



Studies In Slavic Cultures VII

EDITORS

ALYSSA DEBLASIO AND JULIE DRASKOCZY

CORRESPONDENCE
AND SUBMISSIONS

DEPARTMENT OF SLAVIC LANGUAGES AND
LITERATURES

CATHEDRAL OF LEARNING 1417
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
PITTSBURGH, PA 15260
SISC@PIT.EDU

WORLD-WIDE WEB

WWW.PIT.EDU/~SLAVIC/SISC/

DEPARTMENT OF SLAVIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
AND

CENTER FOR RUSSIAN AND EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

2008



Contents:

Editors' Introduction.....	5
Alyssa DeBlasio and Julie Draskoczy	
The Three-Dimensional Heroine: The Intertextual Relationship between <i>Three Sisters</i> and <i>Hedda Gabler</i>	9
Katherine Bowers, Northwestern University	
Performing Hybrid Identity: the Editing History of Gogol's <i>Vechera na kbutore bliz' Dikan'ki</i> (1831-1832)	28
Yuliya Ilchuk, University of Southern California	
The Knight and the Lady: Performing Gender Identity in <i>Wiersze miłosne</i> by Jerzy Harasymowicz.....	50
Ewa Stańczyk, University of Manchester	
The Show Must Go On: Komissarzhevskaia's Defense of Her 1909 Production of Stanisław Przybyszewski's <i>Gody życia</i>	64
Michael D. Johnson, University of Kansas	

by Vasilii Nareznyi and Orest Somov), but mostly because of Gogol's idiosyncratic and "odd" language.² The major Russian critics of the period responded favorably to the publication of *V'echera*, since they espied in them everything that Russian culture lacked at the time: the expression of nationality, a Romantic interest in folklore, and a taste of "local color." However, the language of the tales was criticized for containing so many vulgarisms, colloquialisms, and Ukrainianisms. As Viktor Vinogradov fairly observed, "his [Gogol's] language, being that of a man from another country, was not entirely bound by the old aristocratic speech culture; it was full of dialectal 'inaccuracies'" (209). Many of Gogol's contemporaries repeatedly pointed out these "inaccuracies." For example, Pushkin, in his notes of 1830-1831, spoke ironically of Gogol's proficiency in Russian:

Вот уже 16 лет, как я печатаю, и критики заметили в моих стихах пять грамматических ошибок (и оправдаливо); я всегда была им искренно благодарен и всегда поправляла замеченное место. Прозой я пишу гораздо неправильнее, а говорю еще хуже, и почти так, как пишет Гоголь.³ (qtd. Tikhonravov 198)

In 1836, promoting the second edition of Gogol's *V'echera*, Pushkin again emphasized Gogol's imperfect literary language in the first edition: "Мы так были благодарны молодому автору, что охотно простили ему неровность и неправомерность его слога ... Автор оправдал такое снисхождение" (VII 237).⁴ The idea of Gogol's illiteracy was further developed in the Russian criticism of the 1840s. For example, Vladimir Dal', commenting on the effect that Gogol's *Meritye dushi* [*Dead Souls*, 1842] produced on him, described Gogol's language in terms of delight and confusion:

Greedily you swallow up the whole [story] to the end, then you read it again and still do not notice that he is writing in a *wild language*. You try, pedantically, to figure out, and you see that one absolutely should not write or talk like this. You try to correct it—you spoil it. You cannot touch a word" [emphasis mine] (617).

Throughout the nineteenth century, Russian writers and critics perpetuated the myth of Gogol as a semi-literate Little Russian writer encroaching upon the status of a Great Russian writer. They prompted the writer to polish his style by eliminating evident elements

Performing Hybrid Identity: the Editing History of Gogol's *Vechera na kbutore bliz' Dikan'ki* (1831-1832)

YULIYA ILCHUK
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

In his "Avtorskaia ispoved'" ["The Author's Confession," 1847], Gogol begged his readers not to rely on his works as a source of information about himself (*V'ybranyye* 236). Although his words were targeted at those critics who tried to draw parallels between the writer's personality and his authorial persona in *V'ybranyye mesta iz perepiski s druz'iami* [*Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends*, 1847], they also epitomize the fate of Gogol's earlier work—*V'echera na kbutore bliz' Dikan'ki* [*Evenings on a Farm near Dikan'ka*, 1831-32]. The transformations that the tales underwent in numerous editions in the 1830-40s iconically reflect Gogol's constant vacillations between the Russian and Ukrainian identities. Gogol's "Russification" of *V'echera* in the transition from the first to the second edition suggests his attempt to resolve a disturbing duality in his sense of national identity.¹ I would argue that the duality of Gogol's national identity was artistically realized in the hybridization of the literary language in *V'echera*. In this paper, I will study the hybridization of the literary language in *V'echera* and the history of the editing of the tales in order to demonstrate how the language duality palpable in the first edition of the tales in 1831-1832 was subdued in the second edition of 1836, and then reestablished in the edition of his *Sovinnia* [*Works*] in 1842. The collective editing of the text of *V'echera*, in which Gogol himself, Nikolai Prokopovich, Vissarion Belinskii, and Mikhail Likhonin participated, was nothing short of the act of Gogol's self-fashioning through the use and manipulation of language. The editing of *V'echera* can be interpreted as a performative act in which Gogol realized a translation of self across the boundaries of two languages.

Mistakes in *Vechera* through the Prism of Gogol's Bilingualism

When the first edition of *V'echera* came out in 1831, it "amazed" the Russian audience—not so much because of the "exotic" subject matter (there already existed a rich tradition of Ukrainian tales written

of Ukrainian lexicon (and not only lexicon, but also inverted syntax and intonation) from his works, particularly, from the first edition of *Vechera*. However, what in fact was labeled as Gogol's "illiteracy" was nothing more than an example of a bilingual speaker making his way in a monolingual imperial culture. These ungrammaticalities were, above all, due to the interference between two related languages that often occurs in the bilingual mind. The fact that Gogol was bilingual in Russian and Ukrainian has been rarely discussed in literary criticism.⁵ Scholars usually point out his profound knowledge of Ukrainian folklore, his use of Ukrainian lexicon as local color in *Vechera*, and scanty notes and letters written in Ukrainian, thereby defining bilingualism strictly in terms of descriptive linguistics.⁶

When I use the term "bilingualism" in relation to Gogol, I refer both to his linguistic consciousness and to the bilingualism of his text as an aesthetic discourse feature. My approach to Gogol's bilingualism as manifested in the literary language of *Vechera* serves to establish the relationship of ethnicity to language. In doing this, I follow Pierre Bourdieu in his treatment of regionalist or ethnic identities, which he claims to be "performative":

Regionalist discourse is a performative discourse which aims to impose as legitimate a new definition of the frontiers and to get people to know and recognize the region that is thus delimited in opposition to the dominant definition, [...] which does not acknowledge that new region. (223)

The important implication of Bourdieu's theory is that although regional and ethnic identities essentialize what are actually arbitrary divisions among peoples, and in this sense are not "real," once they are established they exist as mental representations and are as real as if they were grounded in something "natural" (221). My assumption is that the regional form of Russian in which Gogol is psychologically rooted is more "real" and creative than the standard form of Russian used as a kind of *lingua franca*. Regional language was, for young Gogol, one of the channels through which his cultural identity was processed; it created a sense of belonging to a common language and culture and provided some transitional space for his cultural migration to the heart of the Russian empire.

One might claim, however, that bilingualism was not entirely atypical to the Russian cultural situation in the beginning of the nineteenth century. The Russian literary elite readily employed French for

correspondence and society talk. Yet, the proficiency of the Russian gentry in French was acquired over time and cannot be treated on par with the "natural" bilingualism of Ukrainian writers who were exposed to both languages, Russian and Ukrainian, since birth. Moreover, with the difference lying in the value and prestige of the second language, the *additive* bilingualism of the Russian elite occurred in the situation when both languages—Russian and French—were considered equally valued and useful, whereas the *subtractive* bilingualism of Gogol indicated an unequal relationship between the Russian language and Little Russian dialect (*narzhiv*). The chauvinistic attitude towards the Ukrainian language was so common among Russian intellectuals that it made Gogol think of his mixed language in *Vechera* as a personal flaw he needed to fix. It was a rather common attitude among Little Russian gentry to disavow their regional language and demonstrate excellence in Russian. The acquisition of Russian very often resulted in the gradual loss of their native language and ethnic identity. In the case of Gogol's family, however, the bilingualism of its members was a cultural rather than social phenomenon; neither Gogol's parents, nor their relatives, abandoned Ukrainian. Instead, they operated within the two languages—Russian and Ukrainian—all their lives. Gogol's father, Vasilii Afanasievich Gogol, wrote his comedies in the mixed Ukrainian-Russian language, now known as *surzhuk*.⁷ This constant code-switching was imprinted not only on his creative works, but also in his correspondence to his wife.

Gogol's mother spoke two versions of Russian: one, a largely Ukrainianized version of Russian; and the other, the literary Russian language. Her correspondence with family contain various Ukrainian linguistic forms: lexicon ("копица," "шинюк," "вечеря," "карбованець," etc.); grammar ("с Лубен," "за коровы," "в тетиньки," "негодяться доробити," etc.); and orthography ("нихто," "несоветувала," "пробувать," "вже," "Антошка," "болять," "пшущ," etc.). At the same time, her correspondence with the Aksakov family is written in more standard Russian. This differentiation between the Ukrainianized Russian language for colloquial usage and the more or less standard form of Russian for use in polite society occurred in many Little Russian families who had just been admitted into Russian high society and aspired to assimilate. Already during his study at the Nizhyn Lyceum, Gogol coexisted in two different linguistic modes: his letters to home include many Ukrainian words and grammatical forms ("сюды," "гозычили,"

"примете," "влюблен у вас," "разов," "мета," "халстуки," "шлябаум," etc.), inconspicuously formed neologisms ("уроченное время," "не поразкажете ли чего-нибудь употребляю," "жить в разрозненнии," "несбытоумис," etc.),⁸ and various orthographic mistakes.

Strategies of Hybridization in *Vecheva*

The astonishing effect that Gogol's tales produced on the metropolitan audience can be accredited to the artistry of his language. It was not so much the subject matter, but his innovative language, which comprised elements of the Russian vernacular mixed with the Ukrainian vernacular and *суржык*, all fused in a hybrid conglomerate, that made the author successful. Roman Koropec'kyj and Robert Ro-manchuk argue that Gogol used Ukrainian elements in a burlesque tradition, *a la* Ivan Kotliarevs'kyi in *Eneida* (1798), in order to present Ukraine to the imperial public as an "unconscious" souvenir (547). It is fair to admit, however, that the Ukrainian elements in *Vecheva* function not only to "lower" the overall style, but to install a metonymic gap between the Russian language, in which the tales are written, and the Ukrainian language, with its inserted and un glossed words, phrases, and quotes that were vaguely known to the metropolitan reader. Although these elements occur in the speech of all the narrators in *Vecheva*, the language of Rudy Pan'ko, the fictitious editor, and that of Foma Grigor'evich, Dikan'ka's sexton, is the most hybridized. Both of them represent the local Dikan'ka community and therefore incorporate in their language various forms of local dialects and idiomatic expressions. Pan'ko's language, especially that of the "Predislovie" ("Preface") to Book One, clearly manifests his intentional ignorance of standard Russian grammar. It is intentional because the "Predislovie" to Book Two and the tales "Noch' pered Rozhdestvom" ("Christmas Eve") and "Strashnaia mest'" ("A Terrible Revenge"), which he presumably authored, are written in more or less normative Russian. The first group of ungrammaticalities embraces misspelled words that reflect the phonemic nature of Pan'ko's regional language ("сыпило" instead of "сыпало"; "раскащик" instead of "разказчик"; "скрыпка" instead of "скрипка"; "имянно" instead of "именно"; "к шастью" instead of "к счастью"; "грушовый" instead of "грушевый," etc.)⁹ Clearly, the peculiarities of Pan'ko's spelling bear some traces of Ukrainian grammar and pronunciation and reveal his preference of sound over letter. The second group of

ungrammatical forms consists of the grammatical and punctuation mistakes admissible neither in Russian, nor in Ukrainian:

1. most of the verbs with the negative particle "не" are written together, breaking the grammatical rules of the normative Russian of the time ("невчала," "неплачь," "незвольте," "неноси");
2. some of the verbs in the second person present tense have "ь," as in Ukrainian, instead of "е," as in Russian ("зайдишь," "можешь," "упросишь");
3. adverbs, adjectives, and nouns are written together with the negative particle "не" in words that should be written as separate words ("неслишком," "ни слова");
4. or, vice versa, adjectives are separated from the particle "не" where they should be written as one word ("саааааааааа не описанная");
5. the spelling of adverbs are odd: for instance, "вовсе" is written separately as "во все," thereby becoming another part of speech (a noun and a preposition); "во-своаяси," "на-бекрень," "на-сторожэ."

Another strategy for hybridizing the literary discourse is achieved by the use of glosses to the Ukrainian words and idioms unknown to the Russian audience. First, Pan'ko provides two glossaries of Ukrainian words (about 130 entries) that accompany both of his "Predislovie" to Books One and Two (see Appendix). This strategy signifies not only that the discourse is directed toward the other and not a local audience, but it also indicates that the text itself activates the process of language variation. Just as the text includes language variance as a signifying difference, so do the glosses employ Ukrainian words as linguistic variants to denote the insertion of the other into the discourse. Therefore, the glosses function as a bridge between the "center" and "periphery," simultaneously establishing their unbridgeable separation.

Second, Pan'ko, as the author of the whole cycle of tales, intrudes into the text of Foma Grigor'evich, translating or commenting on his use of Ukrainian words and expressions. In the first edition of the tales, Pan'ko's translation of Foma Grigor'evich's Ukrainian words and expressions appeared in italics in the footnotes without any refer-

speaker, thus enabling the speaker to establish kinship with the audience. However, the way in which Foma Grigor'evich resorts to code-switching conceals his regional identity from the Russian audience; he establishes an affinity only with those who belong to his inner circle and excludes others who do not belong to his class and region. In the beginning of his story, Foma Grigor'evich renders his village listeners' request to tell another creepy story in Ukrainian: "Фома Григорьевич! Фома Григорьевич! А туте яку-небудь страшовитину казавчу! А туте, туте! ... — тара-та-та, та-та-та, и поблаут, и поблаут ..." (I, 136).¹⁴ Thus, this code-switching shows how he demarcates those in his audience who can understand his local language from those who cannot.

In sharp contrast to Pan'ko and Foma Grigor'evich, Makar Nazarovich demonstrates his questionable knowledge of local culture.¹⁵ In his use of language, he remains within the cultural code that descends from the imperial center. This code regulates, for example, the use of Ukrainian in the tale "Sorochinskaya iarka" ["Sorochintsy Fair"], in which all the epigraphs in Ukrainian are transliterated into Russian: "Що, Боже ты мій, Господе! Чого нема на тій ярмарци! Колеса, скло, аетоть, цыбуля, крамары всякы ... так, що хоч би в кишені було рублів и с тридцять, то й толи б не закупив усіен ярмаркы" (I, 79).¹⁶ Within the Russian imperial literary code of the beginning of the century, Ukrainian folklore and burlesque literature served to metonymically represent Ukraine, and the transliteration of the epigraphs only reinforces the presumption of imperial consumption. Roman Koropecky and Robert Romanchuk suggest that "the *panich* from Poltava represents and reintegrates the Ukrainian material of the epigraphs into a single, Russian voice ... Indeed, it is only in and through the medium of the imperial literary language that the Ukrainian setting actually coalesces and comes to life ..." (543).

Makar Nazarovich's arsenal of Ukrainian elements is limited to the use of doublets, names of ethnic food, etc. The abundance of doublets in his texts (дружка - кухоль ["a mug"], аа - пекло ["hell"], сорванец - шибеник ["a scamp"], жена - жинка ["a wife"], дєвущка - дивчина ["a girl"], спешить - поспешать ["to hurry"], узать - познать ["to know"], любимый - любый ["beloved"]) in close proximity makes the use of the Ukrainian words redundant; they function only for the sake of local color. In the examples below, translations in the text present functionally undifferentiated lexical items, between

ence to Pan'ko. However, in all subsequent editions of the tales, these comments (with the exception of the one in the beginning of "Noch' pored Rozhdestvom," which is accompanied by the words "primechanie pasichnika" ("the bee-keeper's footnote")) are accompanied by the note "primechanie N.V. Gogolia" ("N.V. Gogol's comment"). In the first edition, Pan'ko's "Predislovie"—his introduction to "Vecher nakanune Ivana Kupala" ["St. John's Eve"]—and all the comments in the footnotes are printed in the same font that is larger and in cursive, unlike the main text of all the tales. Therefore, this gives grounds to attribute all comments in the footnotes to Pan'ko. In the examples below, he provides glosses to the Ukrainian idiomatic expressions, translating them literally into Russian, which not only creates a comic effect, but also neutralizes the original connotation of the expressions.

1. Да, рассказу я вам, как вельмы играли с покойным делом в *фурья*.¹⁰
То есть в *фуряки* [emphasis mine] (I, 136).
2. Люлька-то у меня есть, да того, чем бы зажечь ее, *чорт-ма*.
Не *имеется* [emphasis mine] (I, 141).¹¹
3. *Дивись, дивись, маты, мов бурна, скаче*.
Смотри! Смотри! мить, как сумасшедшая, скачет!
[emphasis mine] (I, 144).¹²

Pan'ko's Russian translations of highly idiomatic Ukrainian expressions have a neutralizing effect: they acquire neutrality in a linguistic context where the native language is functionally marked.

While Foma Grigor'evich's macaronic language does not transgress Russian grammar, it nevertheless contains various Ukrainian elements that penetrate his discourse as a result of code-switching and code-mixing, such as the insertion of Ukrainian lexical material into a structure of Russian or the alternation between two structures (Russian and Ukrainian). Usually, these insertions are italicized in Foma Grigor'evich's text, as in the passage from "Vecher nakanune Ivana Kupala": "Плюйте ж на голову тому, кто это напечатал *бреше, сучий москаль*. Так ли я говорил? *Що то вже, яку кого чорт-ма кленки в голову!* Слушайте, я вам расскажу ее сейчас" (I, 99).¹³ The switching from one language to another within a single paragraph is typically used to reveal to the audience the regional identity of the

body else's texts for publication in his journal *Biblioteka dia chentia* [*Library for Reading*] clearly illustrates the common practice of butcher-ing authors' works.

The history of publication and editing of Gogol's *Vecbera* serves as a vivid illustration of these tendencies. The first attempt at "correcting" the language of the tales was made about a year prior to their publication as a cycle by Pavel Svin'in, the editor of *Syn otechestva* [*Son of the Fatherland*]. The tale "Vecher nakanune Ivana Kurala" ap-peared in the January 1830 issue of the magazine under a slightly dif-ferent title: "Bisavriuk, ili Vecher nakanune Ivana Ku-pala" ["Bisavriuk, or St. John's Eve"]. Svin'in disfigured the tale, hav-ing changed the title and "corrected" the oral locutions and Ukrainian dialectical elements that were part of the tale's artistic design. Trying to avoid such gross editorial intrusions, Gogol decided to collect the tales into a book and in the preface of "Vecher nakanune Ivana Ku-pala," he mocked the whole situation.²¹

In the introduction to the tale, Pan'ko explains the peripetia of how the "Moscovite" obtained Foma Grigor'evich's tale and pub-lished it against his will:

Один из тех господ — нам простым людям мурено
и назвать их — писакни они, не писакни; а вот то
самое, что барышники на наших ярмарках.
Нахватают, напростят, накрадут всякой всячины, да
и выпускают книжечки, не толще бумажки, кажый
месяц, или неделю. Один из этих господ и
выманял у Фомы Григорьевича эту самую
историю, а он и вовсе позабыл о ней. (I, 99)²²

These very specific details characterize those who acted like profiteers: they swindled somebody else's stories and then made money on pub-lishing them, and this arrangement sheds light on the relationship be-tween Gogol and Svin'in. A year after the publication in *Syn otechestva*, Gogol published Book One of his tales without Svin'in's corrections and, until now, this edition remains the only representation of the au-thor's authentic text—an authenticity not present in any subsequent editions. Gogol was therefore conscious of the editorial practices of Russian publishers and magazine editors and, in a sense, he predicted the fate of his *Vecbera*, which he saw significantly distorted after nu-merous corrections. Already by the second edition the text did not contain as many misspellings and grammatical mistakes, which consti-tuted part of the author's artistic intention. Both of Pan'ko's

which the ontological hierarchy is erased. The Ukrainian words retain their material texture, but in joining the single, homogeneous cultural space, they lose their ontological essence.

1. Другой цыган, ворча про себя, понался на ноги, два раза осветил себя искрами, бучато моланями, раздул губами трут и, с каганцом в руках, обыкновенною малороссийскою светильнею, состояшею из разбитого черепка, налитого бара ным жиром, отправился, освещая дорогу [emphasis mine] (I, 91).¹⁷
2. В мирской схолаке, или громаде, несмотря на то что власть его ограничена несколькими голосами, голова всегда берет верх и почти по своей воле высмывает, кого ему угодно, ровнять и гладить дорогу или копать рыи [emphasis mine] (I, 118).¹⁸

As demonstrated earlier, the various strategies of hybridization of the literary language by Pan'ko, Foma Grigor'evich, and Makar Nazarovich differ in one important aspect: while Pan'ko tends to de-territorialize the very grammatical norms of Russian, as if they were processed through the consciousness of a non-native speaker of Rus-sian, Foma Grigor'evich remains within them.¹⁹ In regards to the use of Ukrainian elements, Foma Grigor'evich and Makar Nazarovich are polar opposites: whereas the former uses them without translation or explanation, the latter exploits the Ukrainian material for the sake of exoticism by providing translations, thereby making it easier for the Russian metropolitan audience to process.

Language Ideology at Work: the Editing of *Vecbera*

In nineteenth-century Russia, the development of the insti-tution of authorship accompanied the emergence of the institution of editing. The editors usually performed an ideological function, which consisted in the control and dissemination of texts. They typically coalesced with censors in a single apparatus regulating literary produc-tion by changing authors' texts and significantly distorting them. Gogol was personally deeply dissatisfied with this practice, and he expressed his indignation,²⁰ when Senkovskii published Balzac's novel *Le Pere Goriot* [*Father Goriot*, 1835], having completely rewritten the conclusion of it. In fact, Senkovskii's attempt at "correcting" some-

Vechera, he grouped the tales together with the new collection *Mirgorod*, which had the subtitle "Povesti, sluzhashchie prodolzheniem Vecherov na khutore bliz Dikan'ki" ["Tales that Are the Sequel of 'Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka'"]. In order to emphasize continuity between the two cycles, the writer began to refine his style in *Vechera*. It is important that in the same year, 1836, Gogol was preparing his *Arabeski* [*Arabesques*] for publication and begged Pushkin to proof-read it mercilessly.²⁵ Although it is probable that Gogol remained under the impression of Pushkin's corrections when he decided to correct the style of *Vechera*, it is unlikely that Pushkin or anyone else had a hand in its editing. The corrections were unsystematic; more intensive editing occurred in the text of the "Predislavie" and in the first three tales of Book One. In those texts, the average number of corrections per page was 2.5; in the fourth tale "Propavshaia gramota" ["A lost dispatch"]—less than 2; and in Book Two—less than 1.5. Gogol's editing for the second edition of 1836 reflected his conscious striving to make the *skazki*; style of his storytellers more vivid, while at the same time standardizing their speech manner in accordance with the norms of Russian. To this end he eliminated some Ukrainianisms and Russian dialectisms, replacing "пьянекек" with "пьянехонек," "анбар" with "амбар," "полуаник" with "поланик," "чуадеса деются" — "чуадеса делаются," "чего ж вы перепугались" — "чего ж вы испугались," "сткло" — "стекло," etc.

Another attempt to "improve" the tales was made when Gogol launched the first publication of his *Sochineniia* in 1842, in which *Vechera* and *Mirgorod* formed Volume One. Because Gogol did not feel himself competent in Russian to edit his works, he authorized his classmate from Nizhnyi Lyceum, Nikolai Prokhorovich, to do it, who by that time as a Russian teacher had received the reputation of being an expert in Russian grammar. Delegating to him the enormous right to correct the language and style of his works for the publication of his *Sochineniia*, Gogol wrote:

При корректуре второго тома прошу тебя действовать как можно самоуравней и поновластней: в Тарасе Бульбе много есть погрешностей писца. Он часто любит букву *и*; где она не у места, ее там выбрось. В двух-трех местах я заметил плохую грамматику и почти отсутствующие смыслы. Пожалуйста, поправь везде с такою же свободою, как ты переправляешь

"Predislavie" were especially damaged; his "Afterword,"²³ in which he begged editors for mercy to ignore his misspellings, was discarded *in toto*.

However dissatisfied with such dishonest editorial practices, Gogol changed his own attitude to his texts and began to correct his language and style, mainly by eliminating Ukrainianisms and Russian colloquialisms. Gogol's letter to Mikhail Maksimovich, in which he advised on how to write for a Russian audience, can account for the nature of those changes:

Есть пропалка таких фраз и выражений, оборотов, которые нам, малороссынам, кажутся будут понятны для русских, если мы переведем их слово в слово, но которые иногда unintожают половину смысла поланиника. Почти всегда сильное лаконическое место становится непонятным на русском, потому что оно не в духе русского языка; и тогда лучше десятью словами определить всю обширность его, нежели скрыть его [...] Помни, что твой перевод для русских, и потому все малорусские обороты и конструкции прочь.²⁴ (X, 311-2)

Two moments in the letter deserve consideration: Gogol's concern with addressing the broader audience in a comprehensible literary language and his belief that the richness of Ukrainian idiomatic expressions becomes lost in Russian translation and, thus, they should be avoided. This became an urgent task for Gogol and the contemporary editors of *Vechera*: Prokhorovich, Shevutiov, and Likhonin, who began to eliminate the bilingualism of the first edition of the tales and standardize it according to established literary norms. The standardization of the language took place in two directions: on the one hand, the peculiar Ukrainian lexicon, grammatical forms, and orthography were replaced with Russian equivalents; on the other, the ungrammaticalities, misprints, colloquialisms, and vulgarisms of the Russian language were neutralized. In fact, it was the imperial education system itself that prompted Gogol and the editors to adhere to a standardized version of the Russian language as the norm, marginalizing all variants as impurities. It is possible to claim that language in *Vechera* became the medium through which a hierarchical structure of power was perpetuated.

When in 1836 Gogol decided to publish the second edition of

a linguistic purist: all nouns ending in -ць were replaced with -ц ("голодарабець" — "голодарабець," "оселедешь" — "оселедец," "хлопецъ" — "хлопец"); ending of nouns ("Купала" — "Купала," "по церкве" — "по церкви"); adverbs and prepositions ("ниначе з неба" — "с неба," "по-над самым провалом" — "над самым провалом," "запалака что дитя" — "запалакал как дитя").

Moreover, Prokhorovich eliminated "ь" in the word "bliz" in the title and combined the two glossaries of Ukrainian words from Book One and Book Two into one and placed it at the end of *Mirgoda*, thereby emphasizing the link between two cycles. Because Gogol neither approved nor disapproved these changes, they can be viewed as a supreme violation of his will as an author. However, since Prokhorovich's corrections were sanctioned by the author himself, this version of Gogol's text should be acknowledged as the most valid text. However, there is evidence that Gogol was not completely satisfied with Prokhorovich's work. In his letter to the editor, the writer obscures his dissatisfaction in self-condemnation:

Издание сочинений моих вышло не в том влоане внае, как я думал, и виною, разумеется, этому я, не распорядившись аккуратнее ... Вкрались ошибки, но, я думаю, они произошли от неправильного оригинала и принадлежат пишу или даже мне. Все, что от издателя, то хорошо, что от типографии — то мерзко. Буквы тоже поаламе. Я виноват сильно во всем. Во-первых, виноват тем — ввел тебя в хлопоты, хотя тайный умысел мой был добрый. Мне хотелось пробудить тебя из немижкости и прилвинуть к легельности книжной; но влжу, что еще рано ... (XII, 215-6)²⁶

In all senses, Prokhorovich became an editor *par excellence*, i.e. an Enlightenment figure who claimed authority, explicitly or implicitly. The straightforward Enlightenment effect of his editing was to mediate unintelligible, divergent meanings and translate them for the benefit of readership of the time. In his letter to Gogol dated October 21, 1842, Prokhorovich reported on his work: "I can guarantee the exactness of my correction of which I am proud: I have become a skilled hand ("nabil ruku") at this enterprise and read two proofs by myself;

тетради своих учеников. Если где частое повторение одного и того же оборота периодов, дай им другой, и никак не сомневайся и не задумывайся, будет ли хорошо — все будет хорошо.²⁶ (XII, 84-5)

Prokhorovich really took the writer's advice to correct every mistake. The only problem was that his definition of mistake was too broad: he understood his task as correcting not so much Gogol's orthography, grammar, and punctuation, but improving Gogol's overall style. His corrections can be classified as such:

1. elimination of inversions: in "Strashnaia mest'" instead of "... вышел потихоньку из двора промеж ставшими своими козаками в горы" — "... промеж ставшими своими козаками вышел потихоньку из двора в горы";²⁷
2. insertion of new words whenever Prokhorovich thought they were missing (especially in dialogues between characters, which in principal are incomplete sentences);
3. replacement of ungrammatical, yet very characteristic to the personages, colloquial speech elements. All ungrammaticalities in the language of Rudy Pan'ko were standardized according to Russian grammar and orthography. Vakula in "Noch' pered Rozhdestvom" tries to speak Russian: "Но Боже мой, от чєво она так чертовски хороша."²⁸ Prokhorovich corrected one word, "чєво," replacing it with "чего," and the phrase began to sound grammatically perfect but the effect of deterritorialization had been lost. Similarly, in "Maiskaia noch'" ["A Night in May"], a village clerk reads a letter from the district commissioners: "приказываю тебе сей же час [...] подчинить мосты на столбовой дороге."²⁹ Prokhorovich thought that this was one of Gogol's blunders and replaced it with "починить" (to fix), which is more logically coherent, but neutralizes the clerk's bureaucratic manner of speech;
4. elimination of Ukrainianisms and Gogol's neologisms, which were dubious from the point of view of

print the very first edition of the tales.³¹ It is important to do so not only because the integrity of the author's work needs to be maintained, but because the reprint of *Vechera* could also shed light on Gogol's hybrid language and identity. Nowadays, all editions, including the last one initiated by the Academy of Sciences of Russia, fail to reproduce Gogol's idiosyncratic Russian orthography. The Ukrainian elements appear in the text either in modernized Russian or, as in editions popular with scholars, in transliterated Ukrainian that adheres to modern Ukrainian orthography. I believe that Gogol's language can neither be transliterated into Russian nor translated into Ukrainian, due to its hybrid nature.

Conclusion

The history of Gogol's reworkings and the collective editing of the text of *Vechera* vividly demonstrate the writer's persistent striving to be comprehensible to the broad Russian reading audience, on the one hand, and to manifest his hybrid national identity by preserving the "impure" Russian language, on the other. The "improvement" of Gogol's Russian language over the 1830s and 40s inevitably involved the self-translation of his identity, or his "discursive assimilation," to a new linguistic and cultural community. In a sense, Gogol's identity became a form of "doing," i.e. a local construction that occurred in a particular community of practice. While striving to acquire standard Russian, Gogol at the same time did not entirely abandon the speech of his childhood. Moreover, by appropriating the imperial language, its discursive forms, and its modes of representation, Gogol was able to intervene more readily into the dominant mode of discourse and to interpolate his own cultural realities. Insofar as Russian society at the beginning of the nineteenth century was repressing linguistic diversity, the minorities of the Russian Empire who did not speak standard Russian were subject to symbolic domination.³² Under the hegemonic ideology of homogenization, Gogol became subject to the "symbolic violence" of monolingual standardization, and his integration into the standard linguistic community naturally involved the monolingualization of his literary language.

There is a strong belief among Russian Gogol scholars that after the publication of *Vechera* and *Mirgorod*, when Gogol eliminated the Ukrainian elements from his literary language, the quality of his Russian improved drastically in a short span of time. Not only being an overt simplification, this statement is also used as a main argument in

Belinskii read it one more time after me" (qtd. Shenrok 54). The appearance of Belinskii in the editing process, who was notorious for his attitude toward Ukrainian, can account for the high range of corrections: the average number of corrections drastically increased in the tales following "Maskaia noch'," numbering 3.5 per page. Prokopovich had indeed developed a skilled hand at correcting the tales.

In 1850, Gogol initiated a new collection of his works in five volumes and contracted Stepan Shevyrev for its publication. Shevyrev, as a Slavophile and a professor of Russian literature, was very concerned with polishing Gogol's Russian and convinced the writer to hire Mikhail Likhonin, a colleague from the journal *Moskovite*, for the position of editor. Presumably, Likhonin was assigned to the position because of his excellent knowledge of Russian; he had already published his textbooks *Russkaia grammatika dlia pervonachal'noho obuceniia dlia russkikh* [*Russian grammar for Primary Russian Instruction*, 1839] and the article "O pravopisanii inostrannykh sostvennykh imen" ["On the Orthography of Foreign Proper Names"] in *Moskovitianin* (*The Moscovite*) in 1849. Technically, Likhonin played the same role that Prokopovich played in the first publication of Gogol's *Sobremennia* (1842).

This time, Gogol wanted to correct the proofs with his own hand and was working on them at the time of his death in February, 1852. He managed to proofread the first nine sheets of the first volume (up to the middle of "Noch' pered Rozhdestvom"), the first nine sheets of the second volume (up to the middle of *Taras Bul'ba*), the first thirteen sheets of the third volume (up to *Zapiskei sumashechivogo [Madman's Notes]*), and the first seven sheets of the fourth volume (up to *Revizor [Inspector General]*). Since Gogol's corrections were not systematic, one cannot claim that the edited texts became the new versions of the Gogol's works. Because Gogol was unable to finish his proofreading, it is hard to determine how much damage was done by Likhonin. Taking into account the fact that Gogol did not authorize the final correction of Book Two and that he made his own corrections of Book One in addition to Prokopovich's, it can be said that all these were layered on top of each other, with Gogol's text as a palimpsest. Despite the work of Nikolai Tikhonravov, who aimed to rectify Gogol's text by removing Prokopovich's corrections, and Nikolai Korobka, who continued this task in the end of the nineteenth century, the text of *Vechera* nowadays does not coincide with the text of the first edition and the only way to rectify the situation is to re-

discussions of Gogol's belonging exclusively to Russian culture. The changes in Gogol's literary language throughout his career have never been studied, but even a passing glance at the texts of *Mertvyi dushi* and *V'brunnye mesta iz perepiski s dnic'jami* provides information to debunk the idea of the purity of Gogol's Russian language.³³ Not only had Gogol overcome the "impurity" of his bilingual mind by the 1840s, but his quest for the appropriate language in which he could address the entire Russian nation was indeed a continual process of de- and reterritorialization.³⁴ The history of the editing of Gogol's *V'ebiera* vividly demonstrates these processes: deterritorialization occurs in his non-standard, sometimes ungrammatical use of Russian; however, it is immediately followed by reterritorialization, centered on the normative use of Russian. Gogol's odd usage of the Russian language lies not only in the creation of ungrammatical forms and neologisms, but also in his complicated (compared to, for example, Pushkin's laconic verbal one) syntax—a syntax based on the multiplication of adjectives and the abuse of the pronominal. These innovative, yet strange, linguistic usages (or "tensors" as Deleuze and Guattari refer to them) open new possibilities for language play that are not available in major languages. In *V'ebiera*, Gogol does not so much challenge and subvert the dominant discourse as much as he distances himself from his St. Petersburg territoriality. In doing so, Gogol created a minor literature that signaled the undecipherable quality of becoming Ukrainian and becoming Russian, while never providing readers with a sense that these terms denoted a finite territorial belonging. Positioned on the interstices of two cultures, Gogol's *V'ebiera* opens up the *in-between* space of cultural ambivalence and dilutes the imaginary essence of the Russian nation through a distorted Russian language.

Notes

1. More information on Gogol's dual national identity can be found in Zvinitskovskii.
2. Pushkin, for example, wrote in his letter to A. Voelkov in August 1831 that Gogol's tales "amazed" (*izumili*) him.
3. ["I have been printing [my works] for 16 years already and critics have found only five grammatical mistakes in my poems (and they were right); I have always been grateful to them and have always corrected the marked mistake. I write much worse in prose, and speak even worse, almost as bad as Gogol writes."] All translations are mine, unless otherwise noted.

4. ["We were so grateful to the young author that gladly forgave him his uneven and inaccurate language."]
5. For a discussion of Gogol's bilingualism, see Barabash. See also Mandelstam's analysis of the interference of Ukrainian grammar in Gogol's Russian.
6. See, for example, Karpiuk.
7. Here is an excerpt from Afanasii Gogol's comedy "Roman i Paraska" ["Roman and Paraska"] rendered by Panteleimon Kulish and transliterated by him into Russian:
 Действие происходит в малороссийской хате, убогой, но чистой.
 Параска сидит у печи и прялет. Входит мужик, хорошо одетый, и говорит:
 - Здорова буда, кумо! А кум де?
 Параска. — На печи.
 Кум. — Упять на печи? Або, може, и не лазыв сётанни?
 Тут между кумом и кумою происходит секретный разговор. Она выпрашивает у него зайца, чтоб подарить мужа и выжить его на время из хаты. Кум замечает ей: «Ты, кумо, у лмха граеш», однако ж отаает ей своего лобаччу.
 Когда гость уаалася, Параска обраащается к мужу с увещаниями:
 - Ты б тыка пишов хоть зайца пмылав, щоб мы оскоромылась хоть зачыною.
 Роман (громко с печи). — Чим я ёго буау ловить? У мене чортма ни собаки, ни рушниця.
 Параска. — Кум поросся зайца ловить, а наше коване таке прудже!
 Роман (радостно). — То-то й ё! Я лывалось, а воно так швидко побыло до корыта!
 Параска. — От бачил! Уставай лмш та убнрайся.
 Роман. — Треба ж поспидаты.
 Параска. — Ты знаешь, що у нас ничего нема. Я зробло хыба росольню та накрышу сухарив; ты и попоись. (qtd. Kulish 95-6)
8. More information on Gogol's mistakes in his early correspondence can be found in Tikhonravov's "Zametki o slovare, sostavlennom Gogolem," pp. 197-8.
9. It is important to pinpoint the differences in the orthographical principles of Russian and Ukrainian. Russian orthography, quite phonemic in practice, is based mostly on morphological (the spelling of prefixes; suffixes and endings vary significantly from their pronunciation) and grammatical (it specifies conventional orthographic forms to mark grammatical distinctions, gender, and participles vs. adjectives) principles, rather

than on phonetic ones. Ukrainian orthography, however, is phonemic (all morphemes are written as they are pronounced in isolation, without vowel reduction) and morphemic, although some historical forms unrelated to its phonemic and morphemic structures have been retained.

10. ["I'll tell you about the time the witches played Jackass with my old grand father (80)."] All English translations from Gogol's *Ucherna na khutore bliz Diikan'ki* are quoted from Gogol, *Village Evenings near Di-kan'ka and Mirgorod*.
11. ["I've got myself a pipe, but damn-all to light it with (86)."]
12. ["Look, look, Mama is jumping about like a looney! (90)."]
13. ["Damn the lying Russian dog who printed it - I spit in his face! He hasn't a scrap of wit in his head! Listen and I'll tell you the real story now (35)."]
14. ["Foma Grigorovich! Foma Grigorovich! Do tell us one of your scary stories about the old days! Go on! Tell us, please! ..." (80).]
15. Rudy Pan'ko mocks Makar Nazarovich's incompetence in the proper method of pickling apples. Unlike everyone present at Pan'ko's party, Makar Nazarovich insists that a certain grass be added to the brine. His idea sounds so ridiculous that Pan'ko discourages him from spreading it in order to not make a complete fool of himself.
16. ["Merciful Lord, the things they have at that market! Wheels, glass, tar, tobacco, straps, onions, all sorts of wares ... and even if you had as much as thirty rubles in your pocket you wouldn't be able to buy up the whole of it (12)."]
17. ["The other gypsy, grumbling away to himself, rose to his feet, struck two bright showers of sparks, pursed his lips to blow on the tinder, and brandishing a rough-and-ready lamp, the usual form of illumination in Little Russia, consisting of a potsherd filled with melted mutton fat, set off on his way" (26).]
18. ["At the village council, or rural assembly, where his power is limited to a couple of votes, the headman somehow always gets the upper hand and sends out whomever he wants to do jobs like leveling roads or digging ditches" (59).]
19. In the speech of Foma Grigor'evich there are very few vernacular elements (like "кажись," "гузиль," "гурнуть") and ungrammatical forms (like "куды" instead of "куда," "за нелюбобого ляха" instead of "за нелюбимого ляха").
20. See Gogol's letter to M. Pogodin from January 11, 1834.
21. Foma Grigor'evich asks Pan'ko whose story he is reading: "Постойте! Наперед скажите мне, что это вы читаете? ... Как что читаю, Фома Григорьевич? Ваню была, вашн собственные слова ... - Плюйте ж на голову тому, хто это напечатал! *Бреша, суций Мажаль!*" (I, 99). ["Wait! Tell me first what it is you're reading? ... What I'm reading?

Why, Foma Grigorovich, it's your story, your own words' ... Damn the lying Russian dog who printed it—I spit in his face!" (35).]

22. ["Once one of those gentry types—it's hard for us simple folk to know what to call them—they may know how to push a pen, but they're no better than the horse-traders at our markets. They snatch, beg, and steal whatever they can, and produce little books no bigger than an ABC book every month or even week—well, one of those gents wheedled this story out of Foma Grigorovich, who went and forgot all about it" (35).]
23. ["Please don't take it amiss, good sirs, if there are more mistakes in this little book than there are grey hairs on my old head. What can I do? I've never had much to do with book-learning and the like before ... See how many misprints I've found! All I ask, if you find any of them, is that you pay no attention, and read them as if they were spelt correctly" (216).]
24. ["There are loads of phrases, idioms and expressions which we, Little Russians, think will be clear for Russians, if we translate them literally, but which sometimes destroy half of the original. Almost always a strong laconic passage becomes unclear in Russian because it is not in the spirit of the Russian language; in this case it is better to express it [the Ukrainian word] with ten words, than to conceal it ... Remember that your translation is intended for Russians and therefore all Little Russian idioms and phrases off."]
25. "Do not stop yourself from indignation when you see mistakes," wrote Gogol to Pushkin in his letter from January 22, 1835 (X, 348).
26. ["While correcting the second volume, I beg you to do it as brutally and autocratically as you can: in *Taras Bul'ba*, there are many mistakes that a copyist had made. He likes letter 'z', get rid off it wherever it is misplaced. In two or three places I have noticed bad grammar and almost the complete absence of sense. Please, correct everywhere with as much freedom as when you are correcting the notes of your students. If there is a repetition of the same expression, find another one, and do not doubt or think about it whether it will be good—everything will be good."]
27. ["Danilo ... walked quietly out of the yard, stepping between sleeping Cossacks, and made for the hills" — ["stepping between sleeping Cossacks [Danilo] walked quietly out of the yard and made for the hills."]
28. ["Oh my God, why does she have to be so devilish pretty?"]
29. ["... I forthwith direct you ... to subjugate the bridges on the highway ..."]
30. ["The publication of my works came out not as I intended them to be, and I am the only one who should be blamed, because I did not give accurate orders ... Some misprints have crept into the text, but I think they were because of the bad original and belonged to the copyist, or even to me. Everything that came from the publisher is good, every-

- Dal', V. "Letter to M.P. Pogodin, April 1842." *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* 58 (1952): 617.
- Deleuze, G. and F. Guattari. "What is a Minor Literature." *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*. Trans. D. Polan. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1986: 16-27.
- Gogol', N.V. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem: v 23 tomakh*. Vol. 1. Moskva: Nauka INLI RAN, 2003.
- . *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii: v 14 tomakh*. Moskva: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1937-1952.
- . *V'echera na khutore bliz' Dikan'ki: povesti / Pervaiia knizhka*. Sankt-Peterburg: Tip. Dep. Narod. Prosvieshcheniia, 1831-1832.
- . *Village Evenings near Dikan'ka and Mirgorod*. Trans. and ed. Christopher English. Intro. Richard Pease. Oxford; New York: Oxford UP, 1994.
- . *I ybranye mesta iz perepis'ki s druzh'ami*. Sobranie sochinenii v 9-ti tomakh. Vol. 5. Moskva: Russkaia kniga, 1994.
- Karpuk, Paul A. "Gogol's Research on Ukrainian Customs for the 'Dikan'ka' tales." *The Russian Review* 56 (1997): 209-232.
- Koropec'kiy, R. and Robert Romanchuk. "Ukraine in Blackface: Performance and Representation in Gogol's 'Dikan'ka Tales,' Book 1." *Slavic Review* 62 (2003): 525-47.
- Kulich, P.A. *Zapiski o zhizni Nikolaiia Vasil'evicha Gogolia*. V 2-kh tomakh. Moskva: INLI RAN, 2003.
- Mandel'shtam, I. *O kharaktere gogolevskogo stilia*. Gelf'singfors: Tip. Guvudsta-dobladet, 1902.
- Motolin, A. "K voprosu o nauchnom izdanii sochinenii Gogolia." N.I. pedagog. in-t im. A.I. Gertsena, 1989: 103-121.
- Pushkin, A.S. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v desiaty tomakh*. Leningrad: Nauka, 1977-1979.
- Shenrok, V.I. *Materialy dlia biografii Gogolia v 4-kh tomakh*. Vol. 4. Moskva: Tipografiia G.Lissnet and A.Geshel', 1897.
- Tikhonravov, N. "Zametki o slovare, sostavlennom Gogolem." *Sbornik Obshchestva ljubitelei rossiiskoi slovesnosti na 1891 g*. Moskva: Tipo-lit. I.N. Kushnerev, 1891: 196-208.
- Vinogradov, V. V. *The History of Russian Literary Language from the Seventeenth Century to the Nineteenth*. Condensed. Adaptation into English. Intro. Lawrence L. Thomas. Madison: The U of Wisconsin P, 1969.
- Zviatskovskii, V. *Nikolai Gogol': Tainy, natsionalnoi duzhi*. Kiev: Liket, 1994.

thing from the typography—bad. Letters are also mean. I am so guilty in everything. First of all, I gave you so much trouble, although I meant well. I wanted to awaken you from immobility and get you involved in the book printing; but now I see it was too early ..."]

31. On the necessity to publish the initial text of *V'echera*, see Motolin
32. For more on this, see Bourdieu.
33. In the texts of these Gogol works, the Ukrainian elements penetrate not only the Russian lexicon ("прислужиться," "куды," "завтрако," "доспину," "накмасть," "мармор," "схватилась со стула," etc.) but also its grammar ("послать по художнику").
34. In Deleuze and Guattari's theory of Kafka as a "minor" writer, deterritorialization and reterritorialization figure prominently in tandem with the concepts of "decoding" and "recoding." Territory, in the ethnological sense, is created through the process of deterritorialization, whereby milieu components are detached and given greater autonomy, and reterritorialization, through which these components receive new functions within the newly created territory. The scholars describe the liminal status of the "minor" writer as one who uses the language of a dominant culture or class but "detrterritorializes" that majority language in a politically enabling and subversive manner. "Minor" writer, writing in a "major" language, can defamiliarize that language by allowing the "minor" language—particularly its grammatical categories—to infiltrate the syntax of the "major" language, allowing "one function" to be played off against the other in order that "all the degrees of territoriality and relative deterritorialization" may be "played out" (26). According to this reasoning, the "minority" language therefore "inhabits" or "occupies" the dominant language, undermining any sense of univocal authority. Deleuze and Guattari emphasize that in using these disruptive linguistic techniques, the "minor" writer's objective is to shift the parameter of meaning in a political act that serves to represent the interests of the writer's regional culture.

Works Cited

- Barabash, Iu. *Pochva i sud ba: Gogol i ukrainskaia literatura u istokov*. Moscow: Nasledie, 1995.
- Bojanowska, E. *Nikolai Gogol: Between Ukrainian and Russian Nationalism*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2007.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power: the Economy of Linguistic Exchanges*. Ed. John B. Thompson. Trans. Gino Raymond & Matthew Adamson. Cambridge: Polity, in association with Basil Blackwell, 1991.
- Chaplenko, V. *Ukrainizmy v movi Hoholka. Slavistica. Part 2 (1-2)*. Augsburg: Ukrain'ska Vyl'na Akademiia Nauk, 1948.