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Abstract

Author’s esthetic activity in the bellettristic literature affects all aspects of the textual sphererevealing and shading the author’s discourse, setting the direction and tonality, interacting with conceptual domain of all architectonics creation. The documentary narrative «The Chronicle of Great Jute» by V. Mikhaylov reveals the features where vigorous author’s esthetic activity and the directional author’s discourse embedded in the cascade of functional texts. The analysis of the well-known work shows that functionally significant quotes, hidden intertexts, illustrations, documents, allusions, reminiscences, references to memoirs and retrospections play an important role in designing of the work’s stratagem for the organization of a wide polylogue in a historical and political context.
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El autor en la actividad estética y el texto funcional (sobre la base de la narrativa de V. Mikhaylov ("La cronica del gran jute")

Resumen

La actividad estética del autor en la literatura belletrista afecta todos los aspectos de la esfera textual revelando y sombreando el discurso del autor, estableciendo la dirección y la tonalidad, interactuando con el dominio conceptual de toda la creación arquitectónica. La narrativa documental «The Chronicle of Great Jute» de V. Mikhaylov revela las características en las que la vigorosa actividad estética del autor y el discurso direccional del autor están integrados en la cascada de textos funcionales. El análisis del conocido trabajo muestra que citas funcionalmente significativas, intertextos ocultos, ilustraciones, documentos, alusiones, reminiscencias, referencias a memorias y retrospecciones juegan un papel importante en el diseño de la estratagema de la obra para la organización de un amplio polílogo en un contexto político e histórico.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The perestroika of 90th of the XX century in the Post-Soviet society deeply affected all aspects of spiritual and cultural life of organizations and individuals. Using unprecedented forms, perestroika stimulated the development of the personality in the former Soviet society, inducing to search the novelty, to create, to deny ideological stereotypes of consciousness. The intensification of the personal, psychological and spiritual spheres in terms of freethinking, searching the novelty and
reconsiderations of previous stereotypes touches those writers who were condemned to self-reliance in their inner life and potency of active thought. The dominating ideology of the Soviet regime, imposing rigid, sometimes repressive dictatorship, suppressed many years the free will of the writers, their natural aspiration to originality and freedom of consciousness, imagination, social, historical and psychological truth. The hero of the sign novel by Yu. Dombrovsky “Faculty of Unnecessary Things” precisely and vividly says about this time: “There is a great fear in the world now. All are afraid of everything. It is very important for everyone to seat and wait. There are times when a word is a crime. We must reconcile ourselves to such fate” (DOMBROVSKIĬ, 1969). It is interesting to note that Yu. Dombrovsky compares Stalin to the mythological Gardener, “who weeded millions of human destinies”.

2. METHODOLOGY

In the 90s of the XX centuries, this political and ideological regime has failed, and the majority of the writers started to analyze the subjects, which considerably were in a prohibited zone during the Soviet power. There were the secret pages of World War II, Stalin’s authentic and large-scale repressions, cult of personality in the Soviet Union, ethnic question, the background of great socialist buildings works, human destinies in the Soviet prisons and camps. There were national liberation movements in different regions of the USSR and their consequences, the seamy side of collectivization and industrialization in the USSR, the victims of expropriation of the cattle and grain during revolutionary surplus-appropriation system. The results of civil war and a real picture of Famine-Genocide in 1919-21 and 1930-32, the fate of the victims of political repression and other tormented people. The list of these themes
can be continued and it varies, as in each national republic there were forefront topical issues and problems, which first occupied the imagination of the writers of a particular region. The constraint and unfreedom of writer’s way of thinking during the Soviet era inevitably affected the author of the belletristic style. The author of the belletristic style belongs to esthetic category, to text phenomenon, not to society. The writer and the author of the work of art are in the same relation as the creative person and the text. SUDAKOV and BADIKOV (1991) wrote: “The author as manifestation of creative energy and meaning is not identical to this or that real writer though his spiritual and biographic psychological shape leaves the personal mark on the work and creativity in general”. No doubt, that perestroika of the 90th with new horizons of free thinking affected not only personal psychological and spiritual qualities of the authors in Kazakhstan, but also the their works’ parameters expanding the zones of their esthetic manifestation and activity. As a result in Kazakhstani literature from the point of view of social and esthetic communication, authentic representative texts have appeared. The technique and methodology of the comparative, typological and textual analysis with allocation of the most characteristic signs of the leading discourse in the book by V. Mikhaylovis applied for the disclosure of the specified problems in article (SUDAKOV and BADIKOV, 1991).

3. RESULTS

Taking into consideration the historical peculiarities and specifics of Kazakhstan development in the XX century, the forefront themes during perestroika were the issues of Famine-Genocide 1919-21, 1930-32 and Stalin’s repressions, the fate of Alash Party members and the national liberation movement in different years. On September 15, 1925,
Goloshchekin arrived to Kzyl-Orda, which was Kazakhstan principal of that time. All his undesirable traits had manifested on our land. Valery Mikhaylov, an author of the book ‘Chronicle of Great Jute' said that ‘He did not treat Kazakhs as human. Immediately after his arrival to Kazakhstan, Goloshchekin specified that Soviet did not rule here and it was necessary to arrange new Red October. During 7 years, which he spent in Kazakhstan, Goloshchekin did not leave the capital even once, and did not inquire about life of people.

There are habilitations of the repressed persons and publicizing the activity of atomic and other grounds, unknown pages of World War II, environmental disaster in different regions and situation with Kazakh language. (Altybayeva, 2012) writes: “The XXI century has come, a century of radical changes in all spheres of life of the state, society and individual”. The deep transformational processes connected with search and creative development of new esthetic-world outlook horizons are observed in modern Kazakh literature, art and culture in general”. It is important to note that each of these themes was scaled, versatile and socially important. The analysis and presentation of these themes seriously influenced the public consciousness. The equivalent day the National Library of the Republic of Kazakhstan hosted a performance of a novel Kazakh translation of the Chronicle of the Great Jute, a book through MIKHAYLOV (2003). The book expresses about two million Kazakhs and almost 0.5 million people of other ethnicities who died during the famine of the 1930s. The new edition publishers printed 10,000 copies. All these books were donated to libraries of Kazakhstan, primarily to schools and universities. It was young entrepreneur Shyngys Kulzhanov who initiated and sponsored the book publication (Altybayeva, 2011).
The investigation of such difficult and multidimensional subjects demanded from writers the courage, work in archives, search of the materials often hidden in the special depositories and such work could just change the consciousness of the authors, aggravating political, mental and spiritual aspects of the attitude towards reality, forming responsibility for their own position. Obviously, Mikhaylov (2003) is such a writer, who has published the biggest work of the topical issue – the documentary story “The Chronicle of Great Jute (Famine-Genocide)” in 1996. As a result, the publication of the book by Mikhaylov (2003) “The Chronicle of Great Jute” attracted the attention of world community, including scientists, politicians, journalists, writers, historians, to tragic Famine-Genocide in Kazakhstan in 1919-21 and 1931-32. The result of this research is the comprehensive textual analysis of the story by Mikhaylov (2003), the allocation of characteristic style and structural signs, the definition of poetics and the usage by the writer of various documents, the identification of author’s strategy and dominating discourse in his book (Murdick et al., 2013).

4. DISCUSSION

“The Chronicle of the Great Jute”, which was published in May, 1990, Mikhaylov (2003) denounces the perpetrators provoking the famine in Kazakhstan, cites rare documents, letters of both ordinary people and the powerful of this world. These three works are the largest and multidimensional creations devoted to a hunger subject in the post-revolutionary Kazakhstan. Mikhaylov (2003) writes that it was hard to collect and study the materials on Famine-Genocide, especially in state archive; he did not get access to Committee of National Security archives. Meanwhile a great number of materials were in hands of ordinary people.
Some of them the writer got. Well-known archival worker M.Zh. Hasanayev reported that in 1980 the materials from T.G. Nevadovskaya, which has been issued poetically, had come to archives, it was a poetic requiem about dead for hunger created in 1933 (Aminov, Jensen et al., 2010). Moreover, 1980 year is a period of the USSR power. There were the materials of the thirtieth years, the years of the disaster, basically the letters of Party and public members to the administration, which were not published in the press of that time, for example, the letter of G. Musrepov and his comrades to Goloshchekin, T. Ryskulov’s letter to Stalin. V. Mikhaylov has expressed regret that the directive generalizing Party documents of that time did not contain the truthful analysis of Famine-Genocide on the basis of numbers, statistics and results of the commissions. The consideration of such theme, which was confidentially forbidden even in the 60th and 70th of the XX century for what many people in the 30th and 40th have paid with freedom, confirms spontaneous awakening of V. Mikhaylov’s intellectual and political consciousness, who has decided to be involved into the context of the difficult and unknown socio-political material, similar to the concealed fire. Probably, this step has matured many years ago due to biographic factors as the poet comes from the ancient Russian peasant community, which was dispossessed and banished to Kazakhstan after civil war. During the hunger, only few members of the community survived. Nevertheless, it is clear that preparation for the development of this subject lasted many years by means of collecting archival and documentary material and interviewing people who remembered the years of Famine-Genocide and were the witnesses of this tragedy. Arguing with some authors a Famine-Genocide in Kazakhstan, V. Mikhaylov summarizes: “I think that English historian was mistaken, considering that hunger in Kazakhstan, unlike
hunger in Ukraine, has not been organized purposely. In both republics, the collectivization was held according to the similar scheme and carried out at the same period. Moreover, Kazakh nomads and semi-nomads were forced – by accelerated tempo! – to become settled. For Kazakhstan, they have planned more cruel tests. That is why in Ukraine they exterminated 1/5–1/6 part of the population and in Kazakhstan 1/3 part of the indigenous population has died from hunger – the Kazakhs who terribly suffered and lost a half of their number” (Aminov et al., 2010).

V. Mikhaylov’s appeal to a disaster of Kazakhstan in the 30th was probably dictated firstly by moral motives and sincere impulse of the conscientious person stricken with the scale of national disaster of Kazakhs. Then, judging by author’s notes, this impulse during the work was transformed into the deep interest of the demanding and intellectual person, who decided to investigate independently the most difficult problem of the February and October revolutions in Russia of 1917. He wanted to understand the reason, multistage process of revolutions, which had begun with the attacks of terrorists in the XIX century against monarchs and dignitaries, ended with civil war. He wanted to understand the tragic consequences of it, which lasted until the end of the XX century. The Russian person with the positions of Orthodox spirituality has decided to shovel and analyze the event, which has become the basic one in world collisions of the XX century and defined the fate of hundred millions of people in different countries. The results of this intellectual, ontological work showed the growth of the creative and linguistic potential of the author, demonstrating catholicity, effectiveness and activeness influencing on consciousness of all society. Numerous responses to V. Mikhaylov’s book from Kazakhstan and abroad testify it.
The solution of such problem that cannot be sometimes done by groups of people could not but affect the identity of the writer. It definitely affected the author and identified the development of his historical consciousness, aggravated his moral position, crystallized the feeling of personal responsibility of the Russian man for the Russian revolution, for multimillion victims in the different countries. It escalated an intuition and feeling of the social analyst, skillful publicist and master of a word, who structurally and tactically organized the effective reception of archival and documentary materials. The initial sincere motive in the course of long-term work was transformed into strategic direction of purposeful ontology aimed at analysis of the reasons of socio-political and ideological chimeras – doctrines leading to excessive consequences as revolutions and world war. It is logical that author reaches the philosophical leitmotif of F.M. Dostoyevsky, the key note of demons, the incited ideologists obsessed with a dream to lead humanity to bright future be all means. The word “demons” also becomes a keynote of V. Mikhaylov’s book. V. Mikhailov criticizes Lenin’s doctrine about socialist revolution developed by the founder of Marxism and Leninism, on the basis of K. Marx and F. Engels’s propositions, and pretended to be firm scientific truth. The doctrine is characterized as a complicated controversial theory with a spirit of freemasonry, a texture of the anticlerical, materialistic, positivistic and utopian ideas, in fact – an ideological chimera, anti-system. “The philosophical belief” – negative ideology, absorbs ethnic group in which it has found a shelter, just as the spirochete eats a human body and dies together with it” – L.N. Gumilev acutely characterizes the doctrine as an anti-system. The socialist and communistic doctrine was an anti-system in relation to all traditional institutes, theories and customs of the society’s life. V. Mikhaylov also reveals a personal Lenin’s role in
unprecedented catastrophe – Famine-Genocide, which has captured all Soviet people: “Thus, if in 1891, being the assistant of juryman, Vladimir Ilyich only welcomed and propagandized national hunger, then after 1917, when he became the chairman of Council of People’s Commissars, he gave all concealed opportunities of this “progressive phenomenon” and brought Russia to the most terrible hunger in her thousand-year history”. Hunger according to Lenin’s positivistic, immoral representations, ruthlessly transferred the peasants to the category of the hungry proletariat, who in every possible way eager for revolution. Therefore, it was good for business of revolution.

F.I. Goloshchekin – the Bolshevik, the Leninist, the Stalin’s colleague, the head of Kazakhstan in days of cruel and terrible Famine-Genocide is an object of the strictest and consecutive V. Mikhaylov’s criticism. It is not enough for the writer to depict by artistic means an image of the Bolshevik, the head, one of the organizers and participants of tsar’s family assassination. He sets the most important task – to describe Goloshchekin as the specific social phenomenon of time – the type of the marginal person, political and spiritual degenerate in a form of the Bolshevik – the hidden superman, who rules peoples’ destinies according to cannibal principle – the end justifies the means. To the turn of the XIX and XX centuries, this type of cosmopolitan, ruthless and prudent rationalist, conscious provoker and political dealer and cold-blooded practitioner of cruel affairs was quite formed. Now it is absolutely clear that without such people the radical reorganization of the former Russian Empire was impossible, which has brought to destruction of the whole classes and social layers, the aristocracy and the nobility, the Cossacks and the kulaks, the peasantry and the merchants, old military
administration, the pre-revolutionary intellectuals and clergy ended with death of several tens of millions of people. Nevertheless, among Bolsheviks there were a lot of honest people who sincerely believed in ideals of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine. However, such people disappeared by 1945 due to Stalin’s repressions and war. Mainly the nimble type of opportunist who kept his nose to the wind had a chance to survive. It is known that the principle “the end justifies the means” adopted by the leaders of revolution, civil war and socialist reorganization of society. Such type represents the endless gallery of faces from the first Petrashevists to Lenin and Stalin and those who realized this principle with rolled up sleeves in blood. F. Nietzsche’s words are relevant here: “Perhaps, the future survey of human needs will admit that the equality of people’s deeds is not a good idea; on the contrary, for the benefit of the universal purpose it is necessary to set specific tasks for different stages of humanity development, perhaps, sometimes evil tasks”. V.D. Zhukotsky writes about the connections between Nietzsche’s philosophy and Marxism: “There was one more peculiar current of thought where the Nietzsche’s discourse has revealed its definiteness. This current – the Russian Marxism” (USKEMBAEVA et al., 2016).

The delineation and disclosure of such social type as F. Goloshchekin, – is one of the main tasks of the V. Mikhaylov’s book, which explains the work composition, the main line – dethronement of an image of the Bolshevik, Party figure poeticized in the Soviet literature with the status of a romantic hero during a number of decades. The statement of the problem, which runs through the book and peculiarities of solving these problems characterize the writer as a mature and well-armed artist revealing the reasons of such significant phenomena as emergence
of political party with aggressive ideology and showing the process of formation of the leaders, managers and performers, military cohorts and ordinary mass of people. The transformation of Party ideology into the global material force capable to remake the world map is one of the concomitant tasks of this book. In Goloshchekin’s portrait specific types of persons including Lenin, Sverdlov, Trotsky, Dzerzhinsky, Bukharin, Kaganovich, and Stalin are recognized. It is logical that punctual Goloshchekin got an instruction to kill the tsar’s family. The Center did not doubt at all that he would execute and “exceed” the assignment of top leaders and clean a zone of act without consequences. Goloshchekin was checked in many actions of Bolsheviks, his accuracy in special actions and punctual execution showed that he was – “the faithful Leninist” (USKEMBAEVA et al., 2016).

The activity of the author-storyteller in the bellettristic literature is an esthetic activity mainly with – maximum expressiveness, receptive completeness and – communication in all spheres of existing texts. The activity of the writer is a set of social, esthetic, psychological, mental and spiritual acts, which finally affect the sociohistorical plan of life or society. It is creativity or a creative continuum where the principle of the author has a significant value. It is known that philologically and philosophically developed the author’s concept of freedom in the text. V. Badikov comments: “M. Bakhtin is not teaching how methodologically precisely and fully to find the “image of the author”, it is more important for him to identify the ontological aspect of a problem, the philosophical life – interaction of “one’s own” and “somebody else’s”, the voices in eternal dialogue of life”. Bakhtin’s theory helps to interpret the authentic freedom of author’s consciousness: when the author is only the serviceable
slave of his professional competence, social order or a momentary literary juncture and when he is a true artist, a “supremecourt” for himself. Therefore, within M. Bakhtin’s representations, the work is a difficult texture “one’s own” and “somebody else’s” voices where the one’s own is a litmus piece of paper, precisely reveals and shades others voice, somebody else’s statement, estimating and judging him in a certain focus of moral knowledge. From this point of view, the work acts as a difficult polylogue where the dialogue of one’s own and somebody else’s voices is a leading semantic and constructive line. The author of the work of art can be morally and ontologically free only in such polylogue where there is a basic dialogue (dispute) on the background of historical and eternal semantic instances, the highest judge – the Truth (God). The sincerity of the author, the depth and interpretation of his super task, his stratagem are very important in such polylogue (Mikhaylov, 2003). As it was mentioned before, such stratagem in the book by V. Mikhaylov exists and shows active functional character. For the organization of such polylogue V. Mikhaylov chooses a form of the documentary work, the verbal texture of which contains quotes, inter text, documents, notes, remarks, hints, allusions, euphemisms, reminiscences penetrated by the author’s comment organizing all architectonics.

In order to depict a great hunger of the millennium the author selected the documentary form. It is identified on the title of the page as “the documentary story”. The composition of the first hundred-pages of (Mikhaylov, 2003) story describes an execution of tsar’s family, the hunger of the 1920th, the period after civil war, peripetias of Turkestan civil war and F.I. Goloshchekin’s appearance in Kazakhstan. The following hundred pages depict the comparative analysis of the Masonic
movement in Russia and abroad, the initiation of social-democratic Party in Russia, the comparative analysis between English revolution of the XVI century, French revolution at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries and Russian revolution of the XX century and Goloshchekin’s activity in Kazakhstan. Moreover, the pages show the procedure of expropriation of the cattle and collectivization in the republic, the beginning of hunger in Kazakhstan and repressions against the national intellectuals. The following hundred pages are devoted to the description of kulak’s dispossession in the USSR during 1920th-30th, repressions against clergy of different religions – Orthodoxy mainly, expropriation of property of churches and mosques and insurgent movements in Central Asia and Kazakhstan. Final seventy pages represent picturesque testimony of eyewitnesses of Famine-Genocide in Kazakhstan – the short stories, scenes, memoirs and letters with the author’s comment. In fact the author's comment is a discourse, which estimates, characterizes, organizes and directs an inter textual frame, steadily leading the reader to the logical deduction clearing up with details a true picture of not only a great hunger, but the revolution, which has nearly become the world one. In this documentary book, the author’s discourse represents the main narrative dominant outlining the main zone of search and exposure – notably – the disclosure of the socio-historical, genetic background and the content of such destructive phenomenon for traditional culture as Bolshevism, the socio-political anti-system. Attempting to provide a literary definition for the discourse concept, B. Dzholdasbekova and N. Sarsekeeva formulate: “Nowadays the discourse includes such linguistic concepts as word, speech, the speech inserted into life, the speech of the talking person, relevantly pronounced text, utterances and etc…. (our discharge – A.Zh.).

The functional style was connected first with special type of texts –
newspaper, colloquial, belles-lettristic etc. … Now it is possible to draw a conclusion that the problem of correlation between functional style and discourse concept is unsolved” (Gray et al., 1982).

If we proceed from this definition, the documentary inserts and different types of the intertext should be considered as a functional text. The author's discourse should be defined as a special type of speech, which is externally issued with signs of individual style and the internal conceptual plan reflects the signs of steadily formed stratagem, expanding the author’s implicit knowledge about the main theme of narration. Actually, the author knows the result - the grandiose socio-political experiment of Bolsheviks on creation of socialism and communism on Earth has cost some people of the USSR nearly a half of the population. There is another official information concerning the number of the victims during repressions and hunger: “According to international organization “Memorial” the number of victims of the terror during Soviet period was from 11 - 12 to 38 - 39 million people (146) … (our discharge – A.Zh.) From them: 6 - 7 million have died from hunger of 1932 - 1933 years”. The allocation of signs of a dynamic author’s discourse is important for the overall analysis of the structure of the V. Mikhaylov’s texts. It includes such elements as emotive, author’s modality, intonation, expression, remarks, notes and other forms. The main form is an objective commenting of the described phenomena or events according to the chronicle, or according to the logic of the illustrated documentary material. Researches show that a substantial framework of the text can be wider, than a documentary material: “Any data — historical, ethnic, cultural, geographical and sociological are significant for the writers
building a certain place in their center of the creative world view. These data can be factual and modified”.

The author begins the narration with restraint, which is typical for belletristic style, commenting G. Kairbekova’s story about hunger in Kazakhstan: “The poet GafuKairbekov goes on with his usual hard-of-hearing voice, softly, as if with astonishment”. The G. Kairbekov’s narration is transferred in a muffled intonation. Describing Goloshchekin’s acts, the author continually chooses hidden ironical tone: “Magnificent work” was done for Ural people by Goloshchekin the member of the Central Committee who arrived to Yekaterinburg in February. Sometimes the irony turns into sharp sarcasm: “Did he, Goloshchekin remember, receiving data from everywhere about hunger and cannibalism, how he made meat dumplings on the eve of new 1916, in the far Siberian village Monastic?” Investigating the documentary data, the author shows activity, assuming, guessing, and drawing far-reaching conclusions: “Yakov Mikhaylovich (Sverdlov – A.Zh.) looked himself after the tsar and regulated the actions of the regional commissioner Goloschekin, and not vice versa. Probably, he called Philip Isayevich, his “George” to Moscow to receive information and to give further instructions”. (Our italics – A.Zh.). The author uses on the page 35 an interesting form of the inter text - the verbal description of V.N. Pchelin “The Romanovs’ transferring to the Ural Council”, this scene is full of caustic sarcasm: “Pchelin executed an assignment with all socialist-realistic diligence. He represented two small groups of people, on the background of the soldier’s chain and the train shrouded in smoke, who are tensely peering each other. In the faces of Nicholas II, queen and great princess Maria we see the confusion and alarm, but opposite to them real
heroes stand” (GRAY et al., 1982). Representing the savage reprisal of the tsar’s family, murder of children, women, including innocent women, the author quotes the well-known Pushkin lines:

“Absolute villain!

I hate you, your throne.

Your death, the death of children

I see with cruel gladness”

However, the background of the represented cruel execution of tsar’s family reflects Pushkin’s lines differently, than it is depicted in the famous Soviet textbooks about Pushkin, – in such semantic contrast organized by the author his hidden anger is perceived. We see in the different fragments of the text sometimes explicit or implicit quotes from the Scripture of Christians, through such inter text the author actualizes absolute moral criterion, organizing the special point of view where the trial with eternal, religious position is accented. Therefore, the shape of demons is revealed in the book. For example, the killed “Sister of the queen, Elizabeth Fiodorovna, the famous devotee of mercy, according to the eyewitness, “crossed herself and prayed loudly: “My God, forgive them, they don’t know what they do”. Three months later their bodies were retrieved, on a mine ledge near Elizabeth Fiodorovna the body of one of the victims was found with the tied-up hand. She tried to alleviate the suffering of the neighbor with the broken body and severe bruises of the head”. This scene is represented through the significant semantic
contrast: the cruelty of executioners and mildness of the killed women. The author’s intonation demonstrates the undisguised grief, compassion to the victims and anger to monsters. “My God, forgive them, they don’t know what they do” it is, of course, a periphrasis of the known evangelical expression “Father! Forgive them for they do not know what they are doing”. Forms of sarcasm and irony, used by author, are various, estimating the leaders of revolution, for example, V.I. Lenin. In one of scenes he is assimilated to the axiomatic grandfather Mazay (the allusion is used here - according to function it is an allegory - the hidden citation from the poetic fairy tale by N.A. Nekrasov). As opposed to compassionate Mazay, who saved hares from a high water and put them in the boat, Lenin in the same situation hit the hares by oar: “Ilyich in Shushensk on hunting found himself on the land area full of the frightened hares flooded from all directions. He did not show the features of Mazay. Quickly being active with oar, he hit so many “dumb animals” that the boat bottom because of weight was caved in”. This scene is semantically more significant, than it seems at first sight. There is no doubt that Lenin’s hares on the internal plan are associated with the victims of hunger in Russia, Ukraine and Kazakhstan of 1919-21. On this background, the author’s detail – he hit so many “dumb animals”- looks as a gloomy symbol.

An objective author’s commentary according to the form looks like a meticulous research of circumstances of tsar’s family execution by Bolsheviks, - an event, which has imposed a fate shadow on further activities of communists. From the mental point of view of the book - murder of the Lord’s Anointed - is the inexcusable blasphemy doomed in the history to a damnation and inevitable crash. The research, analysis,
understanding of the details of execution preparation and implementation, comparison of events, facts and documents, intuitive guessing - all this signs of a dominating author’s discourse. When the author understands that, he was right, he cannot but keep from the sharp and condemning invectives. The telegram of the Ural Bolsheviks for the Center reported that only the tsar was executed, but the family was evacuated to the safe place. Here the author exposes a lie because he and the reader know that within three days all members of Romanov’s clan were killed: “It is occasionally or not, but the text contains a mistake in date. However, about “the evacuated family” of the executed tsar, the members of the Ural regional council lied, consciously deceiving the population of “the red capital of the Ural”. The word lied is often used relating to Bolsheviks in different episodes and leaders of revolution of different ranks (MIKHAYLOV, 2003).

Against the background of the sarcastic or objective-analytical or reserved-irate description of repressive acts of Plenipotentiary Representatives of the Bolshevism the sympathetic or sincere attitude to the figures of the Russian orthodox clergy looks differently. These are the Tikhon’s words the Patriarch of Moscow and all Russia during a sermon: “So, awful deeds were made recently: the former Tsar Nikolay Aleksandrovich is killed … Following the doctrine of our God’s Word, we have to condemn these deeds, otherwise the blood will touch us, and not just those who have made it… They will call us as the counter-revolutionaries for it, they will imprison or shoot us. We are ready to undergo all this, hoping that our Redeemer’s words will be about us: “Blessed rather are those who hear the Word of God and obey it”. No doubts, that the word of the Scripture, its Spirit and figures pronouncing
and realizing it patriarchs and churchmen, are authoritative for the author. Their piety sets the immutable moral criterion allowing placing all semantic accents and judging the evil geniuses of history or demons according to the logic of the book. The author’s intention convinces the reader that repression against church, as well as other religions of Russia, extermination of priests, mullahs and lamas, destruction of temples, expropriation of property of church, prohibition of religious activity, - is an infringement on a spiritual body of the people, an attempt to transform a matrix of thousand-year national life according to new curves to create new people on the basis of aggressive atheism.

The prolonged author’s comment analyzing historical acts of Bolsheviks, such as execution of tsar’s family or Famine-Genocide in Kazakhstan and in Ukraine, disclosing scales of national catastrophe with figures, picturesque scenes and fragments of separate events quite often come to the end with an author’s capacious conclusion. This emotional summary, in fact, is the biting note with pejorative assessment: “Only in the mid-twenties Bolsheviks recognized that together with Nicholas II all his family was executed. There are no testimonies that the conscience exasperated executioners. In deed! They were proud of their “revolutionary feat”. Such words in the text as “executioners”, “proud” are semantically painted by moral assessment of the author; they brightly illustrate his position, which consists in unconditional condemnation of Bolsheviks’ crime.

Goloshchekin - is a subject of intent look and analysis of the author. Irony, sarcasm, distancing, the portrait characteristic, hints, allusion disclosure and grotesque are very often used to describe such a
hero. When the author characterizes the image of the iron Plenipotentiary Representative Goloshchekin, he often applies sarcasm and irony – euphemisms and allusions: “He repeatedly, not just once or twice, uses the word “source”, concerning people… (our discharge – A.Zh.) and says that it is necessary “to drink from this source.”

How he drunk from this source by the name of the Kazakh people, became clear recently, - the number of the victims for the researchers varies: whether one million two hundred thousand people, who have died from hunger or one million seven hundred thousand…”.

For the detailed disclosure of Goloshchekin’s image, the author applies the most various means of delineation, specification, the additional characteristic, including vision from outside, the other person. Pages 97 and 98 show the documentary evidence, the description of how he, the writer, thumbing through bound files of newspapers of 1927, found Goloshchekin’s portrait in a profile, which was crossed out by the unknown reader: “Below a shaggy Mephistophelean small beard the inscription stretched obliquely with printing capital letters: “MURDERER”. It was the issue of “The Soviet steppe” May 30, 1927…One more person was crossed out, but with other ink, Philip Isayevich’s portrait was found in the newspaper of November 7, 1932. There was another definition –“The Nit!” We used the statistical textual analysis of the (Mikhaylov, 2003) story taking into consideration the rate of documentary materials and quotes. The first 100 pages of the text were taken for the analysis, and then the revealed statistics were extended to all other parts of the book. Observations show that the rate of citation and illustration of the text by documents, testimonies or functional inter text is
not falling until the end of the work. The first 100 pages are densely equipped with memoirs of eyewitnesses of history, documentary inserts, letters, telegrams, quotes from pages of party and state documents, researches, author’s comments, notes and remarks where either emotional, or political assessment of the author is shown. Besides, there are hidden quotes from the Scripture, the known Party documents and works of leaders, poetic classics, allusions, reminiscence, euphemisms, metaphors and phraseological units. These inter texts are intended for the creation of a reliable image of the prompt, critically terrible era, which did not know a respite, which constantly forged cohorts of ironmen – builders of new society, and doomed to death millions of people. The analysis shows that eyewitnesses’ memoirs of hunger are involved on p. 5, 12, telegrams are quoted on p. 12, 42, 46, 47, 48, quotes are used on p. 15 (3), 16 (3), 20-21, 22 (3), 23 (3), 24 (2), documents are attached (Goloshchekin’s biography) on p. 16-19, protocols are on p. 47, 57. Memoirs are quoted on p. 25 (4), 26 (4), 28, 29 (2), 30, 67, reminiscences are found on p. 27 (3), 28, 31, 32, 33 (2), 36, 38, 39, 40; quotes from written memoirs are on p. 31, 32 (2), 33 (2), 34 (3), 35 (3), 36 (2), 37 (3), 38 (2), 39 (2), 40 (3), 41 (2), 42, 44, 45 (4), 47 (3), 48, 49 (2), 50 (2), 51 (2), 52 (2), 54, 55 (4), 57, 59, 60, 61. Poems are cited on p. 38, 51, 56 (2), 85, 86. Euphemisms are on p. 41 (2), 43 (2), 46, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55, 59, 60, 74, 76 (3), 77, 78; reminiscences from the Bible are on p. 43 (2), 51, 54, 55. Party and government documents are quoted or illustrated on p. 58 (3), 60, 67, 68, 71 (3), 72, 73 (2), 74 (2), 80 (2), 81 (2), 82, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 90 (2), 91, 93 (2), 94, 95 (2), 96. The memoirs published in the press are quoted on p: 61, 62 (2), 75, 76, 77, 78 (2), 86, 88, 92, 98. Materials from the official press on p. 62, 63 (2), 65, 66, 89, 97, 98, 100 are quoted. Euphemisms with political
contents on p. 78 (4), 79, 85, 89, 94, 96 (3), 97 (3), 98 are used. There is an allusion on p. 79, 100 (MIKHAYLOV, 2003).

All this statistical material demonstrates the richness of art and documentary means of V. Mikhaylov’s story for creation of extremely expressional and functional context designed from various components. Among other types of quotes, printing, oral memoirs of eyewitnesses, the published testimonies prevail. The writer widely used Party and government documents that speaks about a huge work, which was done by him in archives. Various inter texts, including verbal illustrations of pictures; reminiscences from the Scripture, citation of poems show a wide palette of art and publicist means of the author, his activity, his public and moral position.

5. CONCLUSION

Functional texts and inter texts of (MIKHAYLOV, 2003) story “The Chronicle of Great Jute” testifies the relevance of the theme of the work and the genre form of this creation. It testifies the efficiency of structure and architectonics for optimal organization of the material, its convincing disclosure and maximal use of all evidential devices and attracted documentary illustrations.
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