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Performing Hybrid Identity: the Editing History of Gogol’s Vechera na khutore bliz’ Dikan’ki (1831–1832)

YULIYA ILCHUK
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

In his “Avtorskaia ispowed” (“The Author’s Confession,” 1847), Gogol begged his readers not to rely on his works as a source of information about himself (V’ibrannyye 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’ibrannyye mesta iz perviiski s droz’dami [Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends, 1847], they also epitomize the fate of Gogol’s earlier work—Vechera na khutore bliz’ Dikan’ki [Evening on a Farm near Dikanka, 1831–32].

The transformations that the tales underwent in numerous editions in the 1830–40s iconically reflect Gogol’s constant vacillations between his Russian and Ukrainian identities. Gogol’s “Russification” of Vechera in the transition from the first to the second edition suggests his attempt to resolve a disturbing duality in his sense of national identity. I would argue that the duality of Gogol’s national identity was artistically realized in the hybridization of the literary language in Vechera. In this paper, I will study the hybridization of the literary language in Vechera 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 subduced in the second edition of 1836, and then reestablished in the edition of his Sbornik [Works] in 1842. The collective editing of the text of Vechera, 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 Vechera 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 Vechera 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 by Vasili Narezhnyi and Orest Somov), but mostly because of Gogol’s idiosyncratic and “odd” language. The major Russian critics of the period responded favorably to the publication of Vechera, 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 dialectical ‘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 язвы грамматической ошибок (и справедливо); я всегда был им искренне благодарен и всегда поправлял замеченные места. Прошу выписать городско неправильно, а говорю еще хуже, и потому так, как пишет Гоголь. (цит. Тихонравов 198)

In 1836, promoting the second edition of Gogol’s Vechera, Pushkin again emphasized Gogol’s imperfect literary language in the first edition: “Мы так были благодарны молодому автору, что охотно простили ему неровность и неправильность его слога … Автор оправдал таковое снисхождение” (VII 237). 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 Mertveye 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...
of Ukrainian lexicon (and not only lexicon, but also inverted syntax and intonation) from his works, particularly, from the first edition of _Èhren_. 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. Scholars usually point out his profound knowledge of Ukrainian folklore, his use of Ukrainian lexicon as local color in _Èhren_, and scanty notes and letters written in Ukrainian, thereby defining bilingualism strictly in terms of descriptive linguistics.

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 _Èhren_ 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 “performatives.”

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. The chauvinistic attitude towards the Ukrainian language was so common among Russian intellectuals that it made Gogol think of his mixed language in _Èhren_ 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, Vasili Alans’evich Gogol, wrote his comedies in the mixed Ukrainian-Russian language, now known as surzhik. 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 (“доля”, “щепок”, “петуха”, “карбованець,” etc.); grammar (“субординация,” “за коровы,” “в тетивы,” “непогодичный,” etc.); and orthography (“ніче” “несподівала” “пробувати,” “як,” “антонимы,” “болить,” “підвал,” etc.). At the same time, her correspondence with the Alaksakov 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 Nizhny Lyceum, Gogol coexisted in two different linguistic modes: his letters to home include many Ukrainian words and grammatical forms (“сюа,” “помчіла,”
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 *mythk*, all fused in a hybrid conglomerate, that made the author successful. Roman Koropeckyi and Robert Romanchuk argue that Gogol used Ukrainian elements in a burlesque tradition, *A Ivan Kotsarev'ski* in *Entida* (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 unglossed 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 authors, 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 ("сампьло" instead of "сампьло"; "раскически" instead of "раскически"; "смртно" instead of "смртно"; "смртно" instead of "смртно"; "смртно" instead of "смртно"; "смртно" instead of "смртно"; "смртно" instead of "смртно"; "смртно" instead of "смртно"; etc.). 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

1. most of the verbs with the negative particle "не" are written together, breaking the grammatical rules of the normative Russian of the time ("нема," "неплача," "неповільніше," "неносія");
2. some of the verbs in the second person present tense have "в," as in Ukrainian, instead of "б," as in Russian ("займешь," "можешь," "уросись");
3. adverbs, adjectives, and nouns are written together with the negative particle "не" in words that should be written as separate words ("несхитким," "ниска");
4. or, vice versa, adjectives are separated from the particle "не" where they should be written as one word ("валість не описання");
5. the spelling of adverbs are odd: for instance, "вообще" is written separately as "все," thereby becoming another part of speech (a noun and a preposition); "во-всобще," "на-обереж," "на-стороже."

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-
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' pered Rozhdestvom,” which is accompanied by the words “primechanie paschnika” (“the bee-keeper’s footnote”) are accompanied by the note “primechanie N.V. Gogoliia” (“N.V. Gogol’s comment”). In the first edition, Pan’ko’s “Predislovie”—his introduction to “Vecher nakonane 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. Давайте расскажу вам, как ведомы играли с пожизненным делом в дураци.
   To есть в дурочку [emphasis mine] (I, 136).
2. Доложи-то у меня есть, да того, чем бьи косите ее, чорта-ма.
   Не изменяя [emphasis mine] (I, 141.11)
3. Давай, давай, лягни, лягни дура, ки, ки.
   Смотри! Смотри! лягни, как проклятая, скопец!
   [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 nakonane Ivana Kupala”: “Я люблю ж на голову тому, кто это напечатали брехни, сучий москал. Так ли я говорил? Что то еще, жу кого чорта-ма капки в вилках? Слушайте, я вам расскажу ее сейчас” (I, 99). The switching from one language to another within a single paragraph is typically used to reveal to the audience the regional identity of the 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 нуте же-нибудь страшеньку ви кавчук! А нуте нуте! ... тара-та-та, та-та-та, и пойдите, и пойдите ...” (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 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 “Sorochynska iarmarka” (“Sorochinsky Fair”), in which all the epigraphs in Ukrainian are transliterated into Russian: “Пож, боже ты мый, господи! Чего не сма на тий ярмарку! Колекса, ско, леботь, ямбога, крамари вски ... так, шо хоч би в кищенних было рубля и с трогалось, то й тогі б не закупив усел ярмарка” (I, 79).16 Within the Russian imperial literary code of the beginning of the century, Ukrainian folklore and bardesque literature served to metonymically represent Ukraine, and the transliteration of the epigraphs only reinforces the presumption of imperial consumption. Roman Koropeckyi and Robert Romanchuk suggest that “the panick from Poltava represents and reintegration the Ukrainian material of the epigraph 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 doubles, names of ethnic food, etc. The abundance of doubles in his texts (кряшка - кухоль [“a mug”], аа - пекло [“hell”], сорванець - швайнчик [“a scamp”], жена - жінка [“a wife”], дівчинка [“a girl”], спілкуючи - поспілкуючи [“to hurry”], узнавать - познавать [“to know”], любиться - любивий [“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
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 пышн, ворча про себя, поднимал на ноги, два раза осветил себя искрами, будто молнией, раздал губами труп, с катанцом в руках, обыкновенною мальороссийскою светильною, состоящую из разбитого черепка, накитного бары ный жиром, отправляясь, освещая дорогу [emphasis mine] (I, 91).17

2. В мирской склад, или громаде, несмотря на то что власть его ограничена несколькими голосами, голова всегда берет верх и почти по своей воле высыхает, кого ему угодно, рояться и гладить дорогу или копать рвы [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 Russian, 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 Vechera

In nineteenth-century Russia, the development of the institution 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 production by changing authors’ texts and significantly distorting them. Gogol was personally deeply dissatisfied with this practice, and he expressed his indignation20 when Senkovskii published Balzac’s novel Le Pére Goriot [Father Goriot, 1835], having completely rewritten the conclusion of it. In fact, Senkovskii’s attempt at “correcting” some-

body else’s texts for publication in his journal Biblioteka dlia ochtienia [Library for Reading] clearly illustrates the common practice of butchering authors’ works.

The history of publication and editing of Gogol’s Vechera 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 nakamne Ivana Kupala” appeared in the January 1830 issue of the magazine under a slightly different title: “Bisaviuki, ili Vecher nakamne Ivana Ku- pala” (“Bisaviuki, or St. John’s Eve”). Svin’in disfigured the tale, having changed the title and “corrected” the oral locations 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 nakamne Ivana Ku- pala,” he mocked the whole situation.21

In the introduction to the tale, Pan’ko explains the peripeteia of how the “Moscovite” obtained Foma Grigor’evich’s tale and published it against his will:

ОДИН ИЗ ТЕХ ГОСПОД — НАМ ПРОСТИМ ЛЮБЫМ МУДРЕЕ И НАЗВАТЬ ИХ — ЛИСАКИ ОНИ, НЕ ЛИСАКИ; А ВОТ ТО САМОЕ, ЧТО БАРЫШНИКИ НА НИХ ВЯЗУХИХ. НАХВАТЯТ, НАПРОСЯТ, НАКРЫВАТ ВСЕЙ ВЕЧНАЯ, ДА И ВЫПУСКНОЙ КНЯЖЕЧКИ, НЕ ТОЛЬКО БУКВАРЕЙ, КАЖДЫЙ МЕСЯЦ, НИЩЕЙ НЕСЛА. ОДИН ИЗ ТЕХ ГОСПОД НО ВЫНУШАЛ У ФОМЫ ГРИГОРЬЕВИЧА ЭТУ САМУЮ ИСТОРИЮ, А ОН И ВООБЩЕ 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 publishing them, and this arrangement sheds light on the relationship between 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 author’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 Vechera, which he saw significantly distorted after numerous corrections. Already by the second edition the text did not contain as many misspellings and grammatical mistakes, which constituted part of the author’s artistic intention. Both of Pan’ko’s
“Predisloviye” 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 Makaimovich, in which he advised on how to write for a Russian audience, can account for the nature of those changes:

Есть пропасть таких фраз и выражений, оборотов, которые нам, малороссиянам, будет понятны для русских, если мы переведем их слово в слово, но которые иногда уничтожают половину смысла подлинника. Почти всегда сильно лаконическое место становится непонятным на русском, потому что оно не в духе русского языка, и тогда лучше десять словами определить всю обширность его, нежели скрыть его [...] Поним, 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, should be avoided. This became an urgent task for Gogol and the contemporary editors of Vechera. Prokopovych, Shevyriv, and Likhin, 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 lexis, 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

Vechera, he grouped the tales together with the new collection Mirgorn, which had the subtitle “Povesti, sluzhashchie prichesleniem ‘Vecherov na khutore blizu Dikanka’” (“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 Aрабек [Arabesque] for publication and begged Pushkin to proofread 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 systematic, more intensive editing occurred in the text of the “Predisloviye” and in the first three tales of Book One. In those texts, the average number of corrections per page was 2.5; in the forth tale “Propavshaiia 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 same 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: “покрежен” with “покрежон,” “инбар” with “нимбар,” “поладник” with “поладник,” “чудеса дейются” – “чудеса делаются,” “чего ж вы перепутались?” – “чего ж вы испугались?” “стекло” – “стекло,” etc.

Another attempt to “improve” the tales was made when Gogol launched the first publication of his Sachetsia in 1842, in which Vechena and Mirgorod formed Volume One. Because Gogol did not feel himself competent in Russian to edit his works, he authorized his classmate from Nizhyn Lyceum, Nikolai Prokopovych, 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 Sachetsia, Gogol wrote:

При корректуре второго тома просьбу тебя действовать как можно самоуправнее и полновластней: в Тараси Бульба много есть порочностей письма. Он часто любит буцю и, где она на мesta, ее там выбрось. В двух-трех местах я заметил плохую грамматику и почти остутствие смысла. Ножалуйста, поправь все с такою же свободою, как ты переправляешь
Prokopovych 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 “Strashnaya mest,” instead of “... выпел потихоньку из двора промеж спавших своими козаками в горы” - “... промеж спавших своими козаками выпел потихоньку из двора в горы”;7
2. insertion of new words whenever Prokopovych 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: “No Boze moy, ot чево она так чертовски хорошо.”8 Prokopovych corrected one word, “чево,” 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: “приказывая тебе сей же час […] Починить мосты на столбовой дороге.”9 Prokopovych 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

Moreover, Prokopovych eliminated “к” 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 Minorum, 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 Prokopovych’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 Prokopovych’s work. In his letter to the editor, the writer obsores his dissatisfaction in self-condemnation:

Писание сочинений моих вышло не в том вполне виде, как я думал, и я виноват, разумеется, этому я, не распорядившись аккуратнее… Вдругили ошибки, но, я думаю, они произошли от неправильного оригинала и принадлежат писцу или даже мне. Все, что от исполнителя, так хорошо, что от транскрипции – то мерзко. Буквы тоже полны. Я виноват сильно все. Во-первых, виноват тем – ввел тебя в капоты, хотя таинный успех мой был добрый. Мне хотелось пробудить тебя из невежества и придать к деятельности книжной; но вижу, что еще рано… (XII, 215-6)10

In all senses, Prokopovych 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, Prokopovych reported on his work: “I can guarantee the exactness of my correction which I am proud: I have become a skilled hand ("nabil nuku") at this enterprise and read two proofs by myself;
Belinski read it one more time after me" (qtd. Shentok 54). The appearance of Belinski 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 “Maiskaia 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 Likhoin, a colleague from the journal Moscovite, for the position of editor. Presumably, Likhoin was assigned to the position because of his excellent knowledge of Russian; he had already published his textbooks Russkaya grammatika dla personal’no gо obuchen’ia dlia russkih [Russian grammar for Primary Russian Instruction, 1839] and the article “O pravopisaniii inostrannych sobstvennykh imen” (“On the Orthography of Foreign Proper Names”) in Moskovitaniia (The Moscovite) in 1849. Technically, Likhoin played the same role that Prokopovich played in the first publication of Gogol’s Sochinenia (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 Zapiski umnashchegy [Madman’s Notes]), and the first seven sheets of the forth volume (up to Krevgor [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 Likhoin. 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 Vcheria nowadays does not coincide with the text of the first edition and the only way to rectify the situation is to re-

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 Vcheria could 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 Vcheria and Mirozhd, 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
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 "Morteys dačhi" and "Vjbronie mesta i prepskisi drugu" 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 Veschera 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 Veschera, 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 Veschera 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 Zviasatkovski.
2. Pushkin, for example, wrote in his letter to A. Vorikov in August 1831 that Gogol’s tales “amazed” Vorikov.
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, Karpuk.
7. Here is an excerpt from Afanasii Gogol’s comedy “Roman i Paraska” [“Roman and Paraska”] rendered by Panteleimon Kulish and transmitted by him into Russian:

Действие происходит в малороссийской хате, у бойой, но чистенькой. Параска сидит у печи и пьет. Входит мужик, хорошо одетый, и говорит:
- Здраво бува, кумо! А кум де?
Параска. - На печи.
Куля. - Удишка на печи? Або, може, і не здається сідлини?
Тут між кумом і кумою проноситься секретний разговор. Она випитанує у неї зайді, щоб подурканти мужа і вийти его на вім від хати. Кум замечает ей: «Ты, кумо, у охе гравц, однако я отдает ей свою добычу.
Когда гость удаляется, Параска обращается к мужу с уверенными:
- Ты бы так пилов хоть зайди пьешь, щоб мы освирепелись хоть ленько.
Роман (громко с печи). - Чим я ёго буду любить? У меня чортоми ни собаки, ни руппниц.
Параска. - Кум пороски зайдя любить; а наме куване такие труда!
Роман (радостно). - То-то й с! Я дивлюсь, а вонь так шылця побилло до корят!
Параска. - От бачи! Уткавай льсь ти убираєш.
Роман. - Треба ж посидіти.
Параска. - Ты знаешь, что у нас ничего нема. Я зроблю хаою росольно та накаршу сахарин; ты и понима.

(qtd. Kulish 95-6)
8. More information on Gogol’s mistakes in his early correspondence can be found in Tikhonravov’s “Zametki o slove, sostavlennoy 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)."

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 Nazarovitch's incompetence in the proper method of picking apples. Unlike everyone present at Pan'ko's party, Makar Nazarovitch insists that a certain glass be added to the brandy. 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 Grigorovich there are very few vernacular elements (like "ваше," "гурашь," "гуришь") and ungrammatical forms (like "venida" instead of "kaia," "за велюбого люка" instead of "за велюбього люка").

20. See Gogol's letter to M. Pogodin from January 11, 1834.

21. Foma Grigorovich asks Pan'ko whose story he is reading: "... Постойте! Наперед скажите мне, что это вы читаете? ... Как что читаете, Фома Григорьевич? Ваши были, ваши собственные слова? ... Пойти же на голову тому, кто это напечатал! Брех, сума Моисеев!" (I, 99).

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 sir, 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 'г'; get rid of 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—all things 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-
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 'Icherca,' see Motorin.

32. For more on this, see Bourdieu.

33. In the texts of these Gogol works, the Ukrainian elements penetrate not only the Russian lexicon ("присутствие," "кулак," "запою," "москвича," "ничкасть," "мармур," "схватиться со стола," etc.) but also its grammar ("после питья"")

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 ethological 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 "deterritorializes" that majority language in a politically enabling and subversive manner. A "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" (28). According to this reasoning, the "minority" language therefore "inhibits" or "occupies" the dominant language, underlining 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.
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