom for "nobody knows," Grinev capitalizes on its literal meaning, flattering Pugachev once more. Grinev suggests that if Pugachev is as important and mysterious as he claims to be, then only God can know his true identity. But at the same time, Grinev humbles the impostor, suggesting that Pugachev is not omnipotent, but subject to divine judgement. Calling on God, Grinev boldly puts himself and Pugachev on equal footing in the face of the highest authority. This rhetorical gambit succeeds: Pugachev accepts the shift in hierarchy and gives up royal pretensions. "So you don't believe [...] that I am the sovereign Petr Fedorovich? Well, all right."

Pugachev and Grinev exchange several more verbal volleys before the impostor releases the officer, but Grinev's job is already done. He has managed to create alternative roles for himself and Pugachev—they are no longer sovereign and subject, but fellow tricksters; their battlefield is language, and an aptly turned phrase can restore life and freedom to the condemned. Yielding to Grinev's guile and charisma, Pugachev releases the officer to fight against him in the government's army—but, paradoxically, the two men part as friends. To conclude their talk, Pugachev claps Grinev on the shoulder, saying, "Go wherever your feet may take you, and do whatever you wish" (8: 477). Winning his freedom, Grinev exercises the trickster's characteristic ability to "turn dead ends into crossroads," both figurative and literal (Pelton 231). Literally, Grinev is free to go in any direction; figuratively, he is poised between two enemy camps. In an impossible feat, the young man has made himself acceptable, for the time being, both to law-abiding nobility and to outlaw commoners simultaneously.

Balancing between the government forces and the rebels involves mediating not only between warring classes, but also between incompatible moral codes and competing cultural identities. The opposing moral universes of a nobleman and a common man, which Grinev must reconcile, are exemplified by his father and his surrogate parent Pugachev. The former demands that Petr never break his oaths (i.e. guard the nobleman's honor), follow rules to the letter, and be exactly what he seems; the latter orders Petr to switch allegiances, breaks the law daily, and delights in pretending to be what he is not. Instead of slavishly following either of his father figures, Grinev creatively re-combines their moral codes. Grinev manages to safeguard his honor, as his father told him, by acting the way that his father's antipode Pugachev would act. Wrangling his honor and life from Pugachev, Grinev does not follow rules, but manipulates them; he does not speak sincerely, but pretends. Paradoxically, the young man keeps his word of honor thanks to his forked

tongue. In this gambit, Grinev also draws on Russia's two competing cultures—the indigenous folk tradition and Western European letters. Grinev finds common ground with Pugachev by speaking the language of Russian folk song. At the same time, Grinev fuses the song's appeal to emotion and imagination with the discourse of reason, characteristic of the European Enlightenment, which the young man must have discovered through the French literature he read, if not through Beaupré's lackadaisical teaching. Thus in his contest of wits with Pugachev, Grinev's limber tongue enables him to mediate between opposing phenomena in all of his three spheres of experience: daily behavior, class, and culture. Devising a miraculous escape from physical and moral death, the young man proves his mettle as a trickster—a slippery sweet-talker who can transform a choice between two evils into a win-win situation.

Grinev performs in his private life the classic functions that mythic tricksters fulfill on a much larger scale for their communities, indeed for their cultures, making them more creative and resilient. As a trickster, Grinev breaks out of prescribed molds, so that he can develop his individuality, adapt to change, and cope with chaos. He creatively fashions a code of conduct that makes sense to him personally, successfully completes the journey from childhood's sheltered indolence to adult pursuits and responsibilities, and survives the bloody rebellion that sweeps away his well-ordered world. But to gain these private victories, Grinev resolves questions that confront not him alone, but all of Russia's nobility: How to preserve one's honor when faced with irreconcilable moral imperatives? How to stay true to one's own noble estate without becoming alienated from the common people? How to learn from Western Europe while honoring Russia's native culture? Realizing the impossibility of either choosing between these opposing terms or synthesizing them fully, Pushkin enlists a Russian trickster to weave together the conflicting strands of Russian life into a paradoxical, yet vital whole.

REFERENCES

Chistov, K. V. *Russkie narodnye sotsial'no-utopicheskie legendy XVII–XIX vv.* Moscow: Nauka, 1967.

Debreczeny, Paul. *The Other Pushkin: A Study of Alexander Pushkin's Prose Fiction.* Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 1983.

Emerson, Caryl. "Grinev's Dream: *The Captain's Daughter* and a Father's Blessing." *Slavic Review* 40.1 (1981): 60–76.

Field, Daniel. *Rebels in the Name of the Tsar.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976.

Finke, Michael. "Puškin, Pugačev, and Aesop." *Slavic and East European Journal* 35.2 (1991): 179–92.

Fitzpatrick, Sheila. "The World of Ostap Bender: Soviet Confidence Men in the Stalin Period." *Slavic Review* 61.3 (2002): 535–57.

Fonvizin, Denis. *Nedorosl'.* Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1958.

Gates, Henry Louis, Jr. *The Signifying Monkey: A Theory of African-American Literary Criticism*. New York: Oxford UP, 1988.
Gillel'son, M., and I. Mushina. *Povest' A.S. Pushkina* Kapitanskaia Dochka: *Kommentarii*. Leningrad: Prosveshchenie, 1977.
Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday, 1959.
Gregg, Richard. "Pushkin, Victor Hugo, the Perilous Ordeal, and the True-Blue Hero." *Slavic and East European Journal* 38.3 (1994): 438–45.
Harris, Joel Chandler. *Uncle Remus: His Songs and His Sayings* [1880]. Ed. Robert Hemenway. New York: Penguin, 1982.
Hyde, Lewis. *Trickster Makes This World*. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 1998.
Hynes, William J. "Mapping the Characteristics of Mythic Tricksters: A Heuristic Guide." In Hynes and Doty, 33–45.
Hynes, William J., and William G. Doty, eds. *Mythical Trickster Figures: Contours, Contexts, and Criticisms*. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 1993.
Jung, C. G. "On the Psychology of the Trickster Figure." Trans. R. F. C. Hull. In Radin, 195–211.
Kerényi, Karl. "The Trickster in Relation to Greek Mythology." Trans. R. F. C. Hull. In Radin, 173–95.
Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *Structural Anthropology*. New York: Basic Books, 1963.
Lotman, Iurii. "Ideinaia struktura 'Kapitanskoi dochki.'" *Pushkinskii sbornik*. Ed. M. Efimova. Pskov: Ministerstvo prosveshcheniia RSFSR, 1962. 3–20.
Meletinskii, Eleazar Moiseevich. "'Nizkii' geroi volshebnoi skazki." *Geroi volshebnoi skazki: Proiskhozhdenie obraza*. Moscow: Vostochnaia literatura, 1958. 213–55.
———. *O literaturnykh arkhetipakh*. Moscow: Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi gumanitarnyi universitet, 1994.
Oksman, Iu. G. "Pushkin v rabote nad romanom 'Kapitanskaia dochka.'" A. S. Pushkin. *Kapitanskaia dochka*. Moscow: Nauka, 1964. 149–208.
Orlov, A. "Narodnye pesni v 'Kapitanskoi dochke.'" *Vremennik pushkinskoi komissii* (1975): 85–89.
Ospovat, Aleksandr. "Imenovanie geroia 'Kapitanskoi dochki.'" *Lotmanovskii sbornik*, vol. 3. Ed. M. L. Gasparov, et al. Moskva: OGI, 2004. 261–69.
Pelton, Robert. *The Trickster in West Africa: A Study of Mythic Irony and Sacred Delight*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1980.
Permiakov, G. L., ed. *Prodelki khitretsov: mify, skazki, basni i anekdoty o proslavlennykh khitretsakh, mudretsakh i shutnikakh mirovogo fol'klora*. 2nd ed. Moscow: Nauka, 1977.
Propp, V. Ia. *Morfologiia skazki*. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1996.
Pushkin, A. S. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v desiati tomakh*. 10 vols. Ed. B. V. Tomashevskii. 2nd ed. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1956–58.
Radin, Paul. *The Trickster: A Study in American Indian Mythology*. New York: Schocken, 1956.
Reyfman, Irina. *Vasilii Trediakovsky: The Fool of the 'New' Russian Literature*. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 1990.
———. *Ritualized Violence Russian Style: The Duel in Russian Culture and Literature*. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 1999.
———. "Poetic Justice and Injustice: Autobiographical Echoes in Pushkin's *The Captain's Daughter*." *Slavic and East European Journal* 38.3 (1994): 463–78.
Rikoun, Polina. "The Trickster's Word: Oral Tradition in Literary Narrative." Diss. Harvard Univ., 2003.
Shklovskii, Viktor. "Kapitanskaia dochka." *Gamburgskii shchet*. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1990. 343–46.
Skvoznikov, V. D. "Stil' Pushkina." *Teoriia literatury*. Ed. G. E. Velikovskaia. Moscow: Nauka, 1965. 60–97.

Smirnov, I. P. "Ot skazki k romanu." *Istoriia zhanrov v russkoi literature X–XVII vv.* Ed. D. S. Likhachev. Leningrad: Nauka, 1972. 284–320.

Terts, Abram. "Puteshestvie na Chernuiu Rechku." *Puteshestvie na Chernuiu Rechku i drugie proizvedeniia.* Moscow: Sakharov, 1999. 425–78.

Tolstoy, Lev. *Anna Karenina.* Trans. George Gibian. New York: Norton, 1995.

Tsvetaeva, Marina. "Pushkin i Pugachev." *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh.* Eds. Anna Saakiants and Lev Mnukhin. Moscow: Ellis Lak, 1994. 5: 498–524.

Uspenskij, Boris. "Tsar and Pretender: Samozvanstvo or Royal Imposture in Russia as a Cultural-Historical Phenomenon," trans. David Budgen. *The Semiotics of Russian Culture.* Ed. Ann Shukman. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1984: 259–92.

Vol'pert, Larisa. "Ironiia v proze Pushkina i Stendalia ('Kapitanskaia dochka' i 'Krasnoe i chernoe')." *Lotmanovskii sbornik,* vol. 3. Ed. M. L. Gasparov et al. Moscow: OGI, 2004. 270–80.

Абстракт

Полина Рикун

Трикстер Гринёв: Проблема парадокса в романе Пушкина «Капитанская дочка»

Пётр Гринёв, главный герой романа Пушкина «Капитанская дочка», вызывает самые разнообразные и даже несовместимые трактовки. Одни считают его дураком, а другие умным, кому-то он кажется искренним, а кому-то хитрым, для одних он верноподданный, а для других бунтовщик. Непонятней всего то, что все эти интерпретации подтверждаются текстом романа, но только отчасти. Как же установить, кем Гринёв является на самом деле? Я предлагаю разрешить эту проблему, рассматривая Гринёва как трикстера. Этот фольклорный персонаж парадоксален по определению, объединяя какие бы то ни было противоположности и воплощая в себе возможность переосмыслить даже самые устоявшиеся категории и выйти из любого безвыходного положения (моё определение трикстера опирается на исследования Леви-Стросса, Хайда, Хайнса, и Пельтона).

Как трикстер, Гринёв служит медиатором противоположностей в повседневной жизни и в конфликте классов и культур. В повседневном поведении, Гринёв соединяет взаимно-исключающие моральные кодексы, а также несовместимые языковые категории (правду и ложь, прямой и переносный смысл). Гибкость и хитрость трикстера спасают Гринёва во время пугачёвского бунта, помогая ему сбалансировать между враждующими классами. Кроме этого, Гринёв служит медиатором между востоком и западом, разрешая конфликт двух культурных ориентаций России. Трактовка Гринёва как трикстера позволяет найти смысловое единство в противоречиях его характера и объясняет, как Пушкин подходит к проблемам, стоящим не только перед Гринёвым, но и перед всем русским дворянством.