

PUBLICATIONS OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF EASTERN FINLAND

*Dissertations in Education,
Humanities, and Theology*



UNIVERSITY OF
EASTERN FINLAND



MERJA SUOMI

METAMORPHOSES OF A TEXT WITHIN THE STALINIST CONTEXT

Kornei Chukovskii's "A High Art" in the 1930s

*Metamorphoses of a Text
within the Stalinist Context*

MERJA SUOMI

*Metamorphoses of a Text
within the Stalinist Context*

Kornei Chukovskii's "A High Art" in the 1930s

Publications of the University of Eastern Finland
Dissertations in Education, Humanities, and Theology

93

University of Eastern Finland

Joensuu

2016

Juvenes Print - Tampereen Yliopistopaino Oy
Tampere, 2016

Sarjan vastaava toimittaja: Maija Könönen.

Myynti: Itä-Suomen yliopiston kirjasto

ISBN: 978-952-61-2268-7 (nid.)

ISSNL: 1798-5625

ISSN: 1798-5625

Suomi, Merja

Metamorphoses of a Text within the Stalinist Context. Kornei Chukovskii's "A High Art" in the 1930s.

Joensuu: University of Eastern Finland, 2016, 287 pages

Dissertations in Education, Humanities, and Theology; 93

ISBN: 978-952-61-2268-7 (print)

ISSNL: 1798-5625

ISSN: 1798-5625

ABSTRACT

The versatile litterateur Kornei Chukovskii (1882–1969) has so far been examined as a researcher and editor of the poet Nikolai Nekrasov, as a literary critic, as a children's writer, and as a translator. The object of the present study is Chukovskii's life-long major work *Vysokoe iskusstvo* (*A High Art*), a collection of essays about Russian literary translation, and particularly its Stalinist period editions 1930, 1936, and 1941. The purpose is to demonstrate that the continuous revising of *Vysokoe iskusstvo* was part of Chukovskii's dexterous professional and survival strategy during that totalitarian period.

The research material is examined in juxtaposition with personal documents and scholarly studies, and analyzed leaning on the concepts of dialogue, chronotope, and Aesopian language. The focus is on the changes that were made to *Vysokoe iskusstvo* in the 1930s and on the way they correspond with the norms and ideology of that time. The motives that directed the revising of *Vysokoe iskusstvo* and Chukovskii's position in the Stalinist culture are assessed.

The results of the study show that Chukovskii attentively observed the public discussion about literature and adjusted his essays accordingly. With the revising of the collection, actual topics are included and forbidden ones evaded. The systematic removing of taboo names from *Vysokoe iskusstvo* in the late 1930s has similarities with the Soviet practice of retouching photographs.

Chukovskii's survival in the 1930s was due to his skill to adjust his writing to the prevalent ideological guidelines and to deploy seemingly conformist appearances. Another influencing factor was his status in Soviet literature. These same characteristics helped him maintain his position as a literary authority in the vicissitudes of Soviet cultural policy. Chukovskii's efforts for the benefit of literary translation and for the preservation of the purity of the Russian language, and also his other endeavors as a citizen can be regarded as an individual's aspiration to act in the role of civic being within the monolithic and ideologically conformist Soviet society.

Keywords: Kornei Chukovskii, *A High Art*, Stalinism, translation, dialogue, chronotope, Aesopian language, subtext

Suomi, Merja

Tekstin metamorfooseja stalinismin kontekstissa. Kornei Tšukovskin “Ylevä taide” 1930-luvulla.

Joensuu: University of Eastern Finland, 2016, 287 s.

Dissertations in Education, Humanities, and Theology; 93

ISBN: 978-952-61-2268-7 (nid.)

ISSNL: 1798-5625

ISSN: 1798-5625

TIIVISTELMÄ

Monipuolista venäläisen kirjallisuuden vaikuttajaa Kornei Ivanovitš Tšukovskia (1882–1969) on tähän mennessä tutkittu runoilija Nikolai Nekrasovin tutkijana ja toimittajana, kirjallisuuskriittikkona, lastenkirjailijana sekä kääntäjänä. Tämän tutkimuksen aiheena on hänen elämänmittainen suurtyönsä Vysokoe iskusstvo (“Ylevä taide”), kokoelma käännösaieheita esseitä, ja erityisesti sen Stalinin ajan editiot 1930, 1936 ja 1941. Tutkimus pyrkii osoittamaan, että kokoelman jatkuva muokkaaminen oli osa Tšukovskin ammatti- ja selviytymisstrategiaa totalitarismin kaudella.

Tutkimusaineistoa tarkastellaan henkilökohtaisten dokumenttien ja tieteellisten tutkimusten valossa nojautuen dialogin, kronotoopin ja Aisopoksen kielen käsitteisiin. Keskiössä ovat ne muutokset, jotka ilmestyivät esseekokoelmaan 1930-luvulla, sekä se, miten muutokset vastasivat ajan normeja ja ideologiaa. Samalla kartoitetaan niitä motiiveja, jotka ohjasivat kokoelman muokkausta, sekä Tšukovskin asemaa Stalinin ajan kulttuurissa.

Tutkimuksen tulokset osoittavat, että Tšukovski seurasi tarkasti julkista keskustelua kirjallisuudesta ja muokkasi esseitään vastaavasti. Muokkauksen myötä kokoelmaan Vysokoe iskusstvo ilmestyy ajankohtaisia aiheita, kun taas kiellettyjä aiheita väistellään. Tabuina pidettyjen nimien systemaattinen poistaminen kokoelmasta 1930-luvun lopulla muistuttaa neuvostoliittolaista käytäntöä retusoida valokuvia poliittisen sensuurin vuoksi.

Tšukovskin selviytyminen 1930-luvulla johtui hänen kyvystään sopeuttaa tekstinsä ajan ideologisten suuntaviivojen mukaisiksi ja käyttää hyväkseen näennäisen konformistisia ilmiä, mutta asiaan vaikutti myös hänen asemansa neuvostokirjallisuudessa. Samat ominaisuudet auttoivat Tšukovskia säilyttämään asemansa kirjallisuuden auktoriteettina Neuvostoliiton kulttuuripolitiikan muutoksissa. Tšukovskin pyrkimyksiä ulkomaisen kirjallisuuden kääntämisen ja puhtaan venäjän kielen hyväksi sekä hänen muutakin toimintaansa voidaan tarkastella yksilön pyrkimyksenä toteuttaa itseään kansalaisyhteiskunnan jäsenenä autoritaarisen ja ideologisesti yhdenmukaistetun neuvostoyhteiskunnan puitteissa.

Avainsanat: Kornei Tšukovski, Vysokoe iskusstvo (“Ylevä taide”), stalinismi, kääntäminen, dialogi, kronotooppi, Aisopoksen kieli, piiloteksti

Foreword

The present study was originally started within the field of translation studies. However, it soon became clear that Kornei Chukovskii's principles of literary translation could not be examined as a purely theoretic, abstract phenomenon. The overall style of Chukovskii's essays was too colorful and personal to fit into the genre of scholarly writing. The author's powerful presence in the text constantly drew attention away from the actual object of the study. Furthermore, the conditions in which Chukovskii once lived and worked began to have more and more relevance. Eventually, the decision was made to change the field of the dissertation to Russian language and culture. The decision proved to be the right one, and it marked the beginning of a mental journey into the deepest abyss of the entire Stalinist period, the 1930s. The experience was distressing but fascinating at the same time. The fascination lays in the fact that despite extensive research conducted by scholars over the course of decades, the period always seems to hold on to unexplored, hidden nooks and excesses.

I am very much indebted to my supervisors for making the realization of this dissertation possible. Prof. emer. Natalia Baschmakoff and Dr. Timo Suni have given their sage advice throughout the process and have always been available for me. Baschmakoff's deep insight into Russian culture, her extensive knowledge about the peculiarities of the Soviet era, and her connections to pre-war Kuokkala painted a living picture of the surroundings in which Chukovskii lived and worked. Suni's sophistication in literature and literary theory, his perception, and his keen eye for detail helped me perceive my own text from a distance and express myself more precisely and logically. My supervisor at the University of Eastern Finland, Prof. Lea Siilin, and the editor of my dissertation, Prof. Maija Könönen have kindly offered me their expertise, also in various practical matters connected with the research and the publishing process. My warm thanks go to all my supervisors for their unfailing support and encouragement.

I want to express my gratitude to the preliminary examiners of my work, Dr. Marja Jänis, and Prof. Dr. Piet van Poucke of Ghent University for their evaluation of my dissertation.

I thank Dr. Kaisu Kortelainen for her patient and friendly responses to my various inquiries as a newcomer to the University of Eastern Finland. I am also much obliged to the staff of the Slavonic Library in Helsinki for their help in acquiring background material for my research.

I address my sincere thanks to the fund Veljekset Ivan, Andrei ja Vladimir Kudrjavzevin rahasto for kindly supporting my research with their scholarship.

Finally, I thank my very dear family for their support during this long process. A special thanks goes to my parents, who, from early on, inculcated in me a love of literature and an interest in foreign cultures. In so doing, they provided an optimal breeding ground for what would eventually materialize as the dissertation at hand.

Hyvinkää, September 2016

Merja Suomi

Contents

ABSTRACT	V
TIIVISTELMÄ	VI
FOREWORD	VII
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 A LITTERATEUR IN THE LAND OF SOVIETS	5
2.1 Becoming a Litterateur	5
2.2 Career Adjustments	10
2.3 In Service of Democracy	16
2.4 World Literature for the Masses	21
2.5 The High Art of Translation	25
2.6 Occupational Hazards	30
2.7 Surviving the 1930s	38
2.8 Family Matters	46
3 METHOD AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	51
3.1 Dialogue and Chronotope	52
3.2 Subtext and Aesopian Language	60
4 NAVIGATING A HIGH ART THROUGH THE 1930s	73
4.1 Twists and Turns of Publication	73
4.2 Stalinist time as a Chronotope	77
4.3 Manifestations of the Setting	90
4.3.1 Now and Then	90
4.3.2 The Friendship of Literatures	96
4.3.3 Role Models	108
4.4 Manifestations of the Performance	127
4.4.1 The Positive Hero	128
4.4.2 Orthodox and Unorthodox Translation	135
4.4.3 Ideological Issues	156
4.4.4 Polemics around Shakespeare	176
4.5 Silent Dialogue	196
4.5.1 The Writer Vanishes	197
4.5.2 The Current and the Undercurrent	227
5 DISCUSSION	251
6 CONCLUSION	265
LITERATURE	267
APPENDIXES	281

1 Introduction

During the Stalinist period, there were different attitudes towards the regime among Soviet writers. Some writers genuinely believed in the Soviet system and willingly devoted their work to promote and propagate the prevalent ideology. The diametrically opposite group consisted of openly dissident writers. Many of them were executed or sentenced to serve in labor camps, particularly during the Great Terror in the late 1930s. The luckier ones managed to emigrate voluntarily, or they were exiled from the Soviet Union. Between those two groups, there existed a vast gray area of writers who neither supported nor actively opposed the Soviet regime but rather reconciled themselves with the current order and the current circumstances. They did their best to be able to do their work, to write and publish, and to protect themselves and their families.

The eminent and versatile litterateur Kornei Ivanovich Chukovskii (1882–1969) was a paragon of the latter kind of Soviet writer. Politically neutral by disposition, he was neither an open dissident nor an avid supporter of the system. He considered Russian literature as his first priority and embraced a personal responsibility to work for its benefit, regardless of party politics. This aspiration guided his decisions from the very beginning, when he chose to cooperate with the Bolsheviks in the cultural reconstruction initiated soon after the October Revolution. Only recent study has brought into light the full significance of his role as an organizer at the time when Soviet culture was beginning to take shape.

Chukovskii's wide-ranging career as litterateur under the Soviet regime lasted for a total of 52 years. During those five decades, he enjoyed a status of authority in a variety of fields, but there were also times when he was assaulted by harsh public criticism and smear campaigns. Periods of respite that offered some creative freedom alternated with periods that were challenging at best and precarious at worst. Chukovskii managed to maintain his unpolitical identity even in the 1930s, when every utterance could be regarded as a political statement. He also escaped the Great Terror, although it struck close to home.

Numerous researches have been made on Chukovskii in the course of the last decades. His production as a children's writer has been the topic of many studies. His most extensive life's work, collecting and editing the poems of Nikolai Nekrasov, has been another important topic of study. Chukovskii has been studied in his pre-revolutionary role as literary critic and as also a translator. Less attention has been given to the skills and strategies that helped Chukovskii survive through the most precarious of time in Soviet history and maintain his status of authority in Soviet literature. In the 1930s, the fate of a litterateur was often determined either by personal sympathies and antipathies, or by pure and simple luck. However, the significance of various survival strategies cannot be underestimated, either. It appears that for Chukovskii, his guiding principle was that it is better to bend than to break. Following this principle, a great benefit for him was an innate sensitivity to cultural nuances and an ability to accommodate his writing to current conventions.

The present study examines the Stalinist period editions of Chukovskii's essay collection *Vysokoe iskusstvo* (hereinafter referred to by its English title *A High Art*) as part of his personal survival strategy and also as his contribution to the public discourse at that time about literature and translation. *A High Art* originated as a handbook that was compiled ad hoc for translator training soon after the October Revolution. Chukovskii contributed

to the handbook with an article that he would later expand into a separate volume. During his lifetime, *A High Art* would be published in six new editions, every one of them revised and expanded by the author. Chukovskii's observations about literary translation have served as a basis for many Soviet translation theorists to build their work on.

In the present study, translation is not a primary issue. Instead, the objective is to establish Chukovskii's methods of adjusting *A High Art* to the norms and values of the Stalinist period. Translation is only relevant inasmuch as its norms and conventions are juxtaposed with the ideological guidelines of the prevalent culture. Several other features in *A High Art* are examined correspondingly, among them the notion of time, literary role models, and the expectations placed on the translator and the reader. Furthermore, manifestations of current public discourse in *A High Art* are examined, for instance, in light of Chukovskii's discussion about Soviet minority nations, about the ideological aspects of translation, and about the appropriate way to translate Shakespeare. The motives behind Chukovskii's authorial decisions are weighed up from different standpoints, personal sympathies and antipathies included. Some more subtle ways of revising *A High Art* are also reflected on, for instance, with reference to the disappearances of certain names from the book in the late 1930s. Another aspect under examination is Chukovskii's possible use of hidden subtexts or Aesopian language in *A High Art*.

Research Material and Method

The research material used in the present study consists of the three Stalinist era editions of *A High Art*, published in 1930, 1936, and 1941. In principle, all the examples used in the study are from those editions. Only in such cases when the corresponding passage in an earlier or later edition is particularly relevant for the topic, is it paralleled with the example under examination. Some examples may pertain to more discussions than one. In such cases, the passage is cited only in the first discussion and thereafter referred to by the numbers of the table and the subchapter.

The method of the study encompasses a close reading of the research material, a comparison of the text between different editions, and an analysis of the observations against the background material. Particular attention is given to the changes that Chukovskii made in *A High Art* when revising the book for new editions.

Background Material

All material used in the present study has been published either in print or on the Internet. Chukovskii's granddaughter Elena Chukovskaia and the literary scholar Evgeniia Ivanova have done extensive critical editing of Chukovskii's latest collected works in 15 volumes. Their forewords and commentaries have provided a valuable source of information about Chukovskii's life and career. Further background material stems from various personal documents, including, first and foremost, Chukovskii's diaries, memoirs, and letters, and also similar documents of his contemporaries. Particularly the memoirs of Chukovskii's daughter Lidiia Korneevna Chukovskaia (1907–1996) and his son Nikolai Korneevich Chukovskii (1904–1965) have helped enliven his personal and professional image. Another valuable source was Chukovskii's *Chukokkala* album, also edited by Elena Chukovskaia. The album contains notes and anecdotes by Russian and Soviet cultural figures from a period covering more than half a century.

Apart from purely biographical facts, the image created of Chukovskii by his family members might, of course, be considered more or less one-sided. Therefore, also external assessments are included in the study, some of which may present him in a less positive light. Then again, even those assessments may have been fueled by a personal agenda. Particularly considering the 1930s, there remain many unanswered questions about Chukovskii's actual situation. Understandably, a thorough documentation of events and reactions in personal diaries or letters would have been unthinkable during that period of terror. Archives from the Soviet era might contain some yet unknown documents that would shed light on the circumstances in which Chukovskii lived and worked and to the perils he may have been facing. Such information would provide interesting material for postdoctoral research. Unfortunately, since the late 1990s, the use of Russian archives has become exceedingly expensive and problematic in other ways, too. Restricted access seems to concern particularly non-Russian researchers.¹

In the present study, several scholarly studies were used as sources of reference for general information about the Soviet era and about the 1930s, in particular. Often-cited scholars include Jeffrey Brooks, Evgeny Dobrenko, Sheila Fitzpatrick, Katerina Clark, and Karen Petrone, among others. Robert Conquest's and Terry Martin's studies have provided background material about Soviet minority nationalities and the Great Terror, respectively. As regards the topic of Russian and Soviet literary translation, particularly a study by L. L. Neliubin and G. T. Khukhuni and a more recent study by Susanna Witt were valuable sources of information. A Russian perspective on a variety of topics was found on the Internet site *Zhurnal'nyi zal*. The articles cited include those by Arlen Blium, Aleksei Bureshin, Eduard Shneiderman, Igor' Sukhikh, and Pavel Uspenskii, to mention only a few. For the lack of page numbers on the site, the articles are referred to by the author's name and the year of publication.

Theoretical framework

Chukovskii's accommodating *A High Art* in the 1930s can be regarded as his dialogue with the Stalinist culture, and therefore, the concepts of dialogue and chronotope provide an optimal theoretical framework for the present study. The concept of dialogue is described by Mikhail Bakhtin as the open-endedness of all communication and as the bidirectional influence between a literary work and the culture in which it is produced. Chronotope, as described by Bakhtin, encompasses the cultural peculiarities of a given combination of time and place. Both concepts have been elaborated by Vladimir Bibler and later, for instance, Nele Bemong and Pieter Borghart have further expanded the concept of chronotope.

Another vantage point has been provided by Lev Loseff's study on the so-called Aesopian language. The term refers to an intricate web of codes and insinuations that enable a writer to convey secret messages to his readers behind a censor's back. Also discussed as "subtexts," Aesopian language was a topic that Chukovskii was well acquainted with, having researched it as a device of the 19th century radical writers. As censorship was a pertinent aspect to be taken into consideration in the 1930s, it seems reasonable to assume that Chukovskii might have invoked some methods of Aesopian language when revising *A High Art*.

¹The issue has been commented e.g. by Jeffrey Burds (2007: 473–474) and Patricia Kennedy Grimsted (2015: cv–cvi).

Note on Translation

All translations from Russian that are not supplemented by source references were done by the author. As regards excerpts from Chukovskii's diary, they are presented in Michael Henry Heim's translations whenever possible. The translations are cited from the English edition of Chukovskii's diary, edited by Victor Erlich. Correspondingly, excerpts and examples from *A High Art* are cited in Lauren Leighton's translations when available. The English edition of the diary is an abridged version of the original, whereas the English edition of *A High Art* was translated from the 1966 edition in Russian, which does not contain all the material included in earlier editions. For the present study, the lacking diary excerpts and examples were translated by the author. Heim's and Erlich's translations are distinguished from the author's by supplementation with source references.

The titles of books and journals and the names of publishing houses appear in the text in Russian, with the English translation provided in parentheses. There are, however, some exceptions to the rule. For the sake of clarity, *A High Art* and the titles of its chapters are referred to by their English translations. Apart from that, it seemed more natural and illustrative to discuss the writer's commune Dom iskusstv using its English name House of Arts.

Note on Transliteration, Emphases, Excisions, and References

Russian words and proper names incorporated in the body text were transliterated into Roman letters according to the Library of Congress system. Longer excerpts and all the examples shown in tables are in their original Cyrillic form.

In Heim's and Leighton's translations as well as in other quotations in English, the system of transliteration may vary and deviate from the general practice used in the present study.

The titles of volumes and journals are emphasized with italics. The titles of individual articles appear in quotation marks.

In quotations and examples, the Russian text is emphasized with italics. Underlinings in examples were done by the author. The emphases in examples are included in Chukovskii's original texts. In the English translations, these are marked by italics, whereas in the original Russian versions, they are distinguished from the rest of the text by the absence of italics. Excisions in quotations and examples are indicated by ellipsis dots within square brackets. All other ellipsis markings indicate excisions in the original texts.

References to different editions are marked merely by the year of publication and page number when it is obvious from the context that the source of reference is *A High Art*. If also the year of publication clearly appears from the discussion, the edition may be referred to by page number only. To avoid confusion, cross references are marked differently. They are presented by the number of the table or the subchapter.

Appendices

Appendix 1 contains a list providing biographical information about some less widely known individuals, whose presentation would, as it seems, have a somewhat disorienting effect amidst the study. Appendix 2 contains explanations of the abbreviations and acronyms that appear in the text. Appendix 3 contains a table which lists those litterateurs relevant to the present study that perished in the Great Terror.

2 *A Litterateur in the Land of Soviets*

Kornei Chukovskii' career is a veritable success story if measured by sophistication and prestige rather than by material wealth. Persistent self-education combined with exceptional linguistic talent helped Chukovskii overcome his modest origins and unprivileged childhood, and he eventually gained a position as a prestigious authority in various fields of Russian and Soviet literature. A professional litterateur, Chukovskii mastered a wide repertoire: criticism and research, translation, essays, memoirs, and philology. He was also the author of ingeniously humorous rhymed fairy tales, and together with Samuil Marshak, he is regarded as a reformer of Russian children's literature.

Another key to Chukovskii's success was his excellent ability to adapt to prevailing conditions. When a path in his career met a dead end, he always found a new area into which to channel his literary talent. (Chukovskaia, L. 2000: 49.) Merely during Chukovskii's lifetime, about 849 editions of his works were published, making altogether 123 million copies (Christesen 1987).

This chapter establishes the framework in which Chukovskii's article about translation was first written in the revolutionary era, expanded into the collection of essays known by the title *A High Art*, and further revised for new editions in the course of the 1930s. Subchapter 2.1 introduces Chukovskii as a beginning litterateur, following his early career from an Odessa newspaper into the literary circles of Saint Petersburg. Subchapter 2.2 burrows into the fundamentally new direction Chukovskii was compelled to take in his career after the October Revolution in 1917. Subchapter 2.3 demonstrates how Chukovskii, albeit a basically unpolitical person, smoothly and proficiently bestowed his talent and competence upon the building of a new Socialist culture. Subchapter 2.4 focuses on Chukovskii's participation in the enterprise of the publishing house *Vsemirnaia literatura* ("World Literature"). Subchapter 2.5 outlines the compiling of a handbook for the translators of *Vsemirnaia literatura*, the precursor of *A High Art*. Subchapter 2.6 peruses the centralizing of literature and the tightening of censorship in the 1920s and the professional difficulties that the development caused for Chukovskii. Subchapter 2.7 examines Chukovskii's situation in the 1930s, which for him like for many of his colleagues were characterized by a certain extent of stabilization and material comfort on the one hand, and insecurity and fear for personal safety, on the other. Subchapter 2.8 canvasses certain events and phenomena of the 1930s that directly affected Chukovskii's family, particularly his son Nikolai and his daughter Lidiia.

2.1 BECOMING A LITTERATEUR

Kornei Chukovskii (born Nikolai Korneichukov) was the illegitimate son of a Ukrainian peasant woman and a Russian student. Soon after Nikolai's birth, his father deserted the

family, and his mother moved from Saint Petersburg to Odessa with her two children. In adolescence, the lack of a patronym was a painful issue for Nikolai, and he, therefore, adopted the pseudonym Kornei Chukovskii. After the 1917 revolution, his change of name, complemented with the invented patronym Ivanovich, was made formal. (Chukovskaia, L. 2012: 155–157.)

Because of his illegitimate origin, Chukovskii was expelled from secondary school as a fifth grader. He apparently tried to continue his studies independently, but no documents about this have survived. At the same time, he immersed himself in language studies. Ukrainian was his mother tongue, so he put great effort into mastering perfect Russian. His preserved archive contains notebooks in which the accent is marked above words so as to show him how to pronounce them correctly. He also taught himself English. (Ivanova 2002a: 8.)

Chukovskii entered the literary sphere in 1901 as a journalist, making his debut at the age of mere nineteen. His first article was titled “K vechno-iunomu voprosu” (“About the Ever-Young Question”). He managed to get it published in the newspaper *Odesskie novosti* (“Odessan News”) with the help of his friend Vladimir Zhabotinskii-Zeev, a young Jewish journalist known as “Altalena.” In that first article, Chukovskii tried to redefine the function of art, which, he reasoned, derived from the general conception of the goals of human activity. In a footnote, the editor of *Odesskie novosti* introduced him as a “young journalist with paradoxical but highly interesting opinions.” Chukovskii soon became a regular contributor to the newspaper and a well-known literary critic in his hometown. (Ivanova 2002a: 9–11.)

Already at that time, Chukovskii voraciously observed current literary trends by attending various circles and clubs, including the “literary-artistic society” (Literaturno-artisticheskoe obshchestvo) of Odessa (see Chukovskaia, E. 2011a: 521). In 1903, the newly married Chukovskii acquired a new assignment: he was sent to London to work as a correspondent for *Odesskie novosti*. During this sojourn of one and a half years, he spent entire days in the library of the British Museum studying Anglo-Saxon literature and improving his English. He complemented his education by diligently attending free-of-charge charity lectures. Returning from England in 1904, Chukovskii settled to live in Saint Petersburg. (Ivanova 2002a: 11–12.)

While still in London, Chukovskii started contributing to the Symbolist journal *Vesy* (“Scales”) (Ivanova 2002a: 12). Issued in 1905, the October Manifesto granted civic rights and freedom of speech. Censorship of the press was repealed. (Evtuhov et al. 2004: 536, 538.) Chukovskii immediately took advantage of the new situation and started an enterprise of his own, a satirical journal titled *Signal*. After publishing merely four issues, *Signal* was suppressed and its owner detained – he was released on bail after nine days. The journal was revived in early 1906 under the new title *Signaly* (“Signals”). In March, Chukovskii was back in court, accused of printing and distributing articles that insulted the Tsar. The initial verdict was six months in prison and five years without license to publish. Chukovskii’s defense attorney Oskar Gruzenberg managed to get the verdict revoked, but *Signaly* was closed down for good. (Chukovskaia, E. 2011a: 526, 551.)

Incidentally, while in detention Chukovskii began translating poems of the American bard Walt Whitman (see Chukovskii 2001a: 6.) In 1964, in an article titled “O sebe” (“About Me”), he commented on his early translations as follows:

В 1907 году мои переводы вышли отдельной книжкой в издательстве «Кружок молодых» при Петербургском университете. Переводы были слабы, но книжка имела огромный успех, так как поэзия Уитмена вполне гармонировала с тогдашними литературными веяниями. (Chukovskii 2001a: 6.)

In 1907, the publishing house *Kruzhok molodykh* ("The Circle of the Young") of the University of Saint Petersburg released my translations as a separate edition. The translations were poor, but the book was an enormous success because Whitman's poetry was in perfect harmony with the current literary trends.

In an article written for the American journal *The Long-Islander* for Whitman's 150th anniversary, Chukovskii tells that he eventually came to hate that book of translations because every single line in it was a "slander against the poet." He confesses having made the mistake of trying to render Whitman's poetry more "elegant" than it was meant to be. In 1914, Chukovskii began editing and correcting those translations, and this work would eventually continue for six decades. During that time, new editions were frequently released, each one revised by the author. The eleventh edition was published in the year of Whitman's anniversary, which was also the last year of Chukovskii's life. In that edition, Chukovskii had made about 200 corrections. (See Chukovsky 1969.)

The closure of the journal *Signal* marked the end of Chukovskii's career in satire. He never wrote about political issues again, although features of satire, such as parody, topicality, and acerbity, marked his authorial style all through his career. For a while after the episode, he only contributed to minor publications, for instance, to the weekly *Teatral'naiia Rossiia*. Later he began publishing in the newspaper *Svobodnye mysli* ("Free Thoughts"), and at that time he was finally established as a critic in Saint Petersburg. (See Ivanova 2002a: 13.) He also wrote for several journals, including *Svoboda i zhizn'* ("Liberty and Life") (see Scherr 2009), *Russkaia mysl'* ("The Russian Thought"), *Niva* ("The Field"), and *Rech'* ("Speech") – the mouthpiece of the Kadets (Konstitutsionnaia Demokraticheskaia partiia or the Constitutional Democrat Party) (see Chukovskii 2001a: 6). After the 1917 Revolution, connections with the Kadet party became a burden and a threat for many intellectuals (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 8). As it turned out, some of Chukovskii's contemporaries would not let his collaboration with *Rech'* be forgotten (see Subchapter 2.7).

Aleksandr Lavrov emphasizes Chukovskii's role both as a representative and as an exponent of the new epoch. One of Chukovskii's favorite arguments was that whereas in earlier decades, Russian literature had originated in the rural way of life and rural way of thinking, the works of contemporary writers and poets embodied modern, urban culture. Although not entirely agreeing with such a sweeping generalization, Lavrov notes that this did very much pertain to Chukovskii himself. (See Lavrov 2003.)

In the early 1920s, the Bolshevik leader and Marxist theorist Lev Trotskii identified Chukovskii as one of the representatives of the rural, old, and traditional Russian literature. Discussing the so-called "fellow-travelers" (see Subchapter 2.6) in his work *Literatura i revoliutsiia* ("Literature and Revolution"), Trotskii contemptuously argued that Chukovskii was rooted "entirely in the past," the symbol of which was the "moss-covered and superstitious peasant." As to Chukovskii's attitude to Russian culture, he pronounced it a banal sort of nationalism. (See Trotsky 2005: 87–88.)

It appears that Trotskii's attack was at least partly induced by Chukovskii's ill-fated letter to Aleksei N. Tolstoi, written in May 1922 while the latter was in voluntary exile in Berlin. In what was intended as a private letter, Chukovskii encouraged Tolstoi to return from exile and underlined his own faith in the future of Russian culture. He also gave vent to his frustration about some issues related to the writers' commune House of Arts (*Dom iskusstv*; see Subchapter 2.3), and, in that context, he mentioned several litterateurs by name. Without asking for Chukovskii's permission, Tolstoi submitted the letter for publishing. In Petrograd, the letter evoked bad blood, and many litterateurs harbored hostile feelings towards Chukovskii for a long time to come. (More in Hickey 2009: 310–312; Ivanova 2004a: 10–11.)

The mass culture that began to emerge in the 1910s offered Chukovskii a cornucopia of topics to review: ideological texts, detective stories, pornographic literature, advertisements and posters, to name a few. At times, Chukovskii was criticized for writing about “fashionable” themes, but it was often his articles that made those phenomena fashionable in the first place. He was often the first one to point out various peculiar features in contemporary culture. As Chukovskii's choice of genre, the sharp and witty feuilleton (*fel'eton*) had now replaced the philosophical treatises he had once written for *Odesskie novosti*. However, he was always careful to adjust his style according to the audience. An ideal platform for feuilletons was the liberal and intellectual *Rech*,¹ whereas for *Niva*, the preferable genre was a deep and detailed writer portrait. (Ivanova 2003: 7–8, 10, 19–20.)

While Chukovskii was still writing for *Odesskie novosti*, his original and unconventional style had an impact on the literary circles of Russia like a breath of fresh air. In Saint Petersburg, his provincial background was not only an asset but also a stumbling block. Readers were delighted by Chukovskii's freshness and the informal, nearly colloquial style that he had appropriated from the British press during his stay in London. What made Chukovskii particularly popular was that his articles targeted the rank-and-file reader, not just the members of the intelligentsia. For that same reason, he was scorned among the sophisticated literary circles of the capital. His articles were criticized for their caricaturist nature, for their abundance of citations, and for their overall “roughness.” By and large, he was seen as an unpolished upstart. Chukovskii's cavalier attitude to literary authorities did not make things any better. He blatantly refused to play by tacitly agreed rules but insisted on treating his subjects equally, regardless of their status. He was particularly fond of publicly correcting others' mistakes by means of his pungent remarks, which usually got straight to the point. Furthermore, he never let a personal relationship interfere with work. His contemporaries apprehensively anticipated their turn to be the target of his fire. (Ivanova 2002a: 11, 13–14, 18, 21–22; 2003: 7, 16, 18, 20, 22.)

Chukovskii was a prolific writer of articles and feuilletons, but he also frequently gave lectures. Test-driving an article orally prior to writing it was a custom he had adopted already at *Odesskie novosti*. For every lecture, he conducted extensive and fastidious background work so as to be prepared for possible questions from the audience. Perhaps for that very reason, Chukovskii usually managed to walk away a winner, even though the atmosphere at those events was often very intense. His points of view evoked heated discussions, which were followed by an outpouring of letters to editorial offices. (Ivanova 2003: 11, 13, 16–18.) Lidiia Chukovskaia (2000: 49) remarks that during the 1910s and the early 1920s, there was not a single notable literary phenomenon in Russia without her father's “peculiar, recognizable voice” echoing in it.

The year 1916 became memorable for Chukovskii: he was part of a delegation of Russian journalists that the British government invited for a visit to England. Among the other invitees were the writers Aleksei N. Tolstoi and Vasily Nemirovich-Danchenko, and the publisher and editor of *Rech'* Vladimir D. Nabokov (Ivanova 2004a: 7.) About his observations on wartime England, Chukovskii wrote a book titled *Angliia nakanune pobedy* ("England on the Eve of Victory," see Chukovskii 1917).

In the aftermath of the 1917 Revolution, Finland declared independence, the border was closed, and Chukovskii lost his beloved dacha. Situated in the village Kuokkala in the Finnish seaside resort of Terijoki, the dacha had been a popular gathering place for the artistic and literary circles of Saint Petersburg between 1912 and 1917. Musical evenings, poetry readings, and other cultural events were frequently arranged, and life-long friendships were established. (Ivanova 2008: 8–9.) According to Lidia Chukovskaia, their dacha was "the center of Russian culture, interlaced with various threads." Among the visitors were writers like Maksim Gor'kii, Vladimir Maiakovskii, Viktor Shklovskii, Leonid Andreev, Anna Akhmatova and Nikolai Gumilev. Among the cultural figures seen at the dacha were also, for instance, the painter Il'ia Repin and the opera singer Fedor Shaliapin. (See Chukovskaia, L. 2000: 47.)

Offended by the way he was treated in one of Chukovskii's feuilletons, Andreev once denominated him "Judas from Terijoki" (*Iuda iz Teriok*) (Ivanova 2002a: 22–23). By the epithet, Andreev was obliquely referring to his own short story "Iuda Iskariot" ("Judas Iscariot," 1907), which commences as follows:

«Иисуса Христа много раз предупреждали, что Иуда из Кариота – человек очень дурной славы и его нужно остерегаться. (Andreev 2013: 452.)

Many times, Jesus Christ was cautioned that Judas Iscariot (from Hebr. "of Kerioth;" M.S.) had a very bad reputation and he should beware of him.

Andreev was probably feeling betrayed and, therefore, wanted to warn others about Chukovskii. He may have also recognized other similarities between Chukovskii and his protagonist. Philip Cavendish (2000: 123) notes that in the short story, Judas is portrayed as "the most intelligent and knowledgeable" of all Christ's disciples. It is unclear whether Chukovskii was pleased or offended about the nickname. In his memoirs of Andreev, he (Chukovskii 2001e: 115) mentions the incident as an example of the writer's sense of humor, calling attention to the phonetic resemblance between the names Iuda iz Teriok and Iuda Iskariot. However, he does not own up to being the object of the nickname but cryptically only refers to "one critic."

Many of the memories about the Kuokkala dacha are recorded in Chukovskii's (2011a; 2011b; 2011c) diary, in his memoir *Sovremenniki* ("Contemporaries," see Chukovskii 2001e), and particularly in the *Chukokkala* album (see Chukovskii 2008b). The album presents a rich panorama of Chukovskii's friends, colleagues, and acquaintances. Chukovskii started composing it in 1914, and it eventually became a sort of "friendship book" among the intelligentsia, who commented contemporary cultural phenomena in various anecdotes, poems, and caricatures. Many entries were drafted on pieces of paper that happened to be at hand, and Chukovskii would later paste them into the ever-expanding album. (Andron-

ikov 2008: 8.) *Chukokkala* was first published in 1979, heavily edited by the censors. Only after the collapse of the Soviet Union did unabridged editions become available, the first one in 1999 and the next one in 2006. (Chukovskaia, E. 2008: 553, 558.)

2.2 CAREER ADJUSTMENTS

After 1917, Chukovskii was compelled to take a new direction in his literary career. During the first few years after the Revolution, the literary sphere was still open for experimentation and variety. On the other hand, the canonization of the new Socialist culture was already in full progress. Although actual organs for censorship had not yet been established, decrees issued in October 1917 abolished all bourgeois newspapers and journals. That marked the beginning of a process that would eventually give the Soviet state a monopoly of the press. That, in turn, meant that forums for independent criticism ceased to exist. Some critics of the older generation reconciled themselves to the new order, while others, Chukovskii among them, gradually abandoned literary criticism altogether. (See Garzonio & Zalambani 2011: 3–4, 14–15.) Lidiia Chukovskaia describes the watershed in her father's career as follows:

Однако к концу двадцатых годов литературным критиком Чуковский быть перестал. Время исключало самобытность в восприятии чего бы то ни было – в том числе и литературы, а тем самым и своеобразие критического жанра. Задача литературного критика сведена была правительствующей бюрократией преимущественно к популяризации очередных «партийных постановлений в области литературы». (Chukovskaia, L. 2000: 49.)

But in the late 1920s, Chukovskii stopped being a literary critic. That time ruled out individuality in the perception of anything – literature included, and thereby also any independence in the genre of literary criticism. The governing bureaucracy reduced the literary critic's duties to the popularization of one "Party resolution in the sphere of literature" after another.

Chukovskaia (2000: 49) goes on to point out that for the rest of his life, her father regretted the loss of his career as critic, his one and true professional vocation. Aleksandr Lavrov describes the changed nature of literary criticism in quite similar terms, emphasizing Chukovskii's personal decision to withdraw from that sphere:

Неудивительно поэтому, что в годы, когда литературным критикам открылась безграничная свобода высказывания исключительно по марксометру, Чуковский предпочел забросить любимое ремесло и удалиться в иные сферы творческой деятельности. (Lavrov 2003.)

Therefore it is not surprising that in those years when literary critics were given unlimited freedom to express themselves, exclusively steered by the Marxometer, Chukovskii preferred to give up his favorite profession and to move on to other areas of creative work.

Chukovskii himself coined the term “Marxometer” in one of his pre-revolutionary articles. It was supposed to be a device for measuring the level of Marxist ideas “in any animate or inanimate object.” Lavrov calls attention to the “eternal topicality” (*neprekhodiashchaia aktual'nost'*) of Chukovskii's ideas. He notes that the Soviet esthetic methodology was virtually based on the Marxometer. (See Lavrov 2003.)

In a certain sense, though, Chukovskii did appear in the role of critic also during the Soviet era, for instance, when he contributed to the public discourse about literature in the 1930s (see Subchapters 4.3, 4.4, and 4.5). That which did change was the essence of literary criticism, as Chukovskaia and Lavrov also underline. Whereas pre-revolutionary criticism had been largely motivated by purely artistic factors, during the Soviet era, it became entwined with various ideological and political elements that all had to be considered.

In the 1920s, it became painfully clear to Chukovskii that there could be no return to his pre-revolutionary career as a critic, although initially he seems to have harbored plans for reviving it. To that end, he edited and complemented some of his earlier articles and even published some new books, although these were virtually summaries of his earlier reflections. Evgeniia Ivanova refers to the book *Dve dushi M. Gorkogo* (“The Two Spirits of M. Gor'kii”), as “the swan song of critic Chukovskii.” Published in 1924, it was almost entirely ignored by the critics, all except for one – negative – review. The author of that review accused Chukovskii of simplifying Gor'kii. (See Ivanova 2004a: 17; 2004b: 607.) To add insult to injury, ideas from the book were later plagiarized in various trivial articles. On December 25, 1925 Chukovskii recorded in his diary the following comment:

В позапрошлом году вышла моя книга о Горьком. О ней не было ни одной статейки, а ее идеи раскрадывались по мелочам журнальными писунами. (Chukovskii 2011b: 250.)

When my Gorky book came out last year [*sic*], there wasn't a review anywhere, though hacks pilfered its ideas right and left in their articles. (Erllich 2005: 175.)

Chukovskii had included translation in his repertoire since the early years of his literary career. Besides Whitman (see above), his translations include works of Shakespeare, Rudyard Kipling, Oscar Wilde, Mark Twain, and of the Ukrainian poet Taras Shevchenko, among others. (Leighton 1984: xx–xxi.) During the Civil War, Chukovskii was employed under Gor'kii's supervision at the publishing house *Vsemirnaia literatura* (see Subchapter 2.4). There his duties involved both translating and assessing translations. After Gor'kii's departure abroad in 1921 and the dissipation of his projects, Chukovskii still earned a living by editing translations of English works. (Ivanova 2004a: 21; 2004b: 606; 2009: 9.) In 1962, the University of Oxford would recognize his efforts on the behalf of English literature by awarding him the degree of Doctorate Honoris Causa (Leighton 1984: xxi).

Chukovskii had also a major project that he had been working on since the 1910s, one he would consider as the most important of all his achievements. That was the collecting and editing of the entire production of the 19th century radical poet, essayist and publicist Nikolai Nekrasov, Chukovskii's favorite since childhood. Painstakingly, one by one, he had gathered original manuscripts, scattered among Nekrasov's various relatives and friends and their descendants. Then in 1914 (see Chukovskaia, L. 2012: 99), Chukovskii had a veritable stroke of luck. It turned out that a friend of his, the academician and lawyer

Anatolii Koni, who possessed an entire archive of Nekrasov's original manuscripts, was willing to donate them to research. The number of documents was so enormous that it took Chukovskii several years simply to read through them all. Some thin leaflets had already been published in the early 1920s, and in 1926, Nekrasov's collected works were first published, complemented with biographic details and Chukovskii's comments. (Chukovskii 2001a: 7–10.)

The very first Nekrasov publication received prestigious feedback, as Lenin praised Chukovskii for his "good and perspicuous work" (*khoroshaia, tolkovaia rabota*). Lenin's wife Nadezhda Krupskaiia, however, did not share his high opinion of Chukovskii's achievement. During the campaign against Chukovskii-ism (see Subchapter 2.6) in the late 1920s, she tried to have the Nekrasov book banned from publishing. Gor'kii eventually salvaged Chukovskii by publicly reminding everybody in *Pravda* about Lenin's complimentary assessment. In the course of decades, new editions of Nekrasov's collected works would frequently be published in the Soviet Union, and in 1962 they would earn Chukovskii the prestigious Lenin prize (see also Subchapter 2.7). (Ivanova & Mel'gunov 2004: 612–614.)

In the fall of 1943, the presidium of the board of the Union of Soviet Writers submitted a petition that Chukovskii be granted a doctorate. His scholarly work on Nekrasov was considered to substitute an academic dissertation. The petition was in progress in the bureaucratic instances when two excoriating articles about Chukovskii's latest children's book *Odoleem Barmaleia* ("Let's Overcome Barmalei") were published in *Pravda*. In those articles, Chukovskii was portrayed as a politically dubious author of a banal and harmful concoction (*poshlaia i vrednaia striapnia*). Chukovskii reacted by sending the editors of *Pravda* a response in which he confessed that the book was a "literary and political error." (Chukovskii 2009: 353–354, 369–370; see also Chukovskaia, E. 2001a: 589–590.) The letter draws a dismaying picture of an atmosphere of oppression and fear. For Chukovskii, denouncing his own work appears to have been self-evident, and the strategy may have saved him from more sinister consequences. As to the petition, it was tacitly abandoned, and Chukovskii eventually received his doctorate in 1957 (Chukovskii 2009: 370).

All things considered, Nekrasov proved to be a fortunate choice for a topic of research. Chukovskii's personal motives for taking on the work stemmed from his penchant for Nekrasov, and also from the lucky coincidence of being in possession of the poet's archives. After the Revolution, another pertinent factor entered the picture. The disseminators of Leninist propaganda eagerly searched through history for revolutionary individuals to be presented as new role models. Regarded as an author-hero of Socialism and a precursor of contemporary proletarian poetry, Nekrasov qualified as such a model. Chukovskii's representation of Nekrasov accentuated the poet's personal and professional struggles and thus helped establish an image of him as somebody "with a heart" championing the cause of the lower classes. (Hickey 2009: 217–218.)

Martha Weitzel Hickey (2009: 219) characterizes Chukovskii as a perceptive observer of prevailing cultural policies and as one the "image-makers" of his generation. To justify her point, she refers to a diary entry of Chukovskii's. In the entry, recorded in 1901, Chukovskii (2011a: 30–31) describes how Nekrasov after the death of the critic Vissarion Belinskii immediately began writing about him in a way that contributed to the creation of Belinskii's

posthumous image as a “mythical figure.” It is interesting to speculate whether Chukovskii was actually conscious of the similarities between the treatment of Belinskii sixty years earlier and the ongoing canonization of Nekrasov. Judging by Chukovskii’s innate perceptivity, it appears quite probable.

Among Chukovskii’s pre-revolutionary articles that were republished in the 1920s (see above) were also those about Nekrasov. They appeared in the journals *Rech’* and *Russkoe slovo* (“Russian Word”) between 1912 and 1917 (see Ivanova & Mel’gunov 2004: 612). The revised articles were published in an anthology titled *Rasskazy o Nekrasove* (“Tales about Nekrasov”). In the role of researcher, Chukovskii invoked the same means and effects that had captivated his audience in his days as a critic, for instance, with topicality and the impression of spoken language (Ivanova 2004a: 20). Chukovskii’s more conservative colleagues looked askance at his journalist way of writing. They were convinced that it would compromise the “academicness” of literary research. One of Chukovskii’s most viscous opponents was another Nekrasov scholar, the Leningrad university professor Vladislav Evgen’ev-Maksimov – not surprisingly, considering that competition for a publisher was extremely hard. (Ivanova 2004a: 20–21.)

Chukovskii was well aware of the pitfalls that his favored devices posed. In a diary entry from April 25, 1921 he writes:

Мои многие статьи потому и фальшивы и неприятны для чтения, что я писал их как лекции, которые имеют свои законы – почти те же, что и драма. Здесь должно быть действие, движение, борьба, азарт – никаких тонкостей, все площадное. (Chukovskii 2011a: 329.)

The reason many of my articles don’t ring true or read well is that I wrote them to be talks, and talks have their own laws, which are related to the laws of drama. They need action, motion, conflict, excitement – no subtleties, everything in the open. (Erich 2005: 86.)

The Revolution had created a paradoxical situation: while the reading audience had multiplied, reaching it had become practically impossible. Instead of producing books for new readers, writers were obliged to “read their work from a sheet of paper to a handful of people.” (Petrovskii 1966: 133–134.) As the shortage of paper during the Civil War all but ended printing and publishing, lecturing became an important source of income for many litterateurs. Various studios and circles mushroomed in Petrograd, and there prevailed what Chukovskii would later recall as a “superstition that after ten to fifteen lessons, anybody could create poetry.” In those days, he sometimes gave as many as eleven courses per week, among them a literary circle for two hundred prostitutes gathered from the streets of Petrograd. (Chukovskii 2001e: 446, 448; 2008b: 272, 275.)

In a diary entry recorded on December 22, 1920, Chukovskii refers to the reduction of printing and publishing:

Вчера на заседании правления Союза писателей кто-то сообщил, что из-за недостатка бумаги около 800 книг остаются в рукописи и не доходят до читателей. (Chukovskii 2011a: 310.)

At yesterday's meeting of the board of the Writers' Union somebody reported that about eight hundred books will remain in manuscript, unpublished, because of the paper shortage. (Erlich 2005: 77.)

One of Chukovskii's activities in the 1920s encompassed the editing and complementing of his studies about children's language. His book on the topic, *Ot dvukh do piati* ("From Two to Five;" see Chukovskii 2001b), was first published in 1928 (then under the title *Malen'kie deti* or "Little Children"), and in the course of decades a number of expanded and revised editions have been published. (See Chukovskaia, E. 2001b: 631.) The book has made Chukovskii a recognized authority in child psychology. Here is yet another domain in which self-education supplemented by genuine interest in the subject matter earned Chukovskii prestige.

In the 1920s, the steadiest income for Chukovskii was provided by children's literature (Ivanova 2009: 10). He had many children of his own: son Nikolai born in 1904; daughter Lidiia born in 1907; son Boris born in 1910; and daughter Mariia ("Murochka") born in 1920 (Chukovskaia, E. 2011a: 550–553). Particularly Murochka was a source of inspiration for her father, and her early childhood coincides with Chukovskii's most creative years as a children's writer. Lidiia Chukovskaia (2012: 146) reminisces: "He became attached to Murochka with particular tenderness: both because she was delicate [. . .], and because she had been bequeathed with an indisputable literary talent." Murochka tragically died of tuberculosis in 1931, at the mere age of eleven. Chukovskii also outlived both of his sons: Boris went missing in the war in 1942 and Nikolai unexpectedly passed away in 1965. (Chukovskaia, E. 2011b: 604; 2011c: 585, 588; Chukovskaia, L. 2012: 146–147.)

An episode associated with Murochka most strikingly evinces the paramount importance of literature in Chukovskii's life. In 1930, while lying in a Crimean tuberculosis sanatorium, she had composed some poems that were sent to her father in Leningrad. In a similar situation, the average parent would probably have lavished unqualified praise on the dying child, but not Chukovskii. In a letter to Murochka, he expresses his appreciation for some of the poems and particularly for her accurate sense of poetic rhythm. Aside from that, he estimates two of the poems as "complete failures" (*sovsem neudachny*). (See Chukovskii 2009: 200–201.) On the surface, Chukovskii's conduct seems unkind, even cruel, but one only has to read his diary entries from the time of Murochka's illness to see the unjustness of such an interpretation. It was not that the child's mortal illness left him cold, but rather that he regarded literature as a transcendental phenomenon, something that went beyond fatherly love. In this younger daughter of his, Chukovskii appears to have somehow, subconsciously, recognized his own alter ego. As it turns out from the following diary entry, he felt that by her mere existence, Murochka had made him a better version of himself. The entry was recorded on July 4, 1932, the first summer after her death:

Теперь только вижу, каким поэтичным, серьезным и светлым я был благодаря ей. Все это отлетело, и остался... да в сущности, ничего не осталось. (Chukovskii 2011b: 483.)

Only now do I see how poetic, serious, and pure I was thanks to *her*. It is gone now, all of it; the only thing left is... Well, actually, there is nothing left. (Erlich 2005: 273.)

Murochka's early death may well have been the most painful loss in Chukovskii's life.

Different versions keep circulating about how Chukovskii's fairy tale "*Krokodil*" ("Crocodile") came to be, none of which entirely rules out the others. In an essay written in 1937, Chukovskii suggests that it was Gor'kii who gave him the impetus for writing his first rhymed fairy tale. The two litterateurs had allegedly been discussing about the need for modernizing traditional children's literature, when Gor'kii had challenged Chukovskii to solve the problem by compiling something himself. (Petrovskii 1966: 117–118.) Chukovskii apparently refers to the day they became acquainted while traveling together on a train in 1916 to visit Il'ia Repin in Kuokkala. Their discussion about "children's matters" is recorded in detail in Chukovskii's memoir of Gor'kii. (See Chukovskii 2001e: 69–71.)

According to another memoir of Chukovskii's, published in 1959, the fairy tale was written to declare war against the old and ossified models and features in children's literature (Petrovskii 1966: 118). The best known and by far the most charming version is the one that came into circulation a couple of years later: *Krokodil* was produced ex tempore while riding on a night train from Helsinki to Petrograd. Chukovskii was traveling with his young son, who was sick. To comfort the petulant child, he started improvising verses that mimicked the rhythmic sound of the running train. "The verses just emerged by themselves," he reminisces, "I did nothing to formulate them." (Petrovskii 1966: 117.)

The truthful version is probably a compilation of the above three versions. The fact that Chukovskii adjusted his story about the origins of the fairy tale over the course of time is another indication of his accurate cultural instinct. He may well have chosen his words in such a way that they would make an impact on the contemporary reader. Gor'kii's prominent presence in the 1937 version of the story may not be a coincidence, either. Gor'kii, who had passed away the previous year, had been a canonized figure in Soviet literature since the early 1930s (Brooks 2001: 110–111, 118). At the height of Stalin's terror, a reminder of close connections with the "great proletarian writer" may well have served as a means of self-preservation.

Chukovskii's collaboration with Gor'kii was at its most active and fruitful in the post-revolutionary years (see Subchapter 2.4), but it had begun already in 1916. The head of the publishing house Parus ("Sail") at the time, Gor'kii invited Chukovskii to run its newly founded children's department. (See Chukovskii 2001a: 7; 2001e: 69.) The first joint project of the two litterateurs was an anthology of fairy tales titled *Elka* ("The Christmas Tree"). Details about the project are recorded in Chukovskii's (2001e: 72–73) memoirs of Gor'kii. Originally written in 1964, Chukovskii's introductory article to an anthology of his fairy tales ("O sebe," see Subchapter 2.1) presents yet another variant of Gor'kii's contribution to the compilation of *Krokodil*:

Под его руководством я составил сборник «Елка» и написал свою первую детскую сказку «Крокодил». (Chukovskii 2001a: 7.)

Under his supervision, I compiled the anthology "The Christmas Tree" and wrote my first fairy tale "Crocodile."

Chukovskii is referring to their Parus project. The publishing house, however, disintegrated before *Krokodil* was finished. Chukovskii next took the manuscript to the children's section of the journal *Niva*, where it was published in 1917. (Chukovskii 2001a: 7.)

In the 1920s, Chukovskii published his best-known fairy tales: *Tarakanishche* (“Cockroach”) and *Moidodyr* (“Wash’em’ clean”) in 1923, *Mukha-Tsokotukha* (“Chatterbox-Fly”) in 1924, *Barmalei* in 1925, *Telefon* (“Telephone”) in 1926, and *Doktor Aibolit* (“Doctor Ouch-It-Hurts”) in 1929. Yet another one, titled *Kradenoe solntse* (“The Stolen Sun”), came out in 1933. (Chukovskaia, E. 2001a: 576–580.) By the mid-1930s, Chukovskii was at the height of his popularity as a children’s writer. A “pioneer honoris causa,” he was a popular guest at various events and matinées. (Kostiukova 2012: 290–291.) Meanwhile, his fairy tales were subjected to continuous and vicious attacks (see Subchapter 4.6).

2.3 IN SERVICE OF DEMOCRACY

Judging by the following diary entry that was recorded on June 19, 1917, Chukovskii’s initial feelings about the turbulent times of the Revolution were bemused rather than excited:

И вторую ночь читаю «Красное и черное» Стендаля, толстый 2-томный роман, утомительный. Он украл у меня все утро. Я с досады, что он оторвал меня от занятий, швырнул его вон. Иначе нельзя оторваться – нужен героический жест; через пять минут жена сказала о демонстрации большевиков, произведенной в Петрограде вчера. Мне это показалось менее интересным, чем измышленные страдания Жюльена, бывшие в 1830 г. (Chukovskii 2011a: 209.)

This is the second night I’ve been reading Stendhal’s *The Red and the Black*, a fascinating novel in two volumes. It robbed my entire morning, too. I was so annoyed at being taken away from my work that I tossed it out. Without a heroic gesture I’d never have torn myself from it. Five minutes later Masha told me about a Bolshevik demonstration that took place in Petrograd yesterday. It sounded less interesting to me than the fabricated sufferings of Julien Sorel dating from 1830. (Erlich 2005: 31.)

Victor Erlich (2005: xii) remarks that the above entry indubitably shows where Chukovskii has placed his own priorities. Indeed, it often proves futile to search Chukovskii’s diary for comments about historical events or for discussions about political or social themes. The most important role in the entries is given to the phenomena of literature and culture. Of course, there were times when the absence of statements can also be explained by a survival instinct, but that probably would not yet apply to the revolutionary era. In an entry recorded in July 1917, Chukovskii speaks of the new order in a sarcastic manner, rather as an outside observer with no personal interest in what was happening around him.

Еще месяц назад я недоумевал, каким образом буржуазия получит на свою сторону войска, и казну, и власть; казалось, вопреки всем законам истории, Россия после векового самодержавия вдруг сразу становится государством социалистическим. Но нет-с, история своего никому не подарит. Вот, одним мановением руки она отняла у передовых кучек крайнего социализма власть и дала ее умеренным социалистам; у социалистов отнимет и передаст кадетам – не позднее, чем через 3 недели. Теперь это быстро. Ускорили исторический процесс. (Chukovskii 2011a: 210.)

Only a month ago I couldn't understand how the bourgeoisie would win over the army and treasury and authorities. Despite all the laws of history it seemed that Russia, after centuries of autocracy, was becoming a socialist state. But no, history will out. With a wave of the hand it took power away from the progressive radical socialist groups and gave it to the moderate socialists. In no less than three weeks it will take it away from the socialists and hand it to the Kadets. Everything goes quickly these days. The historical process has been speeded up. (Erllich 2005: 31–32.)

Chukovskii is apparently referring to the struggles for power between the parties that had formed the Provisional Government after the February Revolution in 1917 (see Evtuhov et al. 2004: 587–588). The last sentence might be meant as a parody of Marx's theory of history. In Marx's opinion, the disparity between the rich capitalists and the poor proletariat would grow until the process would eventually lead into a spontaneous revolution (see e.g. Tucker 1999: 142–143).

Despite the ironic coloring of the above diary entry, it seems that Chukovskii did not mind seeing the age-old autocratic rule in Russia come to an end. Before the Revolution, he had belonged to the liberal intelligentsia, which was sympathetic to revolutionary ideas in an abstract and romantic way but was not interested in actual politics (Ivanova 2004a: 5). Moreover, the dissipation of the monarchy would probably have been in accordance with Chukovskii's liberal worldview. In fact, most intellectuals welcomed the February Revolution, although they were decidedly less enthusiastic about the Bolshevik seizure of power in October (Clark 1966: 72).

During the revolutionary era and the Civil War, Chukovskii happily participated in the enlightening mission of the Bolsheviks and contributed to the building of a new Socialist culture. After a few years, however, his initial optimism and enthusiasm gradually began to wane. By the mid-1920s, they had already given way to disillusionment and frustration, which was at least partly due to professional difficulties and severe material shortages. (Ivanova 2004a: 14–15.)

It almost appears as if in the beginning, Chukovskii deliberately chose to concentrate on what was good under the new order and ignore the bad. However, he was not blind. The following diary entry was recorded on June 26, 1920. In it Chukovskii refers to the member of the Petrograd Soviet administration Boris Kaplun:

У Каплуна издох волчонок. Он кормит своих волчат молоком – в то время как многие матери сохнут от ужаса, что не могут напоить детей! (Chukovskii 2011a: 298.)

One of Kaplun's wolf cubs died. He feeds his cubs with milk while at the same time, many mothers pine away with the horror of not being able to nourish their children.

Between the intelligentsia and the Bolsheviks, there was a state of mutual dependence. While the Bolsheviks needed the intelligentsia's knowledge and expertise in running the new state, the intellectuals welcomed the protection of Bolshevik patrons. (Fitzpatrick 1992: 6.) On an individual level, those who collaborated with the regime were motivated by very different reasons. Reminiscing about the time of *Vsemirnaia literatura* (see Subchapter 2.4) and about his colleagues at the publishing house, Chukovskii comments on Aleksandr Blok and Nikolai Gumilev as follows:

Трудно было бы представить себе двух столь несхожих людей – по внешности, по талантам, по убеждениям, по литературной судьбе.

(Chukovskii 2008b: 263.)

It would be hard to imagine two people as different as they – by appearance, by talent, by convictions, and by literary destiny.

In participating in the cultural activities of the revolutionary era, the two poets had quite opposite considerations. Whereas Blok was genuinely excited about producing new, socially conscious art, Gumilev's primary objective was to advocate poetry as "art for art's sake." Also employed at the publishing house *Vsemirnaia literatura*, the poet Mikhail Kuzmin was apparently motivated by the chance to continue writing theatrical reviews and, thus, influence the development of this field. (See Hickey 2009: 86, 93.)

Two prominent figures in Petrograd's post-revolutionary cultural life were Anatolii Lunacharskii as the Commissar of Education and Gor'kii as his right hand and also as an intermediary between the regime and the intelligentsia. Gor'kii's initial reaction to the Revolution had been sceptical and reserved. However, in the course of the spring of 1918, he gradually changed his attitude and eventually committed himself to cooperate with the new regime. His first official assignment was the establishment of the State Publishing House *Vsemirnaia literatura* (see Subchapter 2.4) in September 1918. (Fitzpatrick 2002: 129–130.) "An intellectual among Bolsheviks and a Bolshevik among intellectuals" (Fitzpatrick 2002: 1–2), Lunacharskii was very popular among the litterateurs. The following comment in the memoir *Sovremenniki* reveals Chukovskii's high opinion of him:

В его лице Советская власть с первых же дней своего бытия предстала перед нами, интеллигентами дореволюционной формации, в самом обаятельном своем воплощении.

(Chukovskii 2001e: 14.)

In his person, the Soviet power from the very first days of its existence appeared before us, intellectuals of the pre-revolutionary order, in its most fascinating embodiment.

Chukovskii was genuinely excited about all the new perspectives that seemed to be opening. He (Chukovskii 2001e: 307) agreed with Lunacharskii's opinion that a new culture can only be built on the foundations of an old one. Chukovskii was, in fact, one of the first intellectuals to begin collaborating with the Bolsheviks. Their ideas about equality and about the enlightening of the masses were easy to sympathize with. Chukovskii contributed to various cultural projects, for instance, in the planning of a new orthography. He participated virtually in all of Gor'kii's enterprises, including the publishing house *Vsemirnaia literatura*, the House of Arts (see below), and a vacation colony in Kholomki, Pskov. (Ivanova 2004a: 9–10.) Participation was rewarded with material comforts and also with valuable new connections. For instance, at *Vsemirnaia literatura*, Chukovskii got the chance to interact with a wide circle of litterateurs and academics. (Hickey 2009: 6–7.)

In his first declaration as the Commissar of Education, Lunacharskii pronounced that "the people themselves, either consciously or unconsciously, must evolve their own culture." The association of proletarian cultural organizations Proletkul't was founded in

October 1917 as an independent body subsidized by Narkompros (The Commissariat of Enlightenment). A “laboratory of proletarian ideology,” it was meant to organize the education of the masses. A number of literary studios and workshops were run under its auspices during the Civil War. In many of them, though, neither the instructors nor the majority of the students were actually proletarian: the epithet often had a merely decorative function. (Fitzpatrick 1992: 20–22; 2002: 26, 89, 95, 98–99.)

Collaborating on the projects of the revolutionary era tightened Chukovskii’s relationship with Gor’kii (Ivanova 2004a: 15–16). The two litterateurs had a lot in common. Both had struggled upwards from modest origins by persevering self-education. Both had initially felt like outsiders when entering the Saint Petersburg literary circles. However, their paths paralleled only up to a certain point. Whereas Gor’kii channeled his energy to revolutionary themes, Chukovskii concentrated on artistic issues.

The warm rapport between Chukovskii and Gor’kii cooled a little in 1921, when the normally dependable Gor’kii responded indifferently to Chukovskii’s appeals on behalf of Petrograd’s hungry writers (see Hickey 2005: 4–5, 160). Nevertheless, it was Gor’kii who would be summoned for help when the campaign against Chukovskii-ism was at its worst (see Subchapter 2.6).

Not only for Chukovskii but for the entire intelligentsia of Petrograd, Gor’kii was a rock to lean on. In his memoirs, Chukovskii describes his patronage as follows:

В первые годы революции мы, петроградские писатели, встречались с ним особенно часто. Он взвалил на себя все наши нужды, и когда у нас рождался ребенок, он выхлопывал для новорожденного соску; когда мы заболели тифом, он хлопотал, чтобы нас поместили в больницу; когда мы выражали желание ехать на дачу, он писал в разные учреждения письма, чтобы нам предоставили Сестрорецкий курорт. (Chukovskii 2001e: 41.)

During those first years after the Revolution, we, the Petrograd writers, met him particularly often. He looked after all our needs, and when anyone of us had a child, he managed to obtain a pacifier for the newborn; when we got sick with typhus, he made sure we were admitted into the hospital; when we expressed the wish to spend time at a dacha, he wrote letters to various establishments making applications for us to stay at the holiday resort in Sestroresk.

In his memoirs, Chukovskii’s son Nikolai notes that during that period, all the artistic and literary life in Petrograd was in one way or another connected with The House of Arts, a writers’ commune that existed in 1919–1922 (see Chukovskii, N. 2012: 254–255). Members and guests were provided with housing and meals, which made the house a lifeline for Petrograd writers particularly during the cold and hungry winter months of 1920–1921. Thanks to Gor’kii, intellectuals were granted special academic rations, although in the worst of times even those were restricted. (Hickey 2009: 116–118.)

The House of Arts may well have been the most ambitious of Chukovskii’s and Gor’kii’s joint projects. Chukovskii’s (2011a: 270–271) diary and the *Chukokkala* album (Chukovskii 2008b: 317–320) contain numerous entries associated with the commune, beginning with its opening on November 19, 1919. A cornucopia of material about the house and its

inhabitants is to be found in Martha Weitzel Hickey's (2009) study *The Writer in Petrograd and The House of Arts*. A fictive approach to the topic was taken by the writer Ol'ga Forsh (2011), whose novel *Sumashedshii korabl'* ("The Crazy Ship"), first published in 1930, paints a colorful picture of life in The House of Arts.

Hickey (2009: xxiv) particularly emphasizes Chukovskii's contribution to the House of Arts. She notes that for years, Chukovskii remained in the shadow of Gor'kii, who had long since been canonized as a founder of the commune. Chukovskii's substantial role came to light only when the Glasnost period made it possible to publish his diary and also the memoirs of several other litterateurs. Hickey describes Chukovskii's commitment to the project as follows:

It is clear that he identified the House of Arts with the future of literature in Soviet Russia and himself with the House. (Hickey 2009: 312.)

Contemporary study indicates that, in actual fact, the initiator behind the project was Chukovskii, not Gor'kii. In the *Chukokkala* album, Chukovskii (2008b: 317) reminisces about how during a visit to the Moscow Palace of Arts (*Dvorets iskusstv*), he got the idea of opening its equivalent in Petrograd. Moreover, it was Chukovskii who personally obtained Lunacharskii's support for the project. Hickey suggests that Chukovskii's "broad pre-revolutionary literary acquaintance, his friendship with the painter Il'ia Repin and ties to the artistic community, his new contacts with Petrograd's academicians through his work for *Vsemirnaia literatura*, and his acquaintance with Bolshevik authorities" may even have made him a more suitable intermediary than Gor'kii. (See Hickey 2009: 12.)

With Gor'kii fully occupied with his other enterprises, Chukovskii shouldered the responsibility for practically all the administrative matters involved with the founding of the house (Hickey 2009: 12). A diary entry recorded on November 14, 1919 suggests that he also shared Gor'kii's duties as a patron:

Говорил я сегодня с Лениным по телефону по поводу декрета об ученых. [. . .] Обещает устроить все, [. . .] (Chukovskii 2011a: 267.)

I talked to Lenin today over the phone about the decree dealing with scholars. [. . .] He promised to take care of everything [. . .], (Erich 2005: 58.)

By the "decree dealing with scholars," Chukovskii is apparently referring to the one that restricted the private ownership of the archives of writers, artists, composers and scholars. The decree had been issued in July of that same year. (See *Otkrytyi tekst*.)

Even before The House of Arts, litterateurs were consulting Chukovskii with their problems. For instance, the Symbolist poet, writer and critic Dmitrii Merezhkovskii and his wife, the poet Zinaida Gippius invited him for a visit to their apartment. The ultimate purpose of the visit, as it soon turned out, was to use Chukovskii's connections in order to extract some special favors from the new regime. Among the things the couple wanted was to retain their apartment instead of it being turned into a *kommunalka* (communal apartment). (See Chukovskii 2011a: 230.) Chukovskii vented his indignation in the following diary entry recorded on October 15, 1918:

Дмитрий Сергеевич – согнутый дугою, неискреннее участие во мне – и просьба: свести его с Луначарским! Вот люди! Ругали меня на всех перекрестках за мой якобы большевизм, а сами только и ждут, как бы к большевизму примазаться. [. . .] Я устроил ему все, о чем он просил, потратив на это два дня. И уверен, что чуть только дело большевиков прогорит – Мережковские первые будут клеветать на меня. (Chukovskii 2011a: 230.)

Merezhkovsky, groveling in insincere concern over me, asked me to introduce him to Lunacharsky! I can't get over them! First they rake me over the coals for my supposed bolshevism; then they want to worm their way into the Bolsheviks' good graces. [. . .] I did everything he asked for – it took two whole days – and I'm sure that as soon as the Bolsheviks go to pot Merezhkovsky will be the first to slander me. (Erlich 2005: 38.)

The last, cynical remark in the citation shows that Chukovskii was well aware of the contradictory attitude towards him among some members of the old intelligentsia. There were those who could not abide his cooperation with Gor'kii because they considered it as treacherous accommodation with the Bolshevik regime (Hickey 1009: 5). Gippius and Merezhkovskii eventually emigrated to the West. On January 3, 1920, Chukovskii (2011a: 283) recorded in his diary: "The Merezhkovskiis have left."

2.4 WORLD LITERATURE FOR THE MASSES

In tsarist Russia, translation had not been a primary issue. At that time, most consumers of literature were people from the nobility, sophisticated enough to read foreign works in the original language. (Ivanova 2004a: 22.) Due to the massive literacy campaigns launched by the Bolsheviks, however, the number of readers rapidly increased after the 1917 Revolution (Evtuhov & al. 2004: 635). Consequently, a broad new audience emerged for both domestic and foreign literature. In the spirit of internationalist ideals, the new regime took a favorable attitude to translation from the beginning. Access to the cultural treasures of other nations was believed to strengthen the kinship among the workers and peasants of the world. (Friedberg 1997: 208–209.)

The function of Vsemirnaia literatura was to produce high-quality Russian translations of European classics. It also had another, no less important function: to provide jobs for Petrograd's literary intelligentsia. At its best, it employed as many as 350 translators. (Fitzpatrick 2002: 132–133.) The project allowed intellectuals to participate in the enlightening of the masses within a field that was not, at least overtly, connected with politics (Petrovskii 1966: 137). Vsemirnaia literatura was run by Gor'kii as an autonomous department of Narkompros, and, therefore, many intellectuals felt as if they were working for him instead of the Bolsheviks (Clark 1996: 102). The post of chief executive officer at the publishing house was assigned to the writer Aleksander Tikhonov, and a "scholarly board of experts" was nominated to supervise the departments of different languages. Chukovskii, together with Evgenii Zamiatin, was in charge of the Anglo-American department. Other board members included Aleksandr Blok and Nikolai Gumilev, the journalist Andrei Levinson, and the orientalist Sergei Ol'denburg, to name a few. The board assembled

twice a week under Gor'kii's chairmanship. In the beginning, the most acute question to solve was the choice of works that would be published during the next few years. (Chukovskii 2001e: 42; 2008b: 211–212.)

Chukovskii's diary entries during that period manifest his enthusiasm for occupying a key position in such an unequaled project. A nearly euphoric mood seems to have carried him and his colleagues through those long days brimming with various activities. The following diary entry was recorded on October 28, 1918:

Тихонов пригласил меня недели две назад редактировать английскую и американскую литературу для «Издательства Всемирной Литературы при Комиссариате народного просвещения», во главе которого стоит Горький. Вот уже две недели с утра до ночи я в вихре работы. Составление предварительного списка далось мне с колоссальным трудом. Но мне так весело думать, что я могу дать читателям хорошего Стивенсона, О'Генри, Сэмюэля Бетлера, Карлейла, что я работаю с утра до ночи – а иногда и ночи напролет. (Chukovskii 2011a: 230–231.)

Tikhonov invited me a fortnight ago to edit Anglo-American literature for the Publishing House of World Literature of the Commissariat of Education headed by Gorky. I've been at it night and day ever since. Putting together the preliminary list was a colossal job, but it makes me so happy to think that I can give readers a decent Stevenson, O. Henry, Samuel Butler, and Carlyle that I work from dawn till dusk and at times the whole night through. (Erlich 2005: 39.)

While Chukovskii was engaged in the rewarding work at *Vsemirnaia literatura*, the darker side of the new order was already present. Established in December 1917 to eradicate potential counterrevolutionary elements, the secret police Cheka was conducting purposeful and organized state terror (see Evtuhov et al. 2004: 609–610). Jörg Baberowski describes the coercive aspect of the Bolshevik regime as follows:

The Bolsheviks were utterly destructive: they were violent perpetrators determined to put an end to the old world. (Baberowski 2003: 756.)

It seems that the aspect of terror had not yet concretely penetrated into the reality Chukovskii was living in, or rather, that he chose to ignore it at the time. The arrest and execution of Gumilev a couple of years later would be a very concrete manifestation of the Bolsheviks' violent measures (more in Subchapter 4.5.1).

The plan at *Vsemirnaia literatura* was to choose “a few thousand books in all languages of the world” to be translated into Russian. Two series would be published to begin with. One of them would consist of actual volumes, such as novels and anthologies of poetry, while the other one, a special “peasant series” (*narodnaia seriia*) would contain leaflets with a few selected short stories. Designed to suit the needs of the newly literate readers, the latter one was particularly close to Gor'kii's heart. (Chukovskii 2001e: 43, 46.) According to L. L. Neliubin and G. T. Khukhuni (2006: 316–317), the intended number of publications was 1500 volumes in the basic series and 2500 leaflets in the peasant series. As reported by Maurice Friedberg, the corresponding numbers are 1500 and 2000. Friedberg itemizes the

number of volumes: the first was originally 800 but was expanded within a year to 1500. (See Friedberg 1997: 4.)

Besides the production of brand new translations, the action plan of *Vsemirnaia literatura* encompassed the assessment of translations that had been made before the Revolution. Those that did not meet the current standards would be re-edited. (Neliubin & Khukhuni 2006: 317.) There was also an ideological level included in the plan. The premise was that a translation manifested the translator's social origin and political disposition, and, therefore, it was possible that the old translations would not be in harmony with the values of the new democratic society. (Friedberg 1997: 111.)

The *Vsemirnaia literatura* enterprise aroused interest also outside the Soviet Union. In the *Chukokkala* album, Chukovskii writes about an episode of that time related to the "malevolent fabrications" that kept circulating in the foreign press. Therefore the board of the publishing house decided to clear up some misunderstandings by writing a response to one of those newspapers – which one, Chukovskii does not mention. The task was assigned to Gumilev. Judging by the response and by Gumilev's cover letter to the editors, *Vsemirnaia literatura* had been featured abroad as some kind of a propaganda machine harnessing ignorant and uneducated people as instruments for promoting its political interests. Gumilev referred to the "professors, academics and writers" employed at the publishing house, and he particularly emphasized the political neutrality of the editorial board. As a matter of fact, had a sympathetic attitude to the Bolshevik cause been an entry requirement, Gumilev himself would have had no business being a member (about Gumilev, see Subchapter 4.5.1). In the letter, he also sagely noted that it was impossible for somebody living in another country to comprehend the reality in which he and his colleagues were working. He stressed that the only way to save Russian intellectual culture in those "hard and terrible days" was for everybody to continue working in the field he had chosen to pursue before the Revolution. A facsimile of Gumilev's letter is preserved in the *Chukokkala* album, and the letter is also cited in Chukovskii's memoirs about Gumilev. (See Chukovskii 2001e: 445–446; 2008b: 271–273.)

Like many other enterprises of that period, the *Vsemirnaia literatura* project was never finished. In the end, it had managed to produce only approximately 120 publications. (Neliubin & Khukhuni 2006: 321.) The publishing house was officially closed down on December 25, 1924 (Chukovskaia, E. 2011b: 602). By then its activity had gradually dwindled and was practically non-existent at the time of the closure. The cadres of translators had also diminished primarily because of emigration. (Friedberg 1997: 4.) Chukovskii's diary entries of those days speak of despondent moods among the board members. Chukovskii also discloses the primary reason for the closure: the state was going to turn off the money taps and stop subsidizing the publishing house. (See Chukovskii 2011b: 178–182.) Katerina Clark (1996: 188) considers the closing down of *Vsemirnaia literatura* as a symptom of a change of values in Soviet society. The internationalism of the revolutionary era was receding, and some signs of nascent anti-Westernism were already in the air.

The successor of *Vsemirnaia literatura* was the publishing house *Academia*, which remained in operation until it was merged with Gosizdat (State Publishing House) in 1938 (Burnett & Lygo 2013: 21). Bequeathed with the catalogs of *Vsemirnaia literatura*, *Academia* largely followed the original program drafted by Gor'kii (Chukovskii 2001e: 52). Thus, even though the *Vsemirnaia literatura* project was never completed, it still left an impor-

tant legacy for Soviet literature. Moreover, the spectrum of authors and books selected for translation included many titles that later would scarcely – if at all – be published in the Soviet Union (Neliubin & Khukhuni 2006: 317).

Back when the *Vsemirnaia literatura* project was still in its early stages, it soon became obvious that the realization of the ambitious plan would require enormous cadres of qualified employees. Therefore, the publishing house started a studio that taught literary translation. Reminiscing about those days in the foreword to the 1930 edition of *A High Art*, Chukovskii points out that not only was there an urgent need to train more employees, but also to elevate the standard of the already existing ones, which was far from superb. (See Chukovskii 1930: 5.) Too many translators practiced their craft “by luck” (*na “ura”*), “at random” (*naobum*), and “adrift” (*bez rulia i vertil*). Instead of following “scientific principles,” they allowed themselves to be guided by instinct. (Chukovskii 2001e: 53.) Chukovskii put the problem in a nutshell:

Но как осуществить эту программу, если хороших переводчиков мало, а главная их масса невежественна, бездарна, неряшлива? (Chukovskii 2001e: 52.)

But how to carry out this program if there are few good translators, while the majority of them are ignorant, talentless and negligent?

Another problem pertained to ideological principles. Applied to translation, the Marxist ideal of collectivism ruled out any manifestations of individuality. Collective translation would become a standard practice in the Soviet Union, often sadly resulting in uneven quality and the loss of the original style. (Friedberg 1997: 111, 137–138.) At *Vsemirnaia literatura*, the beginning of the practice posed some problems. Gor’kii instantly warmed to the idea (Chukovskii 2011a: 233), but apparently all of the veteran translators did not share his enthusiasm. Chukovskii (2001a: 52) explains their stance by describing them as “soloists” totally incapable of collective work.

The *Vsemirnaia literatura* Studio of Artistic Translation was opened in June 1919. The lecturers were writers, poets, and translators, including, for instance, Gumilev and the poet and translator Mikhail Lozinskii. In the beginning, the studio attracted a large audience, but its program did not proceed as planned. Many of the students were not interested in the subtleties of translation but came primarily to socialize and meet with kindred spirits. Those students included, for instance, the young litterateurs who would later form the Serapion Brotherhood (a literary group active between 1921 and 1925; see e.g. Erlich 1994: 112). The frustrated instructors could only watch their intended classes being transformed into a club of sorts. Furthermore, the Civil War caused the number of those attending the studios to diminish. Some left the starving Petrograd and went to stay in the countryside, whereas some left for the front. Others simply grew bored of the lectures. By the fall of 1919, the activity in the Studio had dwindled off. (Chukovskii 2001e: 54, 377, 390–391.)

After the opening of The House of Arts (see Subchapter 4.3), the Studio was reopened in its premises in a renewed and expanded form (Chukovskii 2001e: 391; 2008b: 326). In a diary entry recorded on November 28, 1919, Chukovskii comments on the occasion as follows:

Вчера мы впервые собрались в новом помещении – мы, т.е. слушатели Студии. Дом искусств их разочаровал. Они ожидали Бог знает чего. (Chukovskii 2011a: 275.)

Yesterday we had our first meeting in the new premises – we, that is the students of the Studio. They were disappointed with The House of Arts. They had been expecting God knows what.

The new Literary Studio took on the mission of teaching some practical skills for beginning writers and poets. However, only few of the students had any serious potential for a literary career. The motley audience encompassed children of uneducated working-class families, keen on becoming initiated into literature, members of the old intelligentsia more or less adrift, and those who merely came to enjoy the comfort of heated premises. (Hickey 2009: 24.) Perhaps these circumstances also affected the motivation of the lecturers. Nikolai Chukovskii (2012: 577) remembers his father starting a seminar on literary criticism but losing interest after only ten meetings.

The House of Arts was closed in the fall of 1922 for financial and bureaucratic reasons, among others (more in Hickey 2009: 275–327). The Literary Studio, with its audience steadily declining, had already disintegrated almost a year before the closure (Hickey 2009: 303, 386).

2.5 THE HIGH ART OF TRANSLATION

The publication of *Vsemirnaia literatura*, a handbook for translators, was released on March 10, 1919. Together with the publishing catalogs (see Subchapter 2.4), it was meant to function as a platform for the publishing house's continuing program. Whereas the catalogs identified which works were to be published in the first place, the handbook defined the quality of the work and the requirements posed on the translations. (Petrovskii 1966: 148.) Titled *Printsipy khudozhestvennogo perevoda* ("The Principles of Artistic Translation"), the first handbook was only a leaflet that contained two articles authored by Chukovskii and Nikolai Gumilev, respectively. Its revised and expanded version was published in 1920. Except for Chukovskii's and Gumilev's articles, the second edition also contained two posthumous articles by another board member, Fedor Batiushkov. The literary scholar and philologist Batiushkov had passed away only a short while earlier – succumbed to starvation, as Chukovskii would later recount in a letter to the journalist Aleksandr Iashchenko (see Chukovskii 2008a: 515).

In the foreword to the 1930 edition of *A High Art*, Chukovskii describes the early stages of the book as follows:

Так как никаких учебников или пособий, посвященных технике художественного перевода, у нас не было – [...] – мне пришлось набросать, хотя бы вкратце, нечто вроде «азбуки для переводчиков», которой я и пользовался в студийной работе. Впоследствии эта «азбука» была напечатана (в очень ограниченном числе экземпляров) в качестве практического руководства для тех переводчиков, которые работали в нашем издательстве. (Chukovskii 1930: 5.)

Since there were no textbooks or anything of the kind about artistic translation – [. . .] – I had to sketch out, however briefly, something like an “ABC Book for translators,” which I would also put to use while working in the Studio. Subsequently, this “ABC Book” was printed (with a very limited number of copies) to function as a practical guide for the translators working in our publishing house.

The handbook of *Vsemirnaia literatura* is the first volume about translation ever written in the Russian language. The previous and, apparently, the only Russian book about the topic was Count Boris Golitsyn’s *Reflexions sur les traducteurs russes* (“Reflections on Russian translators”), which had been published as early as in 1811. However, Golitsyn had written his book in French, which was the language of the nobility at that time and which he probably commanded better than Russian. Golitsyn’s views on the actual subject matter were markedly compliant with the norms of the Classical period of French literature. (Neliubin & Khukhuni 2006: 242.) Therefore, even if the book had been translated into Russian, it is unlikely that it would have been considered applicable to the purposes of *Vsemirnaia literatura*.

Since the 19th century, a standard practice in Russian translations of foreign literature had been that the translator explained his principles and his decisions in the foreword. The discussion about issues connected with translation extended into thick literary journals and often escalated into heated debates. (Neliubin & Khukhuni 2006: 240–241.) A distinctly more theoretical approach to the subject matter was taken by the Symbolist poet Valerii Briusov, who discussed the essence of translation in his article “Fialki v tigele” (“Violets in a Crucible”), published in the journal *Vesy* in 1905. After the handbook of the publishing house *Vsemirnaia literatura*, several other works about translation were published in the 1920s. One of them was written by the translator and scholar Andrei Fedorov, who later would be Chukovskii’s co-author in the 1930 edition of *A High Art*. (See Time 2006: 119.)

Chukovskii was well acquainted with the ideas of the past masters. In the translators’ handbook, he entered into a dialogue with them right away, opening his article as follows:

Переводчик художественной прозы не фотографирует подлинник, а творчески воссоздает его. (Chukovskii 1919: 7; 1920: 24.)

The translator of artistic prose does not photograph the original but creatively reconstructs it.

By the above remark, Chukovskii may be obliquely commenting on the writings of the 19th century writer Afanasii Fet, a well-known advocator of literal translation. Fet had used the photograph metaphor to argue for the exact opposite of Chukovskii’s standpoint, maintaining that even a bad photograph presents a truer representation of Venus de Milo than a verbal description ever could (see Neliubin & Khukhuni 2006: 279).

Chukovskii (1936a: 225) would later cite the above pronouncement of Fet’s in an appendix to *A High Art*. As the source of that piece of information, he (Chukovskii 1936a: 217) names Aleksandr Blok. In his memoirs of *Vsemirnaia literatura*, Chukovskii warmly recollects not only Gor’kii’s but also Blok’s assistance in drafting the notes about the “complex and difficult topic” of translation. By and large, the handbook was, indeed, a product

of collective work. Debates about the contents of the handbook would continue for days on end, but it was Gor'kii who had the final word. Chukovskii explicitly gives credit to Gor'kii for his "most active participation" in the development of *A High Art*. He preserved the first edition of the handbook, the pages of which are filled with Gor'kii's hand-written comments and remarks. (See Chukovskii 2001e: 53, 178.)

Besides the idealization of collective work, another essential element in the Marxist-Leninist ideology was a "scientific" worldview (see e.g. Lovell 2009: 13). Early Soviet culture was heavily influenced by the positivist ideas of two authoritative figures. Those were Anatolii Lunacharskii as the Commissar of Education and Aleksandr Bogdanov as the head of Proletkul't. (Evtuhov & al. 2004: 520–521.) They both belonged to the God-builders (*bogostroiteli*), a group of thinkers that had emerged about a decade before the Revolution. The Godbuilders reasoned that God could only be found by uniting with other individuals. Lunacharskii envisioned the proletariat as a Godbuilder at that very historic moment. Lenin did not agree with the philosophy, which he found "muddled, confused and reactionary." Lunacharskii was, however, convinced that while the Bolsheviks' purely scientific and materialist propaganda might appeal to the proletariat, it would not make the desired impact on the intelligentsia – or on the peasants, either. Instead, they should be enticed to join the ranks by offering them an anthropocentric religion with divinity held by Man. (Fitzpatrick 2002: 4–5.)

Despite Lunacharskii's scepticism, it seems that a large part of the intellectuals quite smoothly adopted the scientific worldview. "Scientific" was the key word also in the *Vsemirnaia literatura* project, and it appears frequently in Chukovskii's memoirs about that period. The reassessment of former translations was supplemented with an ambitious plan:

Нужно было выработать лабораторным путем точные критерии для этой оценки.
(Chukovskii 2001e: 46.)

It was necessary, with the help of laboratorial means, to draw up some precise criteria for this reassessment.

The "scientific" outlook on translation was compatible with the regnant ideology, but it was not an entirely new notion. Back in the 18th century, the attitude to translation had been quite pragmatic.² In the meantime, however, the Golden Age of Russian literature and particularly the trend of Romanticism had shifted the emphasis to artistic and creative aspects (see Neliubin & Khukhuni 2006: 240).

Chukovskii's (1919: 7–8) reflections on the translator's role are obliquely commented in Batiushkov's article in the 1920 edition of the handbook. Batiushkov does not mention any names, but he is quite obviously referring to Chukovskii's use of metaphors. Considering that the handbook was compiled as a collective work, Batiushkov almost certainly

² Due to Russia's expanded contacts with foreign countries, scientific and technical texts made up a significant part of the translations. By a special decree, Tsar Peter the Great demanded from translators faithful renderings of the original. Year 1735 saw the founding of the Russian Assembly (*Rossiiskoe sobranie*; see also Neliubin & Khukhuni 2006: 217), the first Russian professional organization of translators. It selected books to be translated, determined some general rules for translators, and produced reviews of their translations. It was also involved in professional training. (Komissarov 2011: 519.) All things considered, its agenda appears to have had many similarities with that of the publishing house *Vsemirnaia literatura*.

knew that the passage would remain unaltered in the new edition – just like Chukovskii almost certainly was familiar with the contents of Batiushkov’s article.

Batiushkov (1920: 14) agrees with Chukovskii about the basic difference between translation and photography (see Subchapter 2.5) but calls to question another one of his notions. Chukovskii characterizes a translator as follows:

Он такой же служитель искусства, как актер, ваятель или живописец. (Chukovskii 1919: 7.)

He is a similar servant of art as an actor, sculptor or painter.

Batiushkov notes that unlike a translator, a sculptor and a painter are free to pursue their personal creativity. Even an actor, albeit bound to the lines written by the playwright, has a various range of possibilities when creating his character. To justify his argument, Batiushkov mentions the name of the main character in Shakespeare’s play *Othello* as an example. He points out that there are virtually as many Othellos as there are actors who play the role. What, in Batiushkov’s opinion, distinguishes a translator from an actor is that a translator is not allowed similar liberties in the reconstruction (*vossozhdanie*) of the original. (See Batiushkov 1920: 14–15.)

As it turns out from the above discussion, the cardinal difference between Chukovskii and Batiushkov was connected with the translator’s artistic freedom. In the 1930s, the juxtaposition between free and literal translation would become intensely saturated with ideological issues (see Witt 2013: 160), but in the revolutionary years such theoretic notions were only beginning to take shape. It is quite possible that the conflict between Chukovskii and Batiushkov concerned different approaches to authoring rather than different notions about translation. A philologist and a scholar, Batiushkov was probably accustomed to precise and unambiguous expression, whereas Chukovskii was quite the opposite type of author. Pespicious and linguistically gifted, he was also colorful, impulsive, and prone to ambiguity – sometimes to the point of inconsequence. Batiushkov may simply have approached Chukovskii’s text too analytically to appreciate its general idea, which does not, in fact, seem to differ from his own as much as his comments suggest.

In the 1941 edition of *A High Art*, Chukovskii returns to the issue. He introduces the topic by citing Batiushkov’s article, then goes straight for the kill:

Это возражение проф. Батюшкова оказывается несостоятельным при первом же соприкосновении с фактами. (Chukovskii 1941: 35.)

Professor Batiushkov’s rebuttal crumbles at the very first contact with the facts. (Leighton 1984: 43.)

Chukovskii (1941: 35) continues by adducing his counter-arguments, the main point of which is that every translator truly creates the translation as individually as an actor creates his role. Just as there are different Othellos depending on the actor (see above), there are different versions of the “Lay of Igor’s Campaign” (*Slovo o Polku Igoreve*, an old Slavic epic poem; M.S.), depending on the translator.

Chukovskii's somewhat bizarre one-sided debate with his former, "nice and estimable" (*milyi i pochtennyi*; see Chukovskii 2001d: 58) confrère in the Vsemirnaia literatura board would continue for decades after the latter's death. The passage is missing from the 1964 edition but reappears in the 1966 (pp. 285–286) and 1968 (pp. 51–52) editions. It is possible that even after all those years Chukovskii was still smarting from the older professor's veiled criticism. Miron Petrovskii (1966: 146), on the other hand, suggests that Chukovskii's conduct was not motivated by personal pride or vanity but by the urgency of the issue. That which was under dispute was the translator's artistic individuality, in other words, the very "artistry of artistic translation."

As the author of *A High Art*, Chukovskii is sometimes called a "translation theorist," whereas others consider the study *Teoriia i praktyka perekladu* ("Theory and Practice of Translation," 1929) by the Ukrainian translator and scholar Oleksandr Finkel' to be the first actual work on translation theory published in the Soviet Union (see e.g. Chernetsky 2011: 45). It might, indeed, be more fitting to speak about Chukovskii as a "translation critic" or a "translation essayist." In *A High Art*, he does not offer a coherent, logically determined theory of translation but rather ideas, opinions, and advice – although particularly on linguistic matters, he is often extremely precise. Of course, one can always question how exhaustive a theory is possible in the first place about subject matter that always involves a certain amount of interpretation.

In 1964, Chukovskii apparently felt safe enough to include in the foreword to *A High Art* the following remark:

Я не лингвист, не ученый. Книга моя – сочинение литератора, литературного критика, а это огромная разница. Там, где ученый беспристрастно устанавливает закономерности изучаемых фактов, критик радуется, негодует, грустит. Он от всей души ненавидит плохое искусство и бурно восхищается талантливым. (Chukovskii 1964: 8.)

I am not a linguist or a scholar. This book is written by a man of letters and literary critic, and this makes a great difference. Where the scholar impartially establishes the general principles of phenomena under study, the critic expresses joy, dissatisfaction, sorrow. He hates bad art with his very soul and expressly admires those who are talented [*sic*]. (Leighton 1984: 7–8.)

The above remark indicates that in the winter of his life, Chukovskii acknowledged having, in actual fact, pursued his critic's vocation throughout his life. In the case of *A High Art*, that vocation found its manifestation in the guise of translation studies. In the forewords to every 1960s edition of *A High Art*, Chukovskii (1964: 5; 1966: 241; 1968: 8) provides a list of scholars – Fedorov among them – whose writings he recommends as reading material for those who are looking for a theoretical approach to translation. This also implies that the book at hand is intended to belong to a different genre altogether.

In the course of decades, the article Chukovskii once wrote for the translators' handbook grew into the essay collection known as *A High Art*. In 1930, it was published as a notably expanded version in an anthology coauthored with Fedorov. Independent editions of Chukovskii's *A High Art* were published during his lifetime in 1936, 1941, 1964, 1966, and 1968. Between the last two editions, passages of the book were removed by the censor

(more in Subchapter 4.3.3). The first unabridged version was published posthumously in 2001 (see Chukovskii 2001c). The 1930 and 1936 editions were, in fact, published under the title *The Art of Translation (Iskusstvo perevoda)*, but for the sake of consistency, in the present study they, too, are referred to as editions of *A High Art*.

2.6 OCCUPATIONAL HAZARDS

After the Revolution, literary criticism in its former sense ceased to exist (see Subchapter 2.2). Members of the old intelligentsia saw their earlier accomplishments being considered as evidence of their fraternization with the exploiting class. For Chukovskii and many of his colleagues, formerly published texts became a potential threat because they were now assessed according to new criteria. Pre-revolutionary articles and reviews were combed for signs of neglect of the interests of the proletariat or of partiality to the bourgeoisie. For Chukovskii, a real danger was posed by his close connections with the Kadet party (see Subchapter 2.1). Kadets were among the Bolshevik's first targets in their hunt for "counter-revolutionary" elements in society. (Ivanova 2004a: 7–8.)

The Kadets were also the first group to be officially proclaimed as "enemies of the people" (Hosking 1992: 55). During the Civil War, mass arrests of Kadets were conducted. At the same time, the entire old intelligentsia, professors, scholars, and other cultural figures were persecuted. The campaign had the firm support of Lenin, who in a letter to Gor'kii insisted that not only Kadets but also "quasi-Kadets" should all be arrested. (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 8.) Even though Chukovskii never was a member of the party, his contribution to *Rech'* and his friendship with its editor Iosif Gessen (see Ivanova 2009: 15) could easily have rendered him a "quasi-Kadet" in the eyes of the regime. The Kadet stigma would remain with Chukovskii throughout his life (see also Subchapter 2.7).

Chukovskii's diary contains mentions of his contribution to *Rech'* (see e.g. Chukovskii 2011a: 140), but no comments are made about his employment by the journal or about his relationship with its editors – unless, for the purpose of self-preservation, he has at some point removed them. When the border between Russia and Finland was closed, a great part of Chukovskii's archives was left at his Kuokkala dacha. Only in 1925 did he manage to obtain permission to travel to Finland and collect what remained of his papers. Returning to the Soviet Union, he chose to leave behind some potentially compromising documents, for instance, those associated with his visit to England in 1916 (see Subchapter 2.1). By then, several members of the delegation had already emigrated to the West. Chukovskii also discarded a number of letters, for instance, those sent by Iosif Gessen. (Ivanova 2008: 7–14.)

The myth of the "liberal 1920s" has long persisted in Soviet cultural history (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 88). The years of NEP (*Novaia ekonomicheskaiia politika* or New Economic Policy) have usually been referred to as a relatively free and pluralist period. However, there were already discernible signs of a centripetal tendency, and the emerging of large umbrella organizations for the creative arts in the early 1920s marked the beginning of cultural centralization. The All-Russian Union of Writers (*Vserossiiskii soiuz pisatelei* or VSP) was established in 1920. Its most prominent posts were given to members of the old intelligentsia – Chukovskii among them. The year 1921 saw the founding of the more ag-

gressive All-Russian Association of Proletarian Writers (Vserossiiskaia associatsiia proletarskikh pisatelei or VAPP). The new association championed the elimination of all individual literary movements and adopted a particularly vicious attitude to the so-called fellow-travelers. (Clark 1996: 144, 152, 185, 335n40.)

The term "fellow-traveler" (*poputchik*) was used by Lev Trotskii in his work *Literatura i revoliutsiia*. It referred to "non-proletarian, non-party literary figures who cooperated with the Soviet regime." (David-Fox 2012: 208, 360n2; see also Subchapter 2.1.) The term was soon adopted into political language and literary criticism (Kornienko 2011: 19), and it was used in Soviet public discussion until the early 1930s (Dobrenko 2011: 48).

During the first half of the 1920s, the Party maneuvered a balancing act between the fellow-travelers and the more aggressive proletarian writers. The position of the former group was bolstered by a Central Committee resolution in 1925, titled "On Party policy in the sphere of literature." In the resolution, it was stated that while the proletariat can be considered as experts when it comes to the social and political issues connected with literature, the issue of style and artistic form is "infinitely more complex." Therefore, cooperation between different literary groups should be essential in the literary policy. (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 4–5, 42.) The fellow-travelers were commented as follows:

With regard to fellow-travelers, we must bear in mind: (1) their differentiation; (2) the significance of many of them as highly qualified "specialists" in literary technique; (3) the reluctance present among this stratum of writers. The general directive here must be a directive of a tactical and cautious attitude toward them, i.e., an approach that will ensure all the conditions for their speediest possible switch to the side of Communist ideology. (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 42–43.)

The equilibrium brought by the 1925 resolution was broken some years later, as during the Cultural Revolution (see below), proletarian writers were made "the bulwark of the Party in the 'Bolzhevization of literature'" (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 5, 49).

One indication of the tightening Party control over cultural matters in the 1920s was the establishment of various new government bureaus. The Soviet censorial board Glavlit (Glavnoe upravlenie po delam literatury i izdatel'stv or "Main Administration for Literary and Publishing Affairs") was founded in 1922, but the regime deployed also other, more subtle strategies. For instance, the distribution of subsidies and even the distribution of paper was controlled by the state. The role of the Party in the cultural life steadily increased. (Clark 1996: 144–145.)

In a diary entry recorded on December 6, 1921, Chukovskii recounts an event in honor of the memory of Nekrasov. His description of the atmosphere at the event attests the omnipresence of Soviet bureaucracy in cultural life:

Вчера в оперном зале Народного Дома состоялся митинг, посвященный Некрасову по случаю столетия со дня его рождения. Я бежал с этого митинга в ужасе. [. . .] [. . .]? о Боже! когда мы пришли в оперный зал Народного Дома – всюду был тот полицейский, казенный, вульгарный тон, который связан с комиссарами. (Chukovskii 2011a: 367–368.)

Yesterday there was a celebration of the hundredth anniversary of Nekrasov's birth in the concert hall of the People's House. I fled in horror. < . . . > From the moment we entered, we could feel the vulgar, official, police-station atmosphere associated with the commissars. (Erlich 2005: 97.)

In Chukovskii's professional life, the early 1920s were an exceptionally difficult period, which, naturally, undermined his financial situation. Continuing as a critic was no longer an option. Furthermore, he had many enemies – possibly even more than he realized at the time. That posed a threat, because petty disagreements could easily grow out of proportion and lead to sinister consequences. The very possibility of acquiring work assignments depended on amicable relationships with the right people, and Chukovskii's career seemed to have reached a dead end. (Ivanova 2004a: 13–14; 2009: 7, 9.) Chukovskii's mood is illustrated the following comment, recorded in his diary on December 25, 1925:

Я бывший критик, бывший человек и т. д. (Chukovskii 2011b: 250.)

I'm a former critic, a former person, and so on. (Erlich 2005: 176.)

In the spring of 1928, the NEP period quite suddenly ended at the onset of Stalin's First Five-Year Plan and the launching of his Cultural Revolution, which in practice meant a relentless proletarian class war against the old "bourgeois" intelligentsia. In that same year, VAPP was renamed the Russian Association of Proletarian Writers (Rossiiskaia assosiatsiia proletarskikh pisatelei or RAPP). Already leading the battle against the so-called rightist elements in arts and scholarship, the association now became the Party's main instrument for distributing power over cultural matters. Between 1928 and 1932, the association had almost total dictatorship over literary criticism and publication. When Lunacharskii resigned from his post in 1929, the old intelligentsia lost a long-time protector at Narkompros. For non-party writers, getting published became extremely difficult. (Fitzpatrick 1992: 112, 137, 240.)

Already before that, tight state censorship had posed an impediment to their work. On January 21, 1928, Chukovskii commented on the situation in his diary as follows:

Но мы в тисках такой цензуры, которой никогда на Руси не бывало, это верно. В каждой редакции, в каждом издательстве сидит свой собственный цензор, и их идеал – казенное славословие, доведенное до ритуала. (Chukovskii 2011b: 349.)

But what is beyond doubt is that we are in the grips of a censorship the likes of which Russia has never known: every editorial board, every publishing house has its censor, and their goal is a ritualized glorification of officialdom. (Erlich 2005: 218.)

Of course, Chukovskii had no way of knowing what the future had in store. With the wisdom of experience, Nadezhda Mandel'stam, the wife of the poet Osip Mandel'shtam (see Subchapter 4.5.1), would later remark in her memoirs that censorship is, in fact, "a sign of relative freedom of the press," not fatal to literature itself. That which was coming was much more dangerous. Stalin's editorial apparatus would reject anything that "did not explicitly meet the State's wishes." (See Mandel'stam 1999: 261.)

The Soviet writer learned to cope by becoming his own censor (see Dobrenko 2001: xviii). Irina Sandomirskaja describes the effect of the long tradition of censorship on Russian literary language as follows:

Affecting all forms of public expression without exception, censorship was not only implemented by appointed officials but also performed through the so-called 'inner editor': self-censorship, a form of cultural competence that belonged to the writers, their experience and intuitive knowledge in the process of writing as to what kind of utterances can or cannot be accepted by the future censor. (Sandomirskaja 2015: 63.)

The publishing process of the *Chukokkala* album illustrates the sensitivity of Soviet writers to the prevailing rules. When the album went through censorship for its first publication in 1979, the majority of those entries that were removed had been written in the 1920s. Elena Chukovskaia (2008: 556) explains the phenomenon by pointing out that in the 1930s, "writers already knew better than to make imprudent jokes even in a private album."

Soviet literature under RAPP took a distinct new direction, which would eventually be concretized in the many cultural institutions that emerged after the founding of the Union of Soviet Writers (see Subchapter 2.7). RAPP banned nearly all publication of Russian émigré writers in the Soviet Union as well as the publication of Soviet writers abroad. It also systematically intimidated and demoralized fellow-traveler writers in the Soviet Union. (Dobrenko 2011: 46–48.)

The 1925 Party resolution (see above) provides an image that the fellow-travelers were perceived as a group of strayed sheep that, by gentle guidance, could easily be moved into the Communist herd. From the part of RAPP, they now were met by a considerably more aggressive attitude. Some fellow-travelers, for instance Evgenii Zamiatin (see also Subchapter 4.5.2) and Boris Pil'niak, became targets of vicious campaigns. One of the favorite slogans of RAPP was "Not a fellow-traveler, but an ally or a foe" (*Ne poputchik, no soiuznik ili vrag*). Thus, Chukovskii, together with many of his colleagues, had now become a "foe." (Dobrenko 2011: 46–48.)

There were those who denied Chukovskii even the status of a fellow-traveler. In the First All-Russian Conference on Children's Literature in 1931, Ivan Razin (the head of the children's section of the publishing house Molodaia Gvardiia; M.S.) classified Soviet writers in three categories: the bourgeois, the fellow-traveler, and the proletarian writers. Chukovskii was included among the bourgeois writers because he, in Razin's words, "based his work on the childish language of a bourgeois child and on its formation and absurdities while scorning contemporary themes." (Petrovskii 1966: 201–201.)

Attacks against Chukovskii's children's rhymes had already begun in the 1920s, and they would continue for two decades, at times abating only to intensify anew. In the press, they became known as the battle against *chukovshchina* ("Chukovskii-ism;" translation borrowed from Chukovskaia, L. 1981: 132–133). (Ivanova 2009: 10–11.)

In Russian language, the suffix *-shchina* has traditionally been used for composing a derogatory notion out of a proper name (Petrov 2015: 56). Well-known examples of such compositions are *ezhovshchina* and *zhdanovshchina*, derived from the names of Nikolai Ezhov (see Subchapter 2.7) and Andrei Zhdanov (see Subchapter 4.2). In connection with

Chukovskii's fairy tales, the word "Chukovskii-ism" came to mean "anthropomorphism, apoliticalness, and a flight from the questions of daily life" (Chukovskaia, L. 1981: 132; about the battle, see below).

In the diary entry recorded on December 25, 1925 (see above), Chukovskii describes the contradictory situation he found himself in as follows:

Как критик я принужден молчать, ибо критика у нас теперь рапповская, судят не по талантам, а по партбилетам. Сделали меня детским писателем. Но позорные истории с моими детскими книгами – их замалчивание, травля, улюлюкание, запрещения их цензурой – заставили меня сойти и с этой арены. (Chukovskii 2011b: 250.)

I'm forced into silence as a critic, because RAPP has taken over criticism and they judge by Party card rather than talent. They've made me a children's writer. But the shameful way they've treated my children's books – the persecution, the mockery, the suppression, and finally the censors' determination to ban them – has forced me to abandon that arena as well. (Erlich 2005: 175–176.)

The first actual campaign against Chukovskii began in February 1928, when *Pravda* published an article titled "О Крокодиле К. Чуковского" ("About K. Chukovskii's 'Crocodile'") by Lenin's widow Nadezhda Krupskaya, who directed the pedagogic section of GUS (Gosudarstvennyi Uchenyi Soviet or "State Council of Scholars"). Krupskaya excoriated the fairy tale as "bourgeois trash" (*burzhuaznaia mut'*). She also argued that it had been intended as a "parody of Nekrasov." Articles that appeared in *Pravda* – or *Izvestiia* – were generally given particular prestige. If a writer was decried in either one of them, he would be removed from the lists of the publishing houses for a long time, and his already existing books would be prohibited. Krupskaya's article set forth a veritable witch-hunt against Chukovskii. His fairy tales were saved from total banning only by the authority of Gor'kii, who wrote a letter to the editors of *Pravda* protesting Krupskaya's article. At that time, Gor'kii was staying in Italy, but Chukovskii's daughter Lidiia had sent him a letter and requested his help. Also the Union of Soviet Writers came forward to defend Chukovskii. (Chukovskaia, E. 2001a: 572, 581; 2001b: 633–634.)

Gor'kii's love for the fairy tale played an important part in the survival of the genre in the 1930s Soviet Union (see O'Dell 2010: 13). Marina Balina (2005: 107) notes that Gor'kii's speech at the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers in 1934 (see Subchapter 2.7) "signaled the fairy tale's ideological rehabilitation." Chukovskii would, however, acquire his iconic status as one of the "founding fathers" of Soviet children's literature only after Stalin's death (Kelly 2007: 135–136).

Despite all the appeals, the battle against Chukovskii-ism was not quelled. It continued for years, and its ultimate goal was to remove Chukovskii's fairy tales from Soviet children's literature once and for all. Several prominent pedagogues and critics pronounced Chukovskii-ism harmful to children (Chukovskaia, L. 2003: 108n2). The last large-scale campaign took place in 1944–1946, and after that, Chukovskii never wrote for children again. (Chukovskaia, E. 2001a: 572–573.) More details of the campaigns are recorded for instance in Elena Chukovskaia's (2001a: 572–593) commentary to Chukovskii's collected

fairy tales. Many scholars have touched on the topic, among them Ben Hellman (2013) in his study *Fairy Tales and True Stories: The History of Russian Literature for Children and Young People (1574 – 2010)*, and Mariia Obukhova (2007) in her dissertation *K. I. Chukovskii i S. Ia. Marshak v kontekste biografii i avtobiograficheskoi prozy*.

Chukovskii apparently became a scapegoat for any phenomena in children's literature that did not meet the stipulations of the "inveterate" pedagogues, so distant from art," as Chukovskii (2011b: 345) characterizes Krupskaia in his diary. For instance in 1929, a group of Leningrad critics and children's writers signed a statement proclaiming that Soviet children's literature was in danger of slipping into the hands of the class enemy, which was led by the "bourgeois" writer Kornei Chukovskii (Hellman 2013: 361). From today's viewpoint, some details related to the campaign seem ludicrous. Chukovskii's criticizers argued for instance that the fairy tale *Mukha-Tsokotukha* not only reflected tsarist values but also contained sexual implications (Chukovskaia, E. 2001a: 576). (See also Subchapter 3.2.)

Of all the humiliations suffered during the campaign against Chukovskii-ism, one particular incident would remain to haunt Chukovskii in his declining years. On December 30, 1929 *Literaturnaia gazeta* ("The Literary Gazette") published an article titled "K sporam o detskoi literature" ("Debates about Children's Literature") by David Khanin, who directed the children's section of Gosizdat. The main part of the article contained an "announcement sent to Gosizdat by the children's writer Kornei Chukovskii." In the announcement, Chukovskii denounced his earlier books and pledged to move on to new, different forms and themes.

Я понял, что таких книг больше писать нельзя, что самые формы, которые я ввел в литературу исчерпаны. Эти формы были когда-то изобретены мною, но теперь они усвоены всеми и понемногу становятся достоянием халтурщиков. Нужно отдать все свои силы на создание новых книг, адресованных другому читателю. Этот читатель весь живет завтрашним днем, ему нужны книги о будущем, книги для будущего. (Chukovskii 1929.)

I realized that such books should no more be written, that the very forms that I introduced into literature have been exhausted. I once contrived those forms, but now they have been adopted by everybody, and little by little they are becoming the property of hacks. One must devote all one's might to creating new books addressed to different readers. That reader lives entirely in the morrow and needs books about the future, books for the future.

The underlying causes of the incident are recorded in an appendix to Chukovskii's (2011c: 505–506) diary, written in 1968. It turns out that in a weak moment, Chukovskii yielded to a "tempter," in other words, Khanin, and allowed himself to be pressured into signing the already drafted announcement. The opening words of the entry betray how painful the issue was to Chukovskii even after all those years:

Мне хочется записать об одном моем малодушном поступке. (Chukovskii 2011c: 505.)

I want to write about an act of cowardice I committed. (Erllich 2005: 564.)

It is obvious that shame and remorse lingered in Chukovskii's mind, even though some external details may have been forgotten. In the memoir, he (Chukovskii 2011c: 505) situates the incident in the 1930s, but the correct date is provided in Lidiia Chukovskaia's (2011c: 582) commentary. Probably due to the mistakenly remembered time, Chukovskii reminisces having promised henceforth to write only "in the spirit of Socialist Realism." In the announcement, he did not explicitly mention Socialist Realism – which, in fact, was introduced as a term in 1932 and canonized only in 1934 (see e.g. Clark 2000: 27). Instead, he promised to write about topics related to agriculture and the countryside:

В числе книг, которые я наметил для своей «пяtilетки» первое место занимает теперь. «Детская колхозия». (Для детей от 10—12 лет).

[. . .] *Это книга для современной деревни, вернее, для деревни ближайшего будущего.* (Chukovskii 1929.)

Among the books I have outlined for my own "Five-Year Plan," the primary position is occupied by

"Children's Kolkhoz" (for 10—12 years old children).

[. . .] *It is a book for the present-day countryside, for the countryside of the near future.*

Apparently, Chukovskii had signed the announcement in the belief that it would remain within the walls of Gosizdat. When he learned that Khanin was going to make it public, he tried to retract it but it was already too late. What Chukovskii calls his "apostasy" became common knowledge, and to make matters worse, it brought him no advantage whatsoever. Instead, he was constantly being pressured to produce "sound ideological works." Moreover, many of those whom he had considered as friends now avoided him. (Chukovskii 2011c: 506.) The act of renouncement alone may have disappointed some of Chukovskii's peers, and particularly the reference to "hacks" probably outraged many children's writers.

The appendix in Chukovskii's diary ends with the following conclusion:

И с той поры раз навсегда взял себе за правило: не поддаваться никаким увещаниям омерзительных Ханиных, темных и наглых бандитов, выполняющих волю своих атаманов. (Chukovskii 2011c: 506.)

From then on I made it a rule never to give in to the exhortations of our despicable, brazen, benighted bandit Khanins doing their bosses' bidding. (Erllich 2005: 565.)

Incidentally, the book *Children's Kolkhoz* was never realized (Chukovskaia, E. 2011c: 582).

There are no entries in Chukovskii's diary between mid-November 1929 and mid-April 1930, so, unfortunately, no comments about the incident were recorded at the time it took place. In June 1930, two entries appear in Chukovskii's (2011b: 404—405; see Subchapter 4.5.2) diary that suggest that he possibly felt insecure and threatened, and considered it wise to cover his back, so to speak. Those entries are filled with unrestrained praise of Stalin, Lenin, and the kolkhoz establishment (more in Subchapter 4.5.2). Victor Erllich (2005: xiv—xv) remarks that such "dismayingly conformist" passages indicate that

"the diarist did not dare to face, let alone commit to paper, profoundly unsettling truths." Erlich continues by citing the writer Veniamin Kaverin, who, in his introduction to Chukovskii's diary, calls attention to an entry in which Chukovskii describes a "wonderful" conversation with his friend, the former Serapion Brother Mikhail Slonimskii. Reportedly, the two litterateurs agreed that censorship and other current obstacles were only teething problems, and despite these problems both felt lucky to be "Soviet writers." Kaverin remarks that "only fear could dictate in the thirties so ultra-loyal a sentiment." (See Kaverin 2011: 9–10) The diary entry in question (see Chukovskii 2011b: 41) was, in fact, recorded already in May 26, 1922, but, as Erlich (2005: xv) points out, that in no way invalidates Kaverin's observation. In the 1930s, a house search with the confiscation of all notes and documents was a credible possibility, and Chukovskii must certainly have taken that into consideration. Composing passages for humoring the censors might have been a survival strategy.

There is also the possibility that Chukovskii has used Aesopian language in his diary, in other words, created a covert "subtext" beneath the visible text. (Aesopian language and subtexts are further discussed in Subchapter 3.2.) Aleksandr Lavrov suggests that he mastered the use of that literary device already as a young litterateur:

Статьи Чуковского 1900-х гг. всецело погружены в литературную атмосферу той эпохи, в них множество полемических выпадов и подтекстов, множество цитат, явных и скрытых, аллюзий, реминисценций, каламбуров и намеков, зачастую ускользающих от внимания даже просвещенных специалистов. (Lavrov 2003.)

Chukovskii's articles from the 1900s are completely saturated with the atmosphere of that epoch, they contain a number of polemical attacks and subtexts, a number of quotations, both overt and hidden, allusions, reminiscences, puns and innuendos that often go unnoticed even by expert specialists.

In the early 20th century, the above literary devices probably served a somewhat different function than they would a few decades later. In many cases, it may have been an intellectual game of sorts among those who had the literary erudition to participate in it. During the Soviet era, resorting to subtexts had more to do with survival, both literally and figuratively. They provided a kind of a bridge between that which cannot be said and that which cannot be left unsaid.

In the early 1930s, Chukovskii published two books about the 19th century radical writer Vasilii Sleptsov (see Subchapter 3.1). The royalties from those books probably provided a welcome supplement to Chukovskii's income while the fate of his children's books was uncertain because of the campaigns. In a letter to the bibliographer N. A. Rubakin in December 1929, he frets about the difficulty in finding someone to publish his books. He, however, mentions one book that came out just "the other day." The book he is referring to is *A High Art*, although the official year of publication is 1930 (see Subchapter 4.1). (See Chukovskii 2009: 178.)

Meanwhile, the battle against Chukovskii-ism went on. In a letter to Gor'kii in April 1930, Chukovskii laments:

[. . .], так как из детской литературы я уже изгнан совсем. Педагоги выдумали какого-то несуществующего злодея-Чуковского, приписали ему множество пороков и с удовольствием бьют его изо дня в день. (Chukovskii 2009: 182.)

[. . .], because from children's literature I've been banished entirely. The pedagogs have invented some non-existent villain-Chukovskii, attributed to him a number of vices, and take pleasure in beating him day after day.

The much-maligned *Krokodil* eventually came out in 1937 (see Tarasenkov & Turchinskii 2004: 727). It should have been published two years earlier, but the project turned into a long, ludicrous battle with the censors. Over and over, Chukovskii was accused of hiding political innuendos in the fairy tale, and of siding with the bourgeoisie. The frustrating course of events is recorded in Chukovskii's (2011b: 550–555) diary, up to the laconic statement: *Krokodil* banned entirely."

It is, however, noteworthy that Chukovskii's children's books were steadily published throughout the 1930s. With the exception of year 1932, several of them came out every year. During the course of the decade, for instance, the fairy tale *Moidodyr* was published nine times, *Telefon* six times, and *Mukha-Tsokotukha* five times altogether. (See Tarasenkov & Turchinskii 2004: 727–728, 730–735.) It appears that the public rebukes notwithstanding, the Soviet authorities recognized the true value of Chukovskii's talent and his significance to Soviet children's literature.

In his biography of Stalin, the historian Oleg V. Khlevniuk describes leader's treatment of writers followingly:

Even Soviet literary lions faced ideological tongue-lashings. All were made aware of their vulnerability and utter dependence on the government's favor. (Khlevniuk 2015: 95.)

Concern for Soviet children's sense of reality (see Chukovskaia, L. 1981: 132) may have been only one aspect in the disparagement targeted at Chukovskii. Perhaps the ultimate objective was to keep him on his toes and, thereby, to hold control over him.

2.7 SURVIVING THE 1930S

When the battle against Chukovskii-ism was at its worst, Chukovskii was uncomfortably reminded of his past liaisons with the Kadets. In 1931, the influential critic and journalist Viacheslav Polonskii made a point of informing the head of Gosizdat, Vasilii Solov'ev about this. Until then, Solov'ev had apparently been unaware of Chukovskii's connections with the party. The editor-in-chief of *Novyi Mir*, Polonskii was generally known as a protector of fellow-travelers, which further highlights the personal nature of the denunciation. (Ivanova 2004a: 8, 14.) In the worst case, the disclosure could have put Chukovskii in a very precarious position. A "dubious political past" was one of the unpardonable crimes in the 1930s (Fitzpatrick 2000: 115; see also Subchapter 4.2).

Another, more public attack came nine years later from the part of Viktor Shklovskii. In his book about Maiakovskii (*O Maiakovskom*. M.: Sovetskii pisatel'), published in 1940,

Shklovskii recalled Chukovskii's collaboration with the Kadets. He had, in fact, devoted an entire chapter to a negative review of his long-time colleague and friend, but what most outraged Chukovskii was that in the book, he was introduced as a "critic of the newspaper *Rech'*." (See Chukovskaia, L. 2003: 263—264; Chukovskii 2009: 309.) In a letter to his daughter Lidiia in June 1940, Chukovskii comments on Shklovskii's review:

О Шкловском скажу: неожиданный мерзавец. Читая его доносы, я испытывал жалость к нему. То, что напечатано, есть малая доля того, что он написал обо мне. По требованию Союза выброшено несколько страниц. Шкл<овский> знает, что я не стану «вспоминать» о его прошлом, и потому безбоязненно «вспоминает» о моем. Но хорош и Союз, который разрешает печатать обо мне такие гадости! (Chukovskaia, L. 2003: 263; Chukovskii 2009: 308.)

About Shklovskii I say: an astonishing bastard. Reading his denunciations, I felt pity for him. That which was published is only a small part of what he has written about me. On demand by the Writers' Union, some pages were left out. Shklovskii knows that I will not "reminisce" about his past, and therefore he fearlessly "reminisces" about mine. But how can the Union let him publish such filth about me!

Mentioning Shklovskii's past, Chukovskii is probably referring to his membership in the Socialist Revolutionaries (Sotsialisty Revoliutsionery or the SRs). The largest political organization in Russia at the time, it was the leading party in the Provisional government formed after the February Revolution (Evtuhov et al. 2004: 527—528, 587, 601). After the Bolshevik coup d'état, the Socialist Revolutionaries, along with other moderate parties, were ousted from the government. Their newspapers, as well as those of the Kadets, were closed down, and some delegates of both parties were arrested. During the Civil War, the Socialist Revolutionaries attempted to seize power from the Bolsheviks. They managed to provoke risings in the new capital Moscow and in some other cities, and they even established a shadow cabinet in the city of Samara. Their growing popularity did not go unnoticed by the Bolsheviks, and in 1921, their most prominent members were imprisoned. Suspicion against the Socialist Revolutionaries lingered for a long time, even after Stalin came to power. It was manifested, for instance, in the notorious Shakhty trial, in which a group of engineers were tried in 1928. Among the multitude of charges presented in the trial, one was an alleged conspiracy of some of the defendants with the Socialist Revolutionaries in overthrowing the Soviet regime. (See Hosking 1992: 55—56, 63, 90, 173—174.)

In 1919, Shklovskii had been given a personal amnesty for his cooperation with the Socialist Revolutionaries, and, after that, he refrained from political activity (Jansen 1982: 48). In 1921, he emigrated to Berlin but returned to the Soviet Union in 1923 (Lanin 1998: 50). After his return, he was allowed to continue his work without being harassed any more than the literary intelligentsia was harassed in general. In the mid-1930s, the situation changed inasmuch as he became a target in the campaign against Formalism (see Subchapter 4.2). (See Fitzpatrick 1992: 53, 201.) During the subsequent years, many writers were arrested and executed, often without conclusive grounds (more in Subchapter 4.5.1). Therefore it would be quite understandable that Shklovskii felt he was dangling on the edge. His backstabbing Chukovskii the way he did may have been an effort to turn the

attention of the Soviet authorities away from his own past. In that case, as Chukovskii suggests, Shklovskii was counting on his integrity, convinced that a counter-attack of a similar scale would not be likely.

The length of the memory of the Soviet authorities is illustrated in the way Shklovskii is referred to in a report about political disposition among writers that the secret police drafted in 1943. His name is complemented with the epithet “former Socialist Revolutionary” (see Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 358). As for Chukovskii, the Kadet stigma still stuck to him in 1962, when he was nominated as a candidate for the Lenin prize (see Subchapter 2.2). A group of old Bolsheviks wrote a letter of protest to the nomination committee. The undersigned were outraged over the prestigious candidature being handed to the “chameleon and bungler” (*khameleon i putanik*) Chukovskii. One of the offenses presented in the letter was Chukovskii’s past activity as the “literary robot” (*literaturnyi robot*) of the Kadet Party. The appeal was, however, outvoted, as the majority of the committee recommended that Chukovskii be granted the prize. (Chukovskii 2005: 706–710; see also Mel’gunov 2005: 13–14.)

In 1932, a Politburo resolution abolished all independent writers’ organizations, specifically RAPP. To replace them, the Union of Soviet Writers (*Soiuz pisatelei SSSR*, hereinafter referred to as the Writers’ Union) was founded in that same year. The term “Socialist Realism” was introduced, and the method was proclaimed as mandatory in all cultural fields. (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 139.) At that time, the details of that method still remained indeterminate. The theory of Socialist Realism was formulated between 1932 and 1934 in a public discussion among literary authorities. A prestigious figure in the process was Gor’kii, who had been denominated as the First Secretary of the Writers’ Union. Socialist Realism was officially canonized in the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers that was held in 1934. Fundamentally, it was a system of signs consisting of certain images, epithets, and catchphrases. By using the proper language, a writer pledged his loyalty to the Soviet state. (Clark 2000: 9, 12–14, 27.) Literature was the arena within which Socialist Realism was formulated and defined, and it, therefore, became a model for other arts to emulate, the “flagship of Soviet culture.” Written texts gained particular significance, and the NKVD diligently surveyed dispositions and opinions among writers. (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 139–140.)

In May 6, 1934 *Pravda* published the definition of Socialist Realism. Its key content was the following:

Социалистический реализм, являясь основным методом советской художественной литературы и литературной критики, требует от художника правдивого, исторически-конкретного изображения действительности в её революционном развитии. При этом правдивость и историческая конкретность художественного изображения должны сочетаться с задачей идейной перделки и воспитания трудящихся людей в духе социализма. (Pravda 1934/123: 4.)

Socialist Realism, the basic method of Soviet artistic literature and literary criticism, demands truthfulness from the artist and a historically concrete portrayal of reality in its revolutionary development. Under these conditions, truthfulness and historical concreteness of artistic portrayal ought to be combined with the task of the ideological remaking and education of working people in the spirit of Socialism. (See Brooks 2001: 108.)

In actual fact, Socialist Realism (see also Subchapter 4.2) was not just a literary canon but part of a large public performance, the principal goal of which was to support and strengthen the foothold of the regime in the society. Writers were expected to actively participate in the performance. In other words, they were to work “under the authority of cultural bureaucrats to promote the government’s changing agenda.” (Brooks 2001: 108–111.)

In Chukovskii’s diary entries recorded in the early 1930s, the current topic of the new doctrine is not discussed. The following entry, recorded on October 14, 1932, probably relates to the first plenum of the union’s Organization Committee in October 1932, where Socialist Realism had been the principal topic (see Clark 2000: 27). Chukovskii comments the event in a laconic manner:

Подхалимляне. Писательский съезд. (Chukovskii 2011b: 494.)

Went to the Writers’ Congress. A bunch of lickspittles. (Erlich 2005: 278.)

In the initial composition of the Organizing Committee, there were 24 members of which nine were fellow-travelers and nine former members of RAPP (Schwartz 2000: 35). The equilibrium seems to manifest a new approach to the fellow-travelers from the part of the Soviet authorities. Evgeny Dobrenko suggests that such a vision may have been too optimistic:

[. . .], Stalin disbanded RAPP, a step the fellow-travelers perceived as liberation, although in practice the Union of Soviet Writers continued to act as RAPP had acted, [. . .] (Dobrenko 2011: 46–47.)

The founding of the Writers’ Union and the canonization of Socialist Realism definitely affiliated culture under the Soviet power. From then on, the roles of Stalin and the Politburo significantly increased in cultural matters. (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 139–140.) Soviet literature was institutionalized, and it became a form of bureaucratic writing: “ideology written out in words.” The right to call oneself a writer no longer depended on literary aspects: it could be acquired only by being a member of the union. (Dobrenko 2001: 317, 380, 389.) The establishment of the Committee on Arts Affairs (Komitet po delam iskusstv) in 1935 complemented the centralization of culture. In the hierarchy of power, it was even above the Writers’ Union. (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 145.)

On the other hand, the Soviet writer was not merely a submissive stooge of the regime obsequiously fulfilling the task he was assigned to. Even the concept of the Soviet writer as the “engineer of human souls” (*inzhenер chelovecheskikh dush*; see e.g. Dobrenko 2001: 377) manifests activity rather than passivity, initiative rather than blind obedience. Catriona Kelly describes the Soviet writer’s double role as follows:

The official Soviet writer might be an instrument of the state, but s/he was also a ‘master of minds’ (*vlastitel’ dum*) as 19th-cent. writers had been. (Kelly 2001: 241n28.)

It is difficult to draw an exact line between those who created and maintained the Soviet literary machinery and those who “conformed” to it. Moreover, many authoritative figures

in the literary system were Party members (see Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 141), which further obfuscates the division.

For an individual writer, membership in the union was vital. It entailed such privileges as higher salaries, special academic food rations, housing, servants, chauffeured limousines, and access to special stores, sanatoria, and holiday resorts. A dacha settlement was built for writers at Peredelkino, a village situated on the outskirts of Moscow. The dachas were allocated for distinguished writers selected by the board of the union. Furthermore, a particular fund was established for providing material help for writers. Among other things, it covered sickness benefits and distributed loans. (Fitzpatrick 1992: 227, 245; 2000: 95–102.)

Chukovskii never held a post in the Writers' Union (Ivanova 2002a: 6), but he was a member and thus belonged to the literary elite (see e.g. Clark 1996: 305). The financial benefits brought by the membership are apparent in the following diary entry from September 15, 1936:

Благосостояние мое за эти пять лет увеличилось вчетверо. (Chukovskii 2011c: 32.)

My material situation has improved fourfold over the past five years. (Erich 2005: 330.)

Chukovskii acquired his Peredelkino dacha in the summer of 1938. By the end of that same year, he got an apartment in Moscow and left Leningrad for good. (Chukovskaia, E. 2011c: 584.) He still found publishing fraught with problems, not even counting his prohibited children's books. For instance, the 1936 edition of *A High Art* took nearly two years to be published (see Subchapter 4.1).

Meanwhile, the political climate in the Soviet Union became tenser. One manifestation of this was the revision of the Soviet criminal code in 1934. Article 58 of counterrevolutionary state crimes was supplemented with a particular decree concerning treason against the fatherland (*izmena rodine*). The decree ordained for a traitor "the supreme measure of criminal punishment" (*vysshaia mera ugolovnogo nakazaniia*), in other words, the death penalty. (See Mochulsky 2011: 189.) Article 58 was quite vague about its domain and open to different interpretations, which, as Robert Conquest points out, was only convenient for the NKVD:

This article was broad enough, or so it might have been thought, to encompass anyone the NKVD wished to repress. (Conquest 2008: 283.)

During the Great Terror, Article 58 provided an inexhaustible source of grounds for delivering execution sentences (see e.g. Conquest 2008.)

On December 1, 1934, the Leningrad Party leader Sergei Kirov was shot to death. The assassination set forth a four-year hunt for those were purportedly involved with it, however indirectly. The blame for arranging Kirov's murder was put on Grigorii Zinov'ev, Lev Kamenev, and Lev Trotskii, all Stalin's former rivals in the Politburo. Trotskii had been expelled from the Soviet Union already in 1929, after which he had been in exile abroad. Zinov'ev and Kamenev were tried in January 1935 and were given prison sentences. In Au-

gust 1936, they were brought to a retrial. At that time, they were both sentenced to death and executed almost immediately after the verdict. (Conquest 2008: 37, 48–49, 91, 104, 412.)

Soon after Kirov's murder, rumors began to circulate within the NKVD that it was Stalin himself who had organized it. Contemporary study seems to support the conjecture. Stalin did have a motive for eliminating Kirov, who had become a rival and a potential threat to his absolute power. (See Conquest 2008: 33, 38). The assassination ended up in enforcing that very power, as Robert Conquest points out:

Kirov's death, in fact, was the keystone of the entire edifice of terror and suffering by which Stalin secured his grip on the Soviet peoples. (Conquest 2008: 37.)

Kirov's murder marked the beginning of the Great Terror.

During the Great Terror, writers were under special surveillance. Both the esthetic methods and the contents of their works were constantly questioned. Being labeled as "Trotskyite" or "counterrevolutionary" became an ominous accusation. The following numbers attest both the scale and the effect of the terror: Out of the 700 writers who convened at the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers in 1934, only 50 survived to attend the following one in 1954. According to contemporary information, 90 per cent of the union members were repressed. (Conquest 2008: 297, 300.)

Conquest (2008: 305) mentions Chukovskii among the litterateurs who actively intervened and filed appeals when their colleagues were caught in the cogs of the Great Terror (see also Subchapter 4.5.1). Also other scholars have acknowledged Chukovskii's role as a defender of repressed and dissident writers (see e.g. Erlich 2005: xvii; Leighton 1974: xviii). His petitioning for the poet Iosif Brodskii in the early 1960s is recorded in detail in Lidiia Chukovskaia's (2013c: 131, 176, 181, 183–184, 278–279, 387n102, 394–395n109) memoir *Zapiski ob Anne Akhmatovoi* ("Anna Akhmatova Journals," see below).

At the Writers' Union and in editorial offices, members of the intelligentsia were constantly pressured to survey their colleagues and denounce anybody displaying "anti-Soviet" tendencies. In 1937, the NKVD "revealed" a writers' conspiracy to murder Stalin, which led to the arrests of several Leningrad writers. It is noteworthy that neither of the alleged leaders of the conspiracy, the writers Nikolai Tikhonov or Il'ia Erenburg (see below), was ever arrested. (Nerler 2009.) Erenburg's name did come up in connection with the case, but only indirectly. In the interrogations, it was reported that his wife Liubov' Erenburg had acted as a "Trotskyite emissary" (*trotskistskii emissar*) in France. The accusation notwithstanding, she was never arrested. (See Shneiderman 1996: 95, 115–116.) Tikhonov later became a prominent figure in the Soviet literary establishment, the First Secretary of the Writers' Union in 1944, a deputy in the Supreme Soviet, and trice the recipient of the prestigious Order of Lenin (see e.g. Pechko, *Bol'shaia sovetskaia entsiklopediia 1969–1978*). Incidentally, on the seventh anniversary of Kirov's death in 1941, the memorial reportage published in *Pravda* contained Tikhonov's poem "Kirov is with Us" (Brooks 2001: 175).

The trials of the Leningrad writers, also known as the Pereval Case, are recorded in detail in Eduard Shneiderman's (1996) article "Benedikt Livshits: arest, sledstvie, rasstrel'" ("Benedikt Livshits, Arrest, Inquest and Execution"). (The trials are further discussed in Subchapter 4.5.1.) The name Pereval refers to a literary group that some of the accused

were associated with. Active in the 1920s, the group included critics from various backgrounds who all shared the opinion that the standard of Russian literature had declined after the turn of the century, and that classics, like Tolstoi and Dostoevskii should be restored as literary models. Their slogan was “Forward to the classics.” (More in Kornienko 2011: 27–30.)

A non-Party writer, Erenburg was constantly attacked by the “proletarianizing militants” but still managed to maintain good relations with the regime and enjoy the trust of the Soviet authorities (David-Fox 2012: 221). He not only escaped the Great Terror but also made a flourishing career as journalist and correspondent (see Brooks 2001: 123, 160, 172–173). Furthermore, he appeared in the role of advocate in various cultural matters. Michael David-Fox (2012: 221) depicts Erenburg as a “uniquely privileged, if embattled, Soviet cultural ambassador who was entrusted with sensitive international assignments.” Apparently, Erenburg was considered to enjoy Stalin’s personal protection (see David-Fox 2012: 221). Jewish by descent, in 1949, he was included in a list of Jews accused of spying for foreign intellegences. His escape from the situation, as it turns out, was due to the leader’s decision not to have him arrested. (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 472.) Katerina Clark and Evgeny Dobrenko (2007: 472) consider it noteworthy that a few years after the incident, Erenburg, by publishing his book *Ottepel’* (“The Thaw”), “coined the one word that will forever remain the sign of the era that followed immediately after Stalin’s death.”

The cases of Boris Pil’niak and Evgenii Zamiatin vividly illustrate the unpredictability of the regime’s attitude to individual writers. RAPP had classified them both as “anti-Soviet writers” (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 109). In 1931, Zamiatin wrote Stalin a letter, in which he complained about the “systematic persecution” that had been going on against him for years and requested for permission to leave the country. Without even consulting with the Politburo, Stalin granted him permission. (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 109–113.) Pil’niak, on the other hand, never asked to be allowed to emigrate. Instead, he tried to atone his purported sins by beginning to write a conformist novel under the personal supervision of the Party functionary Nikolai Ezhov. That did not save him from being repressed. In the fall of 1937, he was arrested for “counter-revolutionary writing,” and executed six months later. (See Conquest 2008: 300.)

Oleg V. Khlevniuk examines Stalin’s capricious attitude to writers as follows:

He had his likes and dislikes, and the latter, however talented, were often targeted for repression. [. . .] Yet despite his politically slanted tastes, Stalin did have a certain ability to distinguish good writing from bad. Perhaps this is why he tolerated and even protected certain talented writers who were not helpful or were even harmful to the regime, such as Mikhail Bulgakov. (Khlevniuk 2015: 95–96.)

Khlevniuk underlines that despite being tolerated, uncooperative writers were harassed by censors and lived under constant fear of being arrested. For instance, Bulgakov had great difficulties to get his works published. (Khlevniuk 2015: 96, 346n10.) In 1939, he finished his work *Batum* (“Batumi”), a historical play extolling the young Stalin, but the leader himself banned it. In Bulgakov’s text, Rosalind Marsh discerns an additional level that could be interpreted as Aesopian parody. Marsh suggests that the text may also contain an allusion to the Great Terror. (See Marsh 2000: 485.)

Boris Pasternak is an example of writers who managed to survive through the 1930s maintaining to their independence and at the same time remain in favor with Stalin (see Subchapter 4.3.3). As to Erenburg's escape from being arrested in 1949, there may have been political motives involved: by protecting him Stalin got a chance to demonstrate that no state anti-semitism existed in the Soviet Union (see Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 472).

A common denominator between the different fates discussed above seems to be their arbitrariness. The writer L. Panteleev (2012: 278) calls the Great Terror a "senseless lottery," in which nobody had control over his own destiny:

Меч был занесен буквально над каждым. (Panteleev 2012: 278.)

The sword was literally hanging over everybody's heads.

The atmosphere of fear and panic is evident in the following diary entry by Chukovskii. It was recorded in 1968, but the memory dates back to the year 1937, to a day when an unexpected delivery arrived at his door. Its sender was apparently an American Chukovskii had become acquainted with four years earlier while staying at a Moscow hotel. During their conversation, it had turned out that a portrait of Chukovskii was hanging on the wall of her home in the United States. Painted by Repin in 1910, it had changed hands more than once, and its fate had long been unknown to Chukovskii. In 1937, Chukovskii would probably never have had risked engaging even in such innocent conversation with a foreigner. The diary entry vividly illustrates how much the atmosphere in the Soviet Union had changed during those four years that had passed since the encounter:

Наступил год сталинского террора – 1937-й. Отечественные хунвейбины распоясались. Шло поголовное уничтожение интеллигенции. Среди моих близких были бессмысленно арестованы писатели, переводчики, физики, художники, артисты. Каждую ночь я ждал своей очереди. И вот как раз в это время приходит ко мне посыльный, на фуражке которого вышито: «Astoria» (из гостиницы «Астория»), вручает мне письмо и пакет. Я разворачиваю пакет: там томики Уолта Уитмена, О'Henry, чулки, карандаши и еще что-то. Я даже не взглянул на конверт, не попытался узнать, от кого посылка, а завернул все вещи в тот же пакет, в каком они были, и отдал рассыльному вместе с нераспечатанным письмом. «Вот... вот... вот... я не читал... не смотрел... возьмите и несите назад», – бормотал я в отчаянии, ибо всякая встреча любого гражданина с иностранцем сразу же в глазах хунвейбинов превращала этого гражданина в шпиона. (Chukovskii 2011c: 479–480.)

Meanwhile the year of Stalin's terror, 1937, was upon us. Our home-grown Red Guards were on the warpath, bent on the mass destruction of the intelligentsia. Many of those nearest and dearest to me – writers, translators, physicists, artists, actors – were arrested for no reason at all. Every night I awaited my turn. And in the midst of all that I had a visit from a messenger with Astoria written on his cap (he came from the Hotel Astoria). He handed me a parcel and a letter. When I opened the parcel, I found volumes of Walt Whitman and O. Henry along with some socks, some pencils, and a few other things. I never even looked at the envelope or tried to learn who the

parcel was from; I simply w everything up again in the parcel they had come in and handed it and the unopened letter back to the messenger. "Here, take it. Here," I mumbled in desperation. "I didn't read a thing. I didn't look at a thing. Take it back. Take it all back," because contact of *any* citizen with a foreigner automatically turned that citizen into a spy in the eyes of the Red Guards. (Erlich 2005: 557.)

The Great Terror passed Chukovskii by, but it hit very close to home.

2.8 FAMILY MATTERS

Of Chukovskii's children, only his daughter Lidiia and his son Nikolai ended up pursuing a career in literature. Boris Chukovskii evidently had neither the disposition nor any particular interest in following in his father's footsteps. Instead, he entered the Polytechnic University of Leningrad to study civil engineering. (See Chukovskii 2011b: 258, 379, 534.) He would later work as a lecturer at his alma mater. In a diary entry recorded on February 10, 1934, Chukovskii mentions Boris having some "problems" (*nelady*) connected with the White Sea Canal (Belomorkanal; see Subchapter 4.2). Apparently, he was expected to be present at the construction site in Medvezh'egorsk, but he stayed in Leningrad instead – not, as Chukovskii emphasizes, for having anything against the project itself but because he did not want to leave his students. (See Chukovskii 2011b: 534.)

Chukovskii's older son Nikolai, on the other hand, showed an interest in literature and creative writing from an early age. He is best known as a translator, although he has also authored some poetry, fiction, and memoirs. During his last years, he was a member of the Writers' Union board and the head of its translators' section (Bogdanova 2011: 515). Nikolai, who sometimes also wrote under the pseudonym "Radishchev," was a frequent visitor in The House of Arts and an active participant in its various activities. He attended, for instance, Gumilev's studio and the meetings of the Serapion Brotherhood (see Subchapter 2.4). (Hickey 2009: 154, 165, 285, 289, 401.) In 1924, he married the translator Marina Chukovskaia (Chukovskii 2011b: 137).

In Chukovskii's (2011a: 232; 2011b: 160–161) diary, there are proud comments about the literary talent of his first-born son. However, he would not let consanguinity influence the assessment of a literary work. That becomes evident in a diary entry recorded on January 29, 1926. Chukovskii was exasperated after trying to edit Nikolai's less than perfect translation. His statement about it is brutally honest:

Перевод отратителен: [. . .], мне приходится вновь переводить огромные куски.
(Chukovskii 2011b: 264.)

It's abominable: [. . .]. I'm going to have to redo large chunks of it. (Erlich 2005: 180.)

It is possible that out of personal ambition, Chukovskii judged his own son's work even more severely than he would have judged the work of an outsider. On the other hand, he was always there for Nikolai, for instance, helping him acquire translation assignments (see Chukovskii 2011b: 343). The father and son also worked on joint projects. For instance,

in 1936, they translated together Mark Twain's novel *The Prince and the Pauper* (see Chukovskaia, E. et al. 2001: 594; Chukovskii 2011c: 5).

Lidiia Chukovskaia is recognized both as a poet and writer in her own right and as the preserver of her father's legacy. In July 1926, apparently because of her youthful gullibility, Lidiia unintentionally came to cause her father great concern by being arrested and deported to Saratov (see Chukovskaia, E. 2011b: 603). At the time of the incident, Lidiia's friend Ekaterina Boronina was staying with her in the Chukovskii apartment while the rest of the family was in the countryside. Lidiia let Boronina use her father's typewriter for drafting, as it later turned out, material for an illegal underground group. Lidiia's initial verdict was three years in exile, but thanks to her father's diligent efforts, she was able to return home already in September 1927. After that, Chukovskii continued trying to help Boronina, whose sentence was five years. (Chukovskaia, L. 2003: 47–48n4, 78n4.) Eventually, Boronina was released after only a few months (see Chukovskii 2011b: 354).

Lidiia Chukovskaia was a life-long trusted friend of the poet Anna Akhmatova. In her memoir *Zapiski ob Anne Akhmatovoi* ("Anna Akhmatova Journals;" see Chukovskaia, L. 2013a, 2013b, 2013c), Chukovskaia chronicles a period that covers nearly thirty years, beginning from year 1938 and ending with Akhmatova's death in 1966. In the foreword to the first volume of the journals, Chukovskaia notes that the majority of discussions in the book relate to literature, but the absence of taboo proper names and words does not mean that they were never discussed. They were left unrecorded out of pure and simple precaution. Chukovskaia characterizes the atmosphere during the Great Terror as a mental "torture chamber" (*zastenok*). (See Chukovskaia, L. 2013a: 11–12.) That torture chamber was never forgotten, even during the most private of conversations:

Мы были ослушниками, мы постоянно его поминали, смутно подозревая при этом, что и тогда, когда мы одни, – мы не одни, что кто-то не спускает с нас глаз, или, точнее, ушей. (Chukovskaia, L. 2013a: 12.)

We were being disobedient, we remembered it all the time, and we also vaguely suspected that even when alone we were not alone, that somebody was keeping an eye – or, more accurately, an ear – on us.

Composing her famous poem *Rekviem* ("Requiem"), Akhmatova considered it far too dangerous to write it down. Reciting the verses aloud, even in whispers, was not an option, either. As it turns out from the above comment by Chukovskaia, in those days even the walls had ears. Therefore Akhmatova would jot down a couple of verses on a piece of paper, show them to Chukovskaia, and then immediately burn the paper. Verse for verse, Chukovskaia memorized the poem and preserved it in her memory through decades, until the time it could safely be written down. (See Chukovskaia, L. 2013a: 12.)

In August 1937, Lidiia Chukovskaia's husband, the physicist Matvei ("Mitia") Bronshtein was arrested on the grounds of "active involvement in Leningrad counterrevolutionary organization." His indictment was signed the following January, and it included several crimes that Article 58 (see Subchapter 2.7) ruled eligible for the death penalty, for instance, preparing for terrorist acts and spying for a foreign country. According to documents, Bronshtein was executed on February 18, 1938. (See Gorelik & Frenkel 1994.)

In that same month, Chukovskaia was very close to being arrested, too. She narrowly escaped because, when the NKVD came for her, she had just left for Moscow to try to gather information about her husband. There she was told that he had been sentenced to “ten years without the right of correspondence.” At that time, it was not yet common knowledge that that was a euphemism for the death sentence. Chukovskii did all he could to help his son-in-law – as much as there was to be done in the first place. Defendants charged under Article 58 were not entitled to legal assistance. For some time, Chukovskaia stayed away from Leningrad but returned there when it became clear that nobody was looking for her. Only in December 1939 did she learn that her husband had been executed in early 1938. Bronstein was posthumously rehabilitated in 1957. (See Chukovskaia, L. 2013a: 8–10, 64, 258, 288, 689.) In 1991, the International School of Subnuclear Physics established a scholarship bearing Bronshtein’s name. Its first recipient was Lidiia Chukovskaia. (Gorelik & Frenkel 1994.)

In his diary, Chukovskii is very reticent about Bronshtein’s fate, except for two words recorded on August 29, 1937. They austerity has a dramatic impact: “Lidiia’s tragedy” (*Lidiina tragediia*; see Chukovskii 2011c: 41). In fact, during that entire period of the late 1930s, Chukovskii’s diary entries remain sporadic and sparse. From the year 1938, there are only two, short surviving entries – one of them a poem for Murochka – and the entries from 1939 take up little more than two pages. (See Chukovskii 2011c: 46–49.) Two decades after the death of his son-in-law, Chukovskii included him in a list of martyrs who suffered under the regime during different but equally as merciless periods of time. The principal topic in the diary entry in question, recorded on March 30, 1958, is the devastation of Chukovskii’s old friend Mikhail Zoshchenko during the 1940s campaigns against writers (see e.g. Ermolaev 1997: 99).

Зощенко [. . .] – с потухшими глазами, со страдальческим выражением лица, отрезанный от всего мира, растоптанный.

[. . .] Очень знакомая российская картина: задушенный, убитый талант. Полежаев, Николай Полевой, Рылеев, Мих. Михайлов, Есенин, Мандельштам, Стенич, Бабель, Мирский, Цветаева, Митя Бронштейн, Квитко, Бруно Ясенский, Ник. Бестужев – все раздавлены одним и тем же сапогом. (Chukovskii 2011c: 257–258.)

Zoshchenko with his burned-out eyes, his martyred look, cut off from the world, crushed.

[. . .] An all too familiar Russian picture: talent smothered and killed. Polezhaev, Nikolai Polevoy, Ryleev, Mikhail Mikhailov, Yesenin, Mandelshtam, Stenich, Babel, Mirsky, Tsvetaeva, Mitya Bronshtein, Kvitko, Bruno Yasensky [, Nikolai Bestuzhev; M.S.] – crushed by the same boot one and all. (Erlich 2005: 429–430.)

The above list of names is only one of those that emerge in Chukovskii’s (2011c: 269, 351, 368, 371, 404) diary during the last decade of his life, after Nikita Khrushchev revealed Stalin’s crimes at the Twentieth Party Congress in February 1956 (see Evtuhov et al. 2004: 733–734). The lists all consist of intellectuals destroyed by the regime. It seems as if Chukovskii wanted to mentally sort out the atrocities of the past and also record them as a legacy to future generations, now that it was relatively safe to do it.

The presence in the list of the 19th century Aleksandr Polezhaev, Nikolai Polevoy, Konraty Ryleev, Mikhail Mikhailov, and Nikolai Bestuzhev (the brother of the well-known writer Aleksandr Bestuzhev) indicates that Chukovskii drew a parallel between the oppression of the tsarist authorities and of the Soviet authorities, reprehending both by the same yardstick.

Scholars and memoirists (see e.g. Erlich 2005: xvii; Leighton 1984: xvii–xix; see also Subchapter 2.7) have called attention to Chukovskii's succor to dissident writers. The critic Lev Levitskii notes that in the 1960s, Chukovskii emerged even more distinctly as a defender of the oppressed. Evidently, he finally felt independent and safe enough to defy the Soviet authorities, for instance, by helping the writer Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn when the latter was in need of a refuge. (See Levitskii 2012: 421.) Lidiia Chukovskaia would carry on her father's mission, which caused her to be expelled from the Writers' Union in 1974. She was rehabilitated during Glasnost, and in 1990, she was the first recipient of the Sakharov prize. (See Tomei 1999: 1130.)

Chukovskaia's novel *Sofiia Petrovna* portrays a woman whose family member disappears in the Great Terror. Written in the late 1930s, it is fundamentally a document of the author's own plights. It was published in Russia only in 1988. Meanwhile, the NKVD had heard about the book and searched Chukovskaia's house, but anticipating a search, she had left the book in the possession of friends and, thereby, managed to preserve it. (Conquest 2008: 294.)

Nikolai Chukovskii's relationship with the Soviet regime appears to have been principally effortless. For instance in the early 1930s he was part of the Leningrad writers' brigade commissioned to collectively write a book about the Narva Gates, with the title *Cetyre pokoleniia* ("Four Generations") (Chukovskii 2009: 261; Dobrenko 2001: 375). Nikolai's disposition is clear in a letter from Chukovskii to the journalist, critic and publicist David Zaslavskii. The letter was written within a week of Stalin's famous proclamation to the Stakhanovites in November 1935: "Life has become better, comrades; life has become more joyous" (see e.g. Petrone 2000: 6; Shulezhkova 2011: 241).

У Коли, кроме присущего ему приятного литературного дара и кроме общей большой культурности, есть еще один плюс: он взволнованно любит нашу эпоху. Третьего дня, прочитав на улице на стенке речь Сталина, он вбежал в комнату к нам с таким лицом, как будто в его личной жизни случилось большое событие, – и говорил о ней с восхищением поэта. (Chukovskii 2009: 260.)

In addition to his inherent, *pleasant* literary talent and to his great general culturedness, Kolia has yet another advantage: he excitedly loves our epoch. The day before yesterday, having read Stalin's speech on the wall, he ran in to our apartment with such a face as if in his personal life something great had happened – and spoke about it with the rapture of a poet.

Further in the letter, Chukovskii's ambivalent feelings about his son's enthusiasm become evident. He appears unconvinced whether it has realistic grounds. He is also bemused at Nikolai's apparent distancing from their shared past as in the literary sphere.

Рабочих он знает неплохо: он ведь написал (вместе с двумя писателями) большую книгу о Московско-Нарвском районе, три года он преподает литературу в рабочем университете – но все же он сын интеллигентного отца, бывшего сотрудника «Речи», который когда-то не знал ничего, кроме стихов Блока и Белого, и это не дает ему схватить самую пуповину эпохи. (Chukovskii 2009: 260.)

The workers he knows quite well. You know he wrote (together with two writers) that big book about the Moscow-Narva region, for three years he has been teaching *literature in a workers' university* – but still he is the son of an intellectual father, a former contributor to *Rech'*, who once knew nothing but Blok's and Belyi's poems, and all this won't let him comprehend the very umbilical cord of the epoch.

Chukovskii's mention of his contribution to *Rech'* has an ironic ring to it, almost as if he were citing somebody else. At the same time, it indicates that in 1935, he still considered it safe to bring up such a potentially incriminating detail of his past in a document that had at least a theoretical chance of falling into the wrong hands. Of course, his connections with the Kadets never were a secret in the first place, about which he kept being reminded (see Subchapter 2.7).

During the Great Terror, Nikolai Chukovskii's connections in literary circles took him within an inch of being arrested. The poets Benedikt Livshits and Valentin Stenich (the pseudonym of Smetanich) were both long-time friends of the Chukovskii family. Entries in Kornei Chukovskii's diary and letters to family members contain mentions of mutual visits and bear witness to his warm relationship with the two poets (for Livshits, see Chukovskii 2009: 168; 2011a: 195; 2011b: 63, 68, 286, 292; for Stenich, see Chukovskii 2009: 168, 190, 224, 227; 2011b: 502, 525). Livshits was particularly close to Nikolai – in spite of an age difference of nearly twenty years (Uspenskii 2010). Although they had occasionally met earlier, an actual friendship between the two litterateurs began in 1925. During the following thirteen years, they met practically every day. (Chukovskii, N. 1989: 119–220.) Nikolai also had a warm relationship with Stenich, for whom he (Chukovskii, N. 1989: 211–244) has devoted an entire chapter in his memoirs, titled “Milyi demon moei iunosti” (“The Gentle Demon of my Youth”).

Livshits and Stenich were both sentenced to death in connection with the Pereval case (more in Subchapter 4.5.1). In September 1938, as an appendix to the accusatory conclusion against Livshits, the NKVD drafted a list of names that had come up in interrogations of the arrested writers. The names had been classified in five categories: “convicted” (*osuzhden*), “arrested” (*arestovan*), “being established” (*ustanovlivaetsia*), “abroad” (*za granitsej*), and “dead” (*umer*). Nikolai Chukovskii's name was under the title “being established.” Somebody had marked his name, among other names, with a hand-drawn check, obviously for future arrests. (Shneiderman 1996: 114–115.) Eduard Shneiderman (1996: 116) suggests that in the Pereval case, a writer's fate was basically a matter of luck. Tens of names were brought up and meticulously documented, but after the “plan for arrests” was completed, those next in line were spared and allowed to continue their lives.

3 *Method and theoretical framework*

A literary work can be examined both as a product of the discursive environment it stems from and as a contribution to it. In other words, it is in a dialogical relationship with the prevailing chronotope. The concepts of dialogue and chronotope are further discussed in Subchapter 3.1.

If the work stems from a culture in which written material is subjected to strict censorship, it is possible that only a sliver of the actual information is visible in the surface text. The rest must be excavated from “between the lines,” in other words from concealed “subtexts.” Both figurative idioms are frequently heard in the context of the study of texts dating from the Soviet era. One must perpetually take into consideration that which may be implicitly present even though the author does not utter it. For deciphering such a concealed message, the reader must be familiarized with the devices of the so-called Aesopian language. Subtexts and Aesopian language are examined in Subchapter 3.2.

As noted above, in one way or another any text manifests the values, norms, and conventions of its discursive environment, with or without the author’s intention. Recognizing them demands thorough and detailed concentration on the text. In literary criticism, this method is referred to with the term “close reading.”

This term was promulgated in the 20th century, particularly by the representatives of New Criticism (see e.g. Makaryk 1995: 120–124). Its fundamental idea is crystallized in the following:

Every New Critic acknowledges the importance of close reading, [. . .] that each word of a poem be scrutinized in detail with regard to all relevant denotations and connotations. (Makaryk 1995: 122.)

The above statement refers to poetry, but the same idea can be applied to prose texts and, in fact, to any texts, non-fiction included.

The reader’s prejudices about the culture that a text represents may sometimes interfere with the perception of the text. Examining representations of the 1950s small-town America, Fredric Jameson calls attention to the opposite images of time and place conveyed by popular culture and so-called “high art,” respectively. Jameson aptly asks whether that period “saw itself” in any of the ways it was represented. (See Jameson 2003: 226–227.) The same can be said about the 1930s Soviet Union. One stereotypical division is the one between those who “actively” dictated the rules for literature and those who “passively” submitted to them. As contemporary studies have demonstrated (see e.g. Clark 2011; Dobrenko 2001), between those two polar opposites there existed a vast gray area in which the Soviet litterateur performed his balancing act. A certain rate of conformism, whether genuine or feigned, was a matter of survival – sometimes a matter of life and death. At the same time, many litterateurs, in fact, helped maintain those very rules, or even subtly influenced on them “from below.”

The goal of the present study is to define Chukovskii's position and his survival strategies in that gray area of Soviet culture as they are illustrated in the 1930s editions of *A High Art*. The method used in the study is the close reading of the texts included in the research material, complemented with their juxtaposition for comparative analysis. With reference to the notion of close reading, the study does not, however, align itself with that branch of New Criticism that insisted that the meaning of a text should be found in the text alone, with personal and historical factors excluded (see Makaryk 1995: 120). In order to capture the deeper layers of meaning in *A High Art*, the present analysis also entails a comparison of the research material with documents that illuminate relevant personal and historical factors.

3.1 DIALOGUE AND CHRONOTOPE

A work, or any text, always bears the influence of the environment in which it was produced, and at the same time, it influences future works and texts written within that same environment. For describing that phenomenon, Bakhtin introduced his concept of dialogism (*dialogizm*). The concept of chronotope (*khronotop*), in turn, defines the particular combination of time and space which the work stems from, in other words, its temporal and spatial environment.

Chukovskii's adjusting *A High Art* according to current tendencies and his contribution to the discursive environment can be examined as his dialogue with the prevailing Stalinist culture. The bidirectional phenomenon of obeying and maintaining the rules was part of that horizontal dialogue. The vertical dialogue in *A High Art* manifests itself in Chukovskii's references to past authorities in translation (see Subchapter 2.5), on the one hand, and in his revising the book between editions, on the other. Therefore, the concepts of dialogism and chronotope provide optimal theoretical premises for examining the 1930s editions of *A High Art*. The latter concept was originally elaborated as a unit for defining phases in literary history, but it can also be used for describing cultural peculiarities in a given culture in a given period.

In Bakhtin's studies, both dialogism and chronotope are discussed primarily in connection with literary texts. On the other hand, his perception of "text" extends far beyond written texts, inasmuch as he (Bakhtin 2013: 107) considers any human act as a potential text. Reversely, a literary work offers him a view of "the human world in its concrete, textual expression" (Alexandrov & Struchkov 1993: 343).

At the heart of Bakhtin's concepts, there is the idea of simultaneity and connectedness between texts, between individuals, and between cultures. For Bakhtin, culture is the "epicenter" of all human thought:

Бахтинская идея культуры [. . .] это идея культуры как средоточия всех иных (социальных, духовных, логических, эмоциональных, нравственных, эстетических) смыслов человеческого бытия. (Bibler 1991: 38.)

Bakhtin's idea of culture [. . .] is the idea of *culture as the epicenter of all other (social, spiritual, logical, emotional, moral, esthetic) thoughts of human existence.*

It is noteworthy that in the domain of culture, Bakhtin subsumes such emotional aspects that in conventional descriptions are often excluded. Thus, also the aspirations, the fears, and the survival strategies of an individual citizen can be included among the elements that constitute the entity of Soviet culture.

Bakhtin's basic ideas evolve from essay to essay and from book to book, and, therefore, the same concepts may appear in a new text in a slightly different guise. Moreover, they are often described more or less ambiguously. The notebook that Bakhtin kept during his last years contains many short, almost title-like sentences, as if the author had merely wanted to leave thoughts floating in the air (see Bakhtin 2013: 132–172). Perhaps he meant to elaborate on them later. On the other hand, such notes also illustrate Bakhtin's fundamental idea of the unfinishedness (*nezavershennost'*) and open-endedness of any text. Due to all this, citing Bakhtin always involves a considerable amount of interpretation. Michael Holquist (2013: xvii–xviii) remarks that the most misunderstood of Bakhtin's concepts is dialogism because he refers to it in various contexts without explicitly defining its meaning. An exception to this rule is a late essay titled "Problema teksta v lingvistike, filologii i drugikh gumanitarnykh naukakh: Opyt filosofskogo analiza" ("The Problem of Text in Linguistics, Philology and the Human Sciences: An Experiment in Philosophical Analysis," 1959–1961), in which the topic is discussed in more detail. The fundamental idea of dialogism is manifest in Bakhtin's characterization of the nature of a text:

The event of the life of the text, that is, its true essence, always develops *on the boundary between two consciousnesses, two subjects*. (Bakhtin 2013: 106.)

Elaborating on Bakhtin's thought, the eminent Russian philosopher of consciousness Vladimir Bibler points out that, figuratively speaking, any text is, in fact, merely a half waiting to be fulfilled into a whole by the reader. Bibler comprehends the essence of the text as follows:

Literary creation is – by its definition and conception – always a "half-text" that takes on its wholeness and completedness (without ceasing to be open-ended!?) in the "author-reader" intercourse. (Alexandrov & Struchkov 1993: 344.)

Bibler's observation suggests that a text is finished only at the moment when it is read. The idea is in accordance with Bakhtin's conception of meaning as something that is regenerated in every new context (see below).

Parallel with 'text,' and often in a synonymous meaning, Bakhtin uses the term "utterance" (*vyskazivanie*). An utterance is a concrete, unique, and unrepeatable realization of language. As such, it can occur only once and only in one particular time and place. Reproduced or reread, it becomes a new utterance, "a new link in the historical chain of speech communication." Every utterance – or text – is dialogically connected to other utterances, other texts. Even people who know nothing about each other are connected by a dialogical relationship if their utterances touch upon the same theme. Understanding is a dialogic process. Language, the conventional system of signs, is only one of the aspects that produce the meaning of an utterance. The other aspect is context. It is the latter one that produces the actual meaning of an utterance. (Bakhtin 2013: 104–109, 114–115, 121.) As

Bibler points out, not only the meaning of a word but also the meaning of an event or a situation eventually stems out of its unique context (see Alexandrov & Struchkov 1993: 349).

Bakhtin examines a literary work as one unified and whole utterance. It is always heteroglot, consisting of a multiplicity of voices. Heteroglossia (*raznorechie* or *raznorechivost'*) is one of the main threads in Bakhtin's work *Slovo v romane* ("Discourse in the Novel," 1934–1935). Besides the author's own voice and the voices of different characters, a novel may contain entire passages from other texts inserted in it. All those other voices are in a dialogic relationship with the author's own words. Language itself is dialogized. Within it, there are different tendencies constantly interrelating among themselves by their respective vocabularies and slogans, and even by their own conceptualizing and evaluation systems. Thus, in a wider sense, language can be regarded as a worldview or an ideology. For Bakhtin, it is a "concrete heteroglot conception of the world." As such, it is also common property, saturated through and through by the accents and intentions of others. In order to appropriate language for himself, the author must adapt it to his own intentions. (Bakhtin 2011: 263, 291–294, 354; 2013: 105, 115.) Bakhtin describes the difficulty of the task as follows:

And not all words for just anyone submit equally easily to this appropriation, to this seizure and transformation into private property: many words stubbornly resist, others remain alien, sound foreign in the mouth of the one who appropriated them [. . .]; they cannot be assimilated into his context and fall out of it; it is as if they put themselves in quotation marks against the will of the speaker. (Bakhtin 2011: 294.)

Chukovskii's *A High Art* generically represents literary criticism, which conforms to what Bakhtin (see 2011: 353) examines as rhetorical genres. Rhetoric is a highly dialogized form of discourse, because it always contains words of others, fractions of other texts that are discussed, questioned, polemicalized, or even ridiculed. Presented in a new context, the transmitted words are often re-accentuated, sometimes up to the point that their original meaning is changed. (Bakhtin 2011: 353–354.) For instance, in *A High Art*, ideology is often manifested in certain words and phrases. Accustomed to current locutions, the 1930s Soviet reader probably passed over them without taking any particular notice, whereas in the eyes of the contemporary reader, they stand out in the text. That is, of course, due to their being alien to us, but only partly so. Another reason is a temporal distance that allows us to examine those locutions in a wider framework, in which their significance may sometimes also be exaggerated.

According to Bakhtin's definition of utterance, different editions of *A High Art* are all separate utterances. What makes them separate is the fact that they were revised in between: otherwise they could be examined as one and the same utterance that only acquires new meanings in new contexts. The latter phenomenon does, however, apply to such material from the previous edition that is included also in the subsequent one. Such a change of meaning may sometimes be accentuated by a slight adjustment in the choice of words.

Bakhtin emphasizes that while a literary work must always be examined in the context of its epoch, it must not be "encapsulated" in its own contemporaneity. Outside their own epochs, works live and are fulfilled in the "great time" that extends from the distant past to the unforeseeable future. (Bakhtin 2013: 3–5, 167.) Bakhtin uses the notion of great

time (*bol'shoe vremia*) in distinction to small time (*maloe vremia*). Their distinctive features are presented in one of the laconic notes recorded in Bakhtin's late years. He describes the process of understanding and the disclosure of new meanings as follows:

Contexts of understanding. The problem of *remote contexts*. The eternal renewal of meanings in all new contexts. *Small time* (the present day, the recent past, and the foreseeable [desired] future) and *great time* – infinite and unfinalized dialogue in which no meaning dies. (Bakhtin 2013: 169.)

In the present study, the larger framework of history is comprehended as great time, whereas small time is composed of Chukovskii's personal and professional life in that framework.

Not only literary works but also entire cultures must be contemplated and evaluated in great time. Temporal distance – outsideness – is a significant factor in understanding them. The contemporary observer poses questions that the culture did not pose in its own historical time. Bakhtin notes that every new epoch discovers something new in past literary works. An author is always “a captive of his own epoch, his own present.” He constructs his work out of ready-made elements, of words and forms that are already filled with meaning. Thus, any work contains an abundance of unrecognized semantic possibilities that can only be disclosed in another time, in a cultural context that is favorable for such a disclosure. (Bakhtin 2013: 4–7, 167.)

It could be assumed that Glasnost and the eventual collapse of the Soviet Union made the 21st century a favorable context for the examination of texts published during the Stalinist period. Considering the amount of information available, they can now be fully contemplated in the great time of history. However, a vertical author-reader intercourse is not a guarantee for an authentic interpretation. For instance in the case of *A High Art*, the original intercourse was horizontal, with a common vantage point included. For the present-day reader, the intercourse is vertical. On the one hand, the reader “knows” what the author had no way of knowing because his present had not yet transformed into a comprehensible package of history. On the other hand, the reader's perception of the small time in which the work was produced cannot but be shallower than it would be in a horizontal author-reader intercourse. This disparity might lead to spurious conclusions – supposing that there is any fixed “right” interpretation in the first place. In light of Bakhtin's thought, meanings cannot be thus assessed.

Another fundamental concept of Bakhtin's is the chronotope. The word itself is constructed of the Greek words *kronos* (time) and *topos* (space). Bibler (1991: 100) characterizes the chronotope as an “indivisible atomic unity of ‘time and space’ characteristic to a novel.” As far as the concept of chronotope is concerned, there were two people who had a significant influence on Bakhtin's thought. One of them was the 18th century German philosopher Immanuel Kant, and the other one was Bakhtin's contemporary, the Russian physiologist Aleksandr Ukhtomskii. The concept of chronotope was first introduced to Bakhtin at a lecture held by Ukhtomskii in 1925. Bakhtin would eventually develop the concept into a unit for studying literary texts on the basis of their spatial and temporal categories. (Clark & Holquist 1984: 102, 278–279.) Bakhtin's (2011: 84–258) essay “Formy vremeni i khronotopa v romane” (“Forms of Time and the Chronotope in the Novel,” 1937–1938)

is particularly dedicated to the topic. In the essay, Bakhtin introduces the most important chronotopes that emerged in the European novel between Antiquity and the late Modern period.

Bakhtin examines the evolution of the novel as part of the general development of literature, but also as a mirror that reflects the cultural changes during a given period:

The novel has become the leading hero in the drama of literary development in our time precisely because it best of all reflects the tendencies of a new world still in the making; it is, after all, the only genre born of this new world and in total affinity with it. (Bakhtin 2011: 7.)

Bibler crystallizes the above idea by remarking that for Bakhtin, the novelist world was key to distinguishing how speech genres evolved and for understanding how reality was perceived at different stages in the great time of culture (see Alexandrov & Struchkov 1993: 342).

In 1973, Bakhtin (2011: 243–258) complemented his chronotope essay with a revised concluding chapter. The new chapter does not present a summary of those written earlier but rather shifts the discussion to another level. As Michael Holquist (2010: 19) aptly notes, “far from serving to sharpen Bakhtin’s original definition, these comments had just the opposite effect.” In the new chapter, Bakhtin discusses the general nature of chronotopes and introduces some new ones – many of them associated with a particular temporal or spatial aspect or with an individual author. He also brings up the significance of chronotopes. Their artistic meaning, obviously, relates to their representational role in a literary work. They provide the setting for a plot to unfold, make time materialize in space. Inasmuch as temporal and spatial determinations in literature have always valorized, chronotopes also function as indicators of the values embedded in a given work. (See Bakhtin 2011: 243, 250.)

The nature of the chronotope remains ambiguous. In Bakhtin’s vocabulary, it may refer to places (e.g. the agora chronotope; see Bakhtin 2011: 131), to heroes and authors (e.g. the chronotope of the rogue, the clown and the fool and the Rabelaisian chronotope; see Bakhtin 2011: 159, 167), and to situations (e.g. the chronotopes of meeting and of crisis and breaks in life; see Bakhtin 2011: 98–99, 248), among other aspects. In some instances, such as in the cases of the chronotopes of agora and meeting, Bakhtin specifies that the one in question either is or can also be a “real-life chronotope.” Moreover, he alternatively uses different terms for one and the same concept. He may, for instance, speak about “time,” “genre,” or “novel” when obviously discussing a chronotope.

Among others, Bakhtin’s major chronotopes include three adventure time chronotopes and two biographical time chronotopes, all relating to their respective periods in history (see Bakhtin 2011: 86, 111, 130, 137, 154). The Rabelaisian chronotope of the Renaissance period encompasses the concept of carnival, one of Bakhtin’s most often applied concepts, which Katerina Clark and Michael Holquist (1984: 301) characterize as a threat to social order or a “gap in the society.”

Nele Bemong and Pieter Borghart (2010: 15n6) call attention to the dispersion in the number of the major chronotopes different scholars have discerned in Bakhtin’s classification. All things considered, giving their exact number is, indeed, challenging. Perhaps Bakhtin even meant it to be so: that would be in accordance with his fundamental idea of the unfinished and open-ended nature of all texts.

Also the tenability of Bakhtin's classification of literary chronotopes has been questioned. Their almost "generic exhaustiveness" appears contradictory to Bakhtin's fundamental idea about the open-ended and uncomplete nature of human culture and its multitudinous phenomena. (Bemong & Borghart 2010: 9.) On the other hand, the very generic nature of Bakhtin's chronotopes makes it possible to use them as models beyond the range in which Bakhtin applied them himself. They can be adapted, for instance, into units for describing a given culture. Many contemporary scholars are inclined to believe that every kind of narrative stems from some "chronotopic configuration" (Bemong & Borghart 2010: 9).

Be it literary texts, newspaper articles, or, as *A High Art*, essayist texts, if they are written in the same period, they are influenced by the same major chronotope. Bemong and Borghart suggest that the idea of a closed genre system might be replaced with a system of "generic chronotopes" which could also be applied to extra-literary phenomena:

Admittedly, among these a number of complex world constructions – which to a certain extent coincide with the typology established by Bakhtin – appear to be so productive that they not only make up genuine types of literary narrative but also, in the final analysis, often come to enrich the domain of popular culture as well. (Bemong & Borghart 2010: 9.)

Since the early 1990s, the chronotope, like Bakhtin's thought in general, has been the topic of many studies. One reason for that may be the fundamental openness and uncompleteness of Bakhtin's ideas that leaves a lot of room for interpretation. For instance, Bart Keunen in his work *Time and Imagination: Chronotopes in Western Narrative Culture* (2011) profoundly analyzes the concept of chronotope, with the contrasting pairs of the equilibrium and conflict chronotopes and the teleological and dialogical chronotopes as his point of departure (see Keunen 2011: 9).

On a practical level, the chronotope might also be examined as a literary device for creating the impression of reality. Keunen describes its elements and their functions as follows:

In the living artistic perception [. . .] the spatial elements (the characters and their attributes, the setting) and the temporal elements (the characters' behavior, the heroic acts that express a certain abstract value) are reforged into a real experience, into a duration, into an image in which lived time becomes palpable: [. . .] (Keunen 2010: 42.)

Analyzing the concept of chronotope, contemporary scholars have supplemented it with adjuncts that define its level or range, for instance, by the prefixes "generic" and "motivic" (see Bemong & Borghart 2010: 6). The concept chronotope can also be examined on two fundamental levels. There are, first, the major chronotopes, and second, the various minor chronotopes they encompass (Bakhtin 2011: 252). One and the same author may have several chronotopes, but usually one of them distinguishes itself as the dominant one. In a literary work, there are three main categories of chronotopes: the chronotope of the novel's world – or representation of the world – and the respective chronotopes of the author and the reader. However realistically depicted, the represented world can never be entirely identical with the real one because, as a creation by an author, it always contains his point

of view. (Bakhtin 2011: 252, 254–256.) Bakhtin's preoccupation with the chronotope extended to his late years, as it appears from the following fragment of thought recorded in his notebook in the early 1970s:

A point of view is always chronotopic, that is, it includes both the spatial and temporal aspects. Directly related to this is the valorized (hierarchical) viewpoint (relationship to high and low). The chronotope of the depicted event, the chronotope of the narrator and the chronotope of the author (the ultimate authorial instance). (Bakhtin 2013: 134.)

Although Bakhtin's study of chronotopes was mainly related to fiction, he (Bakhtin 2011: 253) also emphasized that it is the very world of real-life chronotopes, in other words, the context of culture, which artistic chronotopes stem from.

In his study *Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin ili Poetika kul'tury* ("Mikhail Bakhtin, or Poetics of Culture," 1991), Bibler expands the range of the chronotope beyond literature into the cultural sphere. Bibler's initial position is that all Bakhtin's works should be comprehended as separate parts of one single work. For defining their main thread, Bibler outlines a cultural chronotope that encompasses the entire period (1918–1975) during which they were written. (Bibler 1991: 36, 90.) Bibler describes the task as follows:

Сформулированное определение дает новый парафраз бахтинской идеи хронотопа (время-пространства культуры) и одновременно подводит первоначальные итоги в понимании особенностей хронотопа того культурного феномена, который называется «М. М. Бахтин». (Bibler 1991: 36.)

The formulated definition presents a new paraphrase of Bakhtin's idea of chronotope (the time-space of culture), and at the same time it brings up original synopses of the specificities embraced by the chronotope of the cultural phenomenon called "M. M. Bakhtin."

Bibler's analysis of the "Bakhtin chronotope" concentrates above all on the philosophical sphere in which Bakhtin's concepts and theories were conceived. A comprehensive overview is provided of Bakhtin's influences and models at the different stages of his literary career. At the same time, Bibler examines the cultural chronotope of the 1900s on a more general level:

Но в XX веке хронотоп культуры смещается в эпицентр социальных и личных катастроф и решений, оказывается основным «предметом» душевного и духовного напряжения. (Bibler 1991: 39.)

But in the twentieth century, the chronotope of culture is being displaced into social and personal catastrophes and decisions, becoming a fundamental «matter» of mental and spiritual tension.

The evolution of *A High Art* between 1919 and 1968 might be examined against the chronotope of the cultural phenomenon called Kornei Chukovskii. Of course, there were several chronotopes that covered that period, but the present study focuses on the dominant one at the time he was revising his essays for the editions published in 1930, 1936, and 1941.

Pursuant to Bibler's reasoning, all the social and personal aspects of human life from revolutions to petty triumphs and tribulations are included under the umbrella concept of chronotope. The major chronotope of culture might also be comprehended as the set, the background for the plot of thoughts and deeds to unfold. In that sense, it appears very close to the concept of context. In the present study, the subject of analysis is not a novel but an essayist text that does not contain within it any artistically created imaginary world. Even when the author discusses past or future phenomena, his point of view is tied to the present-day reality. Supplemented with relevant authorial aspects, the regnant cultural chronotope can, thus, also be examined as the chronotope of *A High Art*. In the present study, that chronotope is discussed as the chronotope of Stalinist time (see Subchapter 4.2).

One of the various fields in which Bakhtin's concept of chronotope has been applied is narratology. In his study *The Fiction of Narrative. Essays on History, Literature, and Theory 1957–2007* (2010), the literary theorist Hayden White juxtaposes the chronotope with the notions of "worldview" and "period." While a worldview can be regarded as a fact of consciousness, the chronotope encompasses "the effective conditions of possibility of both *thought* and *action*, *consciousness* and *praxis* within discrete milieus." The concept of period is vague, abstract, and shallow compared with the concept of chronotope, which encompasses all the temporal, spatial, and socio-cultural aspects of life. (White 2010: 240, 242.) White describes the range and depth of the chronotope as follows:

[. . .], because whereas the notion of a period directs attention to the interplay of process and change, that of the chronotope directs attention to social systems of constraints, required repressions, permissible sublimations, strategies of subordination and domination, and tactics of exclusion, suppression, and destruction effected by a local system of social encodings. (White 2010: 240.)

White notes that because of its accessibility to analysis, the chronotope is an excellent notion to be used in historical studies. From documentary records and from recollections of writers, letter-writers, autobiographers, and other contemporaries, a framework can be constructed of the cultural conditions in a given place at a given time, including "the 'legend' that they all took for granted as the common code they shared both for making and reading the terrain of consciousness that they *effectively* occupied." (White 2010: 242.)

The chronotope of the 1930s editions of *A High Art* encompasses the author's small time, or his "conditions of possibility of both *thought* and *action*, *consciousness* and *praxis*," within the milieu that the Stalinist period represents in the great time of history. In the reconstruction of the small time, Chukovskii's diaries, memoirs, and letters provide a valuable source. At the same time, they offer an insider's vantage point to the wider framework of the great time.

Concerning the small time, a challenge is posed by some elements that leave room for speculation. Every private sympathy, antipathy, and aspiration of Chukovskii's may not ever have been recorded – or even uttered aloud. For instance, the various cliques that existed among the Soviet literary intelligentsia (see Subchapter 4.4.4) are one noteworthy factor to be considered when assessing Chukovskii's authorial decisions. All things considered, the very finest nuances in the motives behind his decisions may always remain an enigma.

3.2 SUBTEXT AND AESOPIAN LANGUAGE

One aspect to be taken into consideration is the possibility of the 1930s editions of *A High Art* containing covert messages that the author intended to be deciphered by the sophisticated reader. This conjecture is supported by the fact that Chukovskii apparently mastered the devices for delivering such messages already as a young critic (see Subchapter 2.6), and it turns out that they were a topic of interest for him also in the 1920s (see below). Apart from this, Chukovskii had thoroughly acquainted himself with the production of the radical writers of the 19th century, who had resorted to similar methods in order to evade the tsarist era censorship. In the early 1930s, he particularly concentrated on the “cryptography” (*tainopis'*) used by Vasili Sleptsov (see below).

This subchapter provides a general view of the concepts of Aesopian language and subtext (*podtekst*). The two concepts are often used synonymously, although, technically speaking, they are not synonyms. Not all subtexts are Aesopian. As discussed above, a text is always in a dialogical relationship with the prevailing culture and with the discursive environment, and, therefore, it ineluctably contains a subtext that manifests the current chronotope. That subtext encompasses, for instance, the ideology conveyed by the text, as well as the author's manner of addressing the reader. Furthermore, any hidden meaning “between the lines” of any utterance can also be comprehended as a subtext (see Tammi 1999: 3).

What makes a subtext Aesopian is the author's intention. Using Aesopian devices, the author not only conveys secret messages to the reader but also conducts a secret dialogue with the prevailing culture. Aesopian language functions like invisible ink, enabling the author to write behind the obvious text about forbidden or taboo topics in such a way that only those initiated into the secret can read the message. Thus, the second actor required for the successful delivery of an Aesopian message is an initiated reader predisposed to detecting the invisible part in the text. In the present study, subtexts are discussed in that particular sense, as messages conveyed by an Aesopian author and decoded by an Aesopian reader.

Such devices have proved particularly useful in societies in which the free expression of opinions has been restricted. Vladimir Il'ich Lenin commented on the Russian tradition of Aesopian language as follows:

О, русский человек прошел многовековую школу рабства: он умеет читать между строк и договаривать не сказанное оратором. (Lenin 1967: 361.)

Oh, the Russian has gone through a centuries-old school of slavery: he knows how to read between the lines and finish what the orator has left unsaid.

In Russia, censorship of literature was established only towards the end of the 18th century – relatively late when compared with Western Europe (Baer 2010: 213). Thus, it can be said that for the most part of its existence, modern Russian literature has been controlled by state-run ideological censorship (see Loseff 1984: ix–x).

As to censorship during the Soviet era, it also manifested a general isolationist tendency (Kuhiwczak 2009: 51). That tendency reached its zenith in the 1930s (see Subchapter 4.2). Piotr Kuhiwczak (2009: 50–51) characterizes Soviet censorship as a “complex, multi-

layered and well organized” system with a long tradition extending way back into the tsarist era. Kuhiwczak challenges the narrow image of censorship as coercion enforced upon people by a small group of political elite, pointing out that in any society, there are some tacitly agreed forms of censorship. Kuhiwczak also reasons that the implementation of censorship always requires some amount of popular support or generally accepted justification. Even Soviet censorship originally stemmed from good intentions. The Bolsheviks implemented it in 1917 (see Subchapter 2.2) as a temporary measure to protect the new revolutionary state from any counterrevolutionary ideas that the bourgeois press might impose on people’s minds. However, as it turned out, censorship eventually became a permanent element of the Soviet state. (See Kuhiwczak 2009: 46–48.)

Already during the tsarist era, Russian authors learned to confuse the censors by expressing recusant opinions under the guise of hints and circumlocutions. Referring to the Ancient Greek fabulist Aesop, the expression “Aesopian language” (*ezopovskii or ezopov iazyk*) was launched into popular use in the mid-19th century, promulgated by the writer and publisher Mikhail Saltykov-Shchedrin. “A slave’s way of speaking,” “reading between the lines,” and “cryptography” are all illustrating epithets for this special literary system, which, as Lenin notes in the above citation, also cultivates a particular species of an Aesopian reader. (See Loseff 1984: 1–4, 6, 119.)

Thus, the presence of censorship in a society provides a favorable breeding ground for some special skills. Brian James Baer (2010: 214) refers to this development with the term “productive censorship:”

This term refers to the phenomenon of authors, translators – and readers – who develop often elaborate means of evading censorship both within texts themselves, in the form of Aesopian language and intertextual references, and outside texts, through the invocation of certain background knowledge. (Baer 2010: 214.)

The ways in which such productive censorship was manifested in 19th century radical journals are discussed later in this subchapter.

Maliheh S. Tyrrell has examined Aesopian subtexts, or Aesopian language, from the standpoint of national Azerbaijani literature. During the Soviet era, Aesopian language was used in order to transmit truthful information for native readers and at the same time conceal those messages from Soviet authorities. Tyrrell points out that in a totalitarian society, oppositional views must often be camouflaged as conforming to the dominant ideology. Intending to expose injustices in society, the author protects himself by embedding an oppositional theme into a deeper layer of the work, all the while creating in it a surface layer accordant with the official line. Tyrrell aptly speaks of “two-dimensional literature.” (Tyrrell 2000: 2–4.)

The Soviet authorities were favorably disposed towards Aesopian language and encouraged research on it because it conjured up positive images of the 19th century revolutionary democratic writers, who were appreciated as early precursors of Socialist ideology. Already in the 1920s, efforts were made to decode Aesopian devices and produce “translations” of individual words. While co-editing the work *Russkaia revoliutsiia v satire i iumore* (“The Russian Revolution in Satire and Humor,” 1925), Chukovskii tentatively attempted classifying works on the basis of the Aesopian devices found in them. For the most part, So-

viet study of pre-revolutionary Aesopian language has focused on two 19th century radical journals, *Sovremennik* ("Contemporary"), and *Otechestvennye zapiski* ("National Annals"). (Loseff 1984: 14–15, 229–230.)

Chukovskii would later conduct extensive research on Aesopian language, particularly on the use of its devices in *Sovremennik*. For years, the journal managed to function as a forum for subversive ideas, thanks to the proficiency of its contributors in the use of Aesopian language (Chukovskii 2005: 591, 601). In his research, Chukovskii mainly focused on two authors, Vasilii Sleptsov and Nikolai Nekrasov. His essay "Tainopis' Vasiliia Sleptsova v povesti 'Trudnoe vremia'" ("Vasilii Sleptsov's Cryptography in the Short Story 'Hard Times,'" see Chukovskii 2004b: 203–239) was included in the first volume of Sleptsov's collected works, published in 1932, and the essay "Zhizn' i tvorchestvo Vasiliia Sleptsova" ("The Life and Work of Vasilii Sleptsov," see Chukovskii 2004b: 165–202) was included in the anthology *Liudi i knigi shestidesiatikh godov* ("People and Works of the 1860s"), published in 1934 (the original title of the latter essay was "Vasilii Sleptsov.") In his work *Masterstvo Nekrasova* ("Nekrasov's Mastership," 1952), Chukovskii devoted one chapter exclusively to the Aesopian devices he detected in Nekrasov's poetry. The chapter is titled "Ezopova rech'" ("Aesopian language;" see Chukovskii 2005: 591–624).

The models of Aesopian language used in the present study are primarily based on the work *On the Beneficence of Censorship. Aesopian Language in Modern Russian Literature*, written by the emigrant Russian writer and scholar Lev Loseff. It is the first and, so far, the only general theoretical study on Aesopian language written with the objective of providing a methodology for text analysis. The scarcity of studies is probably due to censorship, which was still strongly present in 1984, on the eve of Glasnost. That was when Loseff's study was published, not in the Soviet Union but in Germany. As "discussion of anti-censorship tactics is impossible in a state of censorship," Loseff emphasizes that he refrained from specifically describing devices of any writer living and working in the Soviet Union. (See Loseff 1984: x–xi, 1, 13.)

Loseff comments on Chukovskii's writings about Aesopian language, remarking that their informal essayist style hinders them from filling the strictest qualifications of a scholarly study. For instance, whereas some aspects concerning Aesopian language are thoroughly examined, others are only mentioned in passing. (See Loseff 1984: 15.) The Lithuanian writer and philologist Tomas Venclova has made similar observations. Venclova notes that Chukovskii's study contains samples but not any general description of Aesopian language. (See Ventslova 2001.) Loseff (1984: 18) speculates on the motives behind Chukovskii's refraining from detailed analysis, suggesting that it may be due to the fact that he was using Aesopian language in his own works. On the other hand, Chukovskii was not and obviously did not even aspire to be a scholar who "impartially establishes the general principles of phenomena under study" (see quotation in Subchapter 2.5.). His approach to the topic was that of a literary critic, hence detailed classifications would have been out of place. Moreover, Aesopian language is not a stagnant phenomenon, and none of its devices ever reoccur in exactly the same appearance (Loseff 1984: x). In other words, the very essence of Aesopian language makes it impossible to be shoehorned into rigorous theoretical categories.

L. Ia. Paklina canvasses the concepts of subtext and Aesopian language in her study *Iskusstvo inoskazatel'noi rechi: Ezopovskoe slovo v khudozhestvennoi literature i publitsistike*

("The Art of the Allegorical Way of Speaking: Aesopian Language in Literature and Journalism"), published at Saratov State University in 1971. Paklina's work consists of three articles, one that examines Aesopian language as Lenin used it, and the other two as it was used in *Otechestvennye zapiski* in the 19th century. As regards Paklina's study, Loseff notes that while some interesting theoretical questions are raised in it, they are not elaborated further. He also considers the description of poetic means too indiscriminate and extensive, and suggests that the study should rather have concentrated on the particular characteristics of poetic means as Aesopian devices. (See Loseff 1984: 18–19, 61.)

Baer (2010: 215, 223–224) touches on Loseff's study in his essay "Literary Translation in the Age of the Decembrists: The Birth of Productive Censorship in Russia." He calls attention to the emphasis on the author's role in Loseff's study, suggesting that a reader-oriented outlook would see the reader as a more active participant in the transmittal of an Aesopian message. (See Baer 2010: 223.) From that premise it follows that the emergence of additional meanings in a text does not always require the author's intention:

[. . .], the meaning of a text is constructed by readers in a specific socio-political context, who could "co-opt" texts for their own ends. (Baer 2010: 223.)

Basically, the idea seems to be very close to Bakhtin's and Bibler's notion about the meaning of a text or of an utterance (see Subchapter 3.1). The meaning is seen as something that ultimately stems from a unique context in which the reader plays an active role.

A recent contribution to the discussion about Aesopian language is Irina Sandomirskaja's (2015) article "Aesopian language: the politics and poetics of naming the unnameable" in the anthology *The Vernaculars of Communism. Language, Ideology and Power in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe*. Both Chukovskii's and Loseff's notions of Aesopian language are discussed in the article. Loseff's idea of Aesopian language as a literary system is epitomized as follows:

For him, Aesopian language is not merely a sum of stylistic or rhetorical devices, but rather an overarching strategy in poetic creation that can involve anything from a felicitous choice of words to the construction of the plot of a novel, to devising a long-term literary mystification, to the occupation of literary establishments in the poet's interests (something Losev illustrates with episodes from Soviet children's literature and literary translation). (Sandomirskaja 2015: 76.)

Sandomirskaja observes that there is a fundamental difference between Loseff's "broad esthetic meaning" of Aesopian language and Chukovskii's notion of it as "guerilla warfare." As to Chukovskii's interpretation of Sleptsov, she suggests that by construing Sleptsov's "far-too-obvious writerly inconsistencies and failures" as deliberately chosen Aesopian devices Chukovskii was, in fact, trying to have him included in the Stalinist literary canon. Sandomirskaja calls attention to Chukovskii's use of the expression "of course" in connection with a politically correct remark, noting that it testified to his awareness of the Soviet censors looking over his shoulder. (See Sandomirskaja 2015: 67–68.) As Chukovskii was a target of persistent attacks during that very period (see Subchapter 2.6), it would have been natural had he wanted to turn the censors' attention to the subversive writers of the

19th century and to their compatibility with current values. However, as it turns out from the above discussion, research on Aesopian language was and remained one of his long-term projects.

Sandomirskaja points out that an Aesopian author may invoke official language for his own ends. He may try to establish an authentic communication by uttering unauthentic conformist dictums, for instance, in an ironic tone. (See Sandomirskaja 2015: 64, 66). At the same time, the author participates in a game that entails the following dilemma:

While teasing the censor by delivering a message from under the censorial radar, the writer could contribute to the subverting of the prevailing order. At the same time, he or she invariably confirmed this very order by the mere choice to take part in the game. (Sandomirskaja 2015: 66.)

Thus, paradoxically, by using Aesopian devices in order to bring forth dissident ideas the author simultaneously conforms to the order at which those ideas are targeted. Samantha Sherry calls attention to the inefficiency of Aesopian language as an actual political weapon, remarking that its function is rather to “create in-groups and strengthen personal bonds” (see Sherry 2015: 176).

Also the Soviet press deployed Aesopian devices. Since open public discourse on certain subjects was taboo, information was often delivered in the guise of various rhetorical figures and tropes. (Loseff 1984: 56–57.) Discussing the theatrical elements in the official discourse of the 1920s and 1930s, Sheila Fitzpatrick presents the following example of the practice:

Theatrical and performance imaginary shows up even in such unexpected contexts as the Aesopian discussion of the 1932–33 famine (whose existence was officially denied): in newspapers and bureaucratic documents, peasants were said to be “staging” a famine and “turning on” a hunger strike; beggars to be “passing themselves off as ruined kolkhozniks.” (Fitzpatrick 2005: 13.)

In actuality, the 1932–1933 famine was the result of the collectivization campaign and the mandatory procurements demanded of kolkhozes (see Fitzpatrick 1994: 69).

The Soviet citizen eventually became a master in deciphering the actual messages hidden between the lines. The skill enabled him to find out what was happening in the country or abroad, or what was being discussed inside the Kremlin. (Fitzpatrick 2000: 188.) Fundamentally, the use of Aesopian language in the major newspapers served quite opposite purposes than its use by individual actors. Whereas the latter users invoked it for creating cracks in the wall of the official truth, the official press used it to bolster up that very truth. Those two usages do not share all the features of Aesopian language, either. In discussing Aesopian language, the present study refers to the latter usage.

Aesopian language does not have an actual informative content. The author is not telling anything that the reader does not already know but rather alluding to some mutual information. From a semantic point of view, Aesopian language equates to a folk riddle: in both cases, the transmitting of the message involves active participation by the reader. An Aesopian author increases the stratification and complexity of the text by creating in it an

additional level of subtext. In practice, it means the “systematic alteration of the text occasioned by the introduction of hints and circumlocutions.” (Loseff 1984: 6, 29, 119, 219–220.)

The delivery of an Aesopian message is based on the assumption of a double audience. That audience includes, first, those who are meant to take the words at face value and, second, of “the initiated,” the intended audience of the hidden message, who are expected to detect the “false bottom” in the text. (Sandomirskaja 2015: 66, 73.) Thus, a premise for the successful use of Aesopian language is an educational gap between the intended reader and the censor. That may have posed a challenge for Aesopian authors of the Soviet era inasmuch as censors were often members of the intellectual elite. (See Loseff 1984: 5, 117.) Sandomirskaja (2015: 81) aptly calls Aesopian language a “language gamble” in which the stakes are high.

The fundamental elements of Aesopian language are screens and markers, two devices with opposite functions. Screens are meant to veil the forbidden message from the censors. Markers, in turn, alert the reader of an Aesopian mode, indicating an additional level embedded in the text. To alert the reader, the author must employ a sufficient number of markers and use them synonymously and consistently. The one and the same element may often simultaneously function as both a screen and a marker. (Loseff 1984: 51–52, 118.)

Commenting on Loseff’s study, Sandomirskaja outlines the ambivalent nature of the two principal types of device as follows:

Aesopian expressions serve as ‘screens’ (means of concealing) and ‘markers’ (means of signalling the presence of a secret meaning), but it is not easy to say which one is which. (Sandomirskaja 2015: 76.)

According to Loseff (1984: 26, 51), Aesopian language is realized in the level of utterance, the extent of which may cover anything between a single phrase and an entire literary work. By the realization of Aesopian language, Loseff apparently refers to the concrete presence of a screen or marker in the text. In another context, Loseff examines Aesopian language as a general phenomenon. He notes that all Aesopian devices are based on the metonymic “substitution of one for another.” Distinguishing three levels on which such substitutions can occur, he juxtaposes the level of utterance (1) with the level of genre and plot (2) and with the level of intended audience (3). An example of level (2) is an original work presented as a translation, and of level (3), a work ostensibly aimed at specialists but, in actual fact, meant for the general reader. (See Loseff 1984: 60–61.) If the entire work were regarded as an utterance, levels 2 and 3 could be seen as its components, not as equal strata with the utterance. This is only one indication of the ambivalence of Aesopian language, which challenges any attempt to force it into a general theoretical framework.

Elaborating on the transmission of an Aesopian message, Loseff leans on Iurii Lotman’s information theory. By the word “information”, Loseff apparently refers to the content of the message, not to any actual new information (see above). According to Lotman, any channel of information contains noise that forms an obstacle between the transmitter and recipient. In Soviet literature, the obvious cause for noise was the “censor’s interference.” Loseff points out that the Glavlit board of censors was only one manifestation of ideological censorship. Another important factor was the own, internal censor of the author. (See Loseff 1984: 42–43.) Such an internal censor was guided by what Irina Sandomirskaja (2015: 63) refers to as “cultural competence” (see Subchapter 2.7).

An artistic text may also contain other kind of noise, material added into it for purely esthetic reasons. From the reader's point of view, noise is usually that part of the text he cannot fully comprehend. Therefore a skillful Aesopian author may utilize noise by using it as a screen. A segment of the text can be written in a manner which the censor is likely to perceive as authorial deficiency, but which hints to the reader of Aesopian content. In principle, the filter of censorship includes three actors, author (A), censor (C), and reader (R). The text itself includes a segment agreeable to the censor (Tc), a taboo segment (Tnc), and a segment of noise (N). Loseff presents the communication between author and reader via censor with the following schema:

$$A: Tc + Tnc + N \rightarrow C: /-Tnc/ Tc + N \rightarrow R$$

While removing the taboo segment – as was expected – the censor is likely to let the noise slip by considering its content irrelevant. Thus, the author's only opportunity for transmitting the forbidden material is to hide it as an Aesopian utterance into the noise segment, thus rendering it as Aesopian "quasi-noise" (Nae). The author may still include also segment Tnc in the text in the event that it might slip by the censor unnoticed:

$$T = Tc + Tnc + N + Nae$$

Of course, a literary work may contain different combinations of the above segments, but the principal schema would be as demonstrated above. In some cases, the author wants to transmit to the reader only such material that is not likely to pass through censorship. He may cleverly construct the work in such a manner that the sophisticated Aesopian recognizes the entire conformist part (Tc) as noise for the benefit of the censor (Nc): $T = Nc + Nae$. From the standpoint of the author, communication would happen according to the following schema:

$$A: Nc + Nae \rightarrow C: /-0/ \rightarrow R$$

In the optimal case, the censor will not distinguish the forbidden material from the noise, and thus, the entire content will be delivered to the reader. (Loseff 1984: 44–46.)

There are instances when an entire work is constructed in the form of noise. As an example of the latter, Loseff presents the book *Iurii Tynianov* (1960) by the literary critic Arkadii Belinkov. Ostensibly, the book is a biography, but, underneath, it is "an extended essay on the nature of despotic and totalitarian power." The work is not written in a scholarly style, as one would expect of a literary-historical genre. Instead, Belinkov addresses his reader in an entirely informal and colloquial manner. The ill-assorted style alerts the reader to the actual, Aesopian content of the work. Loseff points out that the ideological censors allowed the book to be published twice, in two editions, because they considered the stylistic deficiency as merely noise. (Loseff 1984: 46–47.)

The second edition of the book was published in 1965. It appears surprising that even at that time, the book once again passed the censors without them noticing the, according to Loseff's analysis, rather obvious subtext. As reasons for explaining the slip, Loseff (1984: 48) regards the censors' "cultural ignorance" and "gaps in their knowledge." On the other

hand, the Soviet censors hardly lived in a vacuum. Chukovskii's diary recorded on June 28, 1964 indicates that the Aesopian content of Belinkov's book was common knowledge among the intelligentsia:

Он написал книгу о Тынянове, она имела успех, – и он хочет продолжать ту же линию, то есть при помощи литературоведческих книг привести читателя к лозунгу: долой советскую власть. (Chukovskii 2011c: 391.)

He wrote a book about Tynianov, it was a success, and he wants to continue along those lines, that is, with the help of literary books lead the reader to the slogan: Down with the Soviet power.

Had the subtext at that time consisted of a secret code deciphered only by sophisticated Aesopian readers, it seems utterly implausible that Chukovskii would have as matter-of-factly exposed a colleague and – to judge from several diary entries – a friend, even in a private diary and even in the relatively liberal atmosphere of the time. He would not even denounce Viktor Shklovskii in a situation in which many others would probably have retaliated (see Subchapter 2.7). If the Soviet authorities were aware of Belinkov's deliberately portraying Tynianov as "an opponent of the regime and a critic of the Soviet reality" (see Sandomirskaia 2015: 86), it seems that such unorthodox ideas might have made him suspicious. However, Belinkov was allowed to maintain his membership in the Writers' Union (granted in 1961), and even to travel abroad. While visiting Hungary in 1968, he defected to the West. (See Chukovskaia, L. 2013b: 780.)

Even though the signs of a fundamentally evasive and fluctuating system cannot be exhaustively categorized, there must, of course, be some uniformity. Otherwise, markers would be practically impossible to detect. According to Loseff (1984: 61), the most frequently used Aesopian screens and markers in Russian and Soviet literature are quotation, parody, periphrasis, ellipsis, shift, reduction ad absurdum, non sequitur, and allegory. In the following, an effort is made to conjoin with them Sleptsov's and Nekrasov's devices as described by Chukovskii. Some of Paklina's observations are also presented within the framework of Loseff's classification.

Quotation and Parody

Before the 1917 Revolution, quotation was a frequently utilized Aesopian device in political journalism, and the tradition extended into the Soviet era. Quotation differs from the other, more oblique devices inasmuch as it permits the author to openly mention topics that are taboos. The author will begin by quoting someone who opposes the prevailing rule, and will continue by commenting on the quoted passage with utterly conformist and politically correct counter-arguments. These are, however, presented in such a deliberately bland and banal form that the Aesopian reader will easily recognize them as mere screens. (Loseff 1984: 109–110.)

The contributors to *Sovremennik* used a principally similar device. The author would pronounce opinions diametrically opposed to his genuine, generally known convictions. By means of hidden irony or, for instance, through ridiculous effusion, the author would make sure that the Aesopian reader would see through the visible text. Saltykov-Shche-

drin's characterization of this device was "lofty writing turned upside down" (*pisanie slogom, vyvorochennym naiznanku*). (Chukovskii 2005: 615, 617–620.)

Quotation allows the author to subtly alter the very orientation of, for instance, a polemic article. Feigning innocence, the contributors to *Otechestvennye zapiski* would quote or narrate subversive themes and, thereby, slip into the text not only prohibited ideas but even names and biographical details. (Paklina 1971: 13, 40.) Another way to utilize a quotation is recontextualization, which saturates it with ideas not intended by the original author (Loseff 1984: 108). For instance, Bakhtin was a master of this method (see Clark & Holquist 1984: 314).

Aesopian parody involves the manipulation of somebody else's text for social or political purposes. Parodying literary works became a frequently used practice in the 1860s and remained so a couple of years after the 1905 Revolution. When censors eventually were alerted to such parody, it lost much of its signification as a device. In general, it was predominantly non-artistic texts that were parodied during the Soviet era. One exception to the rule was Aesopian children's literature, in which the parody of other literary genres was an essential element. Chukovskii's children's rhymes, for instance, contain images and motifs from Russian literature and folklore and also traces of Symbolism. In the fairy tale *Krokodil* (see Subchapters 2.2 and 2.6), Loseff detects an Aesopian subtext that mocks the political opportunism of the Russian intelligentsia, and in *Tarakanishche* (see Subchapter 2.2), an anti-authoritarian satire. Loseff particularly credits Chukovskii for educating generations of Soviet readers in deciphering Aesopian language. (See Loseff 1984: 92, 99–101, 195–199.)

As it turns out from the criticism against the fairy tale *Mukha-Tsokotukha* (see Subchapter 2.6), the Soviet censors would search for hidden implications in Chukovskii's children's rhymes even where there probably were none. Such a nearly paranoid attitude demonstrates how integral an element Aesopian language was in Soviet culture. The fundamental presupposition was that nothing was quite as it seemed to be. Of course, the existence of subtexts in Chukovskii's fairy tales cannot be ruled out, either, but they would probably be less obvious than suggested. Chukovskii would certainly have known how to use such intricate and subtle Aesopian devices that are not so easily detected.

Parodic stylization provides the author with a way of incorporating other voices, for instance, in a novel. Its significance as a device is based on a difference between the author's intention and the original intention of the cited text. (Bakhtin 2011: 364.) Parody is considered a carnivalesque device, because it often targets topics that society holds sacred (about carnival, see Subchapter 3.1). In the Soviet Union, such topics included the regime and the Party. An absolutely sacred topic was Lenin, and, therefore, the "requisite reference" to him would sometimes function as a screen. Official jargon, propaganda, and "sovietisms" (the bureaucratic and colloquial jargon particular to the Soviet era) provided abundant material for the Aesopian author to manipulate. For instance, the evaluating juxtaposition of the Soviet present to the miserable pre-Soviet past was ubiquitous in public discourse, particularly during the first three decades of Soviet rule. (Loseff 1984: 58, 136–138, 221.) One of those writers who used that device is Evgenii Shvarts, who, incidentally, worked as Chukovskii's secretary for a while in the early 1920s (see Ivanova 2009: 12; Shvarts 2012: 224). In his study on Aesopian language, Loseff (1984: 125–142) has devoted an entire chapter to Shvarts' play *Drakon* ("The Dragon," 1943).

Periphrasis

Chukovskii (2005: 598) refers to the Aesopian language of the 19th century radical writers as “the language of allusions, evasions, allegories, and innuendos” (*iazyk nedomolvok, obin-iakov, inoskazanii, namekov*). In Loseff’s classification, *periphrasis* is a close equivalent to what Chukovskii describes as “evasion.” Loseff (1984: 103) describes it as a device in which “the hallmark of an object is offered in place of its proper name.” A periphrasis may be descriptive, a reference to a certain object by its distinguishing feature. It may also manifest itself as a euphemistic allusion to a person whose name is taboo. (Loseff 1984: 102–103.)

Paklina introduces devices that also share features with periphrasis. In *Otechestvennye zapiski*, the similarity between the views of two people is sometimes indicated by merely mentioning both names in the same context. There were also various ways of obliquely referring to a taboo person. The pseudonym that was used could be as transparent as “the author of” a certain work. A more veiled reference could be, for instance, a citation from that person’s text, or recollections containing significant dates. (Paklina 1971: 37–38.)

Ellipsis

Ellipsis is one of the most effective and frequently used Aesopian devices (Loseff 1984: 104). Although Chukovskii does not explicitly use the word “ellipsis,” he obviously speaks of the same thing when mentioning “the device of silence.” In 1861, the Tsar’s Emancipation Manifesto ostensibly liberated the serfs but actually drove them to “economical slavery,” without land or any other means for living. In *Sovremennik*, the manifesto is not mentioned with a single word, and, as Chukovskii points out, it was that very silence that damned it. One variant of ellipsis is the substitution of the omitted part with a set of three periods, which guide the reader to finish the sentence himself. (See Chukovskii 2004b: 206; 2005: 603–604, 616.) Paklina (1971: 36) mentions the same device when discussing the Aesopian language used in *Otechestvennye zapiski*.

Contrary to the obvious and straightforward ellipsis used in the tsarist era Aesopian language, during the Soviet era, the device became more veiled and subtle. Instead of an actual void in the text, an ellipsis may appear as a thought left unfinished. For instance in a story otherwise narrated in great detail, the author might omit some critical information with the intention that the reader draw his own conclusions. There were also other ways to evade mentioning a prohibited name, like using an indefinite-personal construction or the passive form. (Loseff 1984: 104–107.)

Shift

Shift (*sdvig*) is an artistic device typical in folklore. Cautionary tales have traditionally been veiled in the guise of a fantasy story situated in remote surroundings or in ancient times (“Across the seas, beyond the hills...”). In Russia, a similar device has traditionally provided an effective screen for an Aesopian author to comment on urgent matters behind the censors’ back. (Loseff 1984: 64.) One variation of shift is the concealing of political content under the camouflage of intimate themes. According to Chukovskii, one of Nekrasov’s poems, albeit ostensibly depicting personal passions and sorrows, in fact, contained a secret call for revolution. (See Chukovskii 2005: 613.) Another version of shift is situating a work that actually refers to a phenomenon of domestic reality in some exotic location (Paklina 1971: 21). More than one radical writer managed to slip poems about Russian themes

past the censors by inserting subtitles that introduced the texts as translations (Chukovskii 2005: 613–614).

An Aesopian shift may also have a chronological nature. Chukovskii (2005: 617) mentions that the contributors to *Sovremennik* would comment current events under the guise of historical writing. In *Otechestvennye zapiski*, the censors were confused by a footnote situating a parodic poem with acute issues in “the days of old” (*iz bylykh vremen*) (Paklina 1971: 15). On the other hand, a date could also alert the reader to the presence of an Aesopian subtext. In verses written in 1861, Nekrasov speaks of “human blood and tears,” obliquely commenting on the recent brutal suppression of the peasants’ uprisings around the country. Published only a few years later, the topic of the poem was made clear by mentioning in the commentary the year it was written. (Chukovskii 2005: 602–603.)

During the Soviet era, a shift could often be realized by stylistic contradictions, for instance, by inserting Soviet propagandist vocabulary and catch phrases in a text otherwise written in a neutral literary style, or by a parodic combination of incompatible argots. A shift may also appear in various anachronisms and cultural-idiomatic incongruities, like a Russian proverb in a work situated in a far-away locale, or a typical Soviet expression or turn of plot in a work situated in the ancient past. Loseff calls attention to Shvarts’s elaborate use of Aesopian devices in *Drakon*, and to the numerous shifts in particular. Situated in a medieval setting, the fairy tale is sprinkled with contemporary Russian phrases and Soviet officialese. An unexpected change of style would alert the reader to hidden meanings. Generally speaking, any feature that is obviously out of place in the text might signal the presence of an Aesopian subtext. (See Loseff 1984: 50, 83, 130, 134–137.)

Reductio ad Absurdum and Non Sequitur

Absurdity may also be used as a mere stylistic device in a literary work, but an Aesopian author uses it for a particular function. It may function both as a screen and as a marker. The absurdity of Aesopian language is in fact “false absurdity.” (Loseff 1984: 111, 115.) Perhaps it might also be characterized as “purposeful absurdity.” Listing the Aesopian devices of Nekrasov and his contemporaries, Chukovskii mentions “fantasy” (*fantastika*). At first thought, this sounds like a synonym for allegory. However, it turns out that many of those writers eventually replaced allegory with this very device. Citing the literary scholar A. Lavretskii, Chukovskii describes the device as exaggeration beyond belief, up to the point of fantasy, but he does not elaborate further on the topic or present examples of its use. (See Chukovskii 2005: 620.) The given description of the device appears to correspond to the device of *reductio ad absurdum*.

Loseff (1984: 111) introduces the devices *reductio ad absurdum* and *non sequitur* together, as a pair, probably because they are akin to each other, and, in some cases, even difficult to distinguish from each other. The former device entails single-minded deduction that results in demonstrating the absurdity of a proposition. The latter device refers to an inference that has no luculent connection with what was previously said or is incongruent with the given premises. Both devices are utterly versatile. They may manifest themselves in various ways, for instance, as nonsensical word play, or as a disruption in a poem’s rhyme scheme. In a poem by Pushkin, the word *schast’e* (“happiness”) is unexpectedly paired with the non-rhyming word *nepogoda* (“bad weather”). A subtext that comments on a current topic becomes obvious when the latter word is replaced with the rhyming one

samovlast'e ("despotism"). (Loseff 1984: 114.) Chukovskii does not explicitly include the above devices among the arsenal of the 19th century radical writers. On the other hand, presenting pronouncements diametrically opposed to one's genuine convictions (see above) in the function of noise could also be interpreted as special kind of absurdity. In his study, Loseff (1984: 111) refers to the "stylistic absurdities and eccentricities of plot" utilized by Saltykov-Shchedrin.

According to Marxist esthetic norms, absurdity was a bourgeois phenomenon, and using it in a literary work might even be interpreted as a manifestation of anarchism. Therefore, during the Soviet era, absurdity was rarely found in adult literature. However, owing to the efforts of Chukovskii and Samuil Marshak, "the absurd was granted a legitimate status as a play element and folklore inspiration" in children's literature. (Loseff 1984: 111–112.) In light of the campaigns against Chukovskii-ism (see Subchapter 2.6.), "a legitimate status" appears to be a slightly euphemistic expression. It was the absurdity, in particular, in Chukovskii's fairy tales that caused Nadezhda Krupskaja to denounce them as "bourgeois trash" (see Subchapter 2.6). Obviously, though, it was easier to embed absurdity in fairy tales than in adult literature. On the other hand, in the late 1920s there remained room in Soviet literature for an Avant-Gardist group like OBERIU (*Ob'edinenie real'nogo iskusstva* or the Society for Real Art; see e.g. Kobrinskii 2011: 181–213). Known in the West also as "the Russian absurdists" (see Clark 1996: 231), the members of OBERIU strove to shake the ossified and stereotypical concept of the world in literature.

Had Chukovskii decided to use Aesopian language in *A High Art*, he would probably have chosen the devices among those discussed above, because the genre of non-fiction sets some limitations. It seems that the three following devices would be better suited for poetry or fictive prose.

Allegory

Symbolic representation in the form of allegory (*inoskazanie*) was one of the principal Aesopian devices of the radical writers of the 1860s. For instance Nikolai Chernyshevskii obliquely presented the people of Russia as the "bridegroom," and revolution as "his lovely bride". For Sleptsov, "the poor quality of sealing wax" symbolized letters being intercepted and read by the tsar's gendarmes, whereas "dog training" referred to the exploitation of serfs. A "journal article not corresponding to its title" and an "attempt to renovate a dilapidated manor house with new wall paper and furniture" were allegories illustrating the tsar's ostensible reforms that failed to lighten the burden of the oppressed. (Chukovskii 2004b: 203–206, 212–214; 2005: 598–599, 605–606.)

During the Soviet era, an Aesopian allegory in a literary text was usually targeted at a limited audience. The sources of the screens and markers were drawn from classical mythology or from some other special field that only the most sophisticated readers were likely to be familiar with. Another frequently used source for allegory was the idiom of the intelligentsia, which the censors, presumably, would not to be familiar with. (Loseff 1984: 87.)

In addition to the devices discussed above, Loseff introduces some "extravagant" devices that strictly speaking do not even fill all the characteristics of Aesopian language. Such devices include, for instance, puns and acrostics. Before the Revolution, puns were a popular device, but during the Soviet era, they played only a minor role. The same is true for acrostics, codes hidden, for instance, in the initials of every word or every line. Both de-

vices rarely occurred in Soviet Aesopian language, and when they did occur, they usually supplemented other, not as easily detectable, screens and markers. (Loseff 1984: 115–117.)

There are Aesopian devices that do not precisely fit into any one of the categories listed above or contain features of more than one category. For instance, one of Nekrasov's devices, which Chukovskii characterizes as "laying a veil" (*nalozhenie setki*), has common denominators with Loseff's concept of noise. An entire poem could be written for the special objective of secretly inserting into it a few important verses with political content. The rest of the poem, fully conforming to the official line, would only be meant to camouflage dissident and prohibited ideas. (Chukovskii 2005: 615.) There is, however, a subtle distinction between emphases. For Loseff, the primary function of noise is to prevent the censors from noticing potentially dangerous material, whereas the function of veil was for the benefit of the intended reader of the subtext:

Такая система была основана на полной уверенности, что читатель непременно поймет, какие из этих стихов вынужденные, а какие свои, настоящие, то есть как бы наложить на них сетку, прикрывающую строки, которых не нужно читать. (Chukovskii 2005: 615.)

Such a system was based on the absolute confidence that the reader will certainly comprehend which verses are forced and which of them are by the author, genuine ones. In other words, it is like laying a veil to shade those verses that there is no need to read.

Thus, for Chukovskii, the rather abstract notion of veil means a device that guides the Aesopian reader's gaze past that part of the poem that could be characterized as noise.

Some of the examples presented by Chukovskii and Loseff appear to be single instances of the use of a particular set of devices. That is well in accord with the nature of Aesopian language: the author must always be one step ahead of the censors.

As Sandomirskaja points out,

Aesopian language is a fundamentally ambiguous phenomenon, in the understanding of which one has to deal with multiple uncertainties. (Sandomirskaja 2015: 81.)

Because of the very nature of Aesopian language, a classification of its devices that would provide a categorical model for text analysis is not possible. If such a classification of devices existed, it would no longer be Aesopian language in its essential sense.

4 Navigating *A High Art* through the 1930s

This chapter examines Chukovskii's dialogue with the Stalinist culture in the 1930, 1936 and 1941 editions of *A High Art*. Subchapter 4.1 sums up the publishing timetables of each edition and other details connected with the process. For the present study, the dates of submittal are particularly relevant because some alterations made in the book seem to have a connection with certain incidents or cultural phenomena. As discussed in Subchapter 4.1, the interval between the times of submittal and publication might sometimes be even close to two years.

Subchapter 4.2 outlines the dominant features of the major chronotope that was pervasive in 1930s Stalinist culture. The chronotope was in a constant flux, and most of its shifts were too subtle to be situated into any exact moment. An infinite number of minor chronotopes kept emerging and subsiding, but many of them were significant only at a certain time, in a certain place, or for a certain writer. Therefore, the present study focuses primarily on the major chronotope that represents the great time during which *A High Art* kept evolving.

The spatial and temporal aspects of a chronotope are intertwined in myriad and intricate ways. For most phenomena, their classification into one of the above aspects is not easy. Such a strict categorization is not even beneficial, because it ineluctably narrows the perspective. In Keunen's representation (see Subchapter 3.1), spatial aspects appear more or less static by nature, whereas temporal aspects involve movement, activity and change. Thus, atmospheres, values, and models could be regarded as spatial aspects, and their reverberations in an individual's behavior could be regarded as temporal aspects. Instead of categorically classifying phenomena into aspects, the present study examines them, respectively, as the "setting" and the "performance." The terms refer to the notion of Stalinist culture as an "omnipresent magic theatre" (see Subchapter 4.2).

Subchapter 4.3 discusses the features that compose the setting and Subchapter 4.4 the features that compose the performance of the Stalinist time chronotope as manifested in the 1930s editions of *A High Art*. Subchapter 4.5 takes a slightly different approach. It examines those texts particularly from the author's personal standpoint, contemplating on his motives and his survival strategies. In some cases, that which is not uttered speaks louder than any utterance would.

4.1 TWISTS AND TURNS OF PUBLICATION

The 1930 and 1936 editions of *A High Art* were released by the publishing house Academia. If Chukovskii's letter to N. A. Rubakin (see Subchapter 2.6) is dated correctly, the 1930 edition, in actual fact, came out already in December 1929. Chukovskii's share of the book comprises 82 pages – a notable addition to his share of 29 pages in the previous edition in 1920. With Chukovskii's meticulous working habits, the editing has probably taken a lot of

time. Unfortunately, Chukovskii does not touch on the topic in his diary. There are neither entries about working on the edition nor information about the date when the manuscript was submitted. Chukovskii's co-author Andrei Fedorov (see Subchapter 2.5) has dated his text April–June 1929. Concluding from the date, the manuscript must have been submitted at some point between June and December of that year.

Of his young co-author, Chukovskii's diary contains only one single mention, a cryptic comment recorded on February 1, 1928:

Целый день занимался историко-литературной дребеденью: Татьяна Александровна, Метальников, Федоров. (Chukovskii 2011b: 356.)

Been working all day on historical literary nonsense: Tat'iana Aleksandrovna, Metal'nikov, Fedorov.

If indeed, as designated in the index of the diary, it is Andrei V. Fedorov whom Chukovskii referring to (in other entries, the same surname is associated with the poet and translator Andrei M. Fedorov), his choice of words is interesting. Why would he speak about subject matter, by all appearances, very close to his heart as “nonsense” – or might he possibly be speaking about Fedorov's points of view? The absence of Fedorov's name in Chukovskii's diary may suggest that “co-authoring” in this case meant both authors individually composing their respective texts – with Fedorov's exactly twice as long as Chukovskii's.

The following edition, the first one authored by Chukovskii alone, was submitted in January 1935 (see Chukovskii 2011b: 560). However, it was not released until September 1936 (see Chukovskaia, E. 2011c: 584). While Chukovskii was editing the book (then under the title *Iskusstvo perevoda* or “The Art of Translation; see Subchapter 2.5), he was working on a *Pravda* article with the same title (Chukovskii 1935a: see also Chukovskii 2011b: 546, 554–555). The article “*Iskusstvo perevoda*” was, in fact, submitted first, in December 1934. As it turns out, it contained material that did not suit the censors:

В фельетоне, который я дал «Правде», – «Искусство перевода» – содержатся похвалы издательству «Academia». Их велено убрать. Теперь хвалить «Академию» нельзя – там был Каменев. (Chukovskii 2011b: 554.)

The article I gave to *Pravda*, “*Iskusstvo perevoda*,” – contains praise for Academia. I was told to take it out. You can't praise Academia in *Pravda* now: it was Kamenev's home. (Erlich 2005: 310.)

Chukovskii is referring to the aftermath of Kirov's murder (see Subchapter 2.7). The article was published in *Pravda* on March 1, 1935, and the Party leader had been assassinated exactly three months earlier. Most parts of the article are included in the 1936 edition of *A High Art*. An elaborated version of the article was published in the March 1935 issue of the journal *Krasnaia nov'* (“Red Virgin Soil”), titled “*Vysokoe iskusstvo (Otryvki iz budushchei knigi)*” (“A High Art [Excerpts from the forthcoming book];” see Chukovskii 1935c). The way the article was titled suggests that a new, alternate title to the book was incubating in Chukovskii's mind at the time.

Commenting on the inappropriateness of praising Academia, Chukovskii does not explicitly mention *Pravda*. Victor Erlich has supplemented his translation with that extra piece of information, which, of course, is implicitly present even in the original text. The criteria of censorship were evidently rigid in the official mouthpiece of the Party. In *Krasnaia nov'*, Academia could be praised but with certain qualifications, as it turns out from the following excerpt:

[. . .], и если сейчас «Academia», при всех своих тяжелых недостатках, подняло искусство перевода на высоту небывалую и внедрило в наши литературные нравы тот советский стиль, о котором я сейчас говорил, это потому, что наши издательства, в частности "Academia", впитали в себя творческий опыт "Всемирной литературы", вдохновляемый Горьким. (Chukovskii 1935c: 246.)

[. . .], and if today Academia, despite all of its serious shortcomings, has elevated the art of translation into an unprecedentedly high level and introduced into our literary practices that Soviet style that I have just spoken about, it is because our publishing houses, particularly Academia, have absorbed in themselves that creative experience of Vsemirnaia literatura that was inspired by Gor'kii.

The above statement is certainly justified in that Academia furthered the legacy of Vsemirnaia literatura in the publishing world. The passage was revised for the 1936 edition of *A High Art*. As far as the book was concerned, the name Academia was not taboo – obviously, as it was published by that very enterprise. As can be seen in the example shown in Table 1, Academia is commended without further reservations and juxtaposed with Vsemirnaia literatura as an equal.

Table 1

<p><i>Лишь теперь, лишь после революции, когда возникли такие издательства, как «Всемирная литература», «Academia», «Гослитиздат», поставившие своей задачей дать точнейшие переводы лучших иностранных писателей, – максимальная точность перевода стала непреложным законом. (Chukovskii 1936a: 124.)</i></p>	<p><i>Only now, only after the Revolution, with the appearance of such publishing houses as Vsemirnaia literatura, Academia and Goslitizdat that undertook the task of producing supremely accurate translations of the very best foreign writers, did maximal accuracy become an immutable law.</i></p>
---	--

Beginning with the 1930 edition (p. 28), a passage that acknowledges the above publishing houses is incorporated into every edition of *A High Art* (see also Chukovskii 1941: 207; 1964: 280; 1966: 545; 1968: 294–295). In the 1930 edition, the list also includes ZiF (Zemlia i Fabrika or “Land and Factory”), a publishing house that operated in the 1920s (see Ionov 1930).

In *A High Art*, Chukovskii actively participated in several public discourses of the 1930s. One of those discourses was centered around William Shakespeare (see Subchapter 4.4.4). Chukovskii wrote several articles about translating Shakespeare, with most of their contents eventually ending up in *A High Art* (see Subchapter 4.4.4). The first one, titled

"Iskazhennyi Shekspir" ("Distorted Shakespeare;" see Chukovskii 1934), was published in *Pravda* in August 1934. A few months later, it appeared in the January 1935 issue of *Krasnaia nov*, elaborated and under the new title "Edinoborstvo s Shekspirom" ("A Duel with Shakespeare;" see Chukovskii 1935b). The contents of those articles became part of the 1936 edition of *A High Art*. The 1941 edition was also preceded by two articles about Shakespeare. The first one of them, titled "Iskalechennyi Shekspir" ("Damaged Shakespeare;" see Chukovskii 1939), was published in *Pravda* in November 1936. Its considerably expanded version, titled "Astma u Dezdemony" ("Desdemona's Asthma;" see Chukovskii 1940b), appeared in the February 1940 issue of *Teatr*, the monthly publication of the Ministry of Culture and the Writers' Union.

Other topics of public discourse were the Ukrainian poet Taras Shevchenko (see Subchapter 4.3.3) and the ideological issues involved with translation (see Subchapter 4.4.3). To the former topic, Chukovskii contributed an article titled "Iskoverkannyi perevod T. G. Shevchenko" ("Corrupted Translating of Shevchenko;" Chukovskii 1938), which appeared in *Pravda* on the eve of the Shevchenko's anniversary in November 1938. About ideological issues, Chukovskii (1940a) wrote an article for *Literaturnaia ucheba* ("Literary Studies"), a journal published by the Writers' Union. The article was titled "Sotsial'naia priroda perevodchika" ("The Social Nature of the Translator"), and its contents are to be found under the same title in the 1941 edition of *A High Art*.

Long publishing timetables had caused Chukovskii (2011b: 253–254) harm already in the 1920s, then particularly because of a severe shortage of paper. In his diary, Chukovskii neither comments on the prolonged time it took to get the 1936 edition published, nor discusses the reasons behind the delay. *A High Art* was not the only manuscript of his that was lying about waiting about to be published. At the time when he submitted the manuscript, another book of his was just being released, which had been waiting for its turn for a year (see Chukovskii 2011b: 560).

It seems that all Chukovskii could do was to vent his frustration in his diary. The following exclamation was recorded on February 22, 1936. The title of the book in question does not transpire from the entry.

Оказывается, печатание моей книги отложено до марта!!! Выйдет она только в апреле!! Повторяется история с «Искусством перевода». (Chukovskii 2011c: 15.)

It turned out that the printing of my book has been postponed until March!!! It won't come out before April!!! The history of *The Art of Translation* is repeating itself.

Released by the State Publishing House *Khudozhestvennaia literatura* ("Fiction"), the subsequent edition of *A High Art* came out in February 1941 (see Subchapter 2.7), on the eve of the Second World War. Lauren Leighton (1984: xxxi) notes that the appearance of the book was "devoured by the war." The 1941 edition, too, took more than a year to be published. According to Chukovskii's (2011c: 48) diary, the manuscript was submitted to Academia on December 1, 1939. Therefore, in the present study, the 1941 edition is discussed as one of the 1930s editions of *A High Art*.

From a diary entry recorded on November 26, 1939, it turns out that the latest edition of *A High Art* did not quite satisfy Chukovskii's expectations:

Корплю над книгой «Искусство перевода». Могла бы выйти неплохая книга (пятое издание), если бы я не заболел в сентябре страшным гриппом, после которого мне пришлось «отдохнуть» в Барвихе. (Chukovskii 2011c: 47.)

Laboring on the book *The Art of Translation*. It might have turned out fairly good (the fifth edition), had I not fallen ill in September with a terrible influenza, after which I had to go «rest» for a while in Barvikha.

Three days later, he reports “still slaving over *A High Art*.” One cannot but speculate whether there was something in the book that the censors rejected at first sight – Chukovskii refrains from commenting on the issue. In two subsequent entries recorded within one and the same week, he refers to the book by different titles, in the first entry as *The Art of Translation*, and in the second one as “*A High Art*.” This suggests that the decision about the new title was made at the time the manuscript was submitted. (See Chukovskii 2011c: 48.)

Examining the authorial decisions in *A High Art*, it must be taken into consideration that before the book was published, it had passed through numerous hands. It had been assessed by the editor of the publishing house and inspected by the censor. In fact, those two may have been one and the same person, as in the Soviet Union, the distinction between editing and censoring was quite vague (see Sherry 2015: 70). Unfortunately, the original manuscripts are not available for the present study, and therefore it is unknown which passages may have been removed, changed, or supplemented, particularly as ordered by the censors.

4.2 STALINIST TIME AS A CHRONOTOPE

As suggested in Subchapter 3.1, the chronotope of a non-fictional work is very similar to the cultural chronotope of the period in which it was produced. Thus, the chronotope of Stalinist time outlined in this chapter is also the chronotope of the 1930s editions of *A High Art*. Some phenomena of that period have been discussed in Subchapters 2.6, 2.7, and 2.8, primarily those that had a direct influence on Chukovskii’s personal and professional life. In this subchapter, a broader vantage point is taken in order to outline the chronotope that characterized the Stalinist period. The chronotope also encompasses such “social and personal catastrophes and decisions” as Bibler refers to them in his description of the 20th century cultural chronotope. Both general and personal aspects contribute to the “cultural phenomenon called Kornei Chukovskii.” (See Subchapter 3.1.) Since that chronotope shares some aspects with Bakhtin’s biographical chronotopes, those chronotopes are occasionally used as points of reference. By and large, however, Stalinist culture had distinct hallmarks of its own. Therefore direct analogies with Bakhtin’s chronotopes cannot be made, particularly as they were delineated primarily for the description of tendencies in the history of literature.

This subchapter discusses a major chronotope, or an umbrella chronotope, that covers more than a decade of time. It begins with the period of the First Five-Year Plan and the Cultural Revolution in 1928–1932. As discussed in Subchapter 2.6, the early stage of the chronotope was dominated by the dictatorship of RAPP and by tightening censorship. In

Chukovskii's small time, his work as a litterateur was shadowed by the campaign against Chukovskii-ism. The timeline extends through the 1930s, during which the "Stalinist habitat" gradually took a definite shape (see Fitzpatrick 2000: 4). Katerina Clark and Evgeny Dobrenko divide the period of High Stalinism into the following three sequences: During the years 1932–1935, the doctrine Socialist Realism was instituted. At the same time, a counter-reaction began to emerge against the most extreme phenomena of the Cultural Revolution. In 1936–1938 the Great Terror was at its height. In literature and the arts, a campaign was conducted against "Formalism" and "naturalism." The years 1938–1941 were shadowed by the unstable international situation and by the anticipation of war. (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 149.)

This chapter does not intend to provide a comprehensive description of Stalinist culture but to center on those aspects that seem to have pertained to the revision of *A High Art*. In other words, the goal here is to reconstruct the spatial and temporal aspects that constituted the great time of the 1930s editions. Although some phenomena of that time, for instance the Potemkin village (see below) and the idealization of kolkhoz life, would otherwise be worth delving into more closely, those topics do not have a lot of relevance to *A High Art*. The concept of time, on the other hand, is one of those aspects which do have relevance and which therefore are given particular attention.

The chronotope of Stalinist time was in constant flux, with one phase overlapping another. Some turns in its development can be traced to their exact origin, for instance, the consequences of Kirov's murder. Other turns, like the increasing patriotism in the late 1930s, are more gradual and subtle. Furthermore, there are several phenomena with repercussions and ramifications that extend far beyond their actual time range. The Great Terror casts its shadow over the entire period of the 1930s, but its influence lingered in Soviet society much longer. Kevin McDermott calls into question the widespread belief that those who succumbed to the terror were chiefly members of the political, military, and intellectual elites. If the victims are counted in numbers, the great majority of them were ordinary Soviet citizens. (See McDermott 2008: 176.) Besides those who concretely perished or suffered during the terror, millions of people were traumatized for years and generations to come. Once lost, a sense of security and predictability is not easy to regain.

The second half of Stalin's rule, the time after the Second World War, would bring new and different aspects into the chronotope of Stalinist time. The present study, however, concentrates on its hallmarks in the 1930s.

Sheila Fitzpatrick lists the most distinguishing aspects of Stalinist society as follows:

Communist Party rule, Marxist-Leninist ideology, rampant bureaucracy, leader cults, state control over production and distribution, social engineering, affirmative action on behalf of workers, stigmatization of "class enemies," police surveillance, terror, and the various informal, personalistic arrangements whereby people at every level sought to protect themselves and obtain scarce goods, were all part of the Stalinist habitat. (Fitzpatrick 2000: 3–4.)

A novelist usually adjusts the chronotope of his work to current models and ideals, but at least in theory, he is free to reflect the extra-literary reality in whatever way he pleases. In the 1930s Soviet Union, a particular literary chronotope was canonized by the doctrine

of Socialist Realism (see Subchapter 2.7). Even writers whose works did not “officially” represent Socialist Realism had to adjust their writing to the doctrine and to the values it represented. This also pertained to non-fiction writers like critics and scholars. There were also writers who would not let their creative decisions be dictated from above. For them, practicing the literary profession in the 1930s was in the best case difficult. In the worst case, their determination cost them their lives, as in the case of Osip Mandel’shtam (see Subchapter 4.5.1).

In its early stages, the chronotope of Stalinist time was molded by a shift, which Katerina Clark (2000: 136) describes as “a reorientation from a horizontal, undifferentiated ordering of reality to a vertical, hierarchical ordering.” A new, “sacralized” conception of national time came to define the conception of the Soviet space. Its separateness from historic time is common with Bakhtin’s concept of carnival time (See Brooks 2001: 77–78). Carnival was, however, characterized by “radical inversions of social and conceptual hierarchies” (see Clark & Holquist 1984: 4). The premises of the Soviet national time were diametrically opposed:

Whereas the sixteenth-century French carnival, as Bakhtin described it, was a mockery of official norms, the Stalinist “theatre state” ceaselessly confirmed them. (Brooks 2001: 78.)

The verticality of the new ordering was also manifest in its hierarchical nature. At the lowest level in the hierarchy were ordinary mortals, and at the highest one, Lenin and Stalin. The link connecting them was the Kremlin, which in the 1930s came to acquire significant symbolic value. (Clark 2000: 136, 141–142.)

In public discourse and propaganda, there were two quite opposite approaches to time. On the one hand, the binary opposition between “before” and “after” was frequently and systematically brought into focus, with the Revolution as the turning point (*perelomnyi moment*). The miserable tsarist past was juxtaposed with the happy and prosperous life of Soviet society. In public discourse, even Stalin’s industrialization and collectivization campaigns were incorporated as elements of Revolution. (Petroni 2000: 154.) On the other hand, the gaps between the past, the present, and the future were blurred, and the difference between the historical and the contemporary lost its significance. “Historic” became a standard expression even when praising current achievements of the Soviet state and Soviet citizens. (Brooks 2001: 78–79.) Sheila Fitzpatrick comments on the hyperbolic nature of public discourse as follows:

It was indeed an age of achievement, but it was also an age of extraordinary boosterism, boasting, and exaggeration of what had been achieved. (Fitzpatrick 2000: 70.)

A new outlook was taken on the past, and Soviet history was given depth and prestige by integrating Russian history as part of it. An uninterrupted continuity between the ancient Kievan Rus’ and the Soviet Union was underscored. (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 260.) The history of tsarist Russia was reconsidered, and several “positive and progressive” aspects of it were revealed (Perrie 2006: 150). At the same time, pre-revolutionary writers were granted membership into the Soviet literary canon. Juxtaposing the tendency with the earlier ef-

forts by Proletkul't (see subchapter 2.3) to incorporate Russian classics into proletarian culture, Linn Malli remarks:

Составление «пантеона» - «уместного» культурного наследия - было центральным пунктом и сталинской культуры 1930-х годов. (Malli 2000: 184.)

The compiling of a “pantheon” – an “appropriate” cultural heritage – was also a central point of the Stalinist culture in the 1930s.

The outlines of the pantheon began to take shape at the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers in 1934. In the addresses given at the congress, names of Western classics were frequently heard alongside Russian ones. (Malli 2000: 184.) The proletarian extremism of the Cultural Revolution (see Subchapter 2.6) having already subsided, critics were free, at this time, to discuss the literary predilections of the founding fathers of Socialism. For instance, Marx was professed to have appreciated such Western writers as Shakespeare, Homer, Cervantes, and the “English realist” Charles Dickens. (Klark 2000: 356.)

The 19th century poet Aleksandr Pushkin became an emblem of Soviet culture and a champion of the invented Soviet tradition. The 1937 centennial of his death was lavishly celebrated all around the country. In actuality, a member of nobility and a serf-owner, Pushkin was portrayed as a class-conscious revolutionary and a socialist-minded people's poet. (Petrone 2000: 11, 113, 115, 206.) Stephanie Sandler (2006) examines the Pushkin celebrations in the particular framework of Soviet revisionism in the 1930s. Sandler calls attention to the propagandistic use of hyperbole in connection with the Pushkin festivities:

The word *great (velikii)* resounded constantly: it described Pushkin, elevating him to a heroic status, but also the new Soviet state, the jubilee, and Stalin himself. Lest anyone miss the association of greatness between the political leader and the literary hero, any number of public places and ceremonies provided reminders: in the vestibule of the restored Moika 12 apartment in Leningrad, for example, busts of Stalin and Pushkin were placed alongside one another. (Sandler 2006: 195–196.)

As discussed above, verticality was one of the hallmarks of the Soviet national time in the 1930s. Another one of its peculiarities was that the small time of man was not acknowledged: the signification of an individual was equal to his contribution to the greater whole (see Clark 2000: 95). In both of the above respects, the chronotope of Stalinist time has several parallel features with Bakhtin's biographical time chronotopes. The public self-consciousness of man is one common feature. Bakhtin notes that in the “biographized” image of man, there was no room for “anything intimate or private, secret or personal, anything relating solely to the individual himself.” The emphasis on tradition is a feature shared particularly with Bakhtin's Roman biographical chronotope, in which “the national idea is represented by ancestors.” The all-encompassing role of the state, in turn, correlates with the notion of the public square (agora) in the Greek biographical chronotope. (See Bakhtin 2011: 131–132, 137–138, 145.) Bakhtin describes the meaning of the agora as follows:

But the square in earlier (ancient) times constituted a state (and more – it constituted the entire state apparatus, with all its official organs), it was the highest court, the whole of science, the whole of art, the entire people participated in it. (Bakhtin 2011: 132.)

In the Greek biographical chronotope, the self-consciousness of man was controlled and evaluated at the agora (see Bakhtin 2011: 132). In the chronotope of Stalinist time, its function was filled by the official, state-sponsored press. The merging of the people with the state apparatus is a particularly interesting notion. It was not always so simple to draw a distinct line between the two in Stalinist culture, either. For instance a litterateur's work was no more recognized as an independent creative activity but evaluated as his input to the Soviet system. Katerina Clark describes the Soviet writer's responsibilities in the 1930s as follows:

Indeed, the writer was seen as rather like a trained professional working for the government, who was to implement certain assignments or elaborate certain themes that were given to him either explicitly or implicitly (in either case, often through official speeches, articles in *Pravda*, and so on). (Clark 1998: 56.)

Texts were not considered as the property of the author, either. Without his permission or even without him knowing, they might be rewritten several times before publication, either by an editor or by another writer assigned to the task. In other instances, the author might be ordered to make the predetermined changes in the text himself. (Clark 1998: 56.)

As far as foreign works were concerned, the issue was more complicated. Seeing that they had not been subjected to censorship, there could be no guarantee of the orthodoxy of their contents. One solution to the problem was prioritizing such writers that appeared sympathetic to the Soviet ethos or otherwise politically appropriate. Another solution was adopting free translation as the officially approved method. It gave the translator or the editor a free hand to interpret and correct the text as he thought fit. (Burnett & Lygo 2013: 23–24.) A leading translator and theorist during the Stalinist period, Ivan Kashkin instructed translators to convey only that which is “progressive” and omit “unnecessary details” entirely (Friedberg 1997: 104).

Stalinist culture is frequently referred to in theatrical terms (about masks, see below). Jeffrey Brooks (2001: xvi, 110) characterizes Stalinist culture as a “performance” and as an “omnipresent magic theatre,” in which, with the canonization of Socialist Realism, writers were expected to work as “actors.” Brooks calls attention to the contrast between the current situation and the enthusiastic days of the Revolution:

What began with some artists' voluntary, if self-interested, participation in the revolutionary project became enforced conformity to the rules of the performance in the 1930s. (Brooks 2001: 123.)

The above statement seems fitting also when examining the development of Chukovskii's career after the Revolution.

Conforming to the doctrines of Socialist Realism was part of the performance. Socialist Realist literature manifested the sanctified ethos of the 1930s, and, at the same time, it disseminated the ethos. Sheila Fitzpatrick (2000: 9) notes that Socialist realism was not merely an artistic tendency but a general “Stalinist mentalité.” In public discourse, particularly in the representations of the Soviet countryside, that mentalité manifested itself in Potemkinism. The typical Russian village, which in reality was hungry, poor and desolate, was portrayed as a paradisiacal place where “the sun always shone.” (Fitzpatrick 1994: 16, 262). Potemkinism was a particular all-encompassing approach to Soviet reality:

Potemkinism was a Stalinist discourse in which the defects and contradictions of the present were overlooked and the world was described not as it was but as it was becoming, as Soviet Marxists believed it necessarily *would be* in the future. (Fitzpatrick 1994: 16.)

Throughout the 1930s, Stakhanovites (see below) and other “professional peasants” were invited to participate in various public ritual occasions, such as the national Congress of Outstanding Kolkhozniks. Their role on those occasions was to represent idealized Soviet peasantry. (Fitzpatrick 1994: 16). In a wider sense, every Soviet citizen was expected to participate in the Potemkin theatre. Playing his assigned role, he ignored that which was there, around him, and acknowledged only that which Catriona Kelly (2001: 297) refers to as “incentive visions of the ‘bright future.’” Thus, here, too, the image of Soviet space is determined by the vertical conception of time.

As a representation of the countryside, the Potemkin village filled the function of creating an idyllic and embellished image of Soviet life. In Socialist Realist literature, the same function was filled by pastoral motifs that brought the Soviet present closer to the traditional Russian way of life. The complex features of reality were smoothed, and the general atmosphere of optimism was highlighted. (Clark 2000: 108–109.)

In Soviet mass songs (composed particularly to be performed for the great masses; M. S.) and films, there emerged a lyrical genre that replaced the Marxist ideology of the revolutionary era with the cult of the homeland and earth (*kul't Rodiny i zemli*). The new genre shared many features with ancient Russian folklore. The Soviet land was represented as a mother figure whose primary attributes were fertility (*plodorodie*) and abundance (*izobilie*). (Giunter 1997.) Hans Günther describes the image as follows:

Необъятная страна является огромным материнским телом с цветущими полями и глубокими реками, полными жизненной силы. (Giunter 1997.)

The boundless land appears as a huge maternal body with blossoming fields and deep rivers, filled with life force.

The idyllic Potemkin village and the maternal image of the homeland were different facets of Soviet nationalism, which in Socialist Realism manifested itself as *narodnost'* (derived from the Russian word *narod*, which means ‘people’ or ‘nation’; M.S.). As a concept, *narodnost'* was part of the public discourse about literature even before the Soviet era. For instance, Vissarion Belinskii examined the concept as a constituent of the more comprehensive notion of nationality (*natsional'nost'*). Belinskii associated *narodnost'* in literature with realism. (See Morris 2005: 91.)

In the tenets of Socialist Realism, *narodnost'* signified "orientation toward the people" (Dobrenko 2011: 49). The word was related to such notions as "folk," "people's," "national" and "state." Basically, it meant writing in a simple enough manner so that the text would be accessible to the masses, to the "common man." (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 147, 260.) *Narodnost'* was considered to be "the meeting point of artistic quality, ideological content and social function" (Morris 2005: 91).

Implicitly, *narodnost'* in a text also meant taking distance from "bourgeois" Western culture and demonstrating the author's love for the Soviet Union (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 147). In mass songs and films, the Soviet nation was represented as one "big family" (*bol'shaia sem'ia*), with Stalin as its "wise father" (*mudryi otets*). (Giunter 1997.) The idea of protecting the family had its advantages in the promotion of another tendency that defined Soviet space in the 1930s. That tendency was isolationism. Hitler's rise to power in 1934 brought forth a threat of war. Therefore it was vital to reinforce national solidarity and close ranks against outside intruders. (Ermolaev 1991: 22.)

The campaign against Formalism (see below) in the late 1930s can be examined as one manifestation of Soviet isolationism. Fundamentally, it targeted modernism, which was a distinctly international movement and closely associated with the American and Western European cultures (Brooks 2001: 122). Catriona Kelly describes the Soviet isolationist tendency as follows:

Everything possible was done to distance Soviet reality, in ideological terms, from the negative manifestations of Western culture, such as fashion and the accumulation of material possession. (Kelly 2001: 252.)

The mistrust of anything foreign inevitably affected the Soviet authorities' attitude towards translators. Manifesting a "suspicious interest in foreign lands and cultures," translators were more or less dubious individuals in the eyes of the regime. (Friedberg 1997: 113–114.) In fact, any kind of connection with foreigners was regarded as a disloyalty (Fitzpatrick 2005: 209). In the files of the NKVD, people with contacts abroad were listed under a particular heading among hostile or dissident elements in the society (Conquest 2008: 257).

In general, Soviet cultural policy palpably tightened in the late 1930s. The appointment of Andrei Zhdanov as the head of the Central Committee Directorate for Propaganda and Agitation (*Upravlenie propagandy i agitatsii Tsk VKP(b)*) in 1938 put the final seal on the centralization of culture under the Party. The process had already begun in December 1935, when a Politburo resolution subordinated all branches of art to the Council of the People's Commissars (*Sovnarkom*). The campaign against Formalism was launched in 1936 by a series of articles in *Pravda*. The initial target was the composer Dmitrii Shostakovich, but the campaign soon extended to other arts. Unions of all creative branches began to organize meetings with the objective of exposing "Formalists" among their membership. Anybody unlucky enough to be labeled as a Formalist was pressured into public displays of repentance. (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 146, 229–230.)

The essence of "Formalism" as it was understood is hard to define. As in the case of Socialist Realism, the concern was not about style but of a more comprehensive issue, inseparably connected with the Soviet system. Katerina Clark summarizes it as follows:

The Party leaders did not invent these attitudes and policies, but rather had them implemented with singular rigor. The policies reflect prejudices widely found among Soviet intellectuals. The linguistic and visual puritanism of socialist realism proved persistent and generally outlived Stalin himself, as well as socialist realism. (Clark 1996: 293.)

Clark's observation for its part supports the notion of the Soviet writer as an active contributor to maintaining literary norms and conventions rather than merely as a servile stooge of the regime (see also Subchapter 2.7).

Since the mid-1920s, Stalin had promoted the doctrine of Socialism in one country instead of world revolution, at the same time, emphasizing the importance of guarding the homeland against "capitalist encirclement" (Brooks 2001: 33). The isolation of the Soviet space from the outside world was compensated by a consistent and effective feeding of a sense of unity of its peoples. A distinct sense of a Soviet identity was promulgated among the diverse nationalities inhabiting the state, and public discourse kept highlighting the "patriotic and holy allegiance" of all Soviet nations to the homeland (Petroni 2000: 10–11.)

The Soviet nationalities policy was primarily based on ideas elaborated by Lenin and Stalin. Fundamentally, it was a strategy of promoting ethnicity as a positive aspect of nationalism. It was used as a weapon against the negative and more dangerous nationalist aspects that might have challenged a foreign rule. The policy was officially established by two Party resolutions in 1923. They included a greatest-danger principle according to which great-power chauvinism was more dangerous than local nationalism. Behind it was Lenin's categorical distinction between the significance of nationalism for large nations and for small nations. Lenin's outlook was adopted in the Bolshevik rhetoric, according to which the "defensive" (*oboronitel'nyi*) nationalism of the latter was justified as a response to the "offensive" (*nastupatel'nyi*) nationalism of the former. Nominally, these principles remained valid all through Stalin's rule. However, during the three terror waves of 1928–1930, 1932–1933, and 1937–1938, the greatest-danger principle was violated in that the "bourgeois" nationalists were the principal targets. (Martin 2001: 7–9, 12, 23.)

A popular slogan that illustrates the multinational Soviet state in the early 1930s was the "Brotherhood of the Peoples" (*bratstvo narodov*). In Communist rhetoric, the word "brotherhood" referred to class militancy, and the slogan was well suited for the military campaigns of that period. In the latter half of the decade, a different metaphor was needed, one that would evoke images of mutual love between the Soviet nations and of their common affection for the benevolent Comrade Stalin. In December 1935, Stalin himself introduced a new notion: "the Friendship of the Peoples" (*druzhiba narodov*), which soon became the official metaphor of the multinational state. (Martin 2001: 270, 432, 441, 444.)

The "Friendship of the Peoples" campaign brought into the limelight the diverse ethnic cultures of Soviet minority nationalities. Their exotic features were lauded in the press, and receptions in the Kremlin were arranged for folkloric performers from the small republics. Events called "weeks of national art" (*dekady natsional'nogo iskusstva*) were organized periodically. (Martin 2001: 439, 443.) Jeremy Smith describes the attention lavished at minority nations as follows:

Traditional national costumes were the subject of museum exhibitions, and national musicians were invited to perform and take part in competitions in Moscow, where the cultural diversity of the Soviet Union provided a constant source of entertainment for Party leaders, educated society and workers. In a closely controlled process, national cultures became rooted in an eternal past, with little or no modern dynamic. (Smith 2013: 117.)

Here, again, the vertical timeline is manifested in which ideas and phenomena, or, as in this case, entire cultures could be maneuvered back and forth as best suited for the strategy of consolidating the image of a united Soviet land.

Every nation named their own “people’s poet.” Some of them were contemporary poets, like Belorussia’s Yanka Kupala, Dagestan’s Suleiman Stal’skii, and Kazakhstan’s Dzhambul Dzhabaev (see Subchapter 4.3.2), whereas in Ukraine, the people’s poet was the 19th poet Taras Shevchenko, and in Georgia, the medieval poet Shota Rustaveli. The latter two received particular attention in the Soviet press, and nearly a veritable cult was built around them. (Martin 2001: 444.)

The attitude of the Soviet regime towards non-Russian minorities was not without contradictions. All the while their national self-consciousness was encouraged, many of them were labeled as enemy nations. Some nationalities were even subjected to severe ethnic cleansing, which culminated during the Great Terror. (Martin 2001: 311.) In his constitution speech in 1936, Stalin proclaimed the victory of Lenin’s nationalities policy (Petroni 2000: 181). By then, he had already explicitly dismissed one of its fundamental pillars, the greatest-danger principle. Addressing the Seventeenth Party Congress in 1934, he had remarked that it would be “stupid” to consider the formula valid at any time and in any situation and emphasized that Great Russian chauvinism was, in fact, no greater danger than local nationalism (Martin 2001: 361).

The Friendship of the Peoples ethos also legitimized the rehabilitation of Russian national culture. Its classical canons of literature and art had survived the Revolution and even the Cultural Revolution, but now their Russianness became a particular focus of attention. Gradually, the new tendency shifted Russian culture into a distinctly privileged position over the minority cultures. The new order was officially acknowledged in a *Pravda* editorial in 1936. It pronounced that all the Soviet nations were equal patriots but the Russian nation was the “first among equals.” (Martin 2001: 451–452.) While, for instance, the jubilees of Shevchenko and Rustaveli were celebrated on a supranational level, it was Pushkin and Pushkin alone who was pronounced the national poet of all Soviet nations (Martin 2001: 456). Petroni explains the significance of the 1937 Pushkin centennial as follows:

The Pushkin centennial defined “Soviet” culture as an advanced, progressive, European culture, based on Russian culture, that had the power to transform the less advanced non-Russian cultures of the Soviet Union. (Petroni 2000: 131.)

Thus, the conception of Soviet space notably expanded in the 1930s, as the incorporation of the minority republics in the homeland was instilled in the minds of citizens. In consequence, the notion of the Soviet man became more or less ambiguous. On the one hand, the

Soviet man was defined by ancient Russian tradition and mythology. On the other hand, with the unity of the Soviet nations effectively propagated, a new image of the Soviet man emerged with a multifarious and undefined ethnic nationality.

The key figure in the Socialist Realist novel was the positive hero who “encapsulates the cardinal public virtues” and whose career epitomizes the Soviet nation’s progress towards Communism. That same positive hero became the official model for the self-consciousness of the Soviet man. (Clark 2003: 3.) In the Soviet pantheon, Stalin and other political leaders were ex officio real-life heroes. They were often described with expressions borrowed from folk epics. Other heroes included, for instance, aviators and polar explorers, the brave conquerors of extreme conditions. (Fitzpatrick 2000: 71–72.) In the mid-1930s, a new type of hero emerged in public discourse. This one was the Stakhanovite, the over-achiever in the “culture of labor.” (Kelly 2001: 258–259.)

The chronotope of Stalinist time was utterly idealistic. In the 1930s, the remaking of man became an essential part of the Soviet ethos. The idea of a “New Man” dated from the Cultural Revolution, but its original meaning relates to the upward social mobility among working class people (Fitzpatrick 1992: 240–241). At this time, it came to mean a fundamental, internal transformation of an individual. The enemies of the proletariat would be transformed into New Men through productive work for the Soviet state. The flagship of the ethos was the White Sea Canal that was being constructed by Gulag (*Glavnoe upravlenie lagerei* or State Camp Administration) convicts. The project was accompanied by a massive propaganda campaign in the press. The key word of the campaign was *perekovka* (Shul’man & Klein 2005.) Frequently heard in the 1920s and 1930s public discourse, the word referred to moral and political re-education (*moral’noe i politicheskoe perezovspitanie*) (see Mokienko & Nikitina 1998: 432–433).

Punitive work at the White Sea Canal can also be examined as a cleansing experience. The same fundamental idea repeats itself in the Great Terror, only on a larger scale. Its ultimate goal was to clean Soviet society of any elements that besmirched its ideal image. That goal is explicitly manifest in the emblematic word “purge” (*chistka*), by which the terror is often referred to. It is notable that the ethos of remaking a man had certain reservations. There were stigmas that no amount of cleaning could erase, for instance, having been born into a “bad” social class (Fitzpatrick 2000: 115). There were also unpardonable sins:

The stigma of a dubious political past – membership of other political parties before the Revolution, membership of oppositions within the Bolshevik Party, disgrace as an “enemy of the people” during the Great Purges – was similarly indelible. (Fitzpatrick 2000: 115.)

In August 1933, 120 writers and artists from several Soviet republics made an excursion to the White Sea Canal construction site. The primus motor behind the excursion was Gor’kii, and under his supervision, a “brigade” of 36 writers afterwards compiled an anthology of articles about the canal project. Released in 1934 and titled *Istoriia stroitel’stva Belomorsko-Baltiiskogo kanala* (“History of the Construction of the White Sea – Baltic Canal”), it was conspicuously promoted both in the Soviet Union and abroad. Mikhail Shul’man and Iokhim Klein note that the book was no work of art but pure and simple propaganda. (See Shul’man & Klein 2005.) It had an unambiguous function:

Книга о Беломорканале вносит свою лепту в тот всеохватывающий мнимый мир, который характерен для культуры сталинского времени. (Shul'man & Klein 2005.)

The book about the White Sea Canal became a contribution to that all-embracing mendacious world characteristic to the culture of the Stalinist period.

Even participation in the compiling of the anthology was considered a transforming experience. As one reviewer proclaimed, the book became an “instrument of restructuring the writer’s way of life, the writer’s psyche, and the writer’s culture of labor.” The collective work of writers was a prominent topic in the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers. For instance, Chukovskii’s son Nikolai was there to give an account of the Leningrad writers’ brigade. (Dobrenko 2001: 374–375.) (See Subchapter 2.8, also for the connection of Chukovskii’s son Boris with the White Sea Canal project).

The ethos of transformation was akin to another tendency of the 1930s. All the while the society was becoming socialist, an individual was expected to become a citizen worthy of that society, a “cultured man” (*kul'turnyi chelovek*) (Fitzpatrick 2005: 13). For instance the Pushkin centennial had a secondary function, which was to culturize the Soviet citizen. Participating in the celebrations, the rising elite with a working class background had an opportunity to adopt themselves a new, cultured and educated identity. (Petroni 2000: 116.) Sheila Fitzpatrick (2005: 13) remarks that for the Soviet citizen, becoming cultured was “more a matter of behavior than essence.” In actual fact, it was yet another role that he was expected to play. Furthermore, the Pushkin celebrations were meant to promote Soviet patriotism and, simultaneously, display the citizens’ loyalty to the state (Petroni 2000: 127). In his often-cited work *The Sublime Object of Ideology* (1989), Slavoj Žižek (2008: 225) refers to this tendency as the “obsessive insistence” of the Stalinist rule to maintain an external show of unity:

[. . .], the appearance is to be maintained at any price that people are enthusiastically building socialism, supporting the Party, and so on. (Žižek 2008: 225.)

The new Soviet constitution became part of the show. During its preparation, the citizens were given the opportunity to display their political consciousness. Published in June 1936 as a draft, the constitution was in many respects similar to its American and West-European counterparts, inasmuch as it guaranteed basic civil rights and universal suffrage – even for people labeled as “class enemies.” The draft constitution was submitted for a public “nationwide discussion,” in which individuals were encouraged to influence its content. The discussion led to 48 corrections of the original text. (Petroni 2000: 174.) Petroni comments on the discussion as follows:

The Soviet government mobilized its citizens to participate in civic rituals of democracy at the same time that it denied them basic civil rights. (Petroni 2000: 174.)

The new constitution was ratified on December 5, 1936 at the Eight Extraordinary Congress of Soviets. Stalin’s speech at the event was broadcast on the radio, and it gained great publicity. Elections to the Supreme Soviet were held in the following year – with one single

candidate on each ballot. Many scholars have suggested that the celebrated Stalin constitution was merely a propagandist device for projecting to the outside world an image of the Soviet Union as a democracy. It displayed the Soviet Union as an equal, voluntary and friendly union of eleven republics. (Petroni 2000: 174–175, 181.)

In this manner, the Soviet citizens were displayed as members of a civic society, while their possibility to act as civic beings was decisively restricted. Perhaps the most genuine manifestation of civic activity on the part of the citizens was the abundance of letters that they wrote to the authorities (see Fitzpatrick 2000: 175). If the public discourse around the new constitution was part of the show, those letters stemmed from real and urgent issues. Sheila Fitzpatrick notes that they presented “one of the best functioning channels of communication between citizens and the state.” The authorities often replied to the letters, and the communication was propagated as proof of the soundness of Soviet democracy. (See Fitzpatrick 2000: 175)

Much of the 1930s rhetoric was aimed at establishing a link between Lenin and Stalin and, thereby, legitimizing Stalin’s position as the carrier-on of Lenin’s heritage (Clark 2000: 10). In the celebrations of the Twentieth Anniversary of the October Revolution in 1937, the relationship between the two leaders was particularly highlighted (Petroni 2000: 161). The lineage of heroes was extended even further back. In 1938, a textbook was published with the title *Istoriia Vsesoiuznoi Kommunisticheskoi Partii (Bolshevikov): Kratkii kurs* (“History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks): Short Course,” 1938; see e.g. Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 295). The book contained a quotation from Stalin, in which he compared himself (and other Bolsheviks) with Antaeus, the unbeatable hero of Greek mythology. (Brooks 2001: 78–79.)

Brooks calls attention to the crucial difference between the images of the two leaders. Whereas Lenin was venerated, first and foremost, as an ideological model, Stalin became the “protagonist of an almost sacred cult.” Since the late 1920s and all through the 1930s, the Soviet press, with *Pravda* showing the lead, consistently diminished Lenin’s role. At the same time, Stalin was gradually shifted into the limelight. Every proper Socialist Realist writer was expected to incorporate into his text the obligatory mention of Stalin. The leader’s monopoly over the Soviet press allowed him to personally participate in the creating and maintaining of his official image. Within a decade, the outwardly unimpressive man with less than suave delivery was transformed into a charismatic leader who radiated “authority and almost magical power.” (Brooks 2001: 59–61, 109.)

Ordinary people who had had the chance to personally meet Stalin would relate to the encounter like to a religious experience. They would recount how merely being in the presence of the leader had transformed them, enlightened them into a new consciousness and a new knowledge. (Clark 2000: 143.) For instance, the tractor driver and celebrated Stakhanovite Pasha Angelina uses rapturous expressions in describing in her memoir the first time she met Stalin (Fitzpatrick 2000: 75; see chapter 4.5.2). The image of Stalin as a “benevolent father” and an unfaltering trust in his protection vividly stands out in the innumerable letters written to him by ordinary citizens all through the 1930s. (Fitzpatrick 2005: 166).

The chronotope of Stalinist time is controversial in many ways. Stephen Lovell comments on the clash of values as follows:

For an ideology purportedly based on the values of Enlightenment rationalism, Soviet socialism made surprisingly extensive use of irrational sources of authority: leader cults, quasi-religious rituals, oracular pronouncements, public confession and recantation. (Lovell 2009: 13.)

After the positivism of the first decade following the Revolution, in the 1930s, the Soviet credo took an idealistic turn, eventually becoming a "cult of higher-order knowledge" on the verge of mysticism. The dynamics of discourse changed according to this new tendency. The function of language ceased to be directly referential and, instead, became associational. (Clark 2000: 136, 141.) To find out what was happening in Soviet society, the citizens had to decipher the multifarious insinuations and allusions used in public discourse. In other words, they had to master reading between the lines.

The conception of the Soviet space disseminated by Socialist Realist literature markedly differed from the prevalent reality. Katerina Clark calls attention to the discrepancy:

In truth, during the thirties, the Soviet state was daily becoming more powerful, bureaucratized and centralized, more punitive and more hierarchical. But Soviet novels had to be "optimistic." (Clark 2000: 109.)

In order to survive, the Soviet citizens would create for themselves new identities, masks. In the 1930s, an individual's political history, foreign connections, or having belonged to a privileged class before the Revolution could easily turn into a matter of life and death. For that reason, there were few of those who felt entirely safe and convinced of their own credibility in the eyes of the regime. Even an ostensibly model citizen, loyal to the Soviet state and with an unblemished past, could, in an instant, be labeled an enemy of the people, simply because of a distant kulak³ relative. The general atmosphere of suspicion caused everybody to live in constant fear of being unmasked. In public discourse, "mask" was a frequently used metaphor. (Fitzpatrick 1994: 13, 92, 100–101.)

Aesopian language can also be examined as a verbal mask, behind which the Aesopian writer communicates with his readers. As it turns out from the attitude to Chukovskii's fairy tales (see Subchapter 3.2), participating in that masquerade from day to day made the Soviet citizens prone to over-interpret and see hidden meanings everywhere. The presupposition that everybody was wearing a mask eventually led to the paradox that *not* wearing one could make one suspect. In Chukovskii's case, his post-revolutionary career can be contemplated as a camouflage of sorts. As discussed in Subchapter 2.2, after 1917 the witty, acrimonious, and authoritative critic Chukovskii was compelled to create himself a new identity as a children's writer, translator, and scholar. From that standpoint, even *A High Art* can be contemplated as a mask of sorts.

Concluding from the above discussion, the chronotope of Stalinist time had certain distinctive characteristics. The conception of space was restricted and closed on the one hand, and expansive and ambiguously demarcated on the other. The conception of time was vertical with two opposite focal points: one in the past and one in the future. Similar dichotomies marked the life of the Soviet man. On the one hand, it entailed looking back

³ The word referred to a prosperous peasant (see Fitzpatrick 1994: 3).

into the past for values and models, and a personality cult verging on idolatry. On the other hand, it entailed looking forward into a bright Socialist future, and the assiduous building of Soviet society. Even the conception of the Soviet man was open to interpretations. On one level, it was horizontal by nature, equally encompassing every nationality inhabiting Soviet space. On another level, it was vertical: the value of a man as a citizen was determined by his nationality. Yet another dichotomy concerned the conduct of the Soviet man. He was not recognized as an individual but, first and foremost, as part of the greater whole of the Soviet nation. To be able to maintain the role of public being, he had to maintain another, extremely private being. Behind the public façade, the mask, the individual went on with his life, trying to arrange things in his mind so as to make sense of the senseless. In the back of his mind, he was constantly on the alert, apprehensive of the potentially fateful messing up of his lines. Finally, the very concept of the world was dichotomous and controversial. One of the key words was “realism,” but at the same time, the Soviet man was purposefully maneuvered into cults and idolatry and indoctrinated with imaginary and fictitious visions of the Soviet society.

Chukovskii navigated *A High Art* through the Stalinist period dodging its shallows, taking advantage of the favorable winds, and reefing the sail when storm was raging. Adjusting *A High Art* became part of his survival strategy.

4.3 MANIFESTATIONS OF THE SETTING

This subchapter examines the following three aspects of the Stalinist time chronotope as they appear in *A High Art*: Subchapter 4.3.1 concentrates on the conception of time, Subchapter 4.3.2 on the “Friendship of the Peoples” ethos, and Subchapter 4.3.3 on literary figures as role models.

4.3.1 Now and Then

There are many such instances in *A High Art* in which “then” and “now” are presented as a pair of opposites. The juxtaposition is there already in the 1930 edition (see Table 1 in Subchapter 4.1), but in the 1936 and 1941 editions, it becomes all the more evident. Temporal indicators of present time frequently appear in the text, usually in connection with positive phenomena. The general idea is that things are now better than they were before. A watershed between epochs is the 1917 Revolution. It is the moment and the occasion that distinctly marks the transition into better times. In the 1936 edition, this is evident already in the author’s foreword (see Table 2). Chukovskii refers here to a recently published anthology of Shakespeare’s plays in Russian translations (more in Subchapter 4.4.4).

Table 2

<p><i>Книжка вышла неряшливая, но <u>в прежнее время</u> это было бы фактом весьма незначительным: мало ли <u>тогда</u> выходило неряшливых книг! А <u>теперь</u> это – событие большой важности, потому что, как сообщили мне на съезде писателей, именно с этого, с русского перевода у нас переводят Шекспира на языки тех национальностей, которые <u>только теперь, со времен революции</u>, впервые приобщаются ко всемирной культуре. (Chukovskii 1936a: 7).</i></p>	<p><i>The book came out slipshod, but <u>in the past</u> that would have been a totally insignificant fact: many slipshod books were published <u>in those days</u>! But <u>today</u> such an occurrence has enormous importance, because, as I was informed at the Writers' Congress, it is this Russian translation from which Shakespeare is translated into the languages of those nationalities that <u>only now, since the Revolution</u>, for the first time are introduced to world culture.</i></p>
---	--

The above passage clearly indicates that “now” and “then” equal with before and after the Revolution (see also Table 7 below). The same concerns the example shown in Table 3. Discussing translations of Taras Shevchenko (see Subchapter 4.3.3) from different epochs, Chukovskii (1941: 234) notes that in “the old system” (*staraia sistema*), the translator had absolute power over the original author, and then goes on to present the fundamental difference between the old and the new practices.

Table 3

<p><i>Новая эпоха – советская, нынешняя – громко требует, чтобы всему самоуправству был положен предел, чтобы искусство перевода было подчинено научной дисциплине. (Chukovskii 1941: 234.)</i></p>	<p><i>The new epoch – the Soviet one, the present one – loudly demands that all arbitrariness be limited, that the art of translation be submitted to scientific discipline.</i></p>
---	--

In the juxtaposition between the past and the present, the point of reference is – obviously, considering the domain – the Russian tradition of translation. The verticality of time is manifested in the way contemporary practices are smoothly positioned into their own place in the lineage. As discussed in Subchapter 4.2, Russian tradition was highly esteemed in the 1930s, but, in this context, it is neither sacred nor immune to criticism. On the contrary, it is repeatedly juxtaposed with the present in an unfavorable light. Its treatment resembles iconoclasm rather than adulation.

In one single sentence shown in Table 4, the expression “never before” occurs twice. The epithet “unprecedented” (*nebyvalyi* or “never been”), which further emphasizes the distinction between “now” and “then,” was frequently heard in public discourse. Like its synonym *nevidannyi* (“never seen”), it was usually associated with Soviet achievements (see Mokienko & Nikitina 1998: 364).

Table 4

<p><i>Никогда еще не было в русской литературе такой фаланги квалифицированных переводчиков, поднявших переводческое искусство на <u>небывалую дотолу</u> высоту, какая создалась у нас <u>сейчас</u>, <u>никогда еще</u> культура перевода не была доведена до такой изощренности. (Chukovskii 1936a: 122–123; 1941: 205–206.)</i></p>	<p><i><u>Never before</u> has there been in Russian literature such a phalanx of qualified translators who have elevated the art of translation into that <u>hitherto unprecedented</u> excellence we have <u>now</u> reached, <u>never before</u> was the culture of translation taken to such a level of refinement.</i></p>
---	--

In the foreword to the 1936 edition (p. 10), the Soviet practice of translation is characterized by the epithet *nevidannyi*, whereas in the foreword to the 1941 edition (p. 4), the Soviet translators' consideration of the ethnic features of the original are underscored by the epithet *nebyvalyi* (see Table 14 in Subchapter 4.3.2).

In *A High Art*, Chukovskii often deploys the rhetorical device of repetition, which is particularly evident in the example shown in Table 5. The pronouncement is connected with the topic of translating Shakespeare. In the preceding paragraph, Chukovskii (1936a: 141–142; 1941: 110) had discussed the “barbarian epoch” (*varvarkaia epokha*) when translating Shakespeare was approached from an “anti-scientific” (*antinauchnyi*) and “dilettantish” (*diletantskii*) point of view.

Table 5

<p><i><u>Теперь</u> такому самоуправству конец. <u>Теперь</u> искусство перевода находится под контролем науки. <u>Теперь</u> наши первые требования, предъявляемые к каждому переводу стихотворного текста, — эквилинеарность и эквиритмичность, т. е. равное количество строк и полное соответствие ритмики. <u>Теперь</u> даже такой слабый переводчик Шекспира, каким оказался Кузмин, и тот, как мы видим, принимает все меры, чтобы выполнить эти строгие требования, невыполнение которых ощущается <u>теперь</u> как преступление. (Chukovskii 1936a: 142; 1941: 110.)</i></p>	<p><i><u>Now</u> such arbitrariness has come to an end. <u>Now</u> the art of translation is subordinated to the unremitting control of science. <u>Now</u> our first requirements of every translation of a text in verse are line-for-line equivalency and rhythm-for-rhythm equivalency, in other words an equal number of lines and a complete correspondence of rhythm. <u>Now</u> even such a poor translator of Shakespeare as Kuzmin, even he, as we can see, takes all measures to fulfill the strict requirements the neglecting of which is <u>now</u> considered a crime.</i></p>
--	---

The approximate timeline of that barbarian epoch is implicitly present in the above passage. More explicitly, the juxtaposition of the times before and after the 1917 Revolution is manifested in the same context, in the way Chukovskii (1936a: 141, 1941: 110) refers to one of the representatives of that “barbarian epoch.” The 19th century poet and translator Nikolai Satin is referred to with the word *barin*. The word can be translated as “gentleman,” “landowner,” or simply “sir” as a form of address, but its Russian equivalent is charged with a particular semantic content. In tsarist Russia, the cognomen *barin* (fem.

barynia; see Table 37 in Subchapter 4.4.1) was used about members of the privileged class. In colloquial language, the word mutated into various expressions that all referred to a person who leads a leisure life and who has others do all the hard work. (See Ozhegov & Shvedova 2006: 36.) The Revolution rendered the word obsolete, as everybody came to be addressed simply as a “comrade” (*tovarishch*). Although Satin came from aristocratic circles, the epithet *barin* is hardly suited for what he became. He fraternized with the 19th century radical intelligentsia and contributed, for instance, to the journals *Sovremennik* and *Otechestvennye zapiski* (see Subchapter 3.2). At one point, he was even arrested and deported because of his anti-monarchist tendencies. (See Frede 2001.) Chukovskii is apparently using the “landowner” title mainly as a stylistic device, in order to underline his contempt for Satin’s accomplishments as a translator.

In the short passage shown in Table 5, the word *teper’* (“today” or “now”) occurs five times. Table 6 shows yet another example in which the past and the present are juxtaposed. In this example, the temporal indicators are “the past epoch” (*prezhniaia epokha*) and “the present epoch” (*nyнешniaia epokha*).

Table 6

<p><i>Прежняя эпоха</i> охотно допускала подобное ухарство, но <i>нынешняя</i> и в этом стремится к максимально точной передаче подлинника. (Chukovskii 1936a: 214.)</p>	<p><i>The past epoch</i> willingly permitted such bravado, but in <i>the present one</i>, the aim is to transmit even in this aspect the original with maximum precision.</p>
--	---

The discussion in question concerns the transcription of foreign names. By “bravado,” Chukovskii is referring to the miscellaneous and arbitrary Russian ways of pronouncing these names. In the 1941 edition, the discussion was expanded with new material. Comparing the current conventions of transcription with those of the past, Chukovskii (1941: 213–214) approaches the distinction between the pre-revolutionary epoch and the present one from another angle.

Table 7

<p><i>Нынче</i> фонетизация иноязычных имен проводится широко и последовательно. Но <i>сейчас</i> она вызвана совсем другими причинами. В ней раньше всего сказалось уважение советских людей к национальным культурам всех стран и народов. [. . .] Далекие от шовинизма и зазнайства, мы не считаем, как это было <i>в дореволюционное время</i>, что наша великорусская фонетика есть мерило и норма всех существующих звуков. (Chukovskii 1941: 214.)</p>	<p><i>Today</i>, foreign names are transcribed extensively and consistently. But <i>now</i> it is done for entirely different reasons. First and foremost, the transcription practice manifests the respect of the Soviet people towards the national cultures of all countries and nations. [. . .] Far from chauvinism and conceit, we do not think, like <i>before the Revolution</i>, that our Russian phonetics would be the norm and criterion for all existing phones.</p>
---	---

As it turns out from all of the examples shown in the above tables, it is not the future but the present that has relevance as a temporal center. The prominence of the “now” aspect is an obvious deviation from the widespread notion that the Soviet citizen was manipulated into focusing his eyes beyond the present time and into the future. Instead of being overlooked, the present is emphasized. At least partly, the discordance is explained by the genre of *A High Art*. Unlike a novel, it does not contain any *fictive* positive hero whose path, according to the dictates of Socialist Realism, should be purposefully directed past the dreary present and straight to the glorious future. (About real-life positive heroes, see Subchapter 4.4.1.)

The future is, in fact, rarely brought up in these editions of *A High Art*. In the 1936 edition, the future is mentioned in a phrase that strongly echoes the current official discourse (see Table 8). The entire passage has been omitted from the 1941 edition.

Table 8

<p><i>В будущем бесклассовом обществе работа переводчиков облеγχится в значительной степени: между ними и авторами не останется тех перегородок (а иногда баррикад), которые служат в настоящее время одной из помех к точному воспроизведению переводимого текста. (Chukovskii 1936a: 52.)</i></p>	<p><i>In the <u>future</u> classless society, the work of translators will be considerably easier: between them and authors there will no more be those barriers (and sometimes barricades) that today are one of the obstacles in the way of an exact reproduction of the translated text.</i></p>
---	---

In the sequel to the above passage, the statement is reconsidered. Table 9 shows how the present is now linked with the future, or, more precisely, fused with it.

Table 9

<p><i>В нашем Союзе уже и <u>сейчас</u> переводчик и автор, если они современники, всюду, во всех краях и республиках, социально близки, родственны друг другу или даже принадлежат к одной и той же социальной формации. А это <u>впервые в истории мира</u> дает переводчикам такие возможности, каких у них не было раньше. (Chukovskii 1936a: 52–53.)</i></p>	<p><i>In our Soviet Union <u>even now</u>, if the translator and author are contemporaries, everywhere, in every territory and republic, they are socially close to each other, kindred with each other and even belong to one and the same social system. And this, <u>for the first time in the history of the world</u>, will give translators possibilities that they never had before.</i></p>
---	---

Both the reference to the history of the world (see also Table 21 in Subchapter 4.3.2) and the implicit suggestion that the better future has already dawned are very much in tune with the current Soviet rhetoric. The propaganda campaign around the new constitution had borrowed material from an unpublished article that Stalin had written already in 1929. In the article, Stalin argues that the victory of Socialism would eventually sweep away all class antagonisms. There would be a special unity between Socialist nations, because there would be none of “the unresolvable class contradictions” bourgeois nations are wrestling with. (Martin 2001: 447–448.)

The merging of “now” into “then” in the examples shown in Tables 8 and 9 represents a concept of time that is very abstract. An abstract notion of time is evident also in another passage in *A High Art* (see Table 10), only in a different sense. The passage first appears in the 1930 edition of *A High Art*. The discussion concerns the embellishment of translations that was a common practice in the 18th and 19th centuries (see Chukovskii 1930: 24–26; 1936a: 114–120; 1941: 198–202).

Table 10

<p>Теперь наступила другая пора. Новый читатель уже не требует от литературы приятности. Всякое своевольное обращение с текстом воспринимается как преступление. Широкие массы, впервые знакомясь с мировой словесностью, требуют, чтобы переводы были максимально точным отображением подлинника. Всеобщим идеалом сделалась именно максимальная точность, <u>к которой русская литература приближается только теперь, после столетних блужданий.</u> (Chukovskii 1930: 26)</p>	<p><i>Now a different time has dawned. The new reader no longer demands what is “pleasing” from literature. Every willful mistreatment of a text seems criminal to him. The broad masses that, for the first time, are becoming acquainted with world literature require that translations be maximally precise representations of the original. The universal ideal has become no less than the maximum precision which Russian literature is reaching only now, after a century of wandering in wrong directions.</i></p>
<p>Мне кажется, что требования, предъявляемые к художественному переводу нынешним советским читателем, обусловлены иными социальными факторами, чем те требования, которые выдвигал романтизм. Но как бы то ни было, важно одно: новый читатель непримиримо враждебен переводческим традициям лжеклассицизма. Он не требует от литературы «приятностей». Всякое своевольное обращение с текстом кажется ему преступлением. Его идеалом сделалась именно максимальная точность, <u>к которой русская литература приближается только теперь, после столетних блужданий.</u> (Chukovskii 1936a: 120–121; 1941: 202.)</p>	<p><i>(For consistency, Leighton’s translation of the 1966 edition is cited here in such passages that are identical with the 1930 edition.)</i></p> <p><i>It seems to me that the demand being put forth for artistic translations by modern-day Soviet readers are conditioned by social factors other than those which gave rise to the demands made on the Romantics. But whatever the case, one thing is certain: the modern reader is uncompromisingly hostile to the translation traditions of Classicism. He no longer demands what is “pleasing” from literature. Every willful mistreatment of a text seems criminal to him. His ideal has become no less than <u>the maximum precision which Russian literature is reaching only now, after a century of wandering in wrong directions.</u> (Leighton 1984: 248–249.)</i></p>

It is noteworthy that in the following editions; 1964 (p. 274) and 1966 (p. 538) of *A High Art*, this passage is included in a form similar to the one in the 1936 and 1941 editions. The expression “a hundred years of wandering” refers to a sequence of time with a marked beginning and end. Therefore, the meaning of the expression remains the same regardless of the time of reference. With a quarter of a century between its first and last occurrences

in *A High Art*, the temporal indicator “only now” loses its actuality. However, Chukovskii was famous for his nearly obsessive habit of editing his own texts (see e.g. Ivanova 2008: 13; 2009: 7). In the light of that, the presence of an incongruous passage like the one above hardly appears like an authorial lapse.

Perhaps the incongruity can be explained by the existence of two temporal levels in *A High Art*. One of them is historical time, manifested in the ways that the book is contemporized. Current topics are discussed, and current information is added. New examples are taken from works that the reader of the new edition is likely to be familiar with. The other level is Stalinist time. It is absolute, closed, and finished and, therefore, also immune to the effects of historical time. It neither grows old nor becomes obsolete. While the rest of the book is regenerated, the “now” in that particular sense remains the same. The word no longer functions as a temporal indicator but as a milestone between the inferior past and the superior present, a keeper of a sacred cult.

On the whole, the center of attention in the above examples is neither the past nor the future. Instead, there is a distinct gravitation towards the present. In the Stalinist concept of time, the emphasis is often situated either back or forth from the present. Nonetheless, the approach to time in *A High Art* corresponds with the Stalinist concept more than it would seem at first sight. As it turns out, particularly as shown in Tables 8, 9, and 10, the past and the future were merged with the present. The abstract image thereby engendered corresponds with the separate national time that defines the Soviet space. Moreover, the amplification of present achievements was also an essential element in the Potemkinist culture of the 1930s.

4.3.2 The Friendship of Literatures

In the foreword to the 1930 edition of *A High Art* (p. 5), Chukovskii assesses translation as one of the “most important issues” in Soviet culture. With this statement, he is apparently referring to the newly literate readers (see Subchapter 4.4.1). In the 1936 and 1941 editions, a new aspect emerges to increase the urgency of the issue of translation. Particular emphasis is given to the multinational Soviet state and to the diversity of its nations.

Translation as a national issue was not a new phenomenon in Russia. Its significance was recognized already in the westernizing policy conducted by Tsar Peter the Great. From the late 17th to the early 19th century, the primary function of translation was to help the cultural elites find connections with their European counterparts and also to perceive their position in a wider framework. (See Baer & Olshanskaya 2013: iii.) Nationality translation in the 1930s had a principally similar function, but there was a crucial difference between perspectives. Instead of connecting Soviet citizens with the world outside the state borders, translation was meant to connect them with other nations within their boundaries. The wider framework in which they were positioned encompassed the other Soviet republics, and only them. The ultimate goal was diametrically opposed to Peter the Great's. The shared identity of the Soviet nations was not meant to connect them with the outer world but to *isolate* them from it.

In the 1936 and 1941 editions of *A High Art*, the significance of translation is particularly associated with the issue of Soviet minority nationalities. Also in public discourse, nationality translation was an urgent topic. Chukovskii's contribution to that discourse epitomizes the peculiar double role of the Soviet writer (see Subchapter 2.7). On the one hand, he adhered to prevalent conventions. On the other hand, he was one of the literary authori-

ties that helped establish those conventions, and, thereby, also steered the discourse. Elena Zemskova (2013: 196) remarks that in the 1930s “any opinion expressed by official literary critics was sure to acquire a prescriptive meaning.” Chukovskii certainly was no “official critic,” but he had authority, all the same. His pronouncements were frequently cited, and even when disputed, they gained publicity. In other words, he was in a constant and active dialogical relationship with the surrounding Stalinist culture.

In January 1936, the First All-Union Conference of Translators assembled in Moscow. The keynote address was given by the critic Iogann Al'tman, and nationality translation was one of his principal topics. The terminology Al'tman used in his speech would remain in Soviet discourse on translation for several decades. (Witt 2013: 160–161, 164.) Of the altogether twelve paragraphs that were included in the Draft Resolution of the conference (see Witt 2013: 181–184), eleven touched on nationality translation in one way or another.

Between 1934 and 1936, nationality translation was prominently present also in the coverage of *Pravda*. Another main line was the political significance of translation and translation critique. As it turns out, those two lines overlapped each other in many respects. Chukovskii contributed to the discourse with two articles, of which the one titled “Iskusstvo perevoda” (Chukovskii 1935a) accommodated to the former line, and the one titled “Iskazhennyi Shekspir” (Chukovskii 1934) to the latter. (Witt 2013: 155–156.) Both articles contained passages from the forthcoming edition of *A High Art* (see Subchapter 4.1).

Russian renditions of the works of minority nationality writers were usually supplemented with paratexts and photographs and thoroughly saturated with Soviet ideology. Many of them were virtually panegyrics to Stalin and contributed to the development of his personality cult. In *Pravda*, particularly the literatures of Central Asia and Caucasus were given a lot of column space, with Kazakhstan at the top of the list. In 1936, no less than 15 of the 39 Oriental translations were translations from Kazakh. (Witt 2013: 146–147, 151.)

The Kazakh people's poet Dzhambul Dzhabaev, usually referred to simply as “Dzhambul,” became a figurehead with an important propaganda role. Only three days after the draft constitution (see Subchapter 4.2) appeared in print, *Pravda* published Dzhambul's poem about “Stalin's Great Law.” (Witt 2013: 147, 151.) About Nikolai Ezhov, Dzhambul composed a poem that, as Robert Conquest notes, “gave a view of the police chief which would have been thought excessively rosy if applied to a ruler like Good King Wenceslas.” (See Conquest 2008: 245.) Until his death in 1945, Dzhambul – whom Conquest (2008: 245) refers to as “Stalin's hack bard” – was a regular presence at various public events. He was also awarded several prestigious prizes, for instance, the Stalin prize in 1941. (See Witt 2013: 147, 148n24.)

Ursula Iustus (2000a: 77) points out that the poems by Dzhambul, Suleiman Stal'skii, and other national bards were modified and partly even concocted by Soviet folklorists. Iustus describes the process of collecting and editing their work as follows:

Певцов и сказителей, собранных в этих экспедициях, сопровождали фольклористы или литературоведы, читавшие почти неграмотным певцам статьи из газет и журналов, официальные указы и постановления или политические сочинения, обеспечивая их идеологическим материалом, которым певцы и сказители наполняли традиционные формы и сюжеты фольклора, воспевая новую советскую действительность. (Iustus 2000b: 926.)

The singers and bards gathered during these expeditions were accompanied by folklorists or litterateurs who read to the almost illiterate singers articles from newspapers and journals, official decrees and resolutions or political works, providing them with ideological material that the singers would fill with traditional forms and motifs of folklore, extolling the new Soviet reality.

Thus, Dzhabul and other bards were designated their own particular roles in the Stalinist theatre. (About falsified folklore, see also Subchapter 4.3.3.)

Almost the entire content of Chukovskii's (1935a) *Pravda* article "Iskusstvo perevoda" is included in the 1936 of edition *A High Art* (pp. 6–10, 14, 41–42), most of it in the foreword. The acute topic of nationality translation comes up right from the opening sentence. The recent Writers' Congress was still fresh in Chukovskii's mind while he was working on the text. Of all the delegates, 48 per cent had been non-Russian (Brooks 2001: 277n49). In the foreword, Chukovskii reminds the reader of their contribution to the congress.

Table 11

<p><i>Вопрос о художественных переводах у нас в СССР – дело большой государственной важности, в котором кровно заинтересованы миллионы людей.</i></p> <p><i>Пятьдесят две национальности прибыли к нам на писательский съезд. Тюрки, евреи, узбеки, таджики, белоруссы, латыши, молдаване, казаки, уйгуры, кумыки, аварцы, армяне, карелы, бурято-монголы – всем им нужен непрерывный обмен многообразными культурными ценностями.</i></p> <p><i>(Chukovskii 1936a: 6.)</i></p>	<p><i>The issue of literary translation in our Soviet Union has enormous national significance and profoundly interests millions of people.</i></p> <p><i>Fifty-two nationalities came to us to the writers' congress. Turks, Jews, Uzbeks, Tajiks, Belorussians, Latvians, Moldovans, Cossacks, Uighurs, Kumyks, Avars, Armenians, Karelians, Buryat-Mongols – they all need a continuous exchange of diverse cultural treasures.</i></p>
---	--

Russian by ethnicity and language, the Cossacks (*kazaki*) stand out in the list, which otherwise consisted of non-Russian nationalities. Their presence may be due to a typing error, however. In the 1941 edition (p. 3), they were replaced with the Kazakhs (*kazakhi*).

In the passage shown in Table 11, Chukovskii mentions the national (*gosudarstvennyi*) significance of translation. The mention is included also in the foreword to the 1941 edition (p. 3). The word *gosudarstvennyi* can also be translated as "state-level." During the constitution campaign (see Subchapter 4.2), the aspect of "stateness" (*gosudarstvennost'*) gained a lot of relevance in Soviet propaganda (Martin 2001: 445, 447).

The examples shown in Subchapter 4.3.1 indicate that Chukovskii draws a distinct line between the Soviet present and the tsarist past. That is evident also in the example shown in Table 12. Chukovskii underlines the value given to minority nationalities literature in the Soviet culture of that time. To illustrate the superior attitude that prevailed in the tsarist era, he uses the word *inorodets*, which literally means "of different origin."

Table 12

<p><i>Преступное равнодушие, господствовавшее в дореволюционной литературе к тем, которых называли тогда инородцами, сменилось теперь таким интересом к их литературному творчеству, что мы не мыслим себе номера "Литературной газеты" или книжки журнала, где не было бы переводов из Переца Маркиша, или Чаренца, или Лахути, или Янко Купала, или Тициана Табидзе. (Chukovskii 1936a: 6.)</i></p>	<p><i>The criminal indifference that prevailed in pre-revolutionary literature towards those who at that time were called by the name inorodets has now yielded to such an interest in their literary works that we cannot imagine an issue of Litaraturnaia gazeta or a literary journal without translations of Perets Markish, Eghishe Charents, Abolgasem Lakhuti, Ianka Kupala, or Titsian Tabidze.</i></p>
---	--

By nationality, Markish is Jewish, Charents is Armenian, Lakhuti is Tajik, Kupala is Belarusian, and Tabidze is Georgian. The same passage is included in the 1941 edition (p. 3), only with an altered list of names. (see also Subchapter 4.5.1).

In tsarist Russia, the word *inorodets* referred to a non-Russian subject of the empire. Initially neutral, the word attained a decidedly pejorative connotation in the early 20th century. (Werth 2007: 174.) The word also bears insinuations of Great Russian chauvinism, which Chukovskii decidedly condemns. The issue of chauvinism comes up in more than one context. The example shown in Table 13 relates to a discussion about the importance of maintaining the style of the original in the translation.

Table 13

<p><i>К лицу ли нам такой шовинизм? При переводе литератур братских народов мы должны быть особенно щепетильны в отношении стиля, обуздывая себя при малейшей попытке руссифицировать текст. Руссификация национальных песен, национальных сказок, пословиц, поговорок, оборотов речи, идиом языка того или иного из братских народов означала бы раньше всего неуважение к этому народу, к его национальной культуре. (Chukovskii 1941: 74.)</i></p>	<p><i>Is such chauvinism suitable for us? In translating literature of the brother nations, we must be particularly scrupulous with regard to style, and restrain ourselves even from the smallest attempt to Russify the text. The Russification of national songs, national fairy tales, proverbs, sayings, locutions, or idioms of one or another brother nation would signify, above all, lack of respect for this nation and its national culture.</i></p>
---	---

In the context of translating Taras Shevchenko (see Subchapter 4.3.3), Chukovskii (1941: 249) urges the translator to be sure to reproduce the "national color" of the original so as not to "falsify" the folklore of the minority nations (see Table 31 in Subchapter 4.3.3). In another instance, he (Chukovskii 1941: 214) notes that the "chauvinism and conceit" that characterized the transcription of foreign proper names before the Revolution is now a thing of the past (see Table 7 in Subchapter 4.3.1). He underlines that in the translation names should be as phonetically similar to the original ones as possible, because the sound of names vividly manifests "national esthetics."

Chukovskii also paid attention also to non-Russian poets working on nationality translation. The cross-national aspects related to the issue are evident in the example shown in Table 14. In the foreword, Chukovskii (1941: 4) discusses the Kalmyk epic *Dzhangar*, which, up until then, had been mostly unknown in Russia. No translator could even be found capable of reproducing it in Russian.

Table 14

<p><i>Прошло несколько лет, и национальная политика нашей страны окружила “Джангар” небывалым почетом. Теперь грузинские, армянские, украинские, азербайджанские, белорусские поэты считают делом чести и доблести воспроизвести его тем же национальным размером, какой придал ему калмыцкий народ – сохраняя, как некую великую ценность, все своеобразие калмыцкого стиля. (Chukovskii 1941: 4.)</i></p>	<p><i>A few years would pass by, and the national policy of our country would lavish Dzhangar with unprecedented respect. Today Georgian, Armenian, Ukrainian, Azerbaijani, and Belorussian poets consider it as a point of honor and a matter of gallantry to reproduce it with that very national meter given to it by the Kalmuk people – preserving, like a great treasure, all the distinctive features of the Kalmuk style.</i></p>
---	---

In the 1930s, some ethnic, minority nationality poets would be adopted as common property, in the role of All-Union Soviet writers. The phenomenon was particularly manifest in the discussion about Shevchenko.

Besides erroneous transcription and failure to reproduce the original meter, there were also other potential stumbling blocks in the translation of national literatures. Some translators were in the habit of distorting the personality or “face” of the original author by replacing it with another, different and outright antagonistic (*vrazhdebnyi*) one. As an example, Chukovskii (1936a: 16–17; 1941: 11–12) presents the case when an anonymous translator of the Georgian poet Simon Chikovani had blatantly resorted to the sentimental national clichés that Chikovani particularly loathed and would never have used in his works. From the passage, it turns out that Chikovani had publicly taken the hapless translator to task. Commenting on the episode, Chukovskii cites the poet.

Table 15

<p><i>А в переводе «оказались шашлыки, вина, бурдюки, которых у меня не было и не могло быть, потому что, во-первых, этого не требовал материал, а во-вторых, шашлыки и бурдюки – не моя установка». Выходит, что вместо подлинного Чиковани нам показали кого-то другого, кто не только не похож на него, но глубоко ненавистен ему, – вульгарно-кинжальную фигуру кавказца, которому только и в пору плясать на эстраде лезгинку. Между тем именно с такой шашлычной интерпретацией Кавказа и борется в своих стихах Чиковани. (Chukovskii 1936a: 17: 1941: 11–12.)</i></p>	<p><i>And yet the translations “are filled with shashlyks and wine and sheepskin wine flasks which have never figured in my poetry and will never figure in my poetry, because in the first place the subject matter does not call for them and in the second place shashlyks and sheepskin wineflasks are not what my poetry is about.” It turns out that in place of the real Chikovani we have been presented with someone who not only bears no resemblance to him, but is profoundly repugnant to him – the figure of the dagger-bearing Caucasian who might just as well have been brought out on a stage to dance the lezghinka. And this when it is precisely the shashlyk interpretation of the Caucasus that Chikovani fought against in his poetry. (Leighton 1984: 19.)</i></p>
---	---

On the other hand, the translation would have been in perfect concord with the conventions of that time. The primordial ethos and the celebration of the exotic features of minority nationalities had an important function in Soviet nationalities policy (see Subchapter 4.2). That tendency might be characterized as a policy of appeasement, or, as Terry Martin (2001: 449) calls it, a “strategy.” In that light, Chukovskii’s statement is not quite politically correct. It implies that, while generally striving to adjust his idiom to the prevalent norms, in the fundamental artistic questions, he was as uncompromising as ever.

However, in the sphere of translation, the issue is not quite as unequivocal. In his speech at the First All-Union Conference of Translators, Al’tman explicitly denounced the imprinting of a translation with affected ethnicity. He referred to this practice with the term “exoticism,” which meant emphasis given on the “superficial, formal side” of the original, which caused the content to appear as “specifically nationally restricted.” Al’tman also condemned “stylizing translation” (*stilizatorstvo*) or the “superficial embellishment at the expense of authentic and deep understanding of the language.” According to Al’tman, both practices “essentially despise the national literatures.” (Witt 2013: 167–168.) The issue of form and content is common in the discussion about Formalism, which Al’tman also touched on (see Subchapter 4.4.2). Thus, Chukovskii’s comment in *A High Art* (see Table 15 above), by then already written, was, in fact, quite concordant with the current norms.

In 1930, the position of Russian language as the lingua franca of all Soviet nations was emphasized by such eminent figures as the Deputy Commissar of Education Nadezhda Krupskaiia, and even by Stalin himself (see Blitstein 2001: 254–255). In the foreword to the 1936 edition (pp. 7–8), Chukovskii touches upon the same topic. Commenting on the recently published anthology of Shakespeare (see Subchapter 4.4.4), he calls attention to the fact that foreign literature is translated into the languages of minority nationalities not directly from the original but from the Russian translation (see also Table 2 in Subchapter 4.3.1). Chukovskii underlines the huge responsibility that the situation poses on translators.

Table 16

<p><i>По этому переводу впервые узнают Шекспира и мордва, и узбеки. И если русский перевод плох, то будет плох и татарский, и мордовский, и узбекский, и кумыкский, и бурято-монгольский. Тут создается десятикратное эхо для каждой ошибки, и в соответствии с этим вина переводчица разрастается вдесятеро. (Chukovskii 1936a: 7–8.)</i></p>	<p><i>It is through this translation that also the Mordvins and the Uzbeks get to know Shakespeare. And if the Russian translation is bad, then the Tatar, the Mordvinian, the Uzbek, the Kumyk, and the Buryat-Mongolian translations will be bad, too. Here arises a tenfold echo for every mistake, and accordingly, the translator's fault multiplies tenfold.</i></p>
--	--

Chukovskii had pronounced the same point of view already in his speech at the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers in the context of the newly published Shakespeare anthology. It appears that this observation of Chukovskii's brought a new, formerly overlooked aspect to the assessment of a Soviet translator's work. (See Burleshin 2008.) Driven by his uncompromising professional pride, Chukovskii may have involuntarily caused trouble for some colleagues, for instance, for Mikhail Kuzmin (see Subchapter 4.4.4). On the other hand, Chukovskii was hardly alone in uttering statements of this kind. For instance, Al'tman called attention to the "huge damage" caused by bad translations – or even good translations of harmful books, for that matter. In his opinion, good translations strengthened friendship among Soviet peoples, whereas bad translations strengthened chauvinism and pulled the Soviet nations apart from each other. (See Witt 2013: 165.)

In the spring of 1939, Chukovskii was in Kiev attending the 125th anniversary celebrations of the birth of Shevchenko (Chukovskaia, E. 2011c: 585). The visit is not recorded in Chukovskii's diary, as there are no entries whatsoever for that year until November. In a letter to his wife Mariia Borisovna, the exhilarated Chukovskii 2009: (298–299) rejoices in the praising feedback lavished on his own presentation and in the opportunity to establish relationships with litterateurs of several nationalities. He also brings up another advantage provided by the visit:

Для моей книги «Искусство перевода» здесь собирается чудесный материал, т. к. я свел дружбу с писателями всех народностей. Они дадут мне все, что мне нужно. (Chukovskii 2009: 299.)

For my book *A High Art*, I here gather wonderful material because I have made friends with writers of *all nationalities*. They will give me everything I need.

By his book, Chukovskii is referring to the 1941 edition of *A High Art*, which would be submitted the following December (see Subchapter 4.1). During the anniversary celebrations, Shevchenko earned a positive place in the Soviet literary canon. His becoming a truly Soviet writer entailed translating his most important work *Kobzar'* not only into Russian but also into the languages of the minority nationalities (see Subchapter 4.3.3). Chukovskii's enthusiasm about the multinational community of litterateurs, so palpable in his letter to Mariia Borisovna, is also manifested in the passage from *A High Art* shown in Table 17.

Table 17

<p><i>Но вот около года назад все лучшие поэты России, Белоруссии, Армении, Грузии, поэты узбекские, еврейские, казахские, азербайджанские, киргизские, адыгейцы, башкиры, кабардинцы, балкары, татары, чуваша, туркмены, поэты всех республик и областей, образующих Советский Союз, стали огромным и дружным своим коллективом готовить многоязычный перевод «Кобзаря». (Chukovskii 1941: 243.)</i></p>	<p><i>But about a year ago, all the best poets of Russia, Belarus, Armenia and Georgia, poets of Uzbek, Jewish, Kazakh, Azerbaijani, Kyrgyz, Adygean, Bashkir, Kabardian, Balkarian, Tatar, Chuvash, Turkmen nationalities, poets from all the republics and oblasts making up the Soviet Union, began as a huge and harmonious collective working on a multilingual translation of Kobzar'.</i></p>
---	--

The foreword of the 1941 edition opens bombastically. Chukovskii calls attention to the friendship brought about by the Lenin-Stalin national policy (see Table 18). In the mid- and late 1930s public discourse, that was a popular theme. For instance, the critic Viktor Gol'tsev spoke in very similar terms when discussing the cultural and political importance of translations in an article published in *Krasnaia nov'* in 1936 (see Zemskova 2013: 193–194).

Table 18

<p><i>Победа ленинско-сталинской национальной политики положила начало дружбе народов СССР.</i></p> <p><i>Эта дружба в корне изменила всю литературную жизнь нашей многоязычной страны. Украинцы, белоруссы, грузины, армяне, литовцы, эстонцы, латыши, азербайджанцы, евреи, узбеки, таджики, молдаване, казахи, уйгуры, кумыки, аварцы, карелы, бурят-монголы – именно от того, что они стали братьями, установили между собою непрерывный обмен всеми своими литературными ценностями. (Chukovskii 1941: 3.)</i></p>	<p><i>The victory of the Lenin-Stalin nationalities policy set the beginning of the friendship of the nations of the Soviet Union.</i></p> <p><i>This friendship radically changed the entire literary life of our multi-lingual country. Ukrainians, Belorussians, Georgians, Armenians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Latvians, Azerbaijanis, Jews, Uzbeks, Tajiks, Moldovans, Kazakhs, Uighurs, Kumyks, Avars, Karelians, Buryat-Mongols – exactly because they became brothers, they established among themselves a continuous exchange of all their literary treasures.</i></p>
---	--

Incidentally, Chukovskii would later adjust the first phrase in accordance with the “destalinization” that ensued from Khrushchev’s speech at the Twentieth Party Congress (see Subchapter 2.8). In the following editions; 1964 (p. 7), 1966 (p. 243), and 1968 (p. 10), the “Lenin-Stalin nationalities policy” was replaced with “Lenin’s nationalities policy” (*leninskaia natsional'naia politika*).

Brother nationalities are prominently present in the forewords to the 1936 and 1941 editions of *A High Art*. About twenty non-Russian nationalities are mentioned in both forewords, some of them more than once. In the 1936 edition (p. 6), the literary works of minority nationalities are referred to as “our brother literatures,” but elsewhere in the book,

there are no mentions of brotherhood or friendship in this particular sense. In the 1941 edition, on the other hand, both the brotherhood and the friendship of the Soviet nations are part of the vocabulary. Various derivatives of word "brother," in particular, abound in the text: there are four such instances merely in the foreword (pp. 3–4). In official propaganda, the word "friendship" replaced "brotherhood" in the late 1930s (see Subchapter 4.2). However, judging from Chukovskii's usage, the latter word did not become entirely obsolete, either.

With the exception of the foreword, in the 1936 edition, nationality translation is not a major theme, although it was touched on in some contexts. For instance, the example of Chikovani (see Table 15 above) is included in a discussion about a translator's possible antagonisms towards an original author. The Georgian poet Georgii Leonidze, on the other hand, had been chosen as an entirely opposite example. The Leonidze translator was Nikolai Tikhonov (see also Subchapter 4.3.3), whose merits were highly esteemed in the current official discourse (see Zemskova 1913: 189–190). Chukovskii (1936a: 30–32) comments on Tikhonov's translation using exceptionally laudatory phrases, such as the following: "all my blood started resounding with his rhythms" (*vsia krov' moia stala zvenet' ego ritmami*). However, the center of attention here is not the minority nationality writer but his Russian translator. Chukovskii also participated in the current discourse about faulty translations of political texts into minority languages (see Subchapter 4.4.3), but the actual topic of nationality translation was not the main issue in that case, either.

The above discussion continues in the 1941 edition, in which nationality translation is one of the main lines. With the exclusion of certain specific themes like translating Shakespeare, in most chapters, at least some of the examples are drawn from minority nationality literatures. The issue of transcribing foreign proper nouns is connected to the issue of chauvinism (p. 214; see Table 7 in Subchapter 4.3.1). Translating *Kobzar'* from Ukrainian into other Soviet languages is presented as a heroic act of collective work (p. 243; see Table 17). In the concluding paragraphs, Chukovskii once more returns to the topic of nationality translation, emphasizing its importance in the enforcing of the "brotherly unity" of Soviet nations (pp. 255–256; see Table 21 below).

Nationality translation is a prominent issue also in the discussion about reproducing the style of the original. Non-Russian Soviet writers and the national epics of minority nationalities are presented one after the other as examples that support these arguments (see Chukovskii 1941: 74–79). Russification (*obrusenie*) of the style of an ethnic work is equated with chauvinism (Chukovskii 1941: 74; see Table 13 above). The Soviet translators mentioned in the discussion are all credited with capturing the essence of the works they translated, whereas the tsarist era translators are criticized for either rendering the work into a generic one without any distinct national features or for downright Russifying it. Chukovskii (1941: 78) ascribes the defects in a pre-revolutionary translation of a Georgian work to the translator Vasilii Velicho's "lack of respect" for the people of Georgia. He goes on to remark that this is not surprising, with Velicho being a "great-power chauvinist" (*velikoderzhavnyi shovinist*) and a "*novovremenets*" (the word derives from the name of the 19th century newspaper *Novoe Vremia*, and it was used as a pejorative epithet meaning pro-government; see Trofimov 1994).

Discussing the "complex (and difficult for translators) melodious-literary canon" represented by the Daghestani Suleiman Stal'skii, Chukovskii explains the fundamental reason

behind the superiority of the Soviet translators over the earlier generations of translators.

Table 19

<p><i>Советские переводчики, с таким пиететом относящиеся ко всем национальным особенностям братских литератур, преодолевают огромные трудности, добиваясь точного воспроизведения этих канонических форм. (Chukovskii 1941: 75.)</i></p>	<p><i>The attitude of the Soviet translators towards all the distinctive features of the brother literatures is so reverent that in overcoming enormous difficulties, they attain precise reproductions of those canonical forms.</i></p>
---	---

The reverence (*pietet*) of the Soviet translator for the cultural heritage of the brother nations comes up anew in the passage shown in Table 20. Here, too, the topic is the translators' endeavor to produce accurate reproductions of the original. The issue is expanded into the wider framework of a general Soviet mentality. Once again, Chukovskii has chosen the Kalmuk epic as an example.

Table 20

<p><i>Дело оказывается вовсе не в «одинаковой степени духовного развития двух народов», а в одинаковости их социальной структуры, одинаковости их мировоззрения. Советский переводчик стремится к адекватному воспроизведению калмыцкого эпоса не потому, чтобы он полагал, будто русская культура и калмыцкая в настоящее время равны, а потому, что он верит в равенство их исторических судеб в стране социализма и относится с горячим пиететом к братским народам Союза и к их национальному творчеству. (Chukovskii 1941: 204.)</i></p>	<p><i>The question is not at all of "an identical degree of mental development between two nations," but of the identicalness of their social structures, the identicalness of their world views. The Soviet translator strives for an adequate reproduction of the Kalmuk epic not because he thinks that the Russian and Kalmuk cultures are equal today, but because he believes in the equality of their historical destinies in the land of Socialism and bestows fervent reverence on the brother nations of the Soviet Union and on their national works.</i></p>
---	--

The above example represents one of those instances in which the 1941 edition echoes the current official discourse and attains distinctly political nuances. The epithet "historic" frequently appeared in *Pravda's* coverage of Soviet achievements in the late 1930s. This term was connected to the constitution, to breakthroughs in aviation, and even to the Soviet invasion of Poland in 1939. (See Brooks 2001: 79, 270n148; see also Subchapter 4.2.) Probably unintentionally, the nature of the Soviet translator's attitude remains ambiguous. It can be read either way: the Soviet translator does consider the Russian and Kalmuk cultures equal – or he does not. Of course, the former of the two versions is in accord with the general ethos conveyed in the book.

Despite the ostentatious celebration of ethnic cultures, Russian culture was the indisputable "first among equals" (see Subchapter 4.2). Terry Martin describes the tendency as follows:

Russian culture was now to serve as the core of Soviet culture (though the two were not at all identical), and the Russian language was the principal path for non-Russians to participate in that culture. Anyone opposing this paradigm was a bourgeois nationalist. (Martin 2001: 429.)

In *A High Art*, the superior status of Russian culture manifests itself only obliquely and subtly, for instance, in the choice of words and examples (see also Subchapter 4.5.2). Nevertheless, an overriding idea in *A High Art* seems to be the brotherly unity of all Soviet nations. That is evident for instance in the example shown in Table 21 (see below). The Soviet translator's respect for the literary treasures of the brother nations is also emphasized in the discussion about translating Shevchenko (see Subchapter 4.3.3).

An NKVD report from the fall of 1934 (see Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 173–178) concerning the attitude among writers reveals an altogether different picture. It suggests that chauvinist attitudes did, in fact, exist among those translating the literary treasures of the brother nationalities. The report includes the following citation from another, unnamed document:

The attention paid by the congress to the national literatures evoked unique, chauvinistically colored moods among translators. The general tone was this: nat[ional] writers are bad. It's we who actually make them into writers, sacrificing our own creativity. For this, not only do we not see any gratitude, but we encounter perpetual dissatisfaction, behind-the-scenes accusations, and so on. These writers are widely published here and surrounded with esteem, chosen for central organs of the union and so forth, whereas we always take a back seat. (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 177.)

The historic dimension of Soviet achievements is brought forward already in the 1936 edition (pp. 52–53; see Table 9 in Subchapter 4.3.1). It is once more highlighted in the concluding passages of the 1941 edition.

Table 21

<p>За последние годы советские переводчики прошли такую тренировку, какой не знали за всю мировую историю переводчики других стран и других поколений. Ведь уже многие годы все советские поэты, за двумя или тремя исключениями, переводили, изо дня в день соревнуясь друг с другом, армянских, грузинских, украинских, белорусских, азербайджанских, еврейских поэтов, и перевели уже сотни тысяч, а может быть, миллионы стихов: и «Джангара», и «Давида Сасунского», и Шота Руставели, и Джамбула, и Павла Тычину, и Янку Купала, служа этой повседневной работой братскому единению народов Союза, которое становится еще более актуальным благодаря живому обмену национальными литературными ценностями. (Chukovskii 1941: 255–256.)</p>	<p>Over the last few years, Soviet translators have gone through training that, in the entire history of the world, translators of other countries and other generations have never known. For many years now, all Soviet poets – with the exception of two or three – have raced with each other day after day in translating Armenian, Georgian, Ukrainian, Belorussian, Azerbaijan, and Jewish poets. They have already translated hundreds of thousands, maybe even millions of poems such as <i>Dzhangar</i> and <i>David Sasunskii</i>, as well as poems by <i>Shota Rustaveli</i>, <i>Dzhambul</i>, <i>Pavel Tychina</i>, and <i>Ianka Kupala</i>, and with this daily work they have served the brotherly unity of the nations of the Soviet Union – an issue that is becoming even more actual thanks to an active exchange of national literary treasures.</p>
--	--

From today's point of view, talk about "brotherly unity" seems grotesque at the same time as many non-Russian nationalities were suffering under ethnic cleansing and terror. The expression was, however, compatible with the official truth catered to the Soviet citizen. Furthermore, the arrests and executions that swept through the population – Russians included – were connected to "wrecking," "espionage," and "terrorism" rather than to an ethnic background. On the other hand, among the intelligentsia it was particularly non-Russian writers that were targets of persecution on the pretext of purported "bourgeois nationalist" ideas. In Ukraine, Belorussia, and Kazakhstan, veritable mass arrests and executions were conducted among literary circles. For instance, the leading poets of Georgia, Tabidze and his friend Pavel Iashvili both perished in the terror of 1937. Tabidze was executed, and Iashvili committed suicide soon afterward. (See Conquest 2008: 260–261, 301–303.)

One might speculate whether the politically correct forewords are, indeed, from Chukovskii's pen and not authored by the editor of the publishing house. However, in light of Chukovskii's articles and speeches during that same period, it is fair to suppose that at least for the most part, they are his own genuine texts. At the time of the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers, some indications were detected of existing oppositional tendencies, and that worried the regime. Therefore, there was an urgent need to present a unified front, and writers were particularly instructed to adapt their idiom accordingly. (Brooks 2001: 106.) That might explain the relatively great number of official-sounding and conformist phrases in the 1936 and 1941 editions of *A High Art*.

On the other hand, phrases and locutions are easily infected by public discourse. This applies to any kind of society, irrespective of the existence or non-existence of freedom of speech. Entering into the dialogue of that society entails adapting its idiom – and not only

the idiom but also its conceptual world. Commenting on Soviet public discourse, Ewa M. Thompson, in a somewhat cynical manner, suggests:

Not infrequently, the writers of that period are discussed as if they were “normal” writers forced to write according to the canons of socialist realism,” rather than the people whose conceptual world was deeply mired in the duplicity caused by the Soviet system. (Thompson 1991: 166.)

There may have been those whose conceptual world was, indeed, “mired.” On the other hand, there were probably even more of those who adjusted to the current norms unconsciously, and also those who played by the rules simply to survive.

4.3.3 Role Models

When pre-revolutionary classics were incorporated into the Soviet literary canon in the 1930s, there was one uncomfortable aspect to be considered. David Brandenberger and Kevin M. F. Platt describe the controversy as follows:

[. . .] – these newly discovered “Soviet” heroes were, in the final analysis, a group of nobles, tsarist generals, emperors, and princes, whose status as exemplary figures within the Soviet pantheon of heroes could never be fully reconciled with the reigning revolutionary ethic of Marxism-Leninism. (Brandenberger & Platt 2006: 11.)

By 1937, a definite Soviet pantheon had already emerged. It included such literary heroes as Pushkin, Vissarion Belinskii, Nikolai Chernyshevskii, Nikolai Dobroliubov, Nikolai Nekrasov, and Lev Tolstoi. Also Gor’kii was granted a place in that official canon. (Martin 2001: 451.). Other canonized figures were Mikhail Lermontov and Nikolai Gogol’ (Powelstock 2006: 284).

Aleksandr Pushkin, Mikhail Lermontov, Lev Tolstoi, Nikolai Gogol’

David Powelstock (2006: 284) calls attention to the 1930s phenomenon of lumping very different writers like Pushkin, Lermontov, Tolstoi, and Gogol’ together in order to portray them as “revolutionized avatars” fighting for the reprobation of social injustices. All those four classics were also presented as “realists.” The fundamental motive behind the renovation of their authorial images was to render them compatible with the current ethos:

According to the official Stalinist vision, the classic authors emerged as fundamentally sympathetic to the progressive values of the Revolution, despite having had the misfortune of living and writing in the reactionary Russia of the past. (Powelstock 2006: 284.)

The treatment of Lermontov (see also Subchapter 4.5.2) in the 1930s discourse is a typical example of the “ideological cleansing” of Tsarist era literary heroes. The association of the aristocratic, rebellious yet basically unpolitical poet with “our” progressive ancestors Belinskii and Chernyshevskii was particularly accentuated. (Powelstock 2006: 286, 289.)

In 1938, to honor the 55th anniversary of 19th century writer Ivan Turgenev's death, *Uchitel'skaia gazeta* ("Teachers' Gazette") published an article titled "Velikii, moguchii russkii iazyk" ("The Great, Mighty Russian Language"). Demanding of the Soviet citizens a "protective attitude" to the Russian language, the author of the article juxtaposed Turgenev with Pushkin, Tolstoi, and Gor'kii – and also with Lenin and Stalin. (Martin 2001: 430.)

Table 22 shows an inventory of Soviet literary heroes in the 1936 edition of *A High Art*. As it turns out from the example, the topic under discussion is nationality translation.

Table 22

<p><i>Все народы СССР хотят иметь на своих языках Пушкина и Горького, Фадеева и Шолохова, классиков и современных писателей. (Chukovskii 1936a: 6.)</i></p>	<p><i>All the nations of the Soviet Union want to have in their own languages Pushkin and Gor'kii, Fadeev and Sholokhov, classics and contemporary writers.</i></p>
---	---

In the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers, the three contemporary Soviet writers here juxtaposed with Pushkin had all been granted a place in the Socialist Realist canon (Clark 2000: 4). Aleksandr Fadeev occupied authoritative posts in the Writers' Union from the beginning, and in 1939, he was appointed as its First Secretary (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 142, 148). Mikhail Sholokhov gained exceptional prestige in the literature of the 1930s. Published in sequels between 1928 and 1940, his epic work *Tikhii Don* ("Quiet Flows the Don") was referred to as "the great Soviet novel." Unlike Gor'kii (see below), Sholokhov appears to have been genuinely close to Stalin and enjoyed his protection. A great number of letters between the writer and the leader remain, in archives, bearing witness to their mutual loyalty and trust. (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 336.)

Pushkin, Lermontov, and Tolstoi are all among those writers that Chukovskii (1941: 61) recommends as models for translators (see Table 26 below). Gogol' is mentioned only sporadically in the 1930s editions of *A High Art*. For instance, in the discussion about Charles Dickens, Chukovskii (1930: 82; 1936a: 197) suggests that only Gogol' might be sufficiently qualified to reproduce the humorous features in his works. The 1941 edition (pp. 42–43) also contains quotations from Gogol' commenting on Vasilii Zhukovskii's translation of *The Odyssey* (see Subchapter 4.4.3).

Maksim Gor'kii

Gor'kii's relationship with Stalin was based on mutual benefit rather than mutual loyalty and trust. In the letters exchanged between the two, Gor'kii emerges as an actor determinedly pursuing his own interests behind the Soviet literary scene (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 143–144). Katerina Clark and Evgeny Dobrenko refute one widespread notion of Gor'kii:

Gorky also does not emerge, as some have portrayed him, as an extrasystemic figure, who fought for intellectual values. (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 144.)

From Stalin's and Gor'kii's correspondence it turns out that the latter would often use his influence on the leader, for instance, for promoting his own favorites or for dismissing his

opponents in the Writers' Union. Clark and Dobrenko characterize Gor'kii as "one of the several powerful players determining the fate of Soviet culture." However, at the time of his death in June 1936, his authority had already notably diminished. (See Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 144–145.)

Hitherto, the ultimate cause of Gor'kii's death has not been definitely established, although the issue has been largely speculated for decades. Many scholars are inclined to believe that Stalin was somehow involved in it. (See Baranov 2003.) By the time of his death, Gor'kii had already become a burden for Stalin because of his clear deviations from the official line. Stalin was irked by the way Gor'kii stood by Evgenii Zamiatin and Boris Pil'niak when they were being harassed by RAPP (see Subchapter 2.6). Gor'kii also consistently opposed the punitive measures taken against Kamenev and Zinov'ev (see Subchapter 2.7). Undoubtedly, the timing of Gor'kii's death two months before their August 1936 trial was quite convenient for Stalin. (See Conquest 2008: 86, 299, 388.)

In *A High Art*, Gor'kii naturally enjoys a special status, particularly because of his role in the genesis of the book. Moreover, Gor'kii obviously had significant influence on Chukovskii's professional life, ever since their first encounter shortly before the 1917 Revolution (see Subchapters 2.1 thru 1.6). Gor'kii is presented in *A High Art* as an innovator and organizer rather than an actual literary model. His participation in the emergence of the book is recorded in every edition. In the foreword to the 1930 edition (p. 5), Chukovskii reminisces about how the book was drawn up ad hoc for the translators of the publishing house Vsemirnaia literatura (see Table 23). Gor'kii's name appears in the first sentence.

Table 23

<p><i>Лет десять тому назад издательство "Всемирная литература", руководимое М. Горьким, поставило целью – дать новому советскому читателю лучшие произведения иностранной словесности в переводе на русский язык. (Chukovskii 1930: 5.)</i></p>	<p><i>About ten years ago at the publishing house Vsemirnaia literatura, directed by Gor'kii, the goal was set to provide the new Soviet reader with the best works of world literature in Russian translations.</i></p>
--	--

At the time when the 1936 edition was published, more urgent issues had evidently superseded any authorial recollections. Gor'kii is still present, although in the capacity of a flag-bearer for nationality translation. As shown in Table 24, the foreword contains a longish quotation from him.

Table 24

<p>«Идеально было бы, – писал М. Горький недавно редактору азербайджанской колхозной газеты, – идеально было бы, если бы каждое произведение каждой народности, входящей в Союз, переводилось на языки всех народностей Союза. В этом случае мы все быстрее научились бы понимать национально-культурные свойства и особенности друг друга, а это понимание, разумеется, очень ускорило бы процесс создания той единой социалистической культуры, которая, не стирая индивидуальных черт лица всех племен, создала бы единую, величественную, грозную и обновляющую весь мир социалистическую культуру». (Chukovskii 1936a: 6–7.)</p>	<p>"It would be ideal", wrote M. Gor'kii recently to the editor of an Azerbaijani kolkhoz newspaper, "it would be ideal if every literary work of every ethnic group of the Soviet Union could be translated into the languages of all the ethnic groups of the Soviet Union. In that case we would learn all the more quickly to understand each others' national-cultural characteristics and distinctive features, and this understanding, of course, would very much accelerate the process of creating that united Socialist culture, which, while preserving the individual lineaments of each tribe, would create a united, grand, formidable Socialist culture that can change the whole world".</p>
---	--

Recollections about the early stages of *A High Art* appear in the introduction to the appendix at the end of the 1936 edition (p. 217). Chukovskii sums up the compiling of the first handbook in the editorial board of the publishing house *Vsemirnaia literatura*, supervised by Gor'kii (see Subchapter 2.5; see also Chukovskii 2001e: 42–62). The appendix (pp. 219–223) contains Gor'kii's observations about translation, based on his hand-written notes preserved from those days.

In the 1941 edition, the description of the origin of *A High Art* reappears in the foreword (see Table 25). Here Gor'kii – and in his wake, the entire editorial board – emerges as an early forerunner of the translation ethos of that time.

Table 25

<p>Мало кому известно, как велика в деле организации у нас художественного перевода роль Горького. Когда в 1919 году в Ленинграде возникло издательство «Всемирная литература», Горький круто взял курс на борьбу с теми дурными традициями, которые были завещаны нам переводчиками предыдущей эпохи. (Chukovskii 1941: 5.)</p>	<p>Few people know how great a role in the organization of our artistic translation Gor'kii played. When in 1919 in Leningrad the publishing house <i>Vsemirnaia literatura</i> appeared, Gor'kii took a strong stance against those bad traditions that had been bequeathed to us by the translators of the previous epochs.</p>
--	---

The forewords of all the 1960s editions (1964: 3–4; 1966: 239–241; 1968: 5–7) also contain an account of the history of *A High Art*, supplemented with a quotation from Chukovskii's and Gor'kii's conversation about the fundamental idea of artistic translation.

From the beginning, in *A High Art* (1919: 15; 1920: 38; 1930: 48; 1936a: 74; 1941: 61) Chukovskii advises translators to expand their vocabulary by adopting words from Russian

classics and from the prestigious dictionary of Vladimir Dal' (*Tolkovyi slovar' zhivogo velikoruskogo iazyka* or "Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language"). In the same context in the first handbook for translators (1919: 15), he also recommends that they acquaint themselves with such 19th century writers as Nikolai Leskov, Gleb Uspenskii, and Andrei Pecherskii (also known as Mel'nikov-Pecherskii).

In its original context, the above advice mainly attests to Chukovskii's personal appreciation of the classics of Russian literature. In the 1930 (p. 48) and 1936 (p. 74) editions of *A High Art*, the advice can also be interpreted as a manifestation of the unfolding Soviet literary canon. Leskov, who after 1917 was deemed as a "reactionary writer," had been in oblivion for some time. It was Gor'kii who brought him back to public consciousness in a praising article in 1923. (Mentsel' 2000c: 986—987, 996.) Gor'kii insisted that Leskov was entitled to a place among the other classics of Russian literature (Karals 2006). Uspenskii (see Pursglove 1998: 860) and Pecherskii (see Iur'ev 2007) were also among those writers to whose work Gor'kii gave credit.

As the head of the Vsemirnaia literatura board, Gor'kii found it necessary to criticize Chukovskii's advice to translators. In the margin of an early manuscript of the handbook (see Subchapter 2.5), he had written the following remark:

Совет – опасный. Лексиконы Даля, Усп[енского], Леск[ова] - превосходны, но – представьте себе В. Гюго, переведенного языком Лескова, Уайльда на языке Печерского, А. Франса, изложенного по словарю Даля? Руссификация иностранцев и без того является серьезным несчастьем. (Chukovskii 2008b: 220.)

The advice is dangerous. The vocabularies of Dal', Uspenskii, and Leskov are outstanding, but can you imagine Victor Hugo translated into Leskov's language or Oscar Wilde into Pecherskii's language, or Anatolii France rendered according to the dictionary of Dal'? The Russification of foreigners, in any case, is a serious misfortune.

In the Chukokkala album (Chukovskii 2008b: 221), the above quotation is supplemented with a facsimile of Gor'kii's note. (See also Chukovskii 2001e: 53.) The fact that Chukovskii let the disputed passage remain in his article and later in *A High Art* indicates that as much as he respected Gor'kii's involvement in drafting the handbook, it was ultimately his own judgement that he leaned on.

The recommendation of useful reading material for translators is included in the 1941 edition, but the list of literary models had been altered.

Table 26

<p><i>Даль – вот кого переводчикам нужно читать, а также тех русских писателей, у которых был наиболее богатый словарь: Крылова, Грибоедова, Пушкина, Лермонтова, Сергея Аксакова, Льва Толстого, Тургенева, Чехова, Горького. (Chukovskii 1941: 61.)</i></p>	<p><i>Dal' – that's what translators should read, and also those Russian writers who have the richest vocabulary: Krylov, Griboedov, Pushkin, Lermontov, Sergei Aksakov, Lev Tolstoi, Turgenev, Chekhov, Gor'kii.</i></p>
---	---

The above advice is also included in the 1960s editions of *A High Art* (1964: 89; 1966: 331; 1968: 97), unaltered except for the re-emergence of Leskov. His initial presence in the list is not surprising – particularly in light of Gor'kii's high opinion of him – but neither is his removal from it in 1941. First, when classics were assimilated into the Soviet literary heritage in the 1930s, Leskov did not quite fit in. His political inclinations were considered dubious, as was his fondness for depicting religious folk in his works. In fact, the first post-revolutionary anthology of Leskov's works was not published until the late 1960s. (Wachtel 2006: 118.) Like Fedor Dostoevskii, Leskov was left outside the Soviet canon as an "idealist" and "reactionary" writer (Emerson 2011: 66). Second, in the late 1930s, Leskov's name might have brought up unwanted associations. It was his story on which Dmitrii Shostakovich had based his opera *Ledi Makbet Mtsenskogo uezda* ("Lady Macbeth of the Mtsensk District") (Fitzpatrick 1992: 184). The denouncement of the opera had marked beginning of the anti-Formalist campaign in 1936 (see Subchapter 4.2). Leskov's absence may be due to Chukovskii's own self-censorship, unless it was cut off by the censor.

Leskov's re-emergence in the list in 1964 is, in fact, not quite as comprehensible, considering the way Chukovskii assesses him in another forum during that very same period (see below). The assessment, more of a passing remark, was included in Chukovskii's review about Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's manuscript for the novel *Odin den' Ivana Denisovicha* ("A Day in the life of Ivan Denisovich"). Titled "*Literaturnoe chudo*" ("A Literary Miracle"), the praising review was published in *Novyi mir* in 1962 (Chukovskaia, L. 2013b: 784). Chukovskii's positive evaluation helped Solzhenitsyn obtain permission to publish the novel (see Chukovskaia, E. 2011c: 567.)

In the 1964 (130–133, 139, 144–145, 153) and 1966 (379–382, 388, 393–394, 403) editions of *A High Art*, Chukovskii discusses about the English and Italian translations of *Odin den' Ivana Denisovicha*. The publication of the subsequent edition in 1968 coincided with a tightening political control in the Soviet Union.

The period of Thaw following Stalin's death had slackened Soviet censorship, but already during the last years of Khrushchev's leadership, the cultural policy took a turn backwards to restricted artistic freedom. This is evident, for instance, in the attitude that the Soviet authorities took to Boris Pasternak's nomination for the Nobel prize (see below). With the rise of Leonid Brezhnev as Khrushchev's successor in 1964, the cultural Thaw came to a final end. An early manifestation of the new policy was the 1966 trial against two satirical writers, Andrei Siniavskii and Iulii Daniel'. In 1968, the Prague Spring and the consequent Soviet invasion into Czechoslovakia induced demonstrations that further fed the prevailing suspicious atmosphere. Many writers would be expelled from the Soviet Union in the ensuing years, Solzhenitsyn among them. (See Evtuhov et al. 2004: 734–735, 761–763, 774.)

The 1968 edition of *A High Art* was put on hold because it mentioned the novel *Odin den' Ivana Denisovicha*. In the end, Chukovskii had no choice but to remove the offending pages in order to get *A High Art* published – an act to which he refers in his diary as "shameful treachery" (*postydnoe predatel'stvo*). (See Chukovskii 2011c: 516, 519–520.) Feeling that those obligatory lacunae had mutilated the book, Chukovskii himself regarded the 1966 edition as the "final, canonical text" (see Leighton 1984: xxxii).

In the 1962 review of *Odin den' Ivana Denisovicha*, Chukovskii found fault with every writer included in his earliest list of literary models in *A High Art*, with the exception of Uspenskii:

Автор не щеголяет языковыми причудами (как Даль, Мельников-Печерский, Ал. Ремизов), не выпячивает отдельных аппетитных словечек (как безвкусный Лесков); [. . .]
(See Chukovskaia, L. 2013b: 784.)

The author does not flaunt linguistic oddities in the manner of Dahl, Mel'nikov-Pechersky, or Aleksei Remizov, nor does he dish up juicy lexical tidbits in the tasteless manner of Leskov. (See Klimoff 1997: 107.)

The indiscriminate grouping together of the lexicographer Dal', the 19th century realist Mel'nikov-Pecherskii, and the modernist Aleksei Remizov is interesting. Moreover, not only Leskov but also Dal', despite his "linguistic oddities," maintains his position also in *A High Art* (1964: 89; 1966: 331; 1968: 97) as recommendable reading for translators. As to Gor'kii, the list in the 1941 edition (see Table 26) remains the only instance in *A High Art* that he is presented as a literary model. Instead, in addition to his contribution to the translators' handbook (see above), he is credited for initiating the practice of editing translations in Soviet publishing houses.

Taras Shevchenko

A former serf himself, the 19th century Ukrainian poet and artist Taras Shevchenko passionately opposed serfdom and took the side of the common man. Patriotic in a nostalgic rather than militant sense, his poetry became an emblem of Ukrainian nationalism and national self-consciousness. (Evtuhov et al. 2004: 393.) For Shevchenko, serfdom was inseparably associated with Russian power and Russification, and his poems manifested those feelings. In 1847, he was arrested and exiled for ten years to Siberia, where he served as a soldier. His works were prohibited, and the first complete edition of his poems was not published until 1907. (Conquest 2002: 28–29.)

When ethnic cultures were promoted in the 1920s (see Subchapter 4.2), Shevchenko was assigned to represent classic Ukrainian culture. He became a model for "the revolutionary education of the masses," and a veritable cult emerged around him. (Martin 2001: 90–91.) Shevchenko's most renowned work is a collection of poems titled *Kobzar'*. The Ukrainian word refers to a blind itinerant bard. At the time of the First Five-Year-Plan and the collectivization campaign, indications of obstinacy and self-determination detected among local administrators and evident nationalist feelings among the peasantry aroused suspicion in the Soviet regime. A campaign against Ukrainian nationalism was launched in 1930, and during the ensuing purges, the old intelligentsia of Ukraine was practically annihilated. Singing about the free and heroic past of their land, the real-life *kobzar's* now became dangerous in the eyes of Soviet authorities. The issue was solved by gathering them in a congress, where they were arrested and most of them, reportedly, executed. (Conquest 2002: 217–219, 266.)

The campaigning against "Ukrainian nationalists" continued until 1934. After that, Ukraine disappeared from public discourse for a few years, until the promoting of Shevchenko as a national hero in the late 1930s brought it back into the limelight. (Martin 2001: 363–364.) The 125th anniversary of Shevchenko's birth in 1939 (see Subchapter 4.3.2) occurred during a period marked with various jubilees and memorials of Russian literary heroes, for instance, of Pushkin, Dobroliubov, Nekrasov and Gogol. The initiator behind

the inclusion of Shevchenko in the pantheon was Nikita Khrushchev. (Brooks 2001: 118–119.) Recently appointed as the Party leader of Ukraine, Khrushchev strived to disseminate the sense of national solidarity among the Ukrainian elite. Up until then, Shevchenko had been primarily recognized as a “poet of rebellion.” In the late 1930s, he began to appear in public discourse in the role of national poet, as the “great son of Ukraine.” (Yekelchik 2014: 19, 23.) Serhy Yekelchik calls attention to the potential contradiction in Shevchenko’s new status:

If it were not for the emphasis on Shevchenko’s ‘revolutionary-democratic’ views, this interpretation could have been mistaken for a piece of Ukrainian nationalist propaganda. (Yekelchik 2014: 23–24.)

In reality, Shevchenko played quite an opposite role: his canonization helped obscure openly nationalist writers advocating Ukrainian independence (see Brooks 2001: 119). Thus, the strategy had ulterior motives similar to those of Lenin’s and Stalin’s nationalities policy in the 1920s (see Subchapter 4.2). By a trick of legerdemain, the focus was turned away from potentially threatening issues.

Chukovskii had a special penchant for Shevchenko, whose poems he could recite by heart – in Ukrainian, of course (Chukovskaia, L. 2012: 71, 174). He had loved the poet since childhood. During the first decades of the 20th century, Shevchenko’s name often appeared in his articles and lectures, but after the Revolution, Chukovskii only mentioned him in the context of translation. (Ivanova 2004b: 471–475.) Shevchenko first appears in the 1930 edition of *A High Art* in the role of translator. His rendition of the *Book of Psalms* is presented in that edition as an example of how a translator’s social nature is manifested in his work (see Table 27). (The issue of the translator’s social nature is further discussed in Subchapter 4.4.3.)

Table 27

<p><i>Мудрено ли, что Шевченко, революционер-патриот, мечтавший о раскрепощении Украины, даже в Псалтири отыскал революционные возгласы, которые и запечатлел в переводах. (Chukovskii 1930: 21.)</i></p>	<p><i>No wonder that Shevchenko, a <u>revolutionary-patriot</u> dreaming about the liberation of Ukraine, even in the Book of Psalms found revolutionary exclamations, which also imprint his translations.</i></p>
---	---

In his translation of Psalm 43, Shevchenko used the words “fettors” (*okovy*) and “executioner” (*palach*), which, according to Chukovskii (1930: 21), symbolize autocracy and Tsar Nicholas I. The discussion about the *Book of Psalms* is also included in the 1936 edition, but the comment shown in Table 27 was omitted there. The remaining part of the discussion (Chukovskii 1930: 21; 1936a: 42) contains the observation that, on the whole, there is palpably present in Shevchenko’s translation the “Ukrainian-rebel who hates the executioners of his native land” (*ukrainets-buntar’, nenavidyashchii palachei svoei rodiny*).

This discussion appears as a sequel to the previous topic, which concerns the Symbolist poet Fedor Sologub’s rendition of Shevchenko’s *Kobzar’* (more in Subchapter 4.4.3). Dat-

ing from the early 1920s, the translations were not published as a separate edition until 1934. Referring to Sologub's obvious effort to produce an adequate translation, Chukovskii points out the fundamental obstacle that hindered him from achieving that goal.

Table 28

<p><i>Но то обстоятельство, что Шевченко был революционный боец, а его переводчик – эстет, индивидуалист, декадент, не могло не отразиться в переводе. (Chukovskii 1936a: 41.)</i></p>	<p><i>But the fact that Shevchenko was a <u>revolutionary fighter</u>, while his translator was an esthete, an individualist, and a decadent, could not but be reflected in the translation.</i></p>
--	--

The passage about Sologub is included nearly verbatim also in Chukovskii's article "Iskusstvo perevoda." As can be seen in Table 28, in the 1936 edition, the epithet "revolutionary patriot" that was used in the previous edition (see Table 27) was replaced with the epithet "revolutionary fighter" (*revoliutsionnyi boets*). In the same context, Chukovskii (1936: 41) calls Shevchenko a "poet-fighter" (*poet-boets*), an epithet that also appears in Chukovskii's article "Iskoverkannyi perevod T. G. Shevchenko" (Chukovskii 1938; see Subchapter 4.1). Perhaps Chukovskii himself sensed that at the moment of time, the words "patriot" and "liberation" might be politically incorrect words. They could easily direct the attention of the reader – the censor-reader, in particular – to the uncomfortable territory of Ukrainian nationalism. It is also possible that the original word was edited out by the censor and substituted with a more harmless one. edition (p. 243), however, in an entirely different context (see Table 29 below).

In the 1941 edition p. 24), the epithet for Shevchenko was again adjusted, this time into the plain and simple "revolutionary" (*revoliutsioner*). The epithet appears in a discussion about the unsuitability of the Ukrainian poet, translator, and politician Maksim Slavinskii (see Subchapter 4.4.3) for translating Shevchenko. In another context in the 1941 edition (pp. 46–47), Shevchenko is characterized by the underlining expression "genuine revolutionary" (*podlinnyi revoliutsioner*).

In the present study, Shevchenko is also discussed in Subchapter 4.4.3, from the perspective of the ideological issues connected with the translation of his works into Russian. Chukovskii portrays Shevchenko as a revolutionary author juxtaposed with a "reactionary" or "liberal" Russian translator. The relevant aspect both in this subchapter and in Subchapter 4.4.3 is Shevchenko's revolutionariness, and, therefore, an overlapping of discussions is unavoidable.

In the 1941 edition (pp. 230–231), Chukovskii calls attention to the abundant number of translations of Shevchenko that had been published during the preceding eighty years. He ascribes it to "the romantic love of the Russian people for Ukraine." Shevchenko's new relevance in the Soviet literary canon is clearly manifested in this edition. Translations of his poetry are discussed in various contexts, and his name appears in more than half of the chapters. Altogether, about forty translators are mentioned in connection with the Ukrainian poet, at least in passing. Moreover, the 1941 edition contains a new chapter exclusively devoted to Shevchenko, titled "Tendencies of the Soviet Style in the New Translations of Shevchenko" (*Tendentsii sovetskogo stil'ia v novykh perevodakh Shevchenko*, pp. 220–257). In

the new chapter, translating Shevchenko is mainly discussed from a linguistic point of view. Expanded and re-titled, the chapter is also included in the 1960s editions of *A High Art* (1964: 296–348; 1966: 562–625; 1968: 311–379).

Shevchenko’s conspicuous presence in the 1941 edition can partly be attributed to the concomitance of the publication with his forthcoming anniversary. Another obvious reason is Shevchenko’s newly acquired membership in the pleiad of Soviet literary heroes. In all likelihood, Chukovskii was only happy to have the “official blessing” to immerse himself in this particular topic, to write about a poet so familiar and dear to him. Referring to the enterprise of translating Shevchenko into the languages of minority nationalities (see also Table 17 in Subchapter 4.3.2), Chukovskii marvels at Shevchenko’s fame in the Soviet Union.

Table 29

<p>[. . .] – он, конечно, в самых дерзновенных мечтах не мог представить себе этой небывалой в истории всего человечества всесоюзной, всенародной славы, не мог вообразить ни на миг, что та маленькая “захаливная книжка”, которую он прятал в солдатском своем сапоге, станет с благоговением читаться на всех языках многомиллионным народам раскрепощенной страны. (Chukovskii 1941: 243.)</p>	<p>[. . .] – of course, even in his wildest dreams he could not have pictured this All-Union, nationwide fame, unprecedented in the entire history of mankind. Not for a moment could he imagine that the little self-made notebook, which he kept hidden in his army boot, would be reverently read in all the languages of the millions of people living in a <u>liberated country</u>.</p>
--	---

In the 1930 edition, Shevchenko’s dream about a “liberated country” unambiguously refers to an independent Ukraine, not dominated by Russia (see Table 27). In the 1941 edition, the notion has an altogether different meaning. There, it refers to the friendly union of Soviet peoples liberated from the tsarist regime.

In the new chapter about Shevchenko in the 1941 edition of *A High Art*, Chukovskii introduces four distinctive features in recent translations of *Kobzar’*. The first feature is that the translations convey Shevchenko’s revolutionary ideas (see Table 92 in Subchapter 4.4.3). The second feature is the excellent reproduction of the original meter. In the foreword to this edition, Chukovskii (1941: 4; see Table 14 in Subchapter 4.3.2) calls attention to this general quality in the nationality translation of that time. The third distinctive feature is the “realism” of the translations, and the fourth one is their strict conformance to Shevchenko’s “democratic, folkloristic” style, which Chukovskii also characterizes by the attribute *narodnyi*. (See Chukovskii 1941: 246–249). The significance given to the two latter features echoes the mandates of Socialist Realism (see Subchapter 4.2), whether that was Chukovskii’s intention or not.

On the other hand, *narodnyi* may also be translated as “national.” In the same context (see Table 30), Chukovskii speaks about Ukrainian “national color” (*natsional’nyi kolorit*).

Table 30

<p>А теперь советские поэты, которые в своей переводческой практике ежедневно приобщаются к фольклорам всех национальных областей и республик, научились с таким уважением относиться к поэтическому творчеству братских народов, что никаких фальсификатов фольклора они не допустят, так что каждая шевченковская песня и в переводе звучит у них, как песня украинская, сохраняя свой национальный колорит. (Chukovskii 1941: 249.)</p>	<p>And now Soviet poets, who at every hour in their translation practice are involved with the folklores of all national oblasts and republics, have learned to approach the poetic works of the brother nations with such respect that they refuse to tolerate any falsifiers of folklore. Thus, in their translations every song of Shevchenko's sounds as it does in Ukrainian, with all its national color intact.</p>
--	--

In the late 1930s, the issue of falsified folklore was a hot topic in public discourse. The keen interest in Soviet folklore and the zest for collecting and publishing samples of it had resulted in various falsifications and in the popularization of the entire genre. Many participants in the discourse disapproved the readiness of some eminent folklorists to lavish praise on such works that the performer quite openly admitted having written himself. At the same time, oral tradition lost its earlier significance in the definition of folklore. (Miller 1990: 22–23.)

For the Soviet authorities, the evaporation of the distinction between folklore and literature proper had some definite advantages:

Socialist realist theory viewed literature as utilitarian and didactic, a weapon in the struggle to promote socialism. As a now widely acknowledged part of literature, folklore was viewed as a potential vehicle for the expression of the same manipulative, if progressive, influences. (Ziolkovski 2013: 99.)

The American scholar Richard Dorson has invented a special term for concocted folklore: fakelore. One sub-genre of Soviet fakelore was the *novina*, which in form and composition followed the model of the traditional epic tale *bylina*. Even its name is a modified version of *bylina*, the root word is *byl* ("was" or "has been"). In *novina*, the root word is *novyi* ("new"). The heyday of the *novina* was from the mid-1930s to the mid-1940s, and Lenin and Stalin were its quintessential heroes. Other popular topics were Soviet agricultural, industrial, and military accomplishments, polar expeditions, and so on. (See Ziolkovski 2013: ix, 2, 150.)

The last chapter in the 1941 edition of *A High Art* is devoted to Shevchenko. The topic provides a seamless transition for Chukovskii to once more shift the discussion in that concluding chapter to the general level of nationality translation (see Tables 29 and 30, and also Table 17 in Subchapter 4.3.2). This fact further reinforces the impression of national translation being a main theme, or maybe even *the* main theme, in the edition.

Velimir Khlebnikov, Boris Pasternak, Vladimir Maiakovskii

Three writers appear in the 1936 edition of *A High Art* whose presence is not quite self-evident in light of the literary doctrine of the time. These writers are Velimir Khlebnikov,

Boris Pasternak, and Vladimir Maiakovskii, all early representatives of the Russian Futurism of the 1910s and 1920s. At that time, Chukovskii took an avid interest in the Futurists, lecturing and writing several articles about them. When the eccentricity of the movement confused and alienated the reading public, Chukovskii's lectures and articles functioned as an introductory course of sorts, which made them very popular. (Ivanova 2004a: 7.) Republished in 1922 in an anthology titled *Futuristy* ("The Futurists"), those articles got a cold reception. In a typical review, Chukovskii was portrayed as a merciless critic of the Futurists and a representative of "the savage tradition of bourgeois critique." One of the attacks came from Viktor Shklovskii, who falsely accused Chukovskii of persecuting Maiakovskii. For Shklovskii, this act marked the beginning of a wider campaign against Chukovskii, which would continue for years. The campaign culminated in 1940, when Shklovskii denounced Chukovskii in his book about Maiakovskii (see Subchapter 2.7). (Ivanova & Mel'gunov 2004: 586–587.)

In his memoir *Polutoroglazyi strelets* ("The One and Half-Eyed Archer," 1931), the poet and translator Benedict Livshits (a friend of Khlebnikov's and Maiakovskii's and a prominent member of the Cubo-Futurist circle; see Sheinker 1988: 511–512) speaks warmly about Chukovskii's lectures, which, in his words, provided "grist to our mill." Livshits even playfully suggests that Futurism was Chukovskii's de facto profession without which he would have "starved and turned up his toes". (Chukovskii 2004a: 52; Ivanova & Mel'gunov 2004: 586–587.) (Livshits is further discussed in Subchapter 4.5.1.) In 1940, Chukovskii reminisced his early relationship with the Futurists as follows:

Отношение мое к футуристам было в ту пору сложное: я ненавидел их проповедь, но любил их самих, их таланты. (Chukovskii 2001e: 230.)

My attitude to the Futurists at that time was complicated; I detested their sermon but loved them for themselves, their talent.

Chukovskii's diaries and memoirs (see e.g. Chukovskii 2001e: 230–251, 454–463) bear witness to his warm friendship with both Maiakovskii and Pasternak.

Among the Futurists, Khlebnikov is particularly renowned for his linguistic innovations and experiments. The peak of his creativity was during a time when publishing was first impeded by the First World War, then by the Revolution and the Civil War. His poems appeared only sporadically, and mostly in small journals. His collected works were first published posthumously between 1928 and 1933. At that time, the Soviet literary policy was becoming tighter and more politicized, and Khlebnikov's poetry was not in accordance with the norms of Socialist Realism. His works were published in separate editions in 1936 and 1940, and immediately lashed with negative reviews. Khlebnikov's harshest critics even accused him of anti-Sovietism. (Cooke 1987: 2, 13.) During the Thaw, his poetry was published selectively, and even then heavily edited by the censors (Lygo 2013: 270).

Khlebnikov rarely appears in Chukovskii's personal memoirs, although the two associated in the same circles (see e.g. Chukovskii 2001e: 235; 2008a: 328). The scantiness of reminiscences and anecdotes may be explained by the temperamental makeup of Khlebnikov, who died young, in 1922, from the consequences of malnutrition. Contemporaries describe him as an utterly introverted and reserved personality. (See e.g. Mandelstam 1999: 412;

2011: 91.) Recalling an evening at Il'ia Repin's dacha, Chukovskii (2008b: 144) mentions the presence of "the silent Khlebnikov, who did not participate in the general merriment." On the other hand, the poet's "natural eccentricity" and "legendary image" appear to have made him the object of numerous anecdotes (see Cooke 1987: 3).

Chukovskii first became acquainted with Pasternak in 1917. Later, when both of them lived in the writers' village in Peredelkino, they became even closer. (See e.g. Chukovskii 2000b: 519; 2001e: 454, 459.) In 1958, this friendship caused an utterly awkward situation for Chukovskii. Pasternak was awarded the Nobel Prize for his novel *Doktor Zhivago*, but the Soviet authorities pressurized him into declining the honor. Eventually, Pasternak was expelled from the Writers' Union, and a vicious campaign was run against him. In the course of events, a number of other people were involuntarily drawn into the affair. Chukovskii's name, among others, is included in the KGB document about Pasternak's "connections." (For more details, see Pasternak 2008.)

Accompanied by his granddaughter Elena Chukovskaia, Chukovskii was the first and, as it turned out, the only writer who visited Pasternak's house to congratulate him about the prize (see Chukovskaia, E. 2012: 365–368). A diary entry recorded four days later on October 27 attests to Chukovskii's apprehension of his being involved in the episode, all the while the consequences of the nomination were unfolding. The entry contains a report of the visit, supplemented – obviously later, as the ink is different – with the following remark: "Written to be shown to the authorities" (*Eto napisano dlia pokaza vlastiam*). In the report, Chukovskii (2011c: 268) particularly emphasizes that he never read *Doktor Zhivago* and had no way of knowing about its anti-Soviet content.

Elena Chukovskaia (2012: 367–368) recounts that later that same evening, Chukovskii went to Konstantin Fedin, who was the First Secretary of the Writers' Union at the time, and tried to persuade him not to sign the document for Pasternak's expulsion from the union, but to no avail. Three months later, apprehending another campaign and even deportation, Pasternak appealed to Chukovskii for advice. Recorded in Chukovskii's diary, the reply is illuminating in that it helps in understanding how he managed to survive through the Great Terror. It manifests his capacity for a peculiar kind of passive resistance. While he may have ostensibly played by the rules dictated from above, at the same time, he maintained his integrity and remained loyal to a friend.

- Вы можете считать меня пошляком, но, ради бога, не ставьте себя в такое положение: я, Пастернак, с одной стороны, и советская власть – с другой. Смирненно напишите длинное письмо, заявите о своих симпатиях к тому, что делает советская власть для народа, о том, как вам дорога семилетка – и т.д. (Chukovskii 2011c: 282.)

"Think of me what you will," I said to him, "but for heaven's sake don't put yourself in the position of being me, Pasternak, on one side, and you, the Soviet regime, on the other. Just write a long letter declaring your sympathy for what the Soviet regime is doing for the people and how you love the Seven-Year Plan, and so on." (Erlich 2005: 438.)

Chukovskii's ability to concoct diplomatic phrases may, indeed, have helped not only him but also his friends in critical situations. In general, however, if an intellectual pronounced

some negative comments about the regime, he was not automatically arrested. Pasternak is a prime example of the arbitrariness of the Stalinist terror. He never made secret his politically incorrect opinions, and despite this, he somehow managed to survive and even to win favor with Stalin. (See Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 200, 318, 322.)

In 1936, however, Pasternak caught himself in a situation that might have had sinister consequences. In connection with the Kamenev-Zinov'ev trial (see Subchapter 2.7), a group of prominent writers were told to sign a collective request for the execution of the defendants, a demand that Pasternak blatantly refused. (Fitzpatrick 2000: 197–198.) Reminiscing about the incident in an interview two decades later, Pasternak credited his colleagues for indirectly saving him by not informing the authorities of his refusal (Conquest 2008: 252). As it turned out, somebody else had taken the liberty of signing the document with his name (Brooks 2001: 145).

In the public discourse of the early 1930s, Pasternak, like Nikolai Tikhonov (see Subchapter 4.3.2), was commended as an exemplary translator. This praise was particularly associated with his translations of Georgian poetry. Some negative comments about his translations were made in 1935, but they were firmly balanced by the contributions of Pasternak's defenders, for instance, by the critic and publicist Dmitrii Sviatopolk-Mirskii. In the First All-Union Conference of Translators, Pasternak was presented as a role model for translators assigned to introduce works of minority nationalities to the Russian readers. (Zemskova 2013: 189–195.)

Elena Zemskova underlines the weight of the name of a famous poet like Pasternak in connection with minority nationality works. It was not the original author's name that was usually printed on the cover but the translator's. The Russian rendition was, in fact, to a great degree the translator's creation. In most cases, the translator did not even understand the original language but composed the translation from a word-for-word Russian rendition of the work. (See Zemskova 2013: 195–196.)

In the foreword to the 1941 edition of *A High Art* (p. 3), Chukovskii lauds the colossal work done by Pasternak, Tikhonov, Boris Brik, and Sergei Spasskii when acquainting the Russian reader with the literary heritage of Georgia. However, in a later chapter, he (Chukovskii 1941: 31) mentions the first three litterateurs in a less flattering context (see Table 31). The discussion concerns such cases when the translator's own personality takes over and supersedes that of the original author.

Table 31

<p><i>Или вспомним великолепных грузинских поэтов, которых переводят Тихонов, Пастернак, Борис Брик. В каждом из этих переводов своя доминанта отклонений от подлинника. (Chukovskii 1941: 31.)</i></p>	<p><i>Or let's remember the magnificent Georgian poets translated by Tikhonov, Pasternak, and Boris Brik. Every one of these translations has its own dominant of deviation from the original.</i></p>
---	--

The Russian Formalist School of literary scholarship used the notion of “dominant” (*dominanta*) for describing a dominant quality in a literary work (see Erlich 1980: 199). Chukovskii first uses the term in *A High Art* in the 1930 edition (p. 12), referring to the “dominant of errors” (*dominanta oshibok*) by which the translator keeps thrusting his own personality

on the original author. The 1936 and 1941 editions each contain a chapter devoted to the notion of dominant. In the former edition, it is titled “Dominants of Errors” (*Dominanty oshibok*; Chukovskii 1936a: 11–36), and in the latter one, “Dominants of Deviation from the Original” (*Dominanty otklonenii ot podlinnika*; Chukovskii 1941: 7–36).

The dominants of deviation from the original in Tikhonov’s, Pasternak’s, and Brik’s translations were discussed in the 1936 edition (p. 27) of *A High Art*, in which Chukovskii elaborated on the issue. The passage shown in Table 32 was omitted from the 1941 edition.

Table 32

<p>У Брика все грузины – неоклассики, у Пастернака – сомнамбулы, моменталисты и гении, у Тихонова – лохматые хрипуны, кривоногие дьяволы, яростно продирающиеся сквозь стих, как сквозь чащу репейника. (Chukovskii 1936a: 27.)</p>	<p>Brik’s Georgians are all neoclassic, Pasternak’s are somnabulists, momentalists and geniuses, whereas Tikhonov’s are shaggy-haired croakers and bow-legged devils furiously pushing their way through the poem like through a thicket of burdock.</p>
---	--

With the above example, Chukovskii supports his argument that instead of individual erroneously translated words, critics should focus on the “system of concoctions” (*sistema otsebiatin*) that the translator’s too obvious presence in a text produces (see Chukovskii 1936a: 26). Of course, the original author’s personality could hardly be detected from an – often anonymously made – interlinear trot (*podstrochnik*; see Witt 2013: 148), on the basis of which nationality translations were commonly made (see above). In the journal *Literaturnyi kritik* (“Literary Critic”) in the spring of 1935, the critic Kornelii Zelinskii expressed a point of view that was very similar to Chukovskii’s. While appreciating the artistic value of Pasternak’s translations, Zelinskii pointed out that every single distinctly Georgian national feature had been lost and that the poems were evidently Pasternak’s own creations rather than the original author’s (See Zemskova 2013: 191.)

Stalin’s favor did not save Pasternak from becoming a target of the anti-Formalist campaign. In March 1936, he was one of the writers that *Pravda* accused of Formalism (Brooks 2001: 122). The notion of “Formalist” writing referred to the deliberate “distortion of the Soviet reality” (Belaia 2000: 556). The accusation marked the beginning of a period when Pasternak was not allowed to publish his own works and, therefore, had to resort to commissioned translations to earn a living. At that time, Pasternak equaled translation with serving a prison sentence. He, reportedly, made the following remark: “Maiakovskii shot himself, whereas I translate” (*Maiakovskii zastrelilsia; a ia perevozh*). (Friedberg 1997: 114–115, 192.) Samantha Sherry (2015: 167–176) discusses Pasternak in the role of an Aesopian translator, remarking that in his translations, Pasternak managed to hide various markers (see Subchapter 3.2) and, thereby, secretly “transmit his personal position” (see Sherry 2015: 168).

Both Pasternak’s and Maiakovskii’s names appear in the following list, one of those that Chukovskii compiled in his diary beginning in the late 1950s (see Subchapter 2.8). (Maiakovskii is also included in another similar list; see Chukovskii 2011c: 368.) The entry in question was recorded on January 21, 1965, and it refers to the recent elections to the board of the Writers’ Union. Chukovskii comments on the elections in a blatantly sarcastic manner:

Целый день тысячи писателей провели в духоте, в ерунде, воображая, что дело литературы изменится, если вместо А в правлении будет Б или В, при том непрменном условии, что вся власть распоряжаться писателями останется в руках у тех людей, которые сгубили Бабеля, Зощенко, Маяковского, Ос. Мандельштама, Гумилева, Бенедикта Лившица, Тагер, Марину Цветаеву, Бруно Ясенского, Пастернака и сотни других. (Chukovskii 2011c: 404.)

Thousands of writers spent the whole day in that stultifying atmosphere, fantasizing that literature would change if B or C got elected instead of A even though one condition has not changed: all power over the writers remains in the hands of the people who did in Babel, Zoshchenko, Mayakovsky, Mandelshtam, Gumilyov, Livshits, Tager, Tsvetaeva, Yasensky, Pasternak, and hundreds of others. (Erlich 2005: 502.)

Chukovskii first met Maiakovskii in the summer of 1913. A critic accustomed to being fawned over by novice poets, he was impressed by Maiakovskii's grandeur and by his total lack of servility. At some point in their first meeting, Maiakovskii went as far as to criticize Chukovskii's early translations of Walt Whitman both for their rhythm and for their "saccharine" (*bonbon'erokhnyi*) style. (Chukovskii probably agreed with him, at least with the latter aspect; see Subchapter 2.1). In spite of their artistic differences, the two literateurs soon became fast friends. (Chukovskii 2001e: 231–234.) Maiakovskii became a frequent visitor at Chukovskii's Kuokkala dacha. The Chukokkala album contains many reminiscences and anecdotes about him, and also his own sketches and caricatures. (See Chukovskii 2008b: 102–117.)

During the first few years after the Revolution, the Futurists, who by then had begun to call themselves "left artists," played an important role in the official propaganda. Later, many of them came to lose their initial enthusiasm for the new regime. (Clark 1996: 36–37.) Maiakovskii, however, was one of those who in the late 1920s continued to promote the revolutionary ideas in their art. At that time he worked as the editor in chief of the journal *LEF* (*Levyi front iskusstv* or "Left Front of the Arts"), which represented radical left-wing criticism. (Kornienko 2011: 30.) When RAPP took over (see Subchapter 2.6), it merged into itself all individual literary groupings, including the critics of *LEF* (Dobrenko 2011: 46).

On April 14, 1930, Maiakovskii committed suicide, for reasons that have been speculated on ever since. Apparently, there were several factors that contributed to his final decision. Larisa Oginskaia (2011) notes that two crucial factors that many have overlooked were Maiakovskii's inner conflict between a lyrical poet and a citizen, and the growing mutual disappointment between him and the Soviet regime. Many scholars agree that another obvious reason was continuous harassment by RAPP (Conquest 2008: 299). Chukovskii is apparently referring to the RAPPists in the following rhetorical question recorded in his diary on the day of Maiakovskii's suicide:

[. . .] – и зачем же такому великану было жить среди тех мелких «хозяйчиков», которые поперли вслед за ним – [. . .] (Chukovskii 2011b: 400)

Why did such a giant have to have all those petty bosses trailing after him? (Erlich 2005: 241.)

Katerina Clark (1996: 276), for instance, considers Maiakovskii a casualty of the RAPP campaign. As it turns out, only shortly before his suicide, he had finally yielded to the pressure and joined into the association (see e.g. Rogachevskii 2000: 277).

After Maiakovskii's death, the publication of his works gradually dwindled. That state of affairs urged Maiakovskii's life-long friend and muse Lili Brik to send to Stalin her famous-to-be letter in November 1935. Emphasizing Maiakovskii's propaganda role, in particular, Brik expressed her indignation over the negligence of the poet's "enormous revolutionary legacy." Stalin forwarded the letter to Nikolai Ezhov. On the letter, he had written a message in which he commented Maiakovskii as follows: "Maiakovskii was and is the best and most talented poet of our Soviet era. Indifference to his memory and works is a crime." (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 285–288.) Published in *Pravda*, the comment gained great attention. All that publicity made Maiakovskii posthumously a celebrity, and he eventually became a cult figure in Soviet literature. (See Clark 2011: 329.)

Maiakovskii's canonization occurred at the same time as preparations for the Pushkin centennial were being started (Petroni 2000: 113–114). Karen Petroni construes the implications of Stalin's comment as follows:

This declaration pointed to one of the fundamental features of the Stalin era, the explicit imposition of a hierarchical model of order in all fields of endeavor. Just as Stalin was the supreme leader who lesser leaders should emulate, Maiakovskii was the preeminent Soviet poet and Pushkin was to be the archetypal Russian poet. (Petroni 2000: 114.)

In the early 20th century, Pushkin was generally considered an "emblem for cultural conservatism" (Clark 1996: 157). Maiakovskii, in turn, was one of those who signed the Futurist manifesto *Poshchechina obshchestvennomu vkusu* or "A Slap in the Face of Public Taste" in 1912. The manifesto pronounced Pushkin's poetry as "incomprehensible hieroglyphs" and suggested that Pushkin be thrown overboard from the "steamship of modernity" (Nikoliukin 2003: 1157). At the time, however, many people did not recognize the exclamation literally. More than anything, it was used as a rhetorical device. What most people failed to realize was that Maiakovskii actually loved Pushkin. (Oginskaia 2011.) Viewed in that light, the analogy drawn between Maiakovskii and Pushkin is not as ironic as it might seem.

It was not only Maiakovskii whose works were published sporadically in the early 1930s. The new cultural policy demanded "accessibility" (*dostupnost'*) of literature to the broad masses. Becoming familiarized with the pre-revolutionary classics was considered an important part of the cultural education of a Soviet citizen. In publishing, that meant edging the so-called new Soviet classics out of the way. (Mentsel' 2000a: 497.) Although Stalin's pronouncement canonized Maiakovskii's entire production, the canonization concerned only Maiakovskii. Apart from that, Soviet cultural policy followed its own path, and the campaign against Formalism (see Subchapter 4.2) would soon be launched. (Mentsel' 2000b: 954.)

Before the Revolution, Gor'kii appears to have harbored a benevolent, almost paternalist interest in the Futurists. Writing about them, he particularly highlighted their youthful zest. The following excerpt is from Gor'kii's article "O futurizme" ("About Futurism"), which was published in the journal *Zhurnal zhurnalov* ("Journal of Journals") in 1915:

Как бы смешны и крикливы ни были наши футуристы, но им нужно широко раскрыть двери, широко, ибо это молодые голоса, зовущие к молодой новой жизни. (Gor'kii 1915.)

However amusing and loud these Futurists of ours may be, we must open the doors wide for them, wide, for these are young voices calling out to a young, new life.

By the 1930s, Gor'kii's attitude to the Futurists seems to have changed fundamentally. In his articles written during the first half of the decade, he attacked the "verbal nonsense" (*slovesnaia chepukha*) represented by Futurism. In the same context, he underscored the enlightening mission of the Soviet writer. He maintained that the use of proper language was an essential concern, and another one was the writer's self-discipline. A favorite target of Gor'kii's was Khlebnikov, whose poetic language he pronounced as "verbal chaos" (*slovesnyi khaos*). (Rozenal' 2000: 66; see also Günther 2011: 94, 96.) A proponent of Khlebnikov's poetry was the writer and critic Iurii Tynianov. In his essay "O Khlebnikove" ("On Khlebnikov," in the collection *Arkhaisty i novatory* or "Archaists and Innovators," 1929), Tynianov emphasized that however abstruse they may seem, Khlebnikov's linguistic experiments must not be regarded as nonsense but as a new and original semantic system (see Hickey 2009: 360).

From the standpoint of *A High Art*, the canonization of Maiakovskii happened at an opportune moment. By then, the 1936 edition had already long since been submitted for publication (see Subchapter 4.1), but the positive assessment of Maiakovskii may well have been a credit for the book. Chukovskii's admiration for Maiakovskii's creative talent and innovativeness is evident in the example shown in table 33. On a broader level, however, the topic of discussion in that edition is translating Shakespeare (see Subchapter 4.4.4). Chukovskii (1936a: 173; 1941: 128–129) first refers to the prediction made by the 19th century critic Aleksandr Druzhinin that in a few decades, the Russian language would be rich enough for the proper reproduction of Shakespeare's colorful expressions. Chukovskii then marvels at the plasticity (*plastichnost*) and ductility (*kovkost'*) of the the modern poetic language and at its audacious forms that litterateurs in the previous century could not even dream about. For the vitalization of Russian vocabulary, he gives credit to the "foundry" (*plavil'nia*) of Symbolism and Futurism that Russian literature has gone through in the past thirty years. In that context, Maiakovskii is presented as a herald of and a model for contemporary poetics.

Table 33

<p>Вспомним хотя бы одного Маяковского: есть ли на свете такая метафора, такая гипербола, которые показались бы нам невозможным после его первых же опусов, столь революционизировавших поэтическую русскую речь. (Chukovskii 1936a: 173–174; 1941: 129)</p>	<p>Let's recall a certain Maiakovskii: is there a single metaphor, a single hyperbole that we would consider impossible after his first opuses that so revolutionized the Russian poetic language?</p>
--	--

The coinciding of Maiakovskii's canonization with the onset of the anti-Formalist and anti-naturalist campaigns meant that a lot of attention would be given to his political agitation poetry, whereas his linguistic experiments and innovative poetic devices were ignored entirely (Mentsel' 2000b: 957). It is to those latter features that Chukovskii gives particular attention in *A High Art*. Shklovskii's arguments notwithstanding, Chukovskii spoke of Maiakovskii and his "comrades-in-arms" with commending terms already in his pre-revolutionary articles. In a sense, his early assessment of Maiakovskii conforms well with the image of the poet that would be advocated in the 1930s:

Уже то, что из их среды вышел такой гений современной эпохи, как Владимир Маяковский, свидетельствует, что они действительно были спаяны с современной эпохой катастроф, голодных эпидемий, революций и войн. Нет поэта, который по темам, по интонациям, по словарю, по жестам, по ритмам, по рифмам был бы в такой мере современным поэтом, как именно этот сподвижник Бурлюка, Василия Каменского, Хлебникова. (Chukovskii 2004a: 72.)

The mere fact that from amongst them, such a genius of the present epoch emerged as Vladimir Maiakovskii demonstrates that they were truly one and the same with the contemporary epoch of catastrophes, famines, revolutions, and wars. There is no other poet who, by his themes, by his intonations, by his vocabulary, by his gestures, by his rhythms, or by his rhymes would be, to such an extent, a *contemporary* poet as this particular comrade-in-arms of Burluk, Vasilii Kamenskii, and Khlebnikov.

The examples shown in Tables 34 and 35 below are also from the chapter devoted to Shakespeare. The principal topic here is a new anthology of Shakespeare's plays, edited by the academician M. N. Rozanov and published by the State Publishing House of Literature (GIKhL) in 1934. The anthology was hot off the press at the time Chukovskii was working on the 1936 edition of *A High Art*. The anthology contained translations by the poets Mikhail Lozinskii, Mikhail Kuzmin, Tat'iana Shchepkina-Kupernik, and Sergei Solov'ev. (The Shakespeare anthology is further discussed in Subchapter 4.4.4.)

The example shown in Table 34 refers to a passage criticizing some of the equivalents Kuzmin has used in his translation of *King Lear* (see Rozanov 1934: 251–344) and Shchepkina-Kupernik in her translations of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Tempest* (see Rozanov 1934: 365–422, 441–500). Chukovskii (1936a: 175–176; 1941: 130) finds them too tepid to give credit to the original. To emphasize his point, he juxtaposes Shchepkina-Kupernik's poetic language with that of Khlebnikov's, Maiakovskii's, and Pasternak's.

Table 34

<p><i>Разве теперь, после Хлебникова, Маяковского, Пастернака нам нужно с боязливой оглядкой заменять «курчавые воды» – волнами, «бурю очей» – глазами, «кислоглазое презренье» – презреньем [. . .] и пр., и пр., и пр.? (Chukovskii 1936a: 176; 1941: 130.)</i></p>	<p><i>Do we really now, after Khlebnikov, Maiakovskii, and Pasternak, with timid caution replace "wild waters" with waves, "the tempest of my eyes" with eyes, "sour-eyed contempt" with contempt [. . .] etc., etc., etc.?</i></p>
---	---

A few pages further in the chapter, Chukovskii mentions Khlebnikov, Pasternak and Maiakovskii in an almost identical manner, once again presenting their work as a watershed in the development of poetic expression (see Table 35). In the preceding paragraphs, he (Chukovskii 1936a: 182–183; 1941: 135–136) discusses the proclivity of Russian translators, Shchepkina-Kupernik included, for excessive “compactness” (*kompaktnost’*) of verbal constructions. According to Chukovskii, in a poetic translation, such a method often results in “unnatural enunciation” (*neestestvennost’ diktsii*), “awkward intonation” (*neukliuzhest’ intonatsii*), and “disruptions and fractures in the syntax” (*vyvikhii i perelomy sintaksisa*). Speaking about the wrecking of Shakespeare’s metaphors, Chukovskii is apparently referring to Afanasii Fet, whose rendition of Goethe’s play *Faust* he mentions as one example of “compact” translations.

Table 35

<p>[. . .] я хотел показать, что уничтожение метафор Шекспира, вполне законное в шестидесятых годах, в эпоху наисильнейшей реакции против цветистой и напыщенной речи, нынче уже не может найти оправдания, после того как Хлебников, Пастернак, Маяковский и те, что пришли за ними, расширил диапазон нашей поэтической речи и тем исподволь подготовили нас к безболезненному восприятию наиболее чуждых “духу русского языка” оборотов Шекспира. (Chukovskii 1936a: 183; 1941: 136)</p>	<p>[. . .] I wanted to show that the wrecking of Shakespeare’s metaphors was perfectly legal in the 1860s, in the epoch of reaction against florid and bombastic language, but there are no justifications for it today, after Khlebnikov, Pasternak, and Maiakovskii, and those who came after them broadened the range of our poetic language, thereby gradually preparing us to effortlessly apprehend even the most alien to the “spirit of Russian language” of Shakespeare’s phrases.</p>
---	---

Putting these particular writers in the limelight almost seems like a statement. Praising Khlebnikov, Chukovskii clearly defies Gor’kii’s literary authority. Before Maiakovskii’s canonization, his being presented as a role model no way conformed to the current canon. Pasternak did not meet the qualifications for Socialist Realism any better.

Except for some dark horses, the role models presented in *A High Art* are quite concordant with the Soviet literary canon. On the other hand, the 19th century classics would probably be included in the book, anyway, because of their prestige and their significance for Chukovskii. Therefore, their presence cannot straightforwardly and exclusively be interpreted as his conforming to the official canon.

4.4 MANIFESTATIONS OF THE PERFORMANCE

This Subchapter examines four aspects of the Stalinist time chronotope as they appear in *A High Art*. Whereas Subchapter 4.3.3 examined literary heroes as role models, Subchapter 4.4.1 takes another angle, focusing on two real-life positive heroes: the Soviet reader and the Soviet translator. Subchapter 4.4.2 discusses the contribution of *A High Art* to the public

discourse about Soviet translation. Subchapter 4.4.3 examines the presence of ideological motifs in the 1930s editions. Subchapter 4.4.4 peruses the ideologically and, at times, personally colored discourse about translating Shakespeare.

4.4.1 The Positive Hero

The quintessential positive heroes in *A High Art* are the Soviet reader and the Soviet translator. The image of the translator appears on two different levels: on a concrete level and on an abstract one. The concrete level pertains to the work of individual translators, praising it, criticizing it, and in some cases scorning it. Of particular interest for the present study is the abstract level, however. It paints a picture of a phenomenon called the Soviet translator.

In the 1930 of *A High Art* (p. 26), the notion of the new reader explicitly refers to newly literate readers, that is, to “the broad masses that, for the first time, are becoming acquainted with world literature” (see Table 10 in Subchapter 4.3.1). The roots of this image can be traced to the literacy campaigns launched by the Bolsheviks and to the revolutionary ethos of enlightening the masses (see Subchapter 2.4), which Catriona Kelly describes followingly:

[. . .] ‘the Soviet Masses’ (a construct that was, in some ways, the counterpart of the old intelligentsia myth of the *narod*, embracing all those beyond the Party hierarchy and lacking the intelligentsia’s prestige: not only peasants and factory workers, but the lowest grades of white-collar workers, such as typists and filing clerks, and indeed rank-and-file Party members). (Kelly 2001: 244.)

The foreword to the 1930 edition (pp. 5–6) opens with an account of the genesis of *A High Art* (see also Table 23 in Subchapter 4.3.3). Chukovskii points out that as translation has become “one of the most urgent (*nasushchnyi*) issues in Soviet culture,” the book is now being offered for a wider circle of readers – by which Chukovskii is apparently referring first and foremost to the Soviet translators, inasmuch as the new significance of their work is emphasized in the same context. However, the key point in the foreword is the importance of protecting the interests of the “broad reading masses.”

Table 36

<p><i>Надеюсь, что ее появление вполне своевременно, ибо никогда еще труд переводчика не был так ответствен и социально значителен. Требования, предъявляемые к переводчикам в настоящее время, не бывало повысились, потому что всякий плохой перевод стал ощущаться не только как вопиющая клевета на переводимого автора, но и как злостное вредительство, наносящее ущерб широким читательским массам. (Chukovskii 1930: 6.)</i></p>	<p><i>I hope that the book appears at an opportune time, for never before has the work of a translator involved such responsibility and social importance. The requirements that translators are facing today are higher than ever before because any bad translation is not only perceived as appalling slander against the original author but also as a malicious wrecking that causes damage to the broad reading masses.</i></p>
--	---

The word “wrecking” (*vreditel'stvo*) stands out in the above passage. Since the late 1920s, it was frequently heard in connection with the “wreckers discourse,” a series of campaigns conducted in the press. By his speech at the First All-Union Conference of Translators in 1936, Iogann Al'tman rendered translation part of that discourse. (Witt 2013: 163–164.) For translators, the implications of the wreckers discourse combined with the anti-Formalist campaign (see subchapter 4.2) were as described by Susanna Witt:

In the short term, the applicability of the formalist label in the notorious campaign of spring 1936, combined with the accommodation of the theme of translation to the ‘wreckers’ discourse’, was ominous for the already ambiguous status of translators. (Witt 2013: 181.)

In public discourse, a close synonym to the word “wrecking” was the word “anti-Sovietism” (*antisovetchina*). On a general level, both referred to hostile conduct against the Soviet rule. (See Mokienko & Nikitina 1998: 37, 97.) The citizens were quite thoroughly inculcated with the wreckers discourse, as it turns out from their reactions to the frequent problems with food supply and distribution. Ordinary people would write to the Party leaders demanding them to expose and punish the “wreckers” allegedly responsible for the shortages. (See Fitzpatrick 2000: 45.)

In the example shown in Table 36 above, the good translators are implicitly featured as positive heroes in contrast to the bad translators or “wreckers.” In this particular case, the alleged damage is not aimed directly at the Soviet rule or the Soviet economy but at the broad masses. The use of the word “masses” creates another interesting juxtaposition. During the Cultural Revolution, the Soviet regime promulgated the image of the bourgeois intelligentsia as wreckers and saboteurs harboring loyalties to foreign capitalist powers. They were made into scapegoats for the various economic difficulties that encumbered Soviet society (Fitzpatrick 1992: 119.) Merely by employing contemporary vocabulary, Chukovskii creates an image of bourgeois wreckers threatening the interests of the proletarian masses.

In a chapter titled “The Editing of Foreign Writers” (*Redaktirovanie inostrannikh pisatelei*, pp. 68–73) in the 1930 edition of *A High Art*, Chukovskii discusses the great responsibility on the shoulders of editors. He finds fault in the translation of the recently published anthology of Dickens’ works and lays the blame on the editor Ivan Zhilkin’s lack of knowledge about the novelist and about the epoch and the surroundings in which those works were produced. In the same context, Chukovskii calls attention to the tightened public control over translations, noting that the Soviet press vigilantly safeguards the interests of the reading masses. To elucidate “the contemporary reader’s attitude to bad translations,” Chukovskii cites a recent article by the poet Osip Mandel’shtam, titled “Potoki khaltury” (“The Production Lines of Hack Work”). In that longish quotation from an unmentioned source, Mandel’shtam notes that while the poisoning of wells and the spoiling of water supply systems are punishable offences, no penalty is imposed for damaging those drive belts that connect the brains of the Soviet reading masses with the works of foreign writers. (See Chukovskii 1930: 70–71.)

Incorporated into Chukovskii’s text, the quotation serves a rhetorical function in that it accentuates the urgency of the issue. The quotation is not included in subsequent editions

of *A High Art*. Meanwhile, Mandel'shtam had been arrested and labelled taboo, which seems to explain his absence from the book (more in Subchapter 4.5.1). Had the quotation remained, in the mid- and late 1930s, it would have acquired entirely new meanings. When the campaign against Formalism was at its height, the besmirching of Soviet readers' minds would have been considered a criminal offense. And aimed at an individual writer, such an accusation might have had fatal consequences. The Friendship of the Peoples ethos brought new aspects to the translator's responsibility. As Chukovskii (1936a: 7–8) points out, a poorly done translation would not only cause damage to the translator's own people but also to other Soviet peoples (see Table 2 in Subchapter 4.3.1 and Table 16 in Subchapter 4.3.2). In the example shown in Table 16, Chukovskii uses the Russian word *vina*. This word can be translated as "fault," but also as the more ominously tinged "guilt."

Chukovskii (1930: 26; 1936a: 120–121, 214; 1941: 202) maintains that the new Soviet reader will settle for nothing less than "maximum precision" (see also Table 10 in Subchapter 4.3.1). In the example shown in Table 37, he sums up the idea in a nutshell.

Table 37

<p>Новый читатель уже не желает довольствоваться «Дон Кихотами», «Робинсонами», «Гулливерами» в пересказе разных бойких барынь, он требует таких переводов, которые заменяли бы подлинник. (Chukovskii 1930: 28.)</p>	<p>The new reader no longer wants to settle for "Don Quixotes," "Robinson Crusoes," and "Gullivers" in paraphrases by some smooth-tongued mistresses; he demands translations that could replace the original.</p>
---	--

The above passage is also included in the 1936 (pp. 124–125) and 1941 (p. 207) editions of *A High Art*, in which the expression "smooth-tongued mistresses" (*boikie baryni*) is replaced with "irresponsible individuals" (*bezotvetstvennye litsa*). The word *barynia* (see Subchapter 4.3.1; here translated as "mistress") in the 1930 edition is interesting. Used in a derisive tone it might be interpreted as a "quota proletarianism" in the text, meant to humor RAPP, which at the time had command over publishing.

On the other hand, Chukovskii may be simply be reminiscing about the chaotic situation in Petrograd after the 1917 Revolution. Many representatives of the former upper classes had resorted to translation in order to survive. In his recollections of the publishing house *Vsemirnaia literatura*, Chukovskii tells about the efforts for organizing translation as a proper profession. One of the challenges was posed by those very *barins* and *barynias* who strived to get a foothold in the trade:

В довершение бедствия в Питере вдруг обнаружилось множество лиц, вообразивших себя переводчиками: бывшие князья и княгини, бывшие фрейлины, бывшие пажи, лицеисты, камергеры, сенаторы – вся бывшая петербургская знать, выброшенная революцией за борт. Эти люди осаждали нас изо дня в день, уверяя, что именно им надлежит поручить переводы Мольера, Вольтера, Стендаля, Бальзака, Анатоля Франса, Виктора Гюго, так как, благодаря гувернанткам и боннам, они с младенчества умеют свободно болтать по-французски. (Chukovskii 2001e: 52.)

On top of it all, there suddenly turned up in Saint Petersburg a great many people imagining themselves to be translators: former princes and princesses, former ladies-in-waiting, former pages, lyceum students, chamberlains, senators – the entire former aristocracy of Saint Petersburg, thrown overboard by the Revolution. These people kept harassing us day in day out, maintaining that they, in particular, should be commissioned to translate Molière, Voltaire, Stendhal, Balzac, Anatole France, Viktor Hugo because they, thanks to their governesses and nannies, had fluently jabbered away in French ever since they were babies.

Translation was a haven also in the 1930s and long after, except for a different target group. In the Soviet Union, many of those writers and poets whose original works would not be published were allowed to work as translators (see e.g. Friedberg 1997: 7, 79; Neliubin & Khukhuni 2006: 323).

The self-confidence and assertiveness of the new Soviet reader is evident in the example shown in Table 38. The passage is from a chapter titled "Translations Before and Now" (*Perevodyy prezhde i teper*). In the 1936 (p. 113) and 1941 (p. 194) editions of *A High Art*, the passage is attached to a discussion about the ideals and conventions of each epoch that are manifested in the work of translators. As an example of that tendency, Chukovskii (1936a: 109–114; 1941: 191–198) presents the epic poem "The Lay of Igor's Campaign." Originally written in an Old East Slavic language, the poem has been translated into modern Russian in different epochs and by different generations of translators. Chukovskii first refers to the many fundamental faults in the tsarist era renditions and then goes on to praise a recent translation done by the writer and literary historian Georgii Shtorm. A "contribution both to the 'fine verbal arts' and to science" (*vkład i v "izyashchnuiu clovesnost", i nauku*), Shtorm's translation, according to Chukovskii, would meet the standards of the contemporary Soviet reader.

Table 38

<p><i>Этого требует современный читатель. Этого требует наша эпоха, ставящая выше всего – научную истину, документальность, точность, достоверность. (Chukovskii 1930: 24; 1936a: 113; 1941: 195).</i></p>	<p><i>This is what the present-day reader demands. This is what our epoch demands, as it gives the first precedence to scientific truthfulness, factuality, precision, authenticity.</i></p>
--	--

Truthfulness (*istina*), actuality (*dokumental'nost'*), precision (*tochnost'*), and authenticity (*dostovernost'*) are the fundamental elements that compose the scientific quality of a translation, which appears as the primary expectation of the Soviet reader. They are presented in a similar composition also in another context (see Table 42 below).

A *Pravda* editorial published in 1937 proclaimed that never before had literacy among the Russian speaking people been as high as it was at the time (Sandler 2006: 196). The example shown in Table 39 implies even more: the novice reader has not only grown into an avid consumer of literature but has also become an actual connoisseur in the field.

Table 39

<p><i>Чисто художественное восприятие произведений того или иного иностранного автора неизменно сочетается у современных читателей с научно-исследовательским интересом к нему. (Chukovskii 1936a: 126; 1941; 208.)</i></p>	<p><i>In the minds of modern readers a purely artistic perception of the works of a foreign author is linked inescapably with a scholarly-scientific interest in them. (Leighton 1984: 256.)</i></p>
---	--

The example shown in Table 40 also includes the minority nationalities in the collective notion of uncompromising Soviet consumers of literature, sufficiently sophisticated to conduct a scientific evaluation of a translator's work. The word "here" apparently refers to the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic, and "everywhere" to the non-Russian republics.

Table 40

<p><i>Советский читатель и здесь, как везде, решительно отверг всякие услуги дилетантов и потребовал, чтобы посредниками между им и зарубежным искусством были только такие мастера перевода, которые, воспроизводя тот или иной поэтический текст, могут обеспечить читателю научную точность своей интерпретации. (Chukovskii 1936a: 122; 1941: 205.)</i></p>	<p><i>Here, as everywhere, the Soviet reader has decisively rejected any favors from dilettantes and demanded that the mediator between himself and the art of another language be only those masters of translation who, when they reproduce a poetic text, can guarantee the reader scientific precision of interpretation. (Leighton 1984: 252.)</i></p>
---	---

The response to the demand presented above follows immediately in the following sentence. Chukovskii (1936a: 122—123; 1941: 205—206) affirms that to fill the Soviet readers' needs, there is currently available such a veritable "phalanx" (*falanga*) of qualified translators that was never seen during the history of Russian literature (see Table 4 in Subchapter 4.3.1). The Soviet translator's compatibility with the Soviet reader is evident also in the example shown in Table 41. Praising Mikhail Lozinskii for the conclusive background research he did when translating Dante's *Inferno*, Chukovskii (1941: 57) moves the discussion on to a general level and lavishes praise on the Soviet translator.

Table 41

<p><i>Научное проникновение в подлинник есть верный залог объективно точной репродукции всех смысловых и стилистических особенностей этого подлинника, при том, конечно, непрременном условии, если у переводчика действительно есть тяготение к такой объективности. А у советского переводчика оно есть в величайшей степени. (Chukovskii 1941: 57.)</i></p>	<p><i>Scientific penetration into the original is a veritable guarantee of an objectively precise reproduction of all the semantic and stylistic features of that original, provided, of course, that the translator really has an inclination for such objectivity. And the Soviet translator has it to the highest degree.</i></p>
--	--

In the 1941 edition of *A High Art* (p. 234), the image of the Soviet reader is bestowed with a new characteristic, realism. The example shown in Table 42 is from a chapter dedicated to Taras Shevchenko. In the previous sentence, Chukovskii (1941: 234) has pointed out that the priority of the Soviet translator is “scientific discipline” (*nauchnaia distsiplina*) (see Table 3 in Subchapter 4.3.1). According to Chukovskii, the ultimate authority in assessing how that discipline is manifested in a translation is the Soviet reader.

Table 42

<p><i>В качестве реалиста советский читатель ставит выше всего документальность, достоверность и точность. Современный переводчик, по представлению советского читателя, должен заботиться о точном и научно объективном воспроизведении подлинника. Дилетантизм и кустарщина ненавистны советскому человеку во всех областях, в том числе и в области перевода. (Chukovskii 1941: 234.)</i></p>	<p><i>Being a realist, the Soviet reader gives first precedence to factuality, authenticity and precision. The Soviet reader considers it as the contemporary translator’s duty to produce a precise and scientifically objective reproduction of the original. The Soviet man abhors dillitantism and amateurishness in every sphere, including the sphere of translation.</i></p>
--	---

Although presented in a different context, the statement shown in Table 43 also relates to the translator’s self-discipline. In that example, Chukovskii (1941: 32–33) is discussing the educational aspect of translations. Using the first-person plural as if to speak on behalf of the entire reading audience, he calls for true renditions of the original instead of free translations and paraphrases. It turns out that the issue not only has artistic significance but is also pertinent in a wider, ideological domain.

Table 43

<p><i>Правда, и сейчас еще порою встречаются сознательные, преднамеренные отклонения от переводимого текста, но современный читатель воспринимает их как нечто уродливое, враждебное идейным установкам советской культуры. (Chukovskii 1941: 33.)</i></p>	<p><i>Although even in the present, one occasionally comes across deliberate, premeditated deviations from the original text, the present-day reader perceives them as something deformed, antagonistic towards the ideological guidelines of Soviet culture.</i></p>
--	---

The above example implies that by 1941, the Soviet reader had become sufficiently politically conscious and ideologically acute to actively ward off the potential damage caused by “translator-wreckers” (see Table 36 above). Judging by the example shown in Table 30 (see Subchapter 4.3.3), the Soviet translator is ideologically compatible with the Soviet reader. In the discussion about the superiority of the contemporary translations of Shevchenko over the tsarist era ones, Chukovskii (1941: 53) implicitly underlines the class consciousness of the Soviet translator.

In his keynote address at the First All-Union Conference of Translators, Iogann Al’tman emphasized the political significance of translation and the enormous responsibility it en-

tailed (see Witt 2013: 165). The attention given to the issue in the foreword to the 1936 edition of *A High Art* is in accord with Al'tman's statement. Calling attention to the general lack of appreciation of translators, Chukovskii emphasizes the political significance of their work.

Table 44

<p><i>На Первом съезде советских писателей от их лица так и не выступил никто, хотя именно у нас мастерам-переводчикам должен быть оказываем великий почет – в виду огромной политической роли, которую играют они в нашем Союзе. (Chukovskii 1936a: 9.)</i></p>	<p><i>In the First Congress of Soviet Writers, there was nobody who spoke on behalf of them, although particularly in our country, master translators must be shown great respect – in view of their enormous political role in our Soviet Union.</i></p>
--	---

Judging by the context, the political role of the Soviet translator is first and foremost connected to nationality translation, the principal topic of the foreword to the 1936 edition (see Subchapter 4.3.2). In the 1941 edition, the connection is even more evident. The example shown in Table 45 is from the foreword of that edition.

Table 45

<p><i>Переводчики планомерно и дружно делают работу громадной политической важности: они открывают нам красоту и величие каждого из братских народов и каждому из братских народов открывают красоту и величие русского народа. (Chukovskii 1941: 4.)</i></p>	<p><i>In a systematic and concerted manner, translators carry out this work of enormous political importance: they open to us the beauty and grandeur of every brother nation, and to every brother nation, they open the beauty and grandeur of the Russian people.</i></p>
---	--

As it turns out from the above example, there are two opposite aspects included in nationality translation: translating Russian works into minority nationality languages and vice versa. The example shown in Table 46 is connected with a discussion about translating minority nationality works into Russian. Chukovskii commends the minority nationality "reading masses" for their participation in the project by overseeing the quality of those translations. The influence of that control is evident in the attitude of translators to their work.

Table 46

<p>Чувство литературной ответственности в последние годы у них колоссально повысилось, так как все это время их переводческий труд проходил под суровым контролем широких читательских масс тех областей и республик, литературу которых переводили на русский язык. Стоило им допустить в переводе какую-нибудь, скажем азербайджанского, текста ту или иную неточность, и они получали из Азербайджана тучу укоризненных писем, где читатели выступали на защиту изуродованного переводчиками текста. (Chukovskii 1941: 256.)</p>	<p>In the last few years, their sense of literary responsibility has immensely heightened because during that time, their work has passed through the severe control of the broad reading masses in those regions and republics whose literature they have translated. They only had to let this or that inaccuracy slip in an, let's say, Azerbaijan text, and they would receive a flood of reproachful letters from Azerbaijan, where readers came forward to defend the deformed text.</p>
---	--

Chukovskii (1941: 256) points out that every nation of the Soviet Union currently “jealously” (*revnivo*) watches out for any damage to their literary treasures. In theory, it is presumable that the Russian language was mastered in all republics, because by 1938, it had become a mandatory part of the curriculum in non-Russian Soviet schools. The general quality of instruction was, however, poor. First, very few competent teachers were available. Second, there were nowhere near enough textbooks. The shortage of paper did not make the situation any better. To crown it all, when the Cyrillic alphabet was instituted in all Soviet republics during 1939–1941 (see e.g. Martin 2001: 414–422), every textbook had to be reprinted. (Blitstein 2001: 253, 256, 260–261.) All things considered, the general idea of minority nationality Soviet citizens familiarizing themselves with Russian renditions of their national literary treasures – let alone controlling their quality – sounds more or less utopian.

By and large, the image of the Soviet reader presented in *A High Art* seems quite excessively ideal. It represents him as he is expected to be rather than what he is in actuality. In the above examples, Chukovskii creates two prototypes: the one of the ideal Soviet translator and the one of the ideal Soviet reader. Those two prototypes perfectly match each other. One of them makes demands and the other one responds to the demands. On the one hand, the relationship of the Soviet translator and the Soviet reader is dialogic, and on the other, they complement each other.

4.4.2 Orthodox and Unorthodox Translation

The cultural environment in which the 1930, 1936, and 1941 editions of *A High Art* came into existence was very different from the one in which the first handbooks were compiled. In that early phase, Chukovskii seems to have had *carte blanche* in composing his principles of artistic translation – even considering the collective nature of the work at the publishing house *Vsemirnaia literatura*. Although the issue of translation had long been a topic of public discourse, no general rules or conventions had ever been established. (See Subchapter 2.5.) Therefore, there were no actual authorities in the field, either. Translation was primarily examined from an artistic point of view: the politicization of literature would not begin until a decade later.

The notion that during the Soviet era, Russian translation had reached a zenith is evident in the following remark, which appears in *A High Art* in the 1960s. Here, Chukovskii is commenting on the ideal of scientific translation that prevailed in the 1930s and 1940s:

Считалось, что в переводческом деле начинается новая эра, [. . .] (Chukovskii 1964: 192; 1966: 445; 1968: 211.)

It was believed that a new era was dawning in translation practice, [. . .] (Leighton 1984: 175.)

The 19th century has often been described as the “golden age” of Russian translation. At that time, translation was regarded, first and foremost, as a creative art. The free renderings and paraphrases made by such canonical poets as Pushkin and Lermontov enforced the notion of the translator as an artist in his own right. (Komissarov 2011: 520–521.) Translations were regarded as “self-sustaining, independent works of literature.” Since the target audience of translations represented the multilingual social elite, competent enough to read the original themselves (see also Subchapter 2.4), it was not such an urgent matter for the translator to convey the entire semantic content. The primary function of translations was to cultivate the Russian literary language and contribute to the development of national literature. (Baer 2010: 220–221.)

After the 1917 Revolution, a prominent new feature of the outlook on translation was the emphasis on scientific aspects, which stemmed from the general ethos of the period (see Subchapter 2.5). This urgent matter is conspicuously present in the *Vsemirnaia literatura* handbook.

Table 47

<p><i>Но идеал нашей эпохи – научная, объективно-определяемая точность, во всем, даже в мельчайших подробностях, и приблизительные переводы кажутся нам беззаконием. (Chukovskii 1919: 23; 1920: 52.)</i></p>	<p><i>But the ideal of our epoch is scientific, objectively defined precision, in everything, even in the smallest details, and we perceive approximate translations as illegal acts.</i></p>
---	---

In the 1920s, the pursuit of precision had its heyday in the form of literalist (*bukvalizt*) translation. The popularity of literalism was, at least partly, a counter-reaction to the free translation methods practiced before the Revolution. (Friedberg 1997: 87.) The exponents of the tendency referred to it as “technically exact translation” or “the formal principle of technical precision,” whereas its opponents used the term “literalism,” in a pejorative sense (Witt 2013: 160).

The 1930s saw the gradual banning of literal translation. The two leading theorists of Socialist Realist translation, Ivan Kashkin and Mikhail Alekseev denounced literalism as “Formalist.” As an alternative, they advocated a free translation method that was in accord with the Marxist-Leninist interpretation of history. If such an interpretation so required, the translator would even be allowed to omit some features of the original. This was a particularly advantageous aspect from the standpoint of the Soviet authorities. The canonized

method both justified and facilitated the censoring of unwanted passages in a text. The hard line against literalism would persist until Glasnost. (Friedberg 1997: 79, 103, 105, 113, 181.) As Maurice Friedberg points out:

For over half a century, literalism was banished from Soviet translation practice; [. . .]
(Friedberg 1997: 92)

Thus, the sanctified line against literal translation would cast its shadow over Chukovskii's work on *A High Art* concerning not only the 1930s editions but also the 1960s editions.

In the 1930s, "Formalism" was an elastic concept used in various contexts, common to which all was their negative bias. For instance, in *A High Art*, Chukovskii uses the word when criticizing the excessive attention given to formal features in Anna Radlova's Shakespeare translations (see Subchapter 4.4.4). Between the seemingly separate issues of literal translation and the denounced Formalism, the point of contact was ideology:

'Formalism' became a label for any kind of approach to literary texts that failed to devote the required attention to their ideological content; in the field of translation, it was applied to translations that tended towards a 'literal' rather than a 'free' approach. (Hodgson 2013: 123.)

The opposite of literalism was "realist translation," the main line at the First All-Union Conference of Translators. Among the keynote speakers, there were two advocates of literalism: Mikhail Lozinskii and the translator and critic Aleksandr Smirnov. The latter emphasized the connection between exact translation and the scientific worldview. He noted that translation always entails the ideological appropriation of the original and that the ideology of a text is manifested also in its formal properties. Neither of the two speakers received a favorable response. Instead, in the annual report of the Nationalities' Section of the Writers' Union in that same year, both were denounced for their "formalist" and "abstract" views. (Witt 2013: 160, 170–171, 180.)

In his keynote address, Iogann Al'tman discussed in detail various stylistic deficiencies that can mar a translation. He argued that besides exoticism (see Subchapter 4.3.2), they included impressionism, naturalism or copying translation, and formalism. By "impressionism" Al'tman referred to such a case when a translator lets himself be guided by inspiration, without giving any heed to the content of the original. By "naturalist copying," he meant the translator's failure to find adequate equivalents for Russian words, which results in the presence of various Russianisms in the text. That deficiency was particularly connected with nationality translation. As discussed above, "formalism" equaled literal translation. In the formalist translation method, the reproduction of rhythm, melody, and sound is given first priority, which in turn results in distortion of the content. In Al'tman's words, "it is not difficult to see that the naturalist and the formalist join forces in the perversion of the original." (See Witt 2013: 167–168.)

Al'tman explicitly contrasted naturalist copying with the principles of Socialist Realism (Witt 2013: 168). Kashkin went even further in positioning the new translation doctrine into the framework of Socialist Realism:

Our Soviet literary translation is not at all 'a photographer's craft,' but creative assimilation, a branch of Socialist Realist art."(Friedberg 1997: 103.)

Except for the latter characteristic, Chukovskii (1919: 7; 1920: 24) had presented a similar view already in the early translators' handbook, when he pointed out that the translator "does not photograph the original but creatively reconstructs it" (see also Subchapter 2.5). It is, however, likely that Chukovskii and Kashkin had different ideas about what "creative" assimilation or reconstruction would entail.

Even the free translation method was not always accepted without reservation. There were critics who thought that, for instance, Boris Pasternak's translations of Shakespeare resembled his own poetry too much. That kind of "individualism" was not in accord with the image of translation that the regime wanted to promote. (See Baer & Olshanskaya 2013: xi.) The translator was expected to forget his individual aspirations for the common good:

Indeed, translation was often seen as service to the nation or to the Soviet family, whereas original writing was always suspect as ego-driven and so was much more vigilantly surveilled by the authorities. (Baer & Olshanskaya 2013: xi.)

In the 1930s public discourse, translation was often referred to with the word "craft" (*remeslo*) (see Baer & Olshanskaya 2013: xi).

Leon Burnett and Emily Lygo (2013: 23) point out that the translation of foreign works in the Soviet Union "never ceased to be a source of anxiety." Piotr Kuhiwczak notes that censoring organs in totalitarian societies regard translations as

[. . .] a force that may undermine the interpretation of reality which the oppressive regimes hold as the official one and as the only one the oppressed populations are allowed to accept as true. (Kuhiwczak 2009: 47.)

Merely the inherent dialogic nature of translation made it a problematic issue. On an abstract level, translation opened the utterly closed and guarded borders of the country. Foreign books were potentially dangerous because they provided Soviet citizens with the potential to enter into a dialogic relationship with the outside world. On the other hand, literary sophistication was part of the "culturalization" of the new man" (see Subchapter 4.2), knowledge of world literature included.

Moreover, there was the "Friendship of the People" ethos to be considered. Susanna Witt describes the situation as follows:

Literary translation as action crystallizes a range of problems of particular relevance within the context of Stalinist culture. At the core is the overall problem of accommodating the 'foreign' in a climate of growing suspicion and xenophobia, and of defining the 'foreign' within the framework of a discourse progressively informed by the 'friendship of the peoples' slogan. (Witt 2013: 142.)

Friedberg (1997: 16) regards Soviet translation as a "barometer of the country's political moods." Occurring in the same year as the establishment of the Committee on Arts Affairs

(see Subchapter 2.7) and the campaign against Formalism (see Subchapter 4.2), the First All-Union Conference of Translators marked the ideologization of norms in Soviet translation practice. Translation became an act of tightrope walking, the fundamental purpose of which was “accommodating the ‘foreign’ in a climate of growing suspicion and xenophobia.” (See Witt 2013: 142; 160–161.)

In the early handbooks for translators, Chukovskii discusses translation from the following points of view: phonetics and rhythmicity (*fonetika i ritmika*), style (*stil'*), vocabulary (*slovar'*), syntax (*sintaksis*), and textual precision (*tekstual'naia tochnost'*). In the following paragraphs these are juxtaposed with corresponding themes in the Stalin era editions of *A High Art*.

Since the early days of his literary career, Chukovskii had a habit of recycling his texts: bits and pieces from earlier publications would appear sprinkled throughout new ones (Ivanova 2002b: 563). A similar recycling tendency is manifested in *A High Art*. Some passages from a previous edition could be dissolved and rearranged for a subsequent one. Those fragments often reappeared in a different order or in different chapters, and under different titles altogether. Even individual phrases were sometimes situated differently from the way they were in an earlier edition. Chukovskii’s method of rearranging parts of an earlier text is manifested also in the examples below.

Phonetics and Rhythmicity

On the subject of precision, Chukovskii demands from the translator the faithful reproduction of the rhythm and style of the original.

Table 48

<p><i>Если в переводе не переданы ритм и стиль оригинала, этот перевод безнадежен. Исправить его нельзя, нужно переводить заново. (Chukovskii 1919: 19; 1920: 43; 1930: 55; 1936a: 96.)</i></p>	<p><i>Unless the translation conveys the rhythm and style of the original, it is hopeless. It cannot be amended; the translation must be done anew.</i></p>
---	---

The remark is included nearly verbatim also in the 1941 edition of *A High Art* (p. 182). In the first handbook, Chukovskii (1919: 8) pointed out that the translator’s primary task was to analyze the original author’s style and his “eidology” (*eidologiia*). The latter word derives from the Greek “eidos,” which refers to form, visible appearance, or essence. In the second edition of the handbook and later in *A High Art*, Chukovskii explains this as shown in Table 49.

Table 49

<p><i>Прежде чем взяться за перевод какого-нибудь иностранного автора, переводчик должен точно установить для себя стиль этого автора, систему его образов и ритмику. (Chukovskii 1920: 25; 1930: 30; 1936a: 57; 1941: 91.)</i></p>	<p><i>Before the translator undertakes to do a translation of a foreign author he must determine for himself precisely what the author’s style is – his system of images, his rhythms. (Leighton 1984: 142.)</i></p>
---	--

Discussing rhythm in the 1930 edition (p. 33) of *A High Art*, Chukovskii refers to an article by his co-author Andrei Fedorov in the same book. The 1936 (pp. 59–61) and 1941 (pp. 93–94) editions contain two longish quotations from Fedorov’s (1930: 108–111) article that examine the distinguishing features in the rhythm of prose and in the rhythm of poetry. Chukovskii emphasizes that in establishing the rhythm of the original, the translator’s hearing (*slukh perevodchika*) is a crucial factor. Therefore he urges the translator to read the original aloud as often as possible. This advice was included already in the first handbook version of *A High Art*. (See Chukovskii 1919: 8–9; 1920: 26; 1930: 30; 1936a: 57; 1941: 91.)

Chukovskii notes that some translations manifest the translator’s total deafness to the rhythmic features of the original. As an example of such a case, he presents the tsarist era translator Aleksandr Sokolovskii’s rendition of Shakespeare’s play *Richard III*. He juxtaposes it with the translation done by the contemporary poet and translator Anna Radlova, to the definite advantage of the latter. (See Chukovskii 1936a: 63–64; 1941: 102.)

In the 1941 edition of *A High Art* (pp. 138–181), Chukovskii introduces a new paragraph devoted to critique of Radlova’s recently published translation of Shakespeare’s play *Othello*. Between the 1936 and 1941 editions, he has also adjusted the passage that deals with her translation of *Richard III*.

Table 50

<p><i>Эта глухота стала особенно ощутительная после того, как появился перевод Анны Радловой, где суровый ритм жалоб королевы Маргариты передан с максимальной точностью: [. . .] (Chukovskii 1936a: 63.)</i></p>	<p><i>This deafness became particularly evident after the appearance of Anna Radlova’s translation, in which the fierce rhythm of Queen Margaret’s laments is reproduced with maximal exactitude: [. . .]</i></p>
<p><i>Эта глухота стала особенно ощутительная после того, как появился перевод Анны Радловой. <u>Перевод во многих других отношениях изобилует рядом неточностей</u>, но суровый ритм жалоб королевы Маргариты передан с максимальным приближением к тексту: [. . .] (Chukovskii 1941: 102.)</i></p>	<p><i>This deafness became particularly evident after the appearance of Anna Radlova’s translation. <u>In many other respects, the translation is filled with a myriad of inexactitudes</u>, but the fierce rhythm of Queen Margaret’s laments is reproduced with maximal approximation to the original: [. . .]</i></p>

The adjustment suggests that at some point, Chukovskii has altered his opinion of Radlova’s capacities as a translator. Perhaps he let his opinion of Radlova’s *Othello* color his general judgement of the her work, or perhaps he wanted to smooth the discrepancy between the praising comment and the attack on Radlova later in the 1941 edition (see Subchapter 4.4.4). In the subsequent edition of *A High Art*, the passage about *Richard III* was once again adjusted. In the revised passage, Chukovskii (1964: 165) unambiguously deems the rest of Radlova’s translation “very weak” (*ochen’ slabyi*).

Elsewhere in the 1936 and 1941 editions, the remark shown in Table 48 (see above) is expressed more categorically. Chukovskii (1936a: 142; 1941: 110) equals the lack of complete rhythm-for-rhythm equivalency with a criminal act (see Table 5 in Subchapter 4.3.1). As in many other instances in the 1930s editions of *A High Art*, the fundamental idea and

the solution to deficiencies in translations is submitting the trade of translation to the sciences. The tightening of the scientific standards of translation is evident also in the following remark included in the foreword to the 1936 edition.

Table 51

<p><i>Преодоление анархической стихийности сказывается во всей нашей переводческой практике. Диким показался бы теперь стиховой перевод, в котором не было бы передано ритмо-синтаксическое, мелодико-интонационное своеобразие подлинника. (Chukovskii 1936a: 8.)</i></p>	<p><i>The overcoming of anarchical spontaneity is evident in our entire translation practice. We would now find strange such a verse translation that did not reproduce the rhythmic-syntactical, melodic-intonational distinctiveness of the original.</i></p>
--	---

If by “anarchical spontaneity” Chukovskii is referring to the translator’s instinct, in another passage in the same edition of *A High Art* he seems to maintain quite the opposite view. In a chapter titled “The Social nature of the Translator” (see Subchapter 4.4.3), Chukovskii (1936a: 46) points out that the translator’s ideology and social stand are manifested in the rhythmic character of his translations. The same passage is included in the 1941 edition (p. 54). Following that logic, the creation of rhythm would at least partly be an instinctual process.

The comment shown in Table 51 also suggests that Chukovskii principally agrees with Smirnov (see above) about the significance of the formal features of a translation to its meaning. Chukovskii (1936a: 46; 1941: 54) illustrates his point by presenting an example from a translation in which a poem of Shevchenko’s is distorted. In the 1936 edition, the translator in question is left unnamed, but in the 1941 edition, he is identified as the 19th century poet and journalist Nikolai Berg, whom Chukovskii (1941: 54) characterizes as a “reactionary of the bureaucrat-Slavophile kind” (*reaktsioner kazenno-slavianofil’skogo tolka*).

Chukovskii (1930: 17; 1936a: 47–48) finds fault with the reproduction of rhythm also in Konstantin Bal’mont’s translation of Walt Whitman’s work *Leaves of Grass*. While Whitman’s song for a broad axe imitates the hard and abrupt sound of chopping wood, Bal’mont’s verse is all “melancholy, funereal, monotonous, and rigid” (*unylo, pokhoronno, zevotno, kosnoiazychno*). In the 1936 edition, Chukovskii has complemented the passage with an explanation to the discordance.

Table 52

<p><i>Разница социальных пластов, к которым принадлежат переводчик и переводимый поэт, выразительно сказалась в их ритмике. (Chukovskii 1936a: 48.)</i></p>	<p><i>The difference between the social strata in which the translator and the translated poet belong is vividly manifested in their rhythms.</i></p>
---	---

Thus, as Chukovskii (1930: 16; 1936a: 48) points out, the crucial reason to the incompatibility of the two poets is the difference between their social positions. Whereas Whitman is a carpenter (*plotnik*), Bal’mont is a “high society esthete” (*salonnyi estet*). (Bal’mont’s translations of Whitman are further discussed in Subchapter 4.4.3.)

Style

In the 1920 edition (p. 29), Chukovskii describes the concept of style by quoting the 18th century poet and literary theoretician Vasilii Tred'iakovskii (see Table 53). The quotation is also included in the 1930s editions of *A High Art*.

Table 53

<p>«Поступка автора (то есть его стиль) безмерно сходствует с цветом его волос, с движением очес, с обращением языка, с биением сердца». (Chukovskii 1920: 29; 1930: 35; 1936a: 22; 1941: 12.)</p>	<p>"An author's mien (that is, his style) bears infinite resemblance to the color of his hair, to the movements of his eyes, to the turns of his tongue, to the beating of his heart." (Leighton 1984: 19.)</p>
--	---

Perhaps Chukovskii was inspired by the above idea, when, in the 1960s editions of *A High Art*, he (Chukovskii 1964: 100; 1966: 344; 1968: 110) advised translators to reproduce the essence of the original by substituting "smile for smile, music for music, emotional tone for emotional tone" (*ulybku – ulybkoi, muzyku – muzykoi, dushevnuuiu tonal'nost' – dushevnoi tonal'nost'iu*; translation by Leighton 1984: 92). Tred'iakovskii's pronouncement implies that style is fundamentally linked with the translator as an individual. Since the very first handbook, Chukovskii had voiced a similar recommendation to the translator.

Table 54

<p>Людам, привыкшим к переводу деловых бумаг, коммерческих писем, ученых статей, не следует браться за художественную прозу. Тут противоположные и даже враждебные категории мышления. (Chukovskii 1919: 12; 1920: 31; 1930: 37; 1936a: 76; 1941: 64.)</p>	<p>People accustomed to translating business papers, commercial letters, and scholarly articles should not undertake translations of artistic prose. In these, the categories of thinking are diametrically different, and even antagonistic towards each other.</p>
--	--

In the early editions of *A High Art*, Chukovskii summarizes the connection between content and form in a remark that has quite distinct literalist nuances (see Table 55). Perhaps he has omitted it from the subsequent two editions for that very reason.

Table 55

<p>Искажая форму произведения искусства, мы тем самым искажаем и его содержание. (Chukovskii (1919: 13; 1920: 29; 1930: 34.)</p>	<p>When we distort the form of a work of art, we also distort its content.</p>
--	--

At the First All-Union Conference of Translators, Lozinskii argued for his preference for the literal method in translating poetry with quite similar arguments:

In order to be not dead but alive, a translation must recreate the *form* of the original, for in this form, poured into it and indivisible from it, is its *content*. (Witt 2013: 175.)

Despite the ostensible similarity between his opinion and Lozinskii's, Chukovskii did not actually advocate literal translation (see below).

Although the scientific outlook on translation was an important issue from the beginning (see Table 47 above), it was given considerably more attention in the 1930s editions of *A High Art* (see also Subchapter 4.4.1). In the 1936 edition, this is evident on the very first pages. In this edition, the author's foreword is preceded by the foreword of the publishing house Academia. The anonymous author of the foreword calls for "scientific" (*nauchnyi*), "thorough" (*glubokii*) and "proficient" (*kompetentnyi*) critique on all translations published in the Soviet Union (see Chukovskii 1936a: 5). In his own foreword, Chukovskii describes the new Soviet style of translation on a general level (see Table 56). The same passage is included in the article "Iskusstvo perevoda" (see Chukovskii 1935a) and also in Chukovskii's foreword to the 1941 edition of *A High Art* (see Table 56).

Table 56

<p><i>Вырабатывается и утверждается в нашей литературе советский стиль перевода, научно-художественный, — стиль, который отменяет от себя дилетантщину, кустарничество, слепую вдохновенность и прочие принадлежности вчерашнего литературного дня. Искусство перевода становится понемногу наукой, оставаясь в то время искусством. (Chukovskii 1936a: 8; 1941: 5.)</i></p>	<p><i>A Soviet style of translation is being developed and standardized in our literature, a scientific-artistic style that sweeps aside dilettantism, dabbling, blind inspiration, and other properties of the past days of literature. Little by little, the art of translation is becoming a science, at the same time, remaining an art.</i></p>
--	--

The article "Iskusstvo perevoda" was published in the spring of 1935, and Chukovskii, in fact, had denounced translation guided by pure inspiration even before Al'tman did.

The central feature in the new outlook is its dual nature. On the one hand, translation maintains the status of creative art given to it in the 19th century. On the other hand, the artistic aspect of translation is now complemented with the seemingly very different aspect of "scientificity." In the 1936 edition, Chukovskii characterizes the new role of the translator as shown in Table 57.

Table 57

<p><i>[. . .]; переводчик есть сотворец, он, обладая всеми свойствами поэта, кроме того должен обладать всеми свойствами аналитика. (Chukovskii 1936a: 55.)</i></p>	<p><i>[. . .]; the translator is a co-creator. Not only must he possess all the qualities of a poet, but he must also possess all the qualities of an analyst.</i></p>
---	--

Between the 1920 and 1930 editions, a remark was revised in which Chukovskii juxtaposes the different styles of Fedor Dostoevskii and Lev Tolstoi (see Table 58). Although very minor, this revision is significant in that it manifests a shift in public discourse.

Table 58

<p><i>Разница между стилем Достоевского и стилем Толстого есть, главным образом, разница их темпераментов. (Chukovskii 1920: 29.)</i></p> <p><i>Разница между стилем Достоевского и стилем Толстого есть, главным образом, разница их темпераментов <u>и социальных позиций</u>. (Chukovskii 1930: 35.)</i></p>	<p><i>The difference between the style of Dostoevskii and the style of Tolstoi is largely the difference between their temperaments.</i></p> <p><i>The difference between the style of Dostoevskii and the style of Tolstoi is largely the difference between their temperaments <u>and their social positions</u>.</i></p>
---	---

The word “position” can be interpreted in two alternate ways. It may refer to the different social standings of the two writers, or to their diverse stands on social issues. Either way, it is an indication of political and ideological issues entering into the discourse about literature and translation.

In the 1941 edition of *A High Art* (pp. 74–79), the themes of nationality translation and translating Shevchenko were also incorporated into the discussion about style. Chukovskii emphasizes the Soviet translator’s respectful attitude towards the distinctive formal properties of minority nationality works (see e.g. Table 19 in Subchapter 4.3.2). Shevchenko’s name appears in the context of chauvinism (see Subchapter 4.3.2). Chukovskii accuses pre-revolutionary translators of “Russifying” Shevchenko. Then, once again, he highlights the superiority of the Soviet practice of translation.

Table 59

<p><i>В настоящее время подобное обрусительство стиля – вещь совершенно недопустимая, и не только в отношении братских народностей. Если даже оставить в стороне социально-политические принципы, нынешним советским читателем всякая руссификация стиля ощущается как нарушение элементарных эстетических норм. (Chukovskii 1941: 79.)</i></p>	<p><i>Today, such Russification of style is absolutely unacceptable, and not only with regard to the brother nations. Even putting aside the social-political principles, the contemporary Soviet reader finds any Russification of style as the violation of basic esthetic norms.</i></p>
---	---

The intermingling of politics and literature implied by the example shown in Table 58 above becomes concretely evident in the 1936 (p. 83) and 1941 (pp. 81–81) editions of *A High Art*. In the discussion of style and vocabulary, the translation of the Communist Manifesto (*Kommunisticheskii manifest*) into minority nationality languages was chosen as an example (see below).

Vocabulary

By and large, Chukovskii (1919: 14–15; 1920: 37–38; 1930: 47–48; 1936a: 73–74; 1941: 60) finds the vocabulary of translators very limited and poor. Therefore, he suggests they study the Russian classics and the dictionary of Vladimir Dal' (see Subchapter 4.4.3). Chukovskii describes the issue using his own, characteristically colorful vocabulary.

Table 60

<p><i>Какое-то своеобразное малокровие мозга делает их текст худосочным. Каково такому полнокровному автору, как Бальзак или Киплинг, попасть в обработку к этим анемичным больным, которые словно к тому и стремятся, чтобы обеднить и обесцветить их страницы. (Chukovskii 1919: 15; 1920: 38; 1930: 48; 1936a: 73; 1941: 60.)</i></p>	<p><i>Some peculiar kind of anemia of the brain causes their text to wither. What a shame for a full-blooded author as Balzac or Kipling to end up under the treatment of these anemic patients, who, as if actually aiming for it, impoverish and decolorize the pages by these authors.</i></p>
--	---

The discussion about the Soviet translators' shortcomings in the area of vocabulary was extended in the 1941 edition. In the new passage, Chukovskii commends a group of contemporary translators for their renderings of English and American works, done under the supervision of Kashkin. Chukovskii particularly calls attention to their "rich and versatile" (*bogatyi i gibkii*) vocabulary. (See Chukovskii 1941: 61.)

In the first three editions of *A High Art* (1919: 11–15; 1920: 29–38; 1930: 34–49), vocabulary and style are discussed in separate chapters. In the 1936 and 1941 editions, the two topics were combined into one single chapter. As the number of pages more than doubled, actually nearly tripled between editions 1930 and 1936, the number of examples increased accordingly. Chukovskii (1936a: 89–91; 1941: 85–86) discusses, for instance, the work of the translator Mariia Shishmareva. In the 1941 edition, referring to Shishmareva's verbosity, Chukovskii brings up the issue of "rubles." In the old days, the translator's royalty was based on the number of translated pages, and, therefore, they were tempted to pad the text whenever possible. Chukovskii notes that this was a common habit among some translators before the Revolution. (See Chukovskii 1941: 86–87.)

In the 1936 and 1941 editions of *A High Art*, one example distinguishes itself by its genre in the midst of examples drawn from literary fiction. In the context of style, Chukovskii continues the discussion about the unacceptable practice of Russification (see Table 59 above). He (Chukovskii 1936a: 83; 1941: 80) insists that even though conforming to the rules of Russian syntax, the translator must maintain the style and the "cultural coloration" (*bytovoi kolorit*) of the original. Quite abruptly and inconsequently, Chukovskii's argumentation shifts into translating *from* Russian. He notes that there are some rare situations in which the original cultural coloration cannot be entirely maintained in the translation. As an example of such a case, he uses the translation of the Communist Manifesto into the Kazakh language (see Table 61). The same passage is included nearly verbatim in the 1941 edition of *A High Art* (pp. 80–81.)

Table 61

<p><i>Иногда язык перевода еще не успел оторваться от специфического замкнутого быта создавшей его народности, и в таком случае любое иностранное понятие может быть передаваемо лишь такими словами, которые связаны с бытовой обстановкой данной народности. Так, в переводе «Коммунистического манифеста» на казахский язык слово патриций передано словом бай, и буржуа – тоже бай, и феодал – тоже бай, и промышленник – тоже бай. Слово «феодализм» в одном случае переведено старина, а в другом – занятие скотоводством и земледелием. (Chukovskii 1936a: 83.)</i></p>	<p><i>Sometimes the language of the translation has not yet had time to break away from the particular isolated way of life of the nation in question, and in such a case any foreign conception can be reproduced only by such words that are connected to the social environment of that nation. Thus, in the translation of the Communist Manifesto into the Kazakh language, the word “patrician” was reproduced as bai (“a rich land-owner;” M. S.), and “bourgeois” – also as bai, and “feudal lord” – also as bai, and “industrialist” – also as bai. The word “feudalism” in one case was translated as starina (“old times;” M. S.), and in another as zaniatie skotovosd-vom i zemledeliem (“the practice of cattle-raising and agriculture;” M. S.).</i></p>
--	---

The source for these examples of Kazakh words was an article by the academician A. N. Samoilovich, published in 1933. In the 1936 edition of *A High Art* (p. 83n1), Samoilovich’s article is mentioned in a footnote. Chukovskii presents the same examples in the 1941 edition (pp. 80–81) but without any source of reference. (The absence of the footnote in the 1941 edition is further discussed in Subchapter 4.5.1.) Incidentally, as the authors of the Communist Manifesto were Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, the “cultural coloration” in that case would be German – although the text was probably translated into the Kazakh language via a Russian interlinear trot.

By means of the above discussion, Chukovskii enters into the current public discourse on translating ideological texts into national languages (see also Subchapter 4.4.3). Susanna Witt (2013: 153) notes that the topic was most often discussed in an entirely different context than translations *from* national languages. The latter were part of the “performance,” and their primary function was to promulgate the Stalin cult and Socialist Realism (see Brooks 2001: 113–115; see also Subchapter 4.2). Translating into national languages, on the other hand, was more immediately connected with political and ideological issues, and, therefore, those translations were often subjected to particularly harsh critique. For instance, in October 1934, an editor of *Pravda* rebuked the Crimean State Publishing house not only for failing to issue works by Marx and Lenin as imposed by the Party but also for issuing “distortions” (*iskazheniia*) of them. (See Witt 2013: 153–154.) In *A High Art*, the discussion of the translation of ideological texts into minority languages is mainly confined to the chapter titled “The Social Nature of the Translator” (more in Subchapter 4.4.3).

Sometimes the translator working on such a canonical text might even be suspected of deliberately manipulating the original for a particular agenda of his own. In his address at the translators’ conference, Al’tman accused the Tadzhik translator of Stalin’s work *Voprosy leninizma* (“Problems of Leninism,” 1926) of such conduct, suggesting that by inserting into the text incorrect equivalents like “storehouse” and “granary,” the translator had

“utilized” Russian prejudices about the primitivism of the minority nations. (Witt 2013: 153–154, 165–166.)

Chukovskii’s approach to the issue appears conciliatory rather than denunciative Table 62 shows his comments on the lexical peculiarities in the Kazakh version of the Communist Manifesto. The passage was revised for the 1941 edition.

Table 62

<p><i>Эти затруднения переводчиков – временные. <u>Экономическое развитие и культурный рост Казакской республики скоро обогатят ее речь множеством новых слов.</u></i> (Chukovskii 1936a: 83.)</p> <p><i>Если в каком-нибудь языке еще не выработаны собственные слова для обозначения новых понятий, этот язык должен заимствовать готовые термины у другого народа. Ведь и мы, русские, транспортировали многие слова из чужих языков. <u>Не сомневаюсь, что в настоящее время в казахском языке есть и «буржуа», и «феодал», и «патриций».</u></i> (Chukovskii 1941: 81.)</p>	<p><i>These difficulties for translators are temporary. <u>The economic development and cultural growth of the republic of Kazakhstan will soon enrich its language with a multitude of new words.</u></i></p> <p><i>If a language does not yet have its own words for new conceptions, then that language must borrow existing terms from another nation. Also we, the Russians, have transported many words from foreign languages. <u>I have no doubt that today the Kazakh language contains the words “bourgeois” and “feodal” and “patrician.”</u></i></p>
--	--

The way Chukovskii has adjusted the passage implies that the economic development and cultural growth of Kazakhstan had been realized between the two editions of *A High Art*. The “stateness” (*gosudarstvennost’*) and “sovereignty” (*suverenitet*) of the minority Soviet republics was an important theme in the propaganda campaign around the new constitution (see Subchapter 4.2). In public discourse, the transformation of the Kazakhs from “backward and feudal tribes into a socialist nation and a socialist nationalist state” was lauded as one of the great Soviet achievements. (See Martin 2001: 446–447.) The above revision seems to be in perfect concord with the information that was delivered to Soviet citizens.

Syntax

Chukovskii emphasizes that irrespective of the language of the original, the translation must always sound Russian instead of what he refers to as “translatorese” (*perevodcheskii iazyk*). With the help of several examples, he demonstrates how various foreign syntactic structures can be transformed into fluent and grammatically correct Russian language. (See Chukovskii 1919: 15–19; 1920: 39–43; 1930: 49–55; 1936a: 66–71; 1941: 104–108.) To that end, he advises the translator of a foreign text to “think in Russian.”

Table 63

<p><i>Хороший переводчик, хотя и смотрит в иностранный текст, думает все время по-русски, и только по-русски, ни на миг не поддаваясь влиянию иностранных оборотов речи, чуждых синтаксическим законам родного языка. (Chukovskii 1919: 15; 1920: 39; 1930: 49; 1936a: 65; 1941: 103.)</i></p>	<p><i>A good translator, even while looking at a foreign text, constantly thinks in Russian and only in Russian, without for a moment yielding to the influence of foreign locutions and of syntactic rules alien to his mother tongue.</i></p>
--	---

In the 1936 and 1941 editions of *A High Art*, the topic of syntax follows immediately after the topic of rhythm. Referring to the deafness of translators mentioned in the preceding discussion (see above), Chukovskii suggests that on top of that, some translators are also blind (see Table 64). The passage is a slightly modified version of a similar one in the 1936 edition (p. 64).

Table 64

<p><i>Примеры ошибок, которые я сейчас приводил, свидетельствуют не только о глухоте переводчиков, но и о их слепоте, так как всякий ритмический ход неизбежно отражается в синтаксической структуре данной фразы. (Chukovskii 1941: 103.)</i></p>	<p><i>The examples of errors that I just introduced attest not only to the deafness of translators but also to their blindness, as any rhythmic strike is reflected in the syntactic structure of the phrase in question.</i></p>
--	---

Chukovskii (1936a: 65; 1941: 103) notes that parallelisms (*parallellizmy*), alliterations (*edionachatiia*), and other “syntactic figures” (*sintakticheskie figury*) of the original text are elements constituting its rhythmic character, and, therefore, their reproduction in the translation is vital. However, this must never be done at the cost of good and natural Russian language. Citing the 19th century English poet and critic Matthew Arnold, Chukovskii (1936a: 66; 1941: 104) presents two different approaches to translation that in practice rule each other out. The translator may either intentionally preserve the foreignness of the original, or he may strive to produce such an effect that the reader will forget that the work was ever written in another language. According to Chukovskii, it is the latter method that “contemporary masters” prefer. Referring to those unnamed masters, he elaborates on the issue in the 1941 edition with a quotation from Arnold.

Table 65

<p><i>«Не синтаксис оригинала, – утверждают они, – должен владеть переводчиком, а переводчик должен свободно владеть синтаксисом своего родного языка». Chukovskii 1941: 104.)</i></p>	<p><i>“The syntax of the original,” they affirm, “should not be in command of the translator. Instead, the translator should be in command of the syntax of his own language.”</i></p>
--	--

In the first half of the 19th century, the prominent and disputed translator of English literature Irinar Vvedenskii (see e.g. Neliubin & Khukhuni 2006: 281—285) was regarded as a supporter of the latter method in that he, too, preferred making a foreign work appear as if it had actually been written in Russia. He advised translators as follows:

Сбираясь переводить, вы должны вчитаться в вашего автора, вдуматься в него, жить его идеями, мыслить его умом, чувствовать его сердцем и отказаться на это время от своего индивидуального образа мыслей. Перенесите этого писателя под то небо, под которым вы дышите, и в то общество, среди которого вы развиваетесь, перенесите и предложите себе вопрос: какую бы форму он сообщил своим идеям, если бы жил и действовал при одинаковых с вами обстоятельствах. (Neliubin & Khukhuni 2006: 282.)

Undertaking a translation, you must make yourselves thoroughly acquainted with your author, focus your thoughts on him, empathize with his ideas, feel with his heart, and at the same time relinquish your own individual mindset. Carry this writer under that sky beneath which you breathe and to the society that shapes you, carry him, and pose yourselves the question: In which form would he convey his ideas if he lived and worked in similar circumstances as you do?

Vvedenskii himself interpreted the principle as a license that gave the translator utterly free hands. He went so far as to include his very own concoctions among the original text. Vvedenskii was a frequent topic in the 1930s public discourse on translation. Interestingly, the opposite representatives of free and literal translation all agreed in this one matter: they all denounced Vvedenskii's methods. (Neliubin & Khukhuni 2006: 282—283.)

The juxtaposition of the above two approaches to translation might also be examined as the juxtaposition of free and literal translation. It would be only logical to presume that in order to produce a “domestic” effect, the translator must take considerably more liberties than he would need for maintaining the original, alien effect. For Vvedenskii, such liberties served primarily creative purposes, and an artistic effect was probably what Chukovskii had in mind when giving his advice to translators. In the official line of Soviet translation, on the other hand, these liberties had also another important function. Their ultimate purpose was to preclude citizens from being exposed to harmful and dangerous alien elements (see Friedberg 1997: 79).

Textual precision

The chapter “Textual precision” (*Tekstual'naia tochnost'*) in *A High Art* begins with a discussion of Vvedenskii's translations of Charles Dickens. With a number of examples, Chukovskii points out numerous imprecisions that he had found in those translations. At one point, however, the critique turns into praise of Vvedenskii. Chukovskii notes that despite all his errors, the translator had succeeded in reproducing that which is most important: the spirit of the original. (See Chukovskii 1919: 19—21; 1920: 43—49; 1930: 55—62; 1936a: 96—103; 1941: 182—187.) The passage shown in Table 66 is from the 1941 edition of *A High Art*. The same passage is included nearly verbatim also in the 1936 edition (p. 102). In the three earlier editions, the formulation is slightly different, but the basic idea is the same. (See Chukovskii 1919: 21; 1920: 48; 1930: 61.)

Table 66

<p><i>И все же в его переводах есть много хорошего. Пусть он невежда и враль, искажающий чуть не каждую фразу, но без него у нас не было бы Диккенса: он единственный приблизил нас к его творчеству, окружил нас его атмосферой, заразил нас его темпераментом. Он не понимал его слов, но он понял его самого. Он не дал нам его буквальных выражений, но он дал нам его интонации, его жесты, его богатую словесную мимику. Мы услышали, как Диккенс говорил, а в искусстве это самое главное. (Chukovskii 1941: 186.)</i></p>	<p><i>And nevertheless, there is a lot of good in his translations. Even though he was an ignoramus and a liar disposed to distorting practically every phrase, without him we would not have Dickens. He, and only he, has taken us to Dickens' world, surrounded us with his atmosphere, infected us with his temperament. He did not understand Dickens' words, but he understood Dickens. He did not give us Dicken's literal expressions, but he gave us his intonations, his gestures, his magnificent verbal movements.</i></p>
---	--

The above pronouncement illustrates Chukovskii's stance in the dispute about free versus literal translation. Judging by the comment shown in Table 48 (see above), he considered the reproduction of the rhythm and style of the original as a primary issue. In the 1941 edition, he remarks that the "slogan" (*lozung*) of the present epoch is maximal approximation with the original, but he is not referring to literal translation. In the preceding paragraph, he has already explained what that approximation entails: the translator's own person must remain inconspicuous, with the original author in the limelight. As in the discussion about the requirements of the new Soviet reader (see Table 37 in Subchapter 4.3.1), Chukovskii calls for translations that could "replace the original." Here, he paraphrases the requirement in a way that does not seem to be quite in accord with the artistic priorities discussed above. He points out that the most important aspect of any translation is its "educational value" (*poznvatel'naiia tsenmost'*). (See Chukovskii 1941: 32–33.)

The above comment seems to vaguely echo the didactic and utilitarian values of Socialist Realism. Chukovskii's (1941: 32) elaboration on the issue does not mitigate this impression. He emphasizes that the primary function of translations is to "veraciously" (*pravdivo*) familiarize the reader with the literatures of other countries and other nations. Such priorities do not seem quite compatible with the image of Chukovskii as a devout champion for literary translation as a fine art (see Table 69 below).

Beginning with the first handbooks, Chukovskii underlines that lexical errors alone do not lower the quality of a translation. As an example, he (Chukovskii 1919: 21; 1920: 49; 1930: 63; 1936a: 27–28; 1941: 31) presents an otherwise outstanding translation from English by Mikhail Lermontov. In the 1930s editions of *A High Art*, the same passage is complemented with more examples of translators who have translated individual words erroneously. Among them are, for instance, Valerii Briusov (1930: 63; 1936a: 28; 1941: 31) and Nikolai Gumilev (1930: 63; 1936a: 28). (More about Gumilev in Subchapter 4.5.1.)

As another example of such a case, Chukovskii (1930: 63–64; 1936a: 12, 14–16) presents the poet and translator Valentin Stenich. In the 1936 edition (pp. 14–15), he reminisces how, when reading a translation of Stenich's, he constantly had to jot down notes about mistakenly translated words. Table 67 shows that he assesses Stenich's translation with

arguments that are quite similar to the ones with which he assessed Vvedenskii's Dickens translations (see Table 66 above).

Table 67

<p><i>Но так как эти мелкие ошибки нисколько не повлияли на общий смысл и стиль переводов, я, невзирая на них, принужден был признать, что переводы Вал. Стенича являются одним из больших достижений советской словесности, потому что в них он передал самое главное: художественную индивидуальность переводимого автора во всем своеобразии его стиля. (Chukovskii 1936a: 15.)</i></p>	<p><i>But as these minute errors had no influence on the general idea or on the style of the translation, regardless of them I must admit that the translations of Val. Stenich are among the greatest achievements in Soviet literature, because in them he reproduced that which is most important: the artistic individuality of the original author in all the uniqueness of his style.</i></p>
--	---

The above comment refers to Stenich's translation of the novel *Manhattan Transfer* by the American novelist John Dos Passos. Apparently, Chukovskii at some point mentored – or at least was willing to mentor – Stenich, who was a friend of the family (see Subchapter 2.8). In November 1931, he wrote to his son Nikolai from Alupka, Ukraine, where he was staying with his dying daughter Murochka. In the letter, he mentions Stenich's latest Dos Passos translation, which had been delivered to him. (Chukovskii 2009: 232–233.)

У Стенича в переводе я нашел около 40 погрешностей. Если ему интересно, сообщу. (Chukovskii 2009: 232.)

In Stenich's translation, I found about 40 errors. If he's interested, I'll inform him.

Judging by the date of publication, the translated work would have been the first volume of the U.S.A. trilogy, *The 42nd Parallel*. (About Dos Passos and Stenich, see also Subchapters 4.4.3 and 4.5.1.)

As to literal translation, Chukovskii's position on the issue is manifested even more clearly in another comment about Vvedenskii, shown in Table 68. In fact, the fundamental idea of this comment is exactly the same as in the example shown in Table 66 (see above), except here it is expressed from a different angle.

Table 68

<p><i>мы всегда предпочтем неточный перевод Введенского точному переводу иных переводчиков, ибо в сущности этот неточный перевод гораздо точнее точного, рабски передающего буквы, но не воспроизводящего ни ритма, ни интонаций, ни стиля. (Chukovskii 1920: 49; 1930: 62; 1936a: 103; 1941: 187.)</i></p>	<p><i>we will always prefer Vvedenskii's imprecise translations over the precise translations by other translators, for that imprecise translation is in fact considerably more precise than a precise one slavishly passing over the letters but failing to reproduce the rhythm, the intonations, or the style.</i></p>
---	---

The above comment demonstrates that for Chukovskii, the “form” of a literary work was not embedded in its words and sentences but in what he calls its eidology (see also Table 49 above). Among the advocates for literalism, there were probably those who thought along similar lines but were lumped together with the word-for-word literalists in the general denunciation frenzy. Addressing the First All-Union Conference of Soviet Translators, Lozinskii, for instance, emphasized that in poetry translation, it is vital to convey the “emotional sound” of the original. Therefore, as he pointed out, the reproduction of words and phrases is less important than the reproduction of the original rhythm. (See Witt 2013: 174–175.) Had the above observations of Lozinskii’s been incorporated into *A High Art* in the midst of Chukovskii’s discussion about the significance of rhythm (see above), they would not have stood out in any way.

In the 1936 (p. 103) and 1941 (p. 187) editions of *A High Art*, Chukovskii expands on the issue of literalism by pronouncing that the worst of all translators is a “literalist, deaf and blind to the intonations of the original” (*bukvalist, glukhoi i slepoi k intonatsiiam podlinnika*). The pronouncement shown in Table 69 unequivocally demonstrates that he perceived translation as a creative art. The same basic idea had already been expressed in the opening lines of the translators’ handbook, although the formulation had been revised for the later editions (see Chukovskii 1919: 7; 1920: 24).

Table 69

<p><i>Переводчик не копиист, а художник, мастер слова, соучастник творческой работы того автора, которого он переводит. (Chukovskii 1930: 28; 1936a: 55.)</i></p>	<p><i>The translator is not a copyist but an artist, a master of words, an accomplice in the creative art of the writer he is translating.</i></p>
---	--

As discussed above, some of Chukovskii’s comments seem to contradict the notion of the translation as a fine art. Except for the sudden emphasis on the educational value of translations, there is another tendency in *A High Art* that seems to nullify the artistic notion. The emphasis on the scientific aspects of translation (see above) becomes all the more conspicuous in the 1930s editions of *A High Art*. In the forewords to the 1936 (p. 8) and 1941 (p. 5) editions, the new Soviet style of translation is characterized as a combination of sciences and art (see Table 56 above). The pronouncements shown in Table 3 in Subchapter 4.3.1 and Table 5 in Subchapter 4.3.1 both highlight the submission of translation to scientific discipline (see Chukovskii 1936a: 142; 1941: 110, 243).

The word science (*nauka*) or its various derivatives frequently appear in the 1936 and 1941 editions. Depending on the situation, the Russian word for “scientific,” *nauchnyi* may also be understood as either “scientific” or “scholarly.” For instance, in the example shown in Table 39 (see Subchapter 4.4.1), Lauren Leighton (1984: 256) has replaced the Russian expression *nauchno-issledovatel’skii* (the second word in the compound refers to research) with the English equivalent “scholarly-scientific.”

In the foreword to the 1936 edition of *A High Art* (p. 10), Chukovskii uses the epithet *nauchnyi* when discussing a book devoted to translation theory. That epithet might also be understood as something “possessing academic quality,” but Chukovskii’s general use of the word suggests that in the example shown in Table 70, it is science in the actual sense

of the word that he is referring to. The remark is also included in the article “Iskusstvo perevoda” (Chukovskii 1935a).

Table 70

<p><i>Нам нужна авторитетная, строго научная книга об основных принципах художественного перевода у нас в СССР, [. . .] (Chukovskii 1936a: 10.)</i></p>	<p><i>We need an authoritative, strictly scientific book about the basic principles of artistic translation in our Soviet Union, [. . .]</i></p>
---	--

The above remark is also included verbatim in the foreword to the 1941 edition (p. 5), except for one revision. The book being called for is characterized as authoritative, strictly scientific, and “genuinely Marxist” (*podlinno marksistskii*). The suggestion is in accord with the current discourse on translation. The Draft Resolution of the All-Union Conference of Translators contained the following phrase:

В области теории перевода имеют место всевозможные формалистские и эстетские теории и до настоящего времени нет достаточно разработанной, научно-обоснованной марксистско-ленинской теории перевода. (See Witt 2013: 181.)

In the area of translation theory, all manner of formalist and estheticist theories can be found, and at present there is not a sufficiently developed scientific theory of translation based on Marxism-Leninism. (Witt 2013: 183.)

In the 1936 edition of *A High Art*, the discussion about scientific translation methods includes terms that evoke connotations of physical rather than human sciences.

Table 71

<p><i>А так как самое понятие точности художественного перевода слагается из многих элементов, учет которых может быть осуществлен лишь при помощи лабораторного анализа, – в советском литературоведении все настойчивее звучат голоса о необходимости построить переводческое искусство на фундаменте точных наук. (Chukovskii 1936a: 121.)</i></p>	<p><i>But because the very notion of precision in artistic translation consists of many elements that can be summed up only with the help of laboratory analysis, in Soviet literary scholarship there is more and more persistently being pronounced the necessity of establishing the art of translation on the foundation of exact sciences.</i></p>
---	---

The application of similar vocabulary on cultural discourse was a general practice already in the revolutionary era. The rather abstract and comprehensive notion of laboratory was used in various connections. For instance the association Proletkul't was referred to as a “laboratory of proletarian ideology” (see Subchapter 2.3), the members of LEF (see Subchapter 4.3.3) would use the term “creative laboratory” in their jargon (see Dobrenko 2005: 59), and so on. Chukovskii’s memoirs reveal that the testing of past translations by

using laboratory analysis was also included in the platform of the publishing house *Vsemirnaia literatura*:

[. . .], нужно было дать подробный, строго принципиальный разбор прозаических и стиховых переводов, сделанных переводчиками предыдущих эпох. Нужно было выработать лабораторным путем точные критерии для этой оценки. (Chukovskii 2001e: 46.)

[. . .], it was necessary to make a detailed, strictly principled analysis of the prose and verse translations done by the translators of the past epochs. It was necessary to draw up, using laboratory means, the exact criteria for this evaluation.

Chukovskii well understood the problem that the ambitious publishing plan drafted at *Vsemirnaia literatura* posed to the standard of translations. Calling attention to the fact that many translators worked in veritable haste, he (Chukovskii 1919: 22; 1920: 51) suggested that an institution should be established in which competent editors would carefully examine every translation, comparing it with the original, before it was released for publication. From the standpoint of the reader, the procedure would guarantee the precision of the translation. In *A High Art*, Chukovskii would later give credit to Gor'kii for organizing such an institution.

Table 72

<p><i>Такой институт редакторов был впервые введен М. Горьким в издательстве «Всемирная литература». Было постановлено, что ни одна переводная книга, напечатанная этим издательством, не выйдет без редакционного просмотра. (Chukovskii 1930: 68; 1936a: 185.)</i></p>	<p><i>Such an institution of editors was first introduced by Gor'kii at the publishing house <i>Vsemirnaia literatura</i>. A resolution was made that not a single book printed by that publishing house be published without a preview conducted by an editor.</i></p>
--	---

In the foreword to the 1941 edition of *A High Art* (p. 5), Chukovskii once again recalls Gor'kii's important role and the battle he started against the "bad traditions" (*durnye traditsii*) of the earlier epochs. He also underlines that the entire editorial board of *Vsemirnaia literatura* was absolutely uncompromising in anything that would impair (*iskalechit'*) a translation.

Evidently, the fundamental nature of translation remained an enigma, not only for Chukovskii but also for others partaking in the 1930s literary discourse. Elena Zemskova describes the contradiction as follows:

Translation was constructed as an activity that only experts could carry out, that required some training and qualifications. At the same time, it was conceptualized as a creative activity. These two criteria led to some ambiguity about the nature of the profession, and a 'real artist' was always praised and valued more highly than just a professional translator. (Zemskova 2013: 210.)

At the end of the 1941 edition (p. 257), Chukovskii once more elucidates the dual image of the translator, making an effort to tie together the ostensibly separate lines of scientific and artistic translation. The main topic of the chapter is Shevchenko, but Chukovskii expands the discussion on a general level.

Table 73

<p><i>Советские переводчики должны добиваться, чтобы в их переводах каждое стихотворение того или иного автора оставалось живым организмом. Для этого есть единственное средство: сопереживание, сотворчество, такое слияние с подлинником, когда переводчику кажется, будто он не переводит, а пишет свое, лирически пережитое им самим, когда он чувствует себя, так сказать, соавтором переводимых стихов. Требуется не только научный анализ методики, стилистики, семантики подлинника (без этого никакой художественный перевод невозможен), но и эмоциональное проникновение в духовную биографию автора, поскольку она сказалась в подлежащих переводу стихах. (Chukovskii 1941: 257.)</i></p>	<p><i>Soviet translators must produce translations in which every poem of either this or that author remains a living organism. To that end, there is only one way: empathy, collaboration, such a confluence with the original that the translator feels that he's not translating but writing his own work, his own lyrical experience, and that he feels, so to speak, like a co-author of the poems he's translating. What is needed is not only a scientific analysis of the methods, stylistics, and semantics of the original (without that no artistic translation is possible), but also an emotional penetration into the spiritual biography of the author, in so far as it is manifested in the poems included in the translation.</i></p>
--	--

Chukovskii (1941: 257) concludes the discussion by juxtaposing the above conception of translation with the much-maligned Formalism (see Table 74). At the same time, his proclamation functions as a tagline that concludes the entire edition.

Table 74

<p><i>Если нет этого сопереживания, сотворчества, искусство перевода перестает быть искусством и становится никчемным ремеслом. Доказательству этого антиформалистского тезиса и посвящена настоящая книга. (Chukovskii 1941: 257.)</i></p>	<p><i>If there is not such empathy and collaboration, the art of translation will cease to be an art and will become a good-for-nothing hackwork. This very book is dedicated to the proving of that anti-Formalist thesis.</i></p>
---	---

The above notion was obviously recognized already earlier and also by others. In the foreword to the 1936 edition of *A High Art*, the representative of the publishing house Academia specifically expresses his appreciation for the fact that “the point of the book is aimed at formalist tendencies” in Soviet translation practices (see Chukovskii 1936a: 5). In the 1941 edition (pp. 138–181), the actuality of Formalism is particularly manifested in the chapter devoted to Anna Radlova’s Shakespeare translations (see Subchapter 4.4.4).

4.4.3 Ideological Issues

When the first handbooks for translators were compiled by the editorial board of the publishing house *Vsemirnaia literatura*, the focus was primarily on artistic matters. In the subsequent editions, a new aspect enters *A High Art*. The following editions; 1930 (pp. 16–23), 1936 (pp. 37–53), and 1941 (pp. 37–59), all contain a chapter titled “The Social nature of the Translator” (*Sotsial’naia priroda perevodchika*). In the 1941 edition, this chapter is almost identical to Chukovskii’s (1940a) article with the same title (see Subchapter 4.1).

After the 1930s, the title disappears from *A High Art*, but some topics and passages from the chapter remain, inserted into other chapters. The statement shown in Table 75 illustrates the new outlook on translation that emerged in the 1930s. The issue obviously occupied Chukovskii’s mind, as the passage is fine-tuned and reformulated for every subsequent edition.

Table 75

<p><i>Повторяю, каждый переводчик, в сущности, переводит себя, то-есть отражает в своем переводе свою социальную сущность. (Chukovskii 1930: 23.)</i></p> <p><i>Ведь каждый переводчик переводит себя, то есть сознательно или бессознательно отражает в своем переводе собственную классовую сущность. (Chukovskii 1936a: 39.)</i></p> <p><i>Почти каждый переводчик сознательно или бессознательно отражает в своем переводе свои художественные и общественные настроения. (Chukovskii 1941: 39.)</i></p>	<p><i>I repeat that every translator essentially translates himself, in other words reflects in his translation his own social essence.</i></p> <p><i>Every translator translates himself, in other words consciously or unconsciously reflects in his translation his own class essence.</i></p> <p><i>Almost every translator consciously or unconsciously reflects in his translation his artistic and social dispositions.</i></p>
--	--

In the 1930 edition of *A High Art*, the remark is connected with Aleksandr Druzhinin’s translation of Shakespeare’s play *King Lear*, whereas in the 1936 and 1941 editions, it appears in the context of a contemporary French rendition of Shakespeare’s play *Coriolanus* (see below).

At first sight, the pronouncement shown in Table 75 appears contradictory in light of the emphasis given in *A High Art* to the Soviet translator’s scientific objectivity (see e.g. Table 41 in Subchapter 4.4.1). In the 1930 edition, Chukovskii immediately corrects the disparity by demarcating the sphere of scientific translation.

Table 76

<p><i>Я говорю о переводчиках живого современного текста. Перевод старинных романов, вроде, например, ричардсоновых, форма которых стала уже мертвым шаблоном, может быть произведен с объективной, чисто научную точностью, и, конечно, в таком переводе личность переводчика будет нейтральна, почти незаметна. (Chukovskii 1930: 23.)</i></p>	<p><i>I am speaking about translators of a living contemporary text. The translation of ancient, for instance Ricardian, novels, the form of which has already petrified, can be carried out with objective, purely scientific precision, and, of course, in such a translation the personality of the translator will remain neutral, almost imperceptible.</i></p>
--	--

The above passage is included nearly verbatim also in subsequent editions of *A High Art* (1936a: 52; 1941: 59), in connection with a new discussion about the compatibility of the original author and the translator (see Table 114 in Subchapter 4.5.1).

In the early handbooks, that compatibility is primarily equaled with a similarity of temperaments. As Chukovskii (1919: 7; 1920: 24) points out, the talent of the translator is measured by his ability to let himself “be contaminated” (*zarazit’sia*) with the original author’s emotional self, or to “transform” (*preobrazhat’sia*) himself into the original author. A temperamental kinship between the translator and the author remains a relevant issue in the 1930s editions, but in these editions, the elements of compatibility also include the aspect of social and ideological kinship. The passage shown in Table 77 is a revised and also somewhat more succinct version of a similar one that first appeared in the 1936 edition of *A High Art* (pp. 51–52).

Table 77

<p><i>Так что, если переводчик и автор, как это часто бывает, принадлежат к диаметрально противоположным группам, для обеспечения точности перевода требуется со стороны переводчика значительно больше усилий, чем при переводе идеологически близких ему произведений поэзии. Поэтому гораздо чаще достигают точности те переводчики, которые и по своему мировоззрению и по своему темпераменту близки переводимым писателям и при этом питают и к ним такое сочувствие, что являются как бы их двойниками. (Chukovskii 1941: 58–59.)</i></p>	<p><i>Thus, if the translator and the author, as it often happens, belong to diametrically opposed groups, it takes considerably more effort on the part of the translator to ensure the precision of the translation than in such a case when he’s translating poetry ideologically close to him. Therefore, precision is a lot more often obtained by translators who by both by their worldview and their temperament are close to the original author and sympathize with him so much as to seem like his twin.</i></p>
--	---

Whereas in the above passage, Chukovskii refers to the translators’ “worldview” (*mirovozzrenie*), both in the 1936 edition of *A High Art* and in the article “Sotsial’naia priroda perevodchika,” he (Chukovskii 1936a: 52; 1940a) uses the expression “social nature” (*sotsial’naia priroda*). The fact that the expression “worldview” only appears in one of these

three publications suggests that it was not Chukovskii who made the alteration. Perhaps the editor of the publishing house Khudozhestvennaia literatura considered it outdated to speak about somebody's social nature. In that case, however, particularly considering the political and ideological nuances of the 1930s public discourse, the expression "world-view" seems surprisingly neutral.

In the chapter "The Social Nature of the Translator" in the 1930 and 1936 editions of *A High Art*, Konstantin Bal'mont' is given more attention than any other individual translator. His suitability for translating Walt Whitman is one of the main topics, but in that discussion, the boundary between social and temperamental aspects seems to remain rather vague. Perhaps therefore, in the 1941 edition (pp. 15–17), the discussion was moved to the chapter "Dominants of Deviation from the Original" (see Subchapter 4.3.3).

In the 1930 edition of *A High Art*, the two chapters (pp. 9–16) preceding "Dominants of Deviation from the Original" are exclusively devoted to critique of Bal'mont, the first one targeted at his translations of Percy Bysshe Shelley, and the second one at his translations of Whitman. As regards the latter issue, Chukovskii's impartiality as a critic might be questioned because as a Whitman translator, Bal'mont' was his rival. The two litterateurs both began translating the American bard in the early 20th century, and, during that same period, Chukovskii began publicly criticizing Bal'mont's translations (see below). Later *A High Art* would provide an ideal forum for that critique, which at times seems to have nearly obsessive features. Lauren Leighton describes Chukovskii's devotion to the topic as follows:

Kornei Chukovsky's campaign against Balmont as a translator of Whitman (and Shelley) began in 1906 and remained a lifelong concern. (Leighton 1982.)

Even while criticizing Bal'mont's translations, Chukovskii did not deny his talent as a poet in his own right. For instance, in the anthology *Ot Chekhova do nashikh dnei* ("From Chekhov to Our Days," 1908), he praised Bal'mont as the "precursor" (*predtecha*) of urban literature. He reasoned that while industrialization and migration into cities had considerably changed Russian society, literature still remained rooted in the rural way of life. An exception was the "young poet Konstantin Dmitrevich Bal'mont," whom Chukovskii deemed as capable of conveying the intense and frenetic atmosphere of modern times and of touching the souls of urban dwellers. (See Chukovskii 2002a: 42–44.)

Translation was a different issue altogether. For instance, in his articles published in the journal *Vesy* in 1904 and 1906, Chukovskii elaborated on the deficiencies in Bal'mont's Whitman translations (see Chukovskii 2002a: 429; Leighton 1982). In the 1907 edition of his work *Moi Uitmen* ("My Whitman"), he criticized Bal'mont's language, which he found all too "sugary" (*slashchavyi*) for Whitman's poetry (Scherr 2009). Incidentally, only a few years later Vladimir Maiakovskii would use very similar expressions criticizing Chukovskii's early Whitman translations (see Subchapter 4.3.3).

Behind Chukovskii's merciless criticism of Bal'mont, Leighton (1982) sees primarily "esthetic concerns" and an earnest desire to provide the Russian reader with as faithful renditions of Whitman as possible. Such a desire can, of course, be considered as an altruistic motive to the attacks on Bal'mont. However, the aspect of rivalry cannot be overlooked, either, particularly since royalties for translations were one of Chukovskii's sources of income.

Chukovskii's rhetorical talent was probably one asset that helped him become *the* Russian translator of Whitman while Bal'mont's translations largely fell into oblivion. Barry B. Scherr comments on the two translators as follows:

Cukovskij's harsh dismissal of Bal'mont as both translator and critic seems to have been largely responsible for the tendency among the majority of subsequent scholars to reject Bal'mont's translations in favor of Cukovskij's. Arguably, though, even Cukovskij's late versions of the translations are less superior to Bal'mont's than many have suggested, and that goes doubly for Cukovskij's earliest attempts, the versions more nearly contemporaneous to those of Bal'mont. (Scherr 2009.)

Another significant advantage for Chukovskii in the competition was that unlike Bal'mont (who perished in 1942), he kept revising his translations for an entire six decades (see Subchapter 2.1), and, thereby, prevented them from becoming dated and obsolete.

That Chukovskii acknowledged Bal'mont's talent as a poet is evident in the remark shown in Table 78. Although in many contexts, he speaks of Bal'mont's style in a manner verging on cruelty, here he actually highlights the expressive quality of his original writing.

Table 78

<p><i>Именно потому, что у Бальмонта так резко выражена его собственная литературная личность, он, при всем своем таланте, не способен отразить в переводах индивидуальность другого поэта. (Chukovskii 1930: 12; 1936a: 26; 1941: 15.)</i></p>	<p><i>Precisely because Balmont expresses his own literary personality so acutely, he is incapable, despite all his talent, of mirroring the individuality of another poet in his translations. (Leighton 1984: 23.)</i></p>
---	--

On the other hand, Chukovskii's (1930: 12; 1936a: 26; 1941: 15) personal opinion of Bal'mont's style is not that high, as it turns out from the sequel to the above comment. Chukovskii points out that as Bal'mont's own talent is "dandified" (*fatovatyi*), his Whitman, too, ends up dandified. For Chukovskii (1930: 13; 1936: 18), the translator's replacing the author's original style with his own is equal to violence (*nasilie*) against that author.

The chapter "The Social Nature of the Translator" in the 1930 edition of *A High Art* seamlessly continues the discussion about Bal'mont conducted in the preceding chapter. Chukovskii opens the new chapter with an argument that supports his assessment of Bal'mont's fundamental unsuitability for translating Whitman.

Table 79

<p><i>Это мелочи, но весьма характерные. Они показывают, что переводчик, даже самый талантливый, не в силах, при всем желании, нарушить тот эстетический канон, который внушила ему данная литературная (а, значит, и социальная) группа, и остается бессознательно верен этому канону даже тогда, когда переводит писателя, принадлежащего к враждебной ему общественной группе. (Chukovskii 1930: 16.)</i></p>	<p><i>Those are small but characteristic details. They show that however talented, even with the best will in the world the translator cannot break the esthetic canon installed in him by a given literary (that is, also social) group. He will unconsciously remain faithful to this canon even when translating a writer who belongs to a social group at odds with it.</i></p>
--	---

The remark shown in Table 52 (see Subchapter 4.4.2) implies that a translator's decisions are not only influenced by esthetic canons but also by his personal position and by his way of life. Being a carpenter, Whitman knew exactly how to imitate the sound of an axe, whereas Bal'mont as a "high society esthete" had no qualifications for reproducing it credibly. Juxtaposing Whitman's "muscular" (*muskulisty*) tempo with Bal'mont's "flaccid" (*via-lyi*) and "dragging" (*tiaguchii*) rhythm, Chukovskii, either intentionally or unintentionally, creates the juxtaposing images of an energetic and vigorous workman and a lethargic and lazy nobleman. (See Chukovskii 1930: 17–18; 1936a: 48.) Chukovskii argues that it is this very juxtaposition that hinders Bal'mont's insight into Whitman's poetry and actually turns him against the poet he is translating.

Table 80

<p><i>Иначе так и быть не могло: Уитмэн по своей социальной природе враждебен Бальмонту, и весь перевод Бальмонта есть непрестанная борьба с оригиналом. Такую борьбу с оригиналом нам приходится наблюдать всякий раз, когда писатель, принадлежащий к одному социальному слою, переводит произведения писателя, принадлежащего к другому социальному слою. (Chukovskii 1930: 18; 1936a: 48–49.)</i></p>	<p><i>It could be no other way: Whitman is antagonistic to Bal'mont by his social nature, and Bal'mont's entire translation is a ceaseless battle with the original. We are faced with such a battle with the original every time that a writer belonging to one social stratum translates works of a writer belonging to another social stratum.</i></p>
---	---

Discussing Bal'mont's alleged attitude to Whitman, Chukovskii uses such emotionally intense expressions as "contempt" (*prezrenie*) and "detestation" (*nenavist'*). Bal'mont's treatment of Whitman's rhythm is "the most evil" (*samoe zloe*) of all the bad deeds he torments the bard with. Chukovskii goes as far as to suggest that Bal'mont's "slovenliness" (*neriashlivost'*) is deliberate, that he could not care less about the adequate reproduction of poetry he finds so alien and antagonistic. (See Chukovskii 1930: 18–20; 1936a: 49–50)

Thus, in the chapter “The Social Nature of the Translator,” the deficiencies in Bal’mont’s Whitman translations are put down to different social strata between the translator and the original author. Elsewhere in the book, they are examined from another point of view, as a consequence of the fundamental difference between the author’s and the translator’s poetic styles. Chukovskii accuses Bal’mont of “subordinating” (*podchiniat’*) Whitman to his own Symbolist esthetics. (See Chukovskii 1930: 15; 1936a: 20; 1941: 17.)

Lauren Leighton suggests that it was Bal’mont’s being a Symbolist poet that irked Chukovskii about his Whitman translations more than anything else, and gave impetus to his vicious critique:

To Chukovsky, it was deplorable that Whitman was becoming known in an acutely Symbolist interpretation, [. . .] (Leighton 1982.)

As to Chukovskii’s personal notion of Whitman, he saw the poet as a model and harbinger of the Futurist movement. For instance in the poetic language of Maiakovskii’s and Khlebnikov’s (see subchapter 4.3.3), Chukovskii detected the unmistakable influence of that American “proto-Futurist.” (Scherr 2009.)

The discussion in *A High Art* about the social aspects of translation harks back to the 19th century. One of the translators included in the discussion is Aleksandr Druzhinin, who is particularly known for his translations of Shakespeare, for instance of the plays *King Lear* (1856), *Coriolanus* (1858), *Richard III* (1860), and *King John* (1865). At the beginning of his literary career, Druzhinin attained fame as a writer. Published in the journal *Sovremennik* in 1847, his first novel was a success. For instance Vissarion Belinskii gave it a commending review. Due to the warm reception of his debut, Druzhinin became a regular contributor to the journal. At the turn of the 1850s, he began to gain a foothold in literary criticism and soon became the most influential Russian critic – a position formerly held by Belinskii. From the year 1856 on, he headed the journal *Biblioteka dlia chteniia* (“Library for Reading”). Many intellectuals of that time insisted that the function of literature was to influence on the society by molding the attitudes of the readers. Druzhinin, in contrast, advocated the ideal of art for art’s sake, without any further motives. His main opponent, at that time, was Nikolai Chernyshevskii, the leading critic of *Sovremennik*. Although Druzhinin had his own sympathizers, among them the writer Ivan Turgenev among them, this issue caused his popularity to wane and eventually cost him his post at *Biblioteka dlia chteniia*. After that, he returned to translation. After his death, his name fell into an almost total oblivion, until a new interest in his works arose in the 1990s. (See Lonergan 1998: 263–264.)

In *A High Art*, Chukovskii tells how Druzhinin’s rendition of *King Lear* ended up being perceived as a political statement. Therefore it was warmly welcome by his “reactionary” friends, for instance by Turgenev, who was particularly moved by the way Druzhinin had portrayed King Lear’s loyal and submissive servant Kent. Chukovskii cites a letter in which Turgenev emphasizes that it was the translator’s personal position, his being a “conservative” (*konservator*), that helped him produce such a vivid image of the king’s “great subject” (*velikii vernopoddannyi*). (See Chukovskii 1930: 22–23; 1936a: 43; 1941: 43–44) From the quotation, Chukovskii moves the discussion on to a general level.

Table 81

<p>То-есть рабья приверженность Кента к монарху, с особой энергией выдвинутая в переводе Дружинина, была принята Тургеневым опять таки в плане социальной борьбы. Таким образом, переводчик отражает свою классовую идеологию даже в такой, казалось бы, академической работе, как перевод трагедий Шекспира. (Chukovskii 1930: 23.)</p>	<p>In other words, Kent's slavish devotion to the monarch, highlighted in Druzhinin's translation with particular zest, was once again perceived by Turgenev from the viewpoint of a social battle. Thus, the translator reflects his class ideology even in such an apparently academic work as the translation of Shakespeare's tragedy.</p>
--	--

In the 1936 and 1941 editions, Chukovskii leads the discussion to a yet earlier rendition of *King Lear*. The play was first produced on the Russian stage half a century before the emergence of Druzhinin's translation. Chukovskii argues that the sole function of that staging was to "strengthen and glorify" (*ukrepit' i proslavit'*) the loyalty of the Russian people to the autocratic Tsar. The same pertains to the translator. Chukovskii notes that the "celebrated poet" Nikolai Gnedich particularly highlighted certain aspects in Shakespeare's text in order to make the audience sympathize with the battle of the monarch for his – enclosed in quotation marks – "legal throne." (See Chukovskii 1936a: 43–45; 1941: 44–45.)

In the 1936 and 1941 editions, a new and acute topic enters into the discussion. It turns out that in 1934, Shakespeare's play *Coriolanus* had been staged at Comédie-Française, the state theatre of France. Referring to the translator and scholar Lev Borovoi's article in *Literaturnaia gazeta* (1934/22), Chukovskii (1936a: 37–38; 1941: 38–39) comments on the French rendition of Shakespeare's play.

Table 82

<p>Благодаря такому переводу, старинная английская пьеса сделалась в 1934 году боевым знаменем французских фашистов. Те мечты о твердой диктаторской власти и о сокрушении "революционной демократической сволочи", которые лелеет французский рантье, запуганный "красной опасностью, нашли полное свое выражение в этом модернизованном переводе Шекспира. (Chukovskii 1936a: 38; 1941: 38.)</p>	<p>Thanks to this translation the old English play became a battle flag of French reaction. The dreams about a strong dictatorial power and of the destruction of the revolutionary plebes, dreams cherished by the French rentiers who were alarmed by the "red menace," found perfect reflection in this modernized translation of Shakespeare. (Leighton 1984: 29–30.)</p>
--	---

The translator of the French rendition was the Swiss writer René-Louis Piachaud, whose Fascist sympathies were no secret. Piachaud himself acknowledged his *Coriolanus* as a free translation "adapted to suit the taste of the time." Isabelle Schwartz-Gastine notes that despite the translator's "seemingly innocent" characterization, the translation "fitted nicely to the newly emerging Fascist ideology." (See Schwartz-Gastine 2008: 126–127.)

Although the discussion about the French *Coriolanus* remains in subsequent editions of *A High Art* (Chukovskii 1964: 30; 1966: 268–269; 1968: 34–35), the topic it touched upon was particularly urgent in the mid-1930s. At that time, the Soviet regime was actively striving to recruit members of the cultural intelligentsia to fight against Fascism. In 1934, the Soviet Union joined the “Popular Front,” an international anti-Fascist alliance centered in France. (See Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 190–191.)

Chukovskii mentions that in Borovoi’s article in *Literaturnaia gazeta*, Piachaud is accused of deliberately distorting Shakespeare’s text for political purposes. The distortion, Chukovskii points out, is manifested in the very title of the French version: “The Tragedy of Coriolanus, translated *freely* from the English text of Shakespeare and *adapted to the conventions of the French stage*” (*Tragediia o Koriolane, svobodno perevedennaia s angliiskogo teksta Shekspira i prisposoblennaia k usloviyam frantsuzskoi stseny*). Chukovskii asks the rhetorical question whether Piachaud would have managed to produce an absolutely neutral translation even if he had produced the original word for word. As shown in Table 75 (see above), Chukovskii answers the question by asserting that the social nature of the translator is always manifested in the translation. (See Chukovskii 1936a: 38–39; 1941: 39.)

Next turning the discussion to Druzhinin’s translation of the same play, Chukovskii (1936a: 39; 1941: 39–40) points out that being utterly thorough and conscientious by nature, Druzhinin would never have deliberately mutilated (*kalechit’*) Shakespeare’s text. However, the translator could not help instinctively adapting the text to his own personal convictions, as can be seen in the comment shown in Table 83.

Table 83

<p><i>И все же его «Кориолан» недалеко ушел от того, который так восхищает французских врагов демократии. Потому что в своем переводе он, Дружинин, бессознательно сделал то самое, что сознательно сделал теперь Рене-Луи Пиашо. (Chukovskii 1936a: 39; 1941: 39.)</i></p>	<p><i>And yet his translation comes very close to being exactly the type of translation that so delighted the foes of French democracy, because Druzhinin did exactly in his translation unconsciously what Piachaud did consciously. (Leighton 1984: 30.)</i></p>
---	--

As another example illustrating the visibility of a 19th century translator, Chukovskii presents Vasilii Zhukovskii, a major Romantic era poet and a prestigious translator from several languages. Like Pushkin and Lermontov (see Subchapter 4.4.2), Zhukovskii is known as an advocate of free translation (Komissarov 2011: 520). In his renditions of foreign works, the sentimental and melancholy features of the original were particularly accentuated (Neliubin & Khukhuni 2006: 245). Chukovskii (1930: 23; 1936a: 41; 1941: 40–41) argues that in his translations, Zhukovskii used the original author’s melodies, themes, and images for projecting his own creative self, always remaining within his own “narrow boundaries” (*tesnye predely*).

In the 1941 edition of *A High Art*, the discussion about Zhukovskii is extended to his translation of Homer’s *Odyssey*, published in 1848–1849. Chukovskii (1941: 41) remarks that Zhukovskii’s contemporaries interpreted the translation as a polemic statement targeted against the realist, materialist, and mercantilist epoch so repulsive to the translator.

Table 84

<p><i>Тогдашняя русская действительность казалась Жуковскому – и всему его кругу – ужасной. То был самый разгар плебейских сороковых годов, когда впервые столь явственно пошатнулись устои любезной ему феодально-патриархальной России. (Chukovskii 1941: 41.)</i></p>	<p><i>To Zhukovsky – and to his entire circle – the Russian reality of that time could not but have been hateful. This was the very height of the plebeian forties when it first became obvious that the foundations of his beloved feudal-patriarchal Russia were being shaken. (Leighton 1984: 31.)</i></p>
--	---

Chukovskii continues by pointing out the significance of Zhukovskii's *Odyssey* in its own epoch. At that time, Europe was being convulsed by revolutions. Therefore, some "reactionary journalists" used the translation for their own propagandistic purposes, contrasting its beauty and tranquility with the turmoil raging in the West. (See Chukovskii 1941: 41.)

As it turns out from the above discussion, Chukovskii's first precondition for a precise translation is the social compatibility of the translator with the original author. Rather than class origin, the fundamental issue here appears to be disposition. This is indicated also by the reformulation of the comment shown in Table 75 (see above). In the 1930 edition (p. 23), Chukovskii uses the expression "social essence" (*sotsial'naia sushchnost'*) and in the 1936 edition (p. 39), class essence (*klassovaia sushchnost'*). Finally, in the 1941 edition (p. 39), the earlier expressions are replaced with "social dispositions" (*obshchestvennye nastroyeniia*).

To illustrate his point of view, Chukovskii (1936a: 52) produces a list of ideologically compatible translator-author pairs (see Table 114 in Subchapter 4.5.1). Although not included in the actual list, in the 1936 edition, Nikolai Tikhonov is mentioned in the same context. He is presented as a socially compatible translator for Simon Chikovani because of the similarity of their dispositions.

Table 85

<p><i>Когда Николай Тихонов переводит, например, Симона Чиковани, он чувствует себя его собратом, человеком той же социальной природы. И в этом одна из гарантий близости перевода и подлинника. (Chukovskii 1936a: 53.)</i></p>	<p><i>When Nikolai Tikhonov translates for instance Simon Chikovani, he feels like he's Chikovani's partner, somebody with the same social nature. And that is one of the guarantees for the proximity between the translation and the original.</i></p>
--	--

The praising comment is not entirely in line with another comment Chukovskii (1936a: 27) made about Tikhonov. Elsewhere in the same edition of *A High Art*, he suggests that Tikhonov lumps all Georgians into one and the same mold of "shaggy-haired croakers and bow-legged devils" (see Table 32 in Subchapter 4.3.3). At the worst, such a remark might even be interpreted as an accusation of "Great Russian chauvinism." That, in turn, would be in stark contrast with the idea of partnership between people of a similar social nature.

From the list of compatible writer-translator pairs (see above), Chukovskii (1936a: 52) singles out Valentin Stenich and John Dos Passos for special mention as a pair of "twins." Dos Passos was a prominent representative of American Avant-Gardist literature and a

forerunner of various modernist tendencies. One of his hallmarks was combining different genres within one and the same work. Disapproving of what he considered as an extremely conservative tendency in his native America, he felt a strong affinity with the Socialist movement in the 1920s and 1930s, and even visited the Soviet Union in 1928 (see Subchapter 4.5.1). Marxist critics lauded Dos Passos, but rather than an actual Marxist, he was a humanist. The Spanish Civil War had great symbolic significance for the radical circles in Europe and America, and Dos Passos was among those intellectuals who traveled to Spain at that time. Once there, he was, however, appalled by the atrocities conducted by *both* sides. The disillusionment made him abandon his earlier ideals and turn into a staunch supporter of American democracy. He also began criticizing the totalitarian regime of the Soviet Union. (Dowling 2004: 394–395, 397.) Robert Dowling describes the transformation of Dos Passos' ideological disposition as follows:

Just before the eruption of World War II, Dos Passos effected a notorious shift in his political views from radical to reactionary and subsequently alienated many friends and critics on the Left. (Dowling 2004: 394.)

Until the late 1930s, Dos Passos was highly esteemed in the Soviet Union. Stenich's translations of the "radical" and "progressive" American novelist frequently appeared in the journal *Internatsional'naia literatura*, and some of them were also published in separate editions. The translations of the two first novels of Dos Passos' *U.S.A. Trilogy* (see Subchapter 4.4.2) came out during that period. The third one was never translated because in the meantime, Stenich had been arrested. During that same period, the attitude of the Soviet authorities to Dos Passos changed. He was labeled with epithets like "Trotskyist" and "anti-Soviet." (Blium 2009.)

Stenich is mainly known as a translator, although in his youth, he also wrote some poetry of his own. Highly critical of his work, from the early 1920s on he concentrated almost exclusively on translation. (Chukovskii, N.: 1989: 215, 221.) In 1933–1934, a discourse about two modernist writers went on in the Soviet press, Dos Passos and the Irish James Joyce – whom Stenich also translated. In a broader sense, the issue was related to the orthodox composition of the novel. The participants of the discussion pronounced the modernist techniques represented by Joyce and Dos Passos as chaotic, arbitrary and subjectivist. One of the participants was Stenich, who pointed out that Dos Passos had abandoned composition and replaced it with the confusing technique of montage. He also insisted that Dos Passos had a negative influence on Soviet literature. (Günther 2011: 91, 93, 99–100.)

Stenich's comments are surprising in light of his being the designated translator of Dos Passos. Moreover, according to Nikolai Chukovskii (1989: 233), Stenich very much appreciated the American writer. On the other hand, the sincerity of Stenich's comments might be speculated in light of his personality. In his memoirs about Stenich, Nikolai Chukovskii (1989: 211–244) paints a picture of an extremely verbal, witty and intelligent man who loved practical jokes and was disposed to astounding others by camouflaging himself under various invented guises. (See Chukovskii, N.: 1989: 213–223.) Another contemporary, Nadezhda Mandel'shtam (1999: 317) reminisces that many people considered Stenich a cynic, "but that may have been because they were so afraid of his sharp tongue."

Perhaps Stenich formulated his comments about novelist techniques in a way he knew he was expected to, or perhaps there is covert irony hidden behind them. On the other hand, Stenich might also have been using a mask, presenting another one of those invented guises of his. Be that as it may, had Stenich genuinely harbored a negative attitude towards the techniques of Dos Passos, it seems implausible that he would have translated his works as successfully as he did. N. Chukovskii (1989: 233) particularly highlights Stenich's exquisite sense of style that enabled him to convey the American writer's multi-dimensional text so accurately.

As for Stenich's social nature, he apparently remained an enigma even to his contemporaries. N. Chukovskii describes him as a "fierce" supporter of Socialism. After the Revolution, Stenich joined the Bolshevik Party and fought on their side in the Civil War. In 1921, he was arrested for "premeditated disorder" (*predumyshlennyi razval*) and for "contacts with enemies of the Revolution," and he only barely escaped the death penalty. (See Chukovskii, N.: 1989: 213, 215.) In the early 1920s, Stenich returned to Leningrad and apparently abandoned politics altogether. From then on, he concentrated solely on literary activities. His independent disposition and his refusal to participate in the centralizing processes of Soviet literature might easily have caused him troubles even then. His attitude bordered on being downright provocative; several contemporaries testify to his reckless disposition. At the time when carelessly spoken words could easily prove fatal to the speaker, Stenich openly ridiculed not only the Soviet establishment but even Stalin himself. In 1930, Stenich was deported to Archangel for reasons unknown to this day, and also in 1931 he was arrested for a couple of months. (See Uspenskii, *Nashe nasledie*.) He later ran out of his luck and lost his life in the Great Terror. He was arrested the final time in 1937 and executed the following year. (More in Subchapter 4.5.1.)

The defiant and cavalier picture Pavel Uspenskii (see above) presents of Stenich is not quite consistent with Nikolai Chukovskii's perhaps somewhat idealized image of his friend. He (Chukovskii, N. 1989: 232) remembers Stenich's "detest for the bourgeoisie, love for our Revolution, and his trust in its righteousness," as he elaborates in his memoirs. Of course, Nikolai Chukovskii's outlook may be colored by his personal disposition towards the Revolution and all that it entailed (see Subchapter 2.8). The discrepancy, on the other hand, supports the notion of Stenich's abilities to present any image as he saw fit at any given time.

Chukovskii does not expand on Stenich's social compatibility with Dos Passos. Chukovskii's diary entries about Stenich do not shed any light into his impression of Stenich's ideological disposition, either. In the mid-1930s, Dos Passos was still regarded as a writer with Leftist tendencies. Thus, Chukovskii's presentation of the two as kindred spirits suggests that he shared his son's view of their common friend. Even if he never considered Stenich as an actual revolutionary, he may have recognized in him a belief in democratic ideas. As Nikolai Chukovskii (1989: 233) points out, the distinguishing feature in Dos Passos' novels is their "genuine democracy."

The position of Taras Shevchenko in the chapter "The Social Nature of the Translator" shifts with every edition. In the 1930 edition (p. 21), he is introduced as a translator of the *Book of Psalms* (see subchapter 4.3.3). The passage about the *Book of Psalms* was omitted from the 1941 edition, and Shevchenko is featured only as an original author. (pp. 41–42). The passage about the *Book of Psalms* was omitted the 1941 edition, and Shevchenko is only

featured as an original author. He is devoted the lion's share of attention in the chapter, distinctly more than any other individual writer.

Chukovskii's diary entry recorded on November 26, 1939 (see Subchapter 4.1) suggests that the 1941 edition was revised at least partly with a hurried timetable. It seems likely that Chukovskii would have given most attention to the only entirely new paragraph in that edition, titled "Tendencies of the Soviet Style in the New Translations of Shevchenko" (see Subchapter 4.3.3). The rest of the topics had been passed down from the previous editions, supplemented with new material, and re-organized with a new division of paragraphs. Even the current topic of Shakespeare (see Subchapter 4.4.4) appears as a sequel to a former discussion.

In the article "Iskoverkannyi perevod T. G. Shevchenko," Chukovskii (1938) insists that from the very beginning, every single translator of Shevchenko has distorted the beauty and the music of his poetry and the "revolutionary power" (*revoliutsionnaia sila*) it manifests. The argument is also included in the 1941 edition of *A High Art*, in which Chukovskii elaborates on the subject by presenting examples from a number of translations from different epochs (see Chukovskii 1941: 45–55). The introductory line gives a clue to the trend at the heart of the discussion (see Table 86). By "unconscious distortions," Chukovskii is referring to the governing idea in the chapter that every translator unconsciously marks a translation with his own social nature (see also Tables 75, 79 and 83 above).

Table 86

<p><i>Огромный материал для характеристики именно таких бессознательных искажений подлинника дают недавние переводы стихотворений Шевченко. Этот материал чрезвычайно выразителен и, так сказать, педагогически нагляден. (Chukovskii 1941: 45.)</i></p>	<p><i>An enormous amount of material particularly on such unconscious distortions of the original is provided by the recent translations of Shevchenko. This material is highly significant and, so to speak, educationally illuminative.</i></p>
--	---

For the most part, Chukovskii's *Pravda* article about Shevchenko is devoted to the critique of two translators from the Soviet era, the poets Ivan Belousov and Fedor Sologub (see also Subchapter 4.3.3). Particularly the latter is targeted for a vicious attack. Assessing Sologub's verses, Chukovskii (1938) uses words like "crude" (*topornyi*), "rough" (*brevenchatyi*), and even "stupid" (*storoosovyi*). The passage appears in the 1941 edition (pp. 45–48) of *A High Art* in an extended and elaborated form. Sologub's translation is there examined next to Belousov's, which was done during the same period. None of the two renderings passes through the discussion unscathed, but the general tone of the discussion is somewhat milder than in the *Pravda* article. With his verbal talent, Chukovskii obviously knew how to adjust his idiom to the conventions of the forum in which he was performing. In the 1930s, severe locutions were part of public discourse, and they were not confined to political texts – or rather, every public utterance was at that time perceived as political. Perhaps Chukovskii wanted to use somewhat more neutral language in *A High Art*, which was probably not censored with as fine-toothed a comb as a text intended for *Pravda*.

Criticizing Sologub's and Belousov's translations, Chukovskii notes that both translators have entirely failed to detect in Shevchenko's text the protest against the "extortionate" (*grabitel'skii*) and "exploitative" (*khishchnicheskii*) politics of the Russian Tsars, and of Nicholas I in particular. Moreover, they both have distorted Shevchenko's "spiritual character" (*dukhovnyi oblik*) by transforming his conviction of the non-existence of God and heaven into a diametrically opposed idea. Chukovskii refers to Belousov's rendition as a "reactionary sermon" (*reaktsionnaia propoved'*), whereas he accuses Sologub of "great indifference towards the revolutionary spirit (*revoliutsionnyi pafos*) of Shevchenko's poetry." (See Chukovskii 1941: 45–48.) Sologub had passed away in 1927 and Belousov in 1930, and, thus, neither of them ever saw the review.

Chukovskii's diary entry recorded on October 24, 1923 manifests an emphatic and appreciative attitude towards Sologub, who was his friend. On that day, the two of them had met at the publishing house *Vsemirnaia literatura*. Like so many other litterateurs at that time, Sologub was desperate, and he told Chukovskii about his plans to improve his material situation by beginning to translate Shevchenko.

Мне стало страшно жаль беспомощного, милого Федора Кузмича. Написал человек целый шкаф книг, известен и в Америке, и в Германии, а принужден переводить из-за куска хлеба Шевченку. (Chukovskii 2011b: 110.)

I felt terribly sorry for the helpless, dear Fedor Kuzmich. The man had written enough books to fill a bookcase, he is famous both in America and in Germany, and now he's forced to translate Shevchenko for a piece of bread.

Chukovskii's diary (2011b: 166) reveals that later, while working on the translation of Shevchenko, Sologub described to him "in detail" how he was following the meter of original. In the *Pravda* article, Chukovskii (1938) caustically remarks that Sologub's translation was made so "woodenly" (*mertvo*) and "formally" (*formal'no*) that it was a slander (*kleveta*) against Shevchenko's poetry." In the 1941 edition (pp. 237–238) of *A High Art*, Chukovskii expands on the point of view (see Table 87). The remark contains an amusingly accurate prognostication of machine translation.

Table 87

<p><i>Со всяким переводчиком случается, что он не вполне понимает то или иное место переводимого текста. Но Сологуб и не хочет понять. Он переводит механически, с равнодушием машины; если когда-нибудь изобретут переводческую машину, она будет переводить именно так: строка за строку, как подстрочник, совершенно не вникая в общий смысл того, что она переводит. (Chukovskii 1941: 237–238.)</i></p>	<p><i>It can happen to any translator that he does not quite understand one or another passage in the text he's translating. But Sologub does not even want to understand. He translates mechanically and indifferently like a machine. If one day somebody invents a translating machine, it will translate exactly like that: line by line, like an interlinear trot, without any penetration whatsoever into the general idea of that which it translates.</i></p>
--	---

The interlinear trot was a current notion in the 1930s, when works of minority Soviet nationalities were translated into Russian on the basis of such word-to-word translations (see Subchapters 4.3.2 and 4.3.3).

Chukovskii's opinion of Sologub's translation may also have been colored by the memory of a discussion that took place in 1925. From Chukovskii's (2011b: 226) diary, it turns out that all the while appreciating Shevchenko's capacity as a "musical instrument," Sologub did not have a high opinion of him as a person. He straightforwardly called the poet a "boor" (*kham*), an "ignoramus" (*nevezhda*), and a "coarse" (*grubyi*) person. In the diary entry, Chukovskii has recorded what Sologub said in quotation marks, as direct speech. He has refrained from commenting them, but considering Chukovskii's special fondness of Shevchenko (see Subchapter 4.3.3), his silence speaks loudly.

Before moving on to the tsarist era translations of Shevchenko, Chukovskii concludes the discussion about Belousov and Sologub as shown in Table 88.

Table 88

<p><i>Так искажали переводчики стихотворения Шевченко уже в революционное время. Можно представить себе, сколько искажений вносили они в текст «Кобзаря» в прежнюю эпоху, при царской цензуре. (Chukovskii 1941: 48.)</i></p>	<p><i>That is how Shevchenko's poems were distorted even in the revolutionary era. One can only imagine how many distortions were inserted into the text of Kobzar' in the previous epoch, under tsarist censorship.</i></p>
---	--

One tsarist era translator of Shevchenko who appears in various contexts in *A High Art* (Chukovskii 1941: 24–30, 50–51, 223) is Maksim Slavinskii, a prolific translator that in Chukovskii's (1941: 54) words "under the loud approval of critics translated and edited one hundred ninety-five poems of Shevchenko's, in other words nine tenths of *Kobzar's*." The discussion concerns Slavinskii's translations that were included in a volume published in 1911 for the fiftieth anniversary of Shevchenko's death. The publication is briefly mentioned in Chukovskii's article "Russkaia literatura [v 1911 godu]" ("Russian Literature [in 1911]"), published in the journal *Rech'* in that same year. (See Chukovskii 2003: 555.) Chukovskii does not mince his words when calling into question Slavinskii's suitability for translating Shevchenko.

Table 89

<p><i>Проследите, например, из страницы в страницу, как переиначивал на свой лад стихотворения Шевченко совершенно чуждый его народно-революционной эстетике салонный стихотворец Славинский, какие разнообразные меры принимал он в своем переводе, чтобы Шевченко оказался похож на него, на Славинского. (Chukovskii 1941: 24.)</i></p>	<p><i>Follow, for instance, from page to page how the poet of literary salons Slavinskii altered into his own mode the poems of Shevchenko, to whose folklike-revolutionary esthetics he was entirely alien, what various measures he took in his translation in order that Shevchenko be like him, Slavinskii.</i></p>
--	---

Chukovskii (1941: 27–28) continues criticizing Slavinskii in colorful language. He refers to the translator as a “supporter of banal style” and characterizes his manner of writing as “sugary” (*konfetnyi*) and “romance-like” (*romansovyi*). Chukovskii also calls Slavinskii by the nickname “coiffeur-manicurist” (*kuafer-manikiurshchik*). The origin of the expression – which at first sight seems like an alien species from an altogether different genre – was, reportedly, borrowed from Maiakovskii (see Chukovskii 1941: 28n1).

Slavinskii’s co-translator in the 1911 volume of Shevchenko was the poet Andrei Koltonovskii, whose translations were published in a separate volume in 1933. Chukovskii remarks about Koltonovskii that he did not share those “reactionary features” that characterized so many other translators of Shevchenko. In spite of this, even Koltonovskii fails to meet the standard. Chukovskii points out that although he had natural talent as a poet, he fell short in the area of verbal culture and, therefore, he translated “blindly, haphazardly, at random” (*vslepuiu, na-ura, naudachu*). (See Chukovskii 1941: 232.)

Two 19th century translators are mentioned by name in the *Pravda* article by Chukovskii (1938), the poets Nikolai Berg and Vsevolod Krestovskii, the latter called a “militant reactionary” (*voinstvuiushchii reaktioner*). In *A High Art*, also Berg is referred to a “reactionary,” more exactly, a reactionary “of the bureaucrat-Slavophile kind” (*kazenno-slavianofil'skogo tolka*) (Chukovskii 1941: 54; see Subchapter 4.4.2). Krestovskii is singled out, in particular, as a translator whose personal ideology makes him totally unsuitable for translating Shevchenko.

Table 90

<p><i>Не дико ли, что среди переводчиков был, например, Всеволод Крестовский, воинствующий монархист, черносотенец? Был, как мы видели, и украинский националист либерального толка М. А. Славинский, кровно заинтересованный в том, чтобы по возможности утаить от читателя интернационалистские и революционные идеи Шевченко. (Chukovskii 1941: 53.)</i></p>	<p><i>Isn't it absurd that among the translators, Vsevolod Krestovskii, for instance, was a military monarchist and a black-hundredist? As we have seen, there was also the Ukrainian nationalist of the liberal variety M. A. Slavinskii, who took a vital interest in concealing Shevchenko's internationalist and revolutionary ideas from the reader as effectively as possible.</i></p>
---	--

The Black Hundreds were a Russian monarchist and chauvinist movement that emerged as a backlash to the 1905 Revolution. Supported by Russified Ukrainians, this movement was particularly active in Ukraine. (*Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine*.) It would seem that being a Ukrainian nationalist, Slavinskii would meet the standard as a translator of Shevchenko. According to Chukovskii, however, his liberalist tendencies stood in the way of an adequate translation. Calling Slavinskii a “high society” (*salonnyi*) poet, Chukovskii (1941: 24) accuses him of watering down Shevchenko’s revolutionary esthetics and for transforming Shevchenko into a similar “indolent (*rykhlyi*) liberal” as he was himself. The juxtaposition is similar to the one of Bal’mont and Whitman (see above). In both cases, social incompatibility between the translator and the original author is blamed as the cause behind a deficient translation.

The example in Table 90 also reflects an interesting shift of the emphasis in the discussion about Shevchenko. In the beginning, he was first and foremost a "revolutionary-patriot dreaming about the liberation of Ukraine" (Chukovskii 1930: 21; see Table 27 in Subchapter 4.3.3). Now it is his "internationalist and revolutionary ideas" that are particularly drawn into the limelight.

In the example shown in Table 91, Chukovskii presents the cardinal reason behind all the faults found in past translations of Shevchenko. By "forged silence," he (Chukovskii 1941: 52–53) refers to the hardening political climate and the tightening censorship that prevailed during two decades after Shevchenko's death.

Table 91

<p><i>Вот и случилось, что вследствие этой вынужденной немоты близких к Шевченко революционных писателей, за переводы его «Кобзаря» взялись классово враждебные люди, не принимающие ни его заветных идей, ни его новаторской, сложной и смелой, эстетики. И началась фальсификация наследия Шевченко, которая окончательно прекратилась лишь в нашу эпоху. (Chukovskii 1941: 53.)</i></p>	<p><i>It turned out that due to this forged silence of the revolutionary writers close to Shevchenko, translations of his Kobzar' were undertaken by people at odds with him by class, who could neither accept his cherished ideas nor his innovative, complex, and audacious esthetics. And that's how the falsification of Shevchenko's legacy began, which did not come to a final end until our epoch.</i></p>
--	---

It would seem logical that in the above example, like in many other contexts (see Subchapter 4.3.1), the expression "our epoch" would refer to the Soviet era, the watershed being the 1917 Revolution. However, the connection is not as simple and straightforward as that, as it turns out also from the article "Iskoverkannyi perevod T. G. Shevchenko" (see Chukovskii 1938). In the article, the notion of the present epoch is more limited, quite unequivocally referring to the late 1930s. Chukovskii (1938) remarks that Gosizdat seems to be particularly keen on publishing Sologub's translations. He notes that the Soviet reader no longer settles for these but demands more "veracious" (*pravdivyi*) and "thoughtful" (*vdumchivyi*) translations, which became available only at the present time:

Такие переводы в последнее время стали появляться в советской печати в связи с предстоящим шевченковским празднеством. Среди них есть, конечно, и слабые, но нет в них тех отсебятин, постановок и вымыслов, которые в былых переводах фальсифицировали политическое лицо Шевченко. Потому что для каждого советского поэта Шевченко – великий собрат и соратник. (Chukovskii 1938.)

Such translations have recently begun to appear in Soviet publishing in connection with the forthcoming Shevchenko jubilee. Among them are, of course, also weak ones, but they do not contain those concoctions, schemes, and fabrications that in the past translations falsified Shevchenko's political image. This is because every Soviet poet sees in Shevchenko a great comrade and brother-in-arms.

Chukovskii expands on the above point of view in *A High Art*. In the chapter “Tendencies of the Soviet Style in the New Translations of Shevchenko” in the 1941 edition, he attributes the Soviet translators’s ability to empathize with Shevchenko to their being “people of a revolutionary epoch.”

Table 92

<p><i>Как люди революционной эпохи, советские переводчики чувствуют в Шевченко своего, и в их переводах уже нет и не может быть тех вольных и невольных смягчений, подтасовок и вымыслов, которые в былых переводах фальсифицировали облик Шевченко. У них так сильно развито политическое сознание, что они угадывают революционную направленность там, где прежнему читателю она была незаметна. (Chukovskii 1941: 246.)</i></p>	<p><i>As people of a revolutionary epoch, Soviet translators sense Shevchenko as one of their own, and in their translations, there no longer are and cannot be such intentional and unintentional temperings, manipulations and fabrications that in past translations falsified Shevchenko’s appearance. They have such an intensely developed political consciousness that they will divine revolutionary orientation there, where the past reader never noticed it.</i></p>
--	---

In the course of the discussion, Chukovskii (1941: 245–255) mentions by name sixteen contemporary translators. The great majority of them are contemporaries of Nikolai Chukovskii, whose “excited love” for the epoch evidently perplexed his father (see Subchapter 2.8). Born in the late 1890s or early 1900s, they were literally “people of the revolutionary era,” having witnessed two revolutions already before reaching adulthood. This point of view implies that, albeit being done soon after the Revolution, Sologub’s and Belousov’s translations (see above) were not genuine products of the revolutionary era because the translators did not belong to the revolutionary era generation – as, of course, neither did Chukovskii. Thus, here the influence of the epoch on a translation does not relate to chronological time but to people – the translators – and to the ideological milieu in which they were bred.

The poets Pavel Antokol’skii, Elena Blaginina, Vladimir Derzhavin, Vasilii Tsvelev, Aleksandr Bezymenskii, and Aleksei Surkov all represent the generation to which Chukovskii refers to in the example in Table 92 above. He singles their work out for special mention.

Table 93

<p><i>[. . .] – этими переводами определяется достаточно ясно политическая линия советской интерпретации Шевченко. (Chukovskii 1941: 246.)</i></p>	<p><i>[. . .] – these translations quite clearly determine the political line of the Soviet interpretation of Shevchenko.</i></p>
--	---

In Chukovskii’s discussion about Shevchenko, “political” is one of the key words. For instance, the problem with Berg’s translation, according to Chukovskii (1941: 54), is that Shevchenko is “politically alien” (*politicheski chuzhdyi*) to him. The contemporary poet Aleksandr Minikh, in contrast, is commended for his “deep understanding” of the politi-

cal idea (*politicheskaia mysl'*) of a certain poem of Shevchenko's (Chukovskii 1941: 245). In general, the strength of the young generation of translators appears to be their "intensely developed political consciousness" (Chukovskii 1941: 246; see table 92 above).

The emphasis in Chukovskii's discussion about Shevchenko evinces how ideological and political aspects increasingly gained ground in Soviet culture in the 1930s. The new political undercurrents in *A High Art* are evident also in the remark shown in Table 94.

Table 94

<p><i>Правда, и сейчас еще порою встречаются сознательные, преднамеренные отклонения от переводимого текста, но современный читатель воспринимает их как нечто уродливое, враждебное идейным установкам советской культуры. (Chukovskii 1941: 33.)</i></p>	<p><i>Even today, one now and then comes upon conscious, deliberate deviations from the original, but the contemporary reader will perceive this as something that is deformed, at odds with the ideological guidelines of Soviet culture.</i></p>
--	--

The above passage appears as a sequel to the one in which Chukovskii (1941: 33) calls for maximal approximation of translations with their originals (see Table 43 in Subchapter 4.4.1).

In the 1936 edition (p. 37), the chapter "The Social Nature of the Translator" begins with the demonstration of errors found in the dictionaries of some Soviet minority nationalities. In the 1941 edition (p. 37–38), the passage had been expanded, but the opening line remains the same.

Table 95

<p><i>Переводчик нередко пользуется переводимыми текстами для укрепления и защиты своих собственных социальных позиций. (Chukovskii 1936a: 37; 1941: 37.)</i></p>	<p><i>The translator often uses the text he is translating for bolstering and defending his own social standpoints.</i></p>
---	---

In the 1936 edition of *A High Art* (p. 37), Chukovskii continues by cursorily listing a few defective translations of ideologically colored words in dictionaries from Russian into minority nationality languages without further commenting on them. No source of reference is provided, but it seems that the examples have been taken from the ongoing public discourse (see Witt 2013: 153–154). The 1941 edition (p. 37) was complemented with a new passage, the topic of which is the newly published Turkish translation of Stalin's work *Ob osnovakh leninizma* ("The Foundations of Leninism," 1924). In the discussion, Chukovskii (1941: 37; see Table 96) refers to a *Pravda* article titled "Istoriia odnogo perevoda 'Ob osnovakh leninizma'" ("The History of One Translation of 'Foundations of Leninism'"). The article was published in June 1936 as part of *Pravda's* coverage of nationality translation (see Subchapter 4.3.2). Its authors were two Party leaders from the Azerbaijan and Bashkir Soviet republics, Mirza Davud Guseinov and Khadzhi Gabidullin, the latter also known as a historian and turkolog. (About Guseinov and Gabidullin, see also Subchapter 4.5.1.)

Table 96

<p><i>Года три тому назад в Стамбуле вышла в переводе на турецкий язык монументальная работа тов. Сталина «Об основах ленинизма». (Chukovskii 1941: 37.)</i></p>	<p><i>Some three years ago, there came out in Istanbul a Turkish translation of comrade Stalin's monumental work "The Foundations of Leninism."</i></p>
--	---

According to the *Pravda* article in question, the Turkish translator Khaidar Rifat had "arbitrarily proclaimed himself as the co-author of comrade Stalin." The argument is demonstrated with the help of several examples of such cases in which the translator has erroneously reproduced individual words or sentences or even omitted material included in the original text. It turns out that everywhere in the translation, even in the very title of the book, the word "Leninism" had been replaced with the phrase "*Lenin mezhebi*," which, translated back from Turkish into Russian, would mean "the religion of Lenin" (*Leninskaia religiia*). The authors of the article interpret the deficiencies in the translation as the intended and systematic re-writing of Stalin's original words. (See Gabidullin & Guseinov 1936.)

It is the word "leninism" that Chukovskii uses as an example in *A High Art*. He complements Gabidullin's and Guseinov's text by providing yet another Russian translation of the phrase "*Lenin mezhebi*:" "the dogmatics of Lenin" (*verouchenie Lenina*). In the article, Gabidullin and Guzeinov mentioned the word *verouchenie* in another context, noting that the translator Rifat had used the word both when speaking about Marx and when speaking about Buddha.

The passage shown in Table 97 is from Chukovskii's own pen, not borrowed from the *Pravda* article. Chukovskii comments on the above mistranslated word with indignation – either genuine or feigned.

Table 97

<p><i>Искажено одно только слово, и тем самым исковеркана целая книга. Благодаря этому одному искажению мы все, весь Советский Союз, представлены какими-то сектантами, набожными приверженцами ленинской церкви, а научный социализм, вся сила которого заключается именно в том, что он впервые на нашей планете подчиняет исторические процессы науке, превращен в одно из многих религиозных течений, где разум подчиняется догме. (Chukovskii 1941: 37.)</i></p>	<p><i>Only one distorted word, and the entire book is corrupted. Because of this one distortion we all, the entire Soviet Union, are presented as some kind of sectarians, devout adherents to the church of Lenin, and scientific Socialism, which is so powerful particularly because it is the first on our planet to subordinate the historical processes to science, is transformed into one of those numerous religious tendencies in which reason is subordinated to dogma.</i></p>
---	--

After the passage about Stalin's *Ob osnovakh leninizma*, the discussion continues in a similar tenor. The list of errors in dictionaries that was already included in the 1936 edition (p. 37; see above) appears in an expanded form. Furthermore, Chukovskii (1941: 37–38) elaborates on some of the examples that earlier were only briefly mentioned. The comments

imply the Soviet minority nationality translators are either quite ignorant in the sphere of Soviet politics, or perhaps, worse still, deliberately cultivate ideologically questionable translations. In the example shown in Table 98, Russian original authors are juxtaposed with Mordvin translators.

Table 98

<p>Русский автор пишет, например, о социалистическом соревновании. Для него социалистическое соревнование одна из форм братского сотрудничества. А мордовский переводчик переводит: работа вперегонку, то есть конкуренция, злое соперничество, построенное на капиталистической потогонной системе труда. (Chukovskii 1941: 37–38.)</p>	<p>A Russian author writes, for instance, about Socialist competition. For him, Socialist competition is a form of brotherly collaboration.</p>
--	---

Another “malicious” (*zlostnyi*) distortion was made by the “Kazakh nationalists,” who replaced the word “revolution” with the “inoffensive word ‘change’ (*izmenenie*).” Chukovskii (1941: 38) suggests that the mistranslation was due to their secret wish that the Revolution would degenerate into “gradualism” (*postepenovshchina*), “peaceful reformism of the liberal kind” (*mirnyi reformizm liberal’nogo tolka*).

Like the example from the Communist Manifesto (Chukovskii 1936a: 83; 1941: 80–81; see Subchapter 4.4.2), the examples from the dictionaries of Soviet minority nationalities and from Stalin’s work *Ob osnovakh leninizma* stand out like sore thumbs in the book devoted to the artistic translation of literature. If they are meant to function in *A High Art* as “quota references” to politically correct issues, then in the 1941 edition, the quota is complemented with a reference to Friedrich Engels. As the source of information, Chukovskii presents Engels’ “famous” (*znamenityi*) article “Kak ne sleduet perevodit’ Marksa” (“How Marx Should Not Be Translated”), published in 1937 in the collected works of Marx and Engels. The citation relates to a translation from English into German, and, therefore, it seems particularly out of place in *A High Art*. On top of all that, it is situated in the middle of examples of translations into Russian from English and from French. (See Chukovskii 1941: 211–212.) Formulated somewhat differently, the indirect quotation from Engels is also included in the following editions of *A High Art*; 1964 (p. 13), 1966 (pp. 249–250), and 1968 (p. 17).

Mentioned together with Stalin already in the opening line of the foreword (p. 3; see Table 18 in Subchapter 4.3.2), Lenin also gets his fair share of attention in the 1941 edition. In the discussion about the article “Ob osnovakh leninizma” (see above), his name or its derivatives appear nine times on one and single page (see Chukovskii 1941: 37). By and large, the chapter “The Social Nature of the Translator” presents a confusing *mélange* of topics extending from Zhukovskii to Lenin to Stalin.

By the time the 1941 edition of *A High Art* was released, the article “Sotsial’naia priroda perevodchika” (Chukovskii 1940a) had already been published in the journal *Literaturnaia ucheba* (see Subchapter 4.1). It had also already been attacked. In December 1940, *Pravda*

published an article titled "Chemy uchit "Literaturnaia ucheba" ("Whom Does 'Literary Studies' Teach?") by the playwright and journalist Aleksandr Shtein. The principal theme of the article is critique of the entire journal and its editorship. The author points out that the journal is supposed to help young writers adopt Socialist esthetics and a Marxist-Leninist outlook on culture, but all it has to offer is "pseudo-scientific analyses," homespun literary sonnets," and "vulgar sociology" (analyzing literature purely in terms of its socio-economic underpinnings; see Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 210). As an example of the latter, Shtein presents Chukovskii's (1940) article. He ridicules Chukovskii's suggestion that the translation always manifests the translator's social nature. What particularly outrages Shtein in the article is Chukovskii's assessment of Zhukovskii's translations (see above), considering that, at their time, they were "admired by Belinskii." (See Shtein 1940.)

No doubt, Chukovskii was well aware of the incompatibility of the chapter "The Social Nature of the Translator" with the general line followed by *A High Art*. The reasons and motives behind the chapter can be speculated, but one very plausible explanation is that Chukovskii was doing his best to adapt every edition to current conventions. That would have been necessary merely in order to ensure as smooth and rapid a publishing process as possible. However, the timing of the discussion about what Shtein condemned as vulgar sociology was unfortunate. As Karen Petrone (2000: 137–138) points out, since RAPP was abolished in 1932 (see Subchapter 2.7), that particular variety of Marxist criticism was already "dangerously behind the times."

On the other hand, when mentions of Lenin or Stalin, or other politically correct topics materialize in a work representing a fundamentally unpolitical genre, the possibility of an Aesopian subtext must also be taken into consideration. The possible presence of Aesopian language in *A High Art* is further discussed in Subchapter 4.5.2.

4.4.4 Polemics around Shakespeare

Considering Chukovskii's longstanding interest and expertise in the English language and literature (see Subchapter 2.1), it seems only natural that English classics are given a lot of column space in *A High Art*. In the first three editions, the lion's share of attention is given to Charles Dickens, who was one of Chukovskii's favorite writers. Chukovskii would often amuse himself by finding equivalents among Dickens' characters for his own friends and acquaintances. (See Chukovskaia, E. et al. 2001: 590.) The attention given to Dickens in *A High Art* may also be explained by the fact that the Victorian era novelist had been extremely popular in Russia since the 19th century. Getting acquainted with Dickens was part of the "intellectual and spiritual education" of the Russian reader, and the influence of Dickens in the formation of the 20th century writer was recognized. In the agenda of the publishing house Vsemirnaia literatura, Dickens was one of the most important Western writers. In fact, the studio of Vsemirnaia literatura (see Subchapter 2.4) significantly contributed to Dickens' eventually becoming part of the Soviet literary canon. (See Finer 2013: 104, 107). Of course, the solidarity the novelist displayed for the poor and the oppressed was also in perfect accord with the Socialist ethos.

In the 1930s, William Shakespeare emerged as an iconic representative of Western literature in the Soviet Union. In a *Pravda* editorial in 1935, he was cited as a model for the great Soviet culture. Katerina Clark examines the significance of Shakespeare productions in Soviet theatres against a "cult of passion," prevalent in the mid-1930s as part of a general

European trend. Among those productions, plays that featured the themes of tragic love and death held a predominant position. (Clark 2011: 23, 139, 245—247.) In 1935, the theatre critic P. A. Markov described the phenomenon as follows:

Из глубины столетий на нашу сцену пришла полнокровная жизнь, полнокровные образы, в которых высокая жизненная правда соединена с такой же высокой поэзией. В Шекспире театры ищут путь к большим и сильным чувствам, к подлинной трагедии. (Markov 1977: 120.)

From the depths of centuries, a full-blooded life, full-blooded images came to our stage. In them, the high truth of life is combined with such high poetry. In Shakespeare, theatres search for a way to great and powerful feelings, to a genuine tragedy.

The year 1935, in particular, was a veritable “year of Shakespeare” in the Soviet Union, with exceptionally high numbers of his plays premiered. In public discourse, Shakespeare was a frequently occurring topic. Except for the eternal question about whether he, indeed, was the genuine author of his works, the superiority of one Russian translation over another was disputed. A prominent forum for the debate was provided by the Shakespeare Conference, which convened on November 25—27, 1935. (Clark 2011: 184.)

Shakespeare’s name is first mentioned in *A High Art* only in the 1930 edition, but in the 1936 edition, his name appears more frequently than Dickens.’ In the 1941 edition, the shift of emphasis from Dickens to Shakespeare is all the more marked. Separate chapters in the 1936 (pp. 128—184) and 1941 (109—181) editions are devoted to recent Shakespeare anthologies, published in 1934 and in 1939, respectively. The discussion about Shakespeare is particularly interesting in these two editions because it is directly connected with the current public discourse. Chukovskii’s participation in that discourse was not confined to *A High Art*: he also wrote articles about the topic for newspapers and journals (see Subchapter 4.1). Furthermore, from an entry recorded in Chukovskii’s (2011b: 545) diary on November 29, 1934, it turns out that he lectured about Shakespeare for the Translators Section of the Writers’ Union. In his diary, Chukovskii does not elaborate on the lecture except for mentioning that the reception was cold. However, the date of the entry suggests that the principal topic of the lecture may have been a new Shakespeare anthology.

In the 1936 edition of *A High Art*, the Shakespeare chapter consists of Chukovskii’s (1935b) article “Edinoborstvo s Shekspirom,” which was published in *Krasnaia nov’* (see Subchapter 4.1). Titled “A Duel with Shakespeare,” pp. 128—184), the chapter contains Chukovskii’s reviews of Mikhail Kuzmin’s, Mikhail Lozinskii’s, and Tatiana Shchepkina-Kupernik’s translations (see also Subchapter 4.3.3). Only Solov’ev’s translation is entirely omitted from the review, both in *A High Art*, in *Pravda* (see Subchapter 4.1), and in *Krasnaia nov’*. A poet and a priest, Solov’ev had been arrested in 1931 and initially sentenced to exile, but because of his fragile psyche, he had not endured the interrogations in the Lubyanka prison and had been committed to a mental institution, instead (Solov’eva 1993). Because of Solov’ev’s situation, Chukovskii may have refrained from discussing him.

If Solov’ev’s arrest was, indeed, for Chukovskii a reason for circumspection, Lozinskii’s arrest obviously was not. A close friend of Nikolai Gumilev’s (see Subchapter 4.5.1), Lozinskii was interrogated by Cheka at the time of the Civil War, and during the following

years he grew accustomed to his home being searched one time after another. In 1932, he received a three-year suspended sentence for “the standard charge of anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation.” What ultimately seems to have protected him was being on good terms with the right people, and also Gor’kii’s protection. (See Ivanovskii 2005.) As his visibility at the First All-Union Conference of Translators (see Subchapter 4.4.2) indicates, Lozinskii was a prominent figure in Soviet literature in the 1930s.

The present study focuses on the review of Kuzmin’s translation of Shakespeare’s play *King Lear*, because it is by far the most censorious of the three reviews. In the *Pravda* article, the unsuccessful translator was left unidentified, but in *Krasnaia nov’*, Kuzmin is mentioned by name. Incidentally, Chukovskii was entrusted with assessing and editing Kuzmin’s translations already in the early 20th century while he was contributing to the journal *Niva*. In the spring of 1912, Chukovskii wrote Kuzmin a letter to inform him that the journal had not delivered full payment for his translation of the Irish poet and playwright Oscar Wilde so far, due to some errors in the translation. In the letter, Chukovskii explained the errors in detail and, as it turns out, his corrections were taken into consideration in the final text. (See Chukovskii 2008a: 295–296.)

Chukovskii and Kuzmin were also colleagues at the publishing house *Vsemirnaia literatura* (see Subchapter 2.4), where the latter worked as a translator and editor in the French department (Hickey 2009: 93). There are no comments in Chukovskii’s diary about their cooperation at *Vsemirnaia literatura*.

Chukovskii was not the only critic who found deficiencies in Kuzmin’s rendition of *King Lear*. For instance, Aleksandr Smirnov – who had, in fact, attended to the editing of the anthology (see Rozanov 1934: 5) – would refer to it as a failure among Kuzmin’s translations. He considered Kuzmin more successful as a translator of the comic genre than the tragic. (See Burlëshin 2008.)

Kuzmin is first mentioned in *A High Art* in the 1930 edition, and in a positive connection. Chukovskii praises the institution of editors that Gor’kii had first established at the publishing house *Vsemirnaia literatura* (see Table 72 in Subchapter 4.4.2). He points out that the practice has already produced a “veritable cooperative of irreproachable workers” (*tselnaia artel’ bezuprechnykh rabotnikov*). As examples of those irreproachable workers, Chukovskii mentions Kuzmin, Lozinskii, Smirnov, and Adrian Frankovskii. (See Chukovskii 1930: 68–69.) In the corresponding passage in the 1936 edition (p. 186), the list of names is identical, with the exception of Kuzmin. His name had been removed and replaced with the Symbolist poet and translator Vil’gel’m Zorgenfrei (see Subchapter 4.5.1). Perhaps Chukovskii felt that such a positive assessment would be inconsistent with the discussion about Kuzmin elsewhere in the book, particularly if juxtaposed with being called a “weak” translator of Shakespeare (Chukovskii 1936a: 142; see Table 5 in Subchapter 4.3.1).

Chukovskii never made secret of his opinion about Kuzmin as a poet. That is apparent, for instance, in two articles that were published in the journal *Rech’* in 1908 and 1909. In the first one, titled “O khikhikaiushchikh” (“About the Snickerers”), Chukovskii (2003: 376–382) introduces a certain type of author that he labels as a “snickerer.” The word refers to somebody whose every work is dominated by an ironic smirk, a constant “*khi-khi*.” In the discussion, in which the premise is that “geniuses never smirk,” Kuzmin is presented as a representative of those who do. In the second article, Chukovskii (2003: 415) describes “the quintessence of Kuzmin’s art” in quite a similar tone. He argues that whatever the topic

and whatever the poet is saying, “he always says it in a coquettish manner” (*on vseгда govorit eto zhemaniyas*’), wearing “that peculiar smile.”

Another illustrating example is the following assessment of Kuzmin’s work, recorded in Chukovskii’s diary on February 13, 1921. In this entry, Chukovskii tells about the program at the commemorative event of the 84th anniversary of Pushkin’s death at the House of Arts (see Hickey 2009: 134–135).

Стишки М. Кузмина, прошепелявленные не без ужимки, - стихи на случай - очень обыкновенные. (Chukovskii 2011a: 320.)

Kuzmin lisped and minced his way through some unexciting little poems written for the occasion. (Erlich 2005: 81.)

In the 1936 edition of *A High Art*, Chukovskii begins the extensive main chapter titled “Duel with Shakespeare” with a subchapter titled “A New *King Lear*” (*Novyi “Korol’ Lir”*). This subchapter points out deficiencies in Kuzmin’s translation of *King Lear*. The following paragraphs summarize the eleven ways in which, according to Chukovskii, Shakespeare is distorted in Kuzmin’s translation.

The first way of distortion (p. 128–129) is the total conversion of what is said in the original, for instance altering the expression “almost impossible” into “possible.” The second way (p. 129) is what Chukovskii calls the “idiotizing” (*idiotizatsiia*) of the text. By this, he refers to impossible concepts that appear in the translation, such as “pearls of diamonds.” In this context, Chukovskii also points out some mistakenly translated words, which he ascribes to the translator’s mere “nodding acquaintance” (*shapochnoe znakomstvo*) with the English language.

The third way of distortion (p. 129–130), “the cruelest” (*naibolee zhestokii*) and “the most prevalent” one, entails the transformation of Shakespeare’s verses into “something like the intermittent barking of a dog” (*nekotoroe podobie preryvistogo sobach’ego laia*). As an example of such a case, Chukovskii presents a passage in which the translator has replaced the one and only pause in the original with six pauses, thereby causing “great loss to Shakespeare’s complex intonations.” He describes the effect as shown in Table 99.

Table 99

<p><i>Вместо богатой психологическими оттенками речи - однообразное фельдфебельское рывканье. (Chukovskii 1936a: 130.)</i></p>	<p><i>A language rich in psychological nuances has been replaced with the monotonous bellowing of a drill sergeant.</i></p>
--	---

That intermittent quality of language was something that also Smirnov observed in his review (see Burlashin 2008).

The fourth way of distortion (pp. 131–132) is the translator’s striving, first and foremost, for briefness instead of striving for precision. In consequence, the translation is marked by what Chukovskii calls a “telegram style.” Using one of his characteristically colorful expressions, he also remarks that Kuzmin “chops off the hands and feet” from Shakespeare’s phrases so as to be able to “squeeze them into his own cramped (*malovmestitel’nyi*) verse.”

The fifth way of distortion (p. 132–133) includes the removal of important epithets, whereas the sixth one (p. 133) is a diametrically opposing tendency. This is the translator’s manner of inserting into the text new epithets that were never in the original. The seventh way (p. 133) is an unnatural conciseness of words, which Chukovskii explains by the translator’s wanting to maintain “at any cost” exactly the same number of lines in the translation as there were in the original. – A similar aspect is included in Chukovskii’s review of Anna Radlova’s Shakespeare translation in the 1941 edition of *A High Art* (see below).

The eighth way (p. 133–134) of distortion is the Russification of Shakespeare’s text. Chukovskii notes that in Kuzmin’s translations, an English earl speaks like the Russian common man. The ninth way of distortion (p. 134) is “slipshod” (*neriashchliovyi*) treatment of the Russian language. In the midst of the critique, Chukovskii quite unexpectedly doles out praise for Kuzmin the poet.

Table 100

<p><i>Это кажется почти невероятным, чтобы такой сильный поэт, как Кузмин, такой замечательный мастер стиха, обнаруживал столь малое знакомство с правилами российской грамматики. (Chukovskii 1936a: 134.)</i></p>	<p><i>It appears almost incredible that such a powerful poet as Kuzmin, such a remarkable master of verse, would display so little knowledge of the rules of Russian grammar.</i></p>
---	---

The grandiloquent words may either be taken at face value or interpreted as irony. Chukovskii’s earlier comments about Kuzmin support the latter alternative, as does, of course, the rest of the review. The expressions might well be borrowed from the poet himself, who apparently had a liking for a similar style. For instance, in one review, Kuzmin had referred to Anna Radlova as a “genuine remarkable poet with great flight and horizons” (*podlinnyi zamechatel’nyi poet s bol’shim poletom i gorizontami*) (see Chukovskaia, L. 2013a: 312). Equipped with his linguistic talent, Chukovskii could very easily have picked up the tenor and, at a suitable opportunity, used it for a variation of his own.

Perhaps even more likely, Chukovskii is parodying somebody else’s assessment of Kuzmin, for instance, the following one by the literary scholar Viktor Zhirmunskii. Written in 1934, the comment is related to Kuzmin’s then unfinished translation of the English poet Lord Byron’s satiric poem “Don Juan,” of which Zhirmunskii was the editor (see Time 2006: 166–167).

Перевод сделан большим поэтом, мастером русского стиха, [. . .] (Time 2006: 167.)

The translation was done by a great poet, a master of Russian verse, [. . .]

An excoriating review by Dmitrii Sviatopolk-Mirskii, however, caused the publishing house Academia to withdraw the translation of *Don Juan*. Kuzmin died before managing to revise the translation, which was eventually left in the archive of the publishing house. (Time 2006: 166.)

If, indeed, it was Zhirmunskii’s comment that Chukovskii had in mind when formulating the phrase shown in Table 100 above, then also the rest of Zhirmunskii’s phrase is

implicitly present: "but – by a master very much out of tune with the original" (*no – masterom, ochen' nesozvuchnym originalu*). Zhirmunskii pointed out that in principle, Kuzmin did translate precisely, but not in the style of the original. Instead, he colored the translation with his own personal style. (See Time 167–168.) Chukovskii may even have wanted to create a connotation between this statement and the tenth way (p. 135) of distorting Shakespeare, which is the "decolorizing" (*obestsvechivanie*) of the idiosyncratic expressions of the English text. Whereas the third way of distortion is the "cruellest" one (see above), this one is "the most destructive" (*samyi razrushitel'nyi*) one, because it insults Shakespeare more than the rest of the ways all added up.

Both in the articles and in the 1936 edition of *A High Art* (pp. 128, 135), Chukovskii mentions that Kuzmin's translation includes *eleven* ways of distorting Shakespeare. In the *Pravda* article "Iskazhennyi Shekspir" (Chukovskii 1934: 3), only five of them are introduced – perhaps due to limited column space. In the article "Edinoborstvo s Shekspirom," Chukovskii (1935b: 182–184) introduces the same ten ways that were discussed above. The eleventh way is never specified. Further in the discussion about Shakespeare, Chukovskii briefly returns to the tenth way, and in the same context he criticizes Kuzmin of tidying off Shakespeare's metaphors. This could be regarded as part of the "decoloring" of the text, but on the other hand, it might also be what Chukovskii means by the eleventh way of distorting Shakespeare. (See Chukovskii 1936a: 167–168, 175–176.)

The numbered account of the deficiencies in Kuzmin's translation functions as an effective rhetorical device that puts the focus on the translator's colossal failure. It appears as if Chukovskii has expressly tried to produce as many items in the list as possible. Otherwise, for instance, the fourth and the seventh ways of distortion (see above) might have been seen as manifestations of a similar tendency.

Table 101 shows the ending of the subchapter "Duel with Shakespeare," which reveals the author's impeccable sense of drama. The citation is from Kuzmin's *King Lear* (see Rozanov 1934: 279).

Table 101

<p><i>Но даже из вышеизложенного, я надеюсь, читателю ясно, что, если бы Шекспиру довелось познакомиться с этой новой версией «Лира», он непременно сказал бы то самое, что, по словам переводчика, сказал о своем сыне разгневанный Глостер: Не мое изделие!</i> (Chukovskii 1936a: 135.)</p>	<p><i>But even from the foregoing, I hope it becomes clear to the reader that if Shakespeare could acquaint himself with this new version of King Lear, he would certainly say the same that, in the words of the translator, the incensed Earl of Gloster said about his son: Not my making!</i></p>
--	---

In order to illuminate Chukovskii's point of view in the above example, in the present study, the quotation from Shakespeare's *King Lear* was freely retranslated back into English from the Russian translation. In the original text (Shakespeare 1984: 840), it reads: "I never got him!"

The tendency to which Aleksei Burchin (2008) refers as Chukovskii's "considerable efforts for the dethroning (*razvenchanie*) of Mikhail Kuzmin" has attracted the attention of

researchers. For instance, John E. Malmstad and Nikolay Bogomolov (1999: 341) characterize Chukovskii's treatment of Kuzmin with the epithet "savage." After the article "Izkhennyi Shekspir" had been published in *Pravda* in 1934, Rozanov wrote Kuzmin a letter in which he tried to explain the unfortunate occurrences that had eventually resulted in such an excoriating review:

При печатании Вашего перевода «Короля Лира» типография допустила ряд досадных опечаток, которые и дали Чуковскому повод (хотя и совершенно недостаточный) учинить неприличную вылазку в «Правде». (Kuzmin 1998: 299–300.)

At the printing of Your translation of *King Lear*, the printing plant made a number of vexatious typographical errors, which gave Chukovskii grounds (although entirely insufficient) for making the unseemly combat in *Pravda*.

The above comment by Rozanov implies that some of the examples that Chukovskii had chosen to demonstrate Kuzmin's "ways of distorting Shakespeare" were, in actual fact, typographical errors made by the printer.

The examples discussed above are not included in the 1941 edition of *A High Art*, which omits the entire chapter "Duel with Shakespeare." In its place, however, is an elaborated version of the passage that discusses Kuzmin's endeavor to maintain the original number of lines in the translation (see Chukovskii 1941: 109–110). In the 1936 edition (p. 133), that tendency was introduced as Kuzmin's seventh way of distorting Shakespeare (see above).

Aleksei Burlëshin (2008) suggests that Chukovskii's vicious review of Kuzmin manifested his "overt partiality" (*iaonaia pristrastnost'*) in the matter. He recalls to the reader Chukovskii's early poem "Sovremennoe" ("Contemporary"), published in the journal *Svobodnye mysli* ("Free Thoughts") in 1908. Burlëshin interprets the poem as a "rude parody" of Kuzmin and remarks that already at that time, Chukovskii was biased against the poet. The first stanza of the poem opens as follows:

*Милый друг! Достань-ка венник
И пойдем со мной в предбанник.
Подарю тебе полтинник...*

*Milyi drug! Dostan'-ka venik
I poidem so mnoi v predbannik.
Podariu tebe poltinnik...*
(Chukovskii 2002b: 191.)

The one and the same rhyme *-nik* recurs throughout the entire stanza, line after line. The Author-Self of the poem is inviting "the choice of my passions" (*moikh strastei izbrannik*) to join him in the sauna (*ban'ia*), with the promise of a present of fifty kopeks ("Today I don't begrudge the money because it's my name day"). The second stanza is built on the same principle, only the recurring rhyme is now *-lok* (*zatylok, palok, shchelok*, and so on). (See Chukovskii 2002b: 191–192.) An exact translation of the above excerpt is impossible because of the cultural realia included, but the absurd combination of the homely and the lofty that

characterize the entire poem would have been apparent to the Russian reader. Moreover, the poem seems as if it was written in a deliberately factitious and awkward manner. It is bizarre, banal, and suggestive all at the same time.

The poem “Sovremennoe” ends with a suggestion of an “*odnopol'yi potselui*” (“same-sex kiss”; see Chukovskii 2002b: 192). It might be speculated whether Kuzmin’s overt homosexuality might have been an issue for Chukovskii and contributed to his negative attitude towards the poet. On the other hand, the poem touched upon a very current topic. Only two years earlier, Kuzmin had published his first novel, titled *Kryl'ia* (“Wings”), “the world’s first homosexual coming-out narrative” (see Healey 2002: 145). Deemed as “pornographic” and “sodomistic” (*muzhelozhnyi*), the novel caused a public outcry as soon as it appeared. Kuzmin was labeled with a scandalous reputation that would cling to him for years. (Levina-Parker 2007.) The novel also generated a series of humoristic reviews in the press, the main theme of which was Kuzmin in the sauna. The theme would live on in various anecdotes until the late Soviet era. (Bershtein 2005.) All those jokes were probably inspired by the significant role of the sauna in the novel *Kryl'ia*, in which it represented the “womb” of the homosexual circles of Saint Petersburg (see Panova 2007). With his ever-acute antennae for current topics, Chukovskii may have written the travesty with the particular intention of contributing to that public discourse.

However, a derisive remark in the Chukokkala album supports the speculation that, for one reason or another, Chukovskii may, indeed, have harbored a personal distaste for Kuzmin. One double-page spread in the album (see Chukovskii 2008b: 166–167) contains a caricature of a Petrograd ball in 1907 with a number of litterateurs present. In the drawing, Chukovskii singles out Kuzmin, who is portrayed in the background – in Chukovskii’s words – “coquettishly (*zhemanno*) feeding an apple to his latest lover – whose name I’ve already forgotten.”

Kuzmin perished in 1936 after having been hospitalized since the spring 1935 (Malmstad & Bogomolov 1999: 357). It would be easy to draw parallels between Kuzmin’s falling ill and the appearance of the latest publication of Chukovskii’s article “Edinoborstvo s Shekspirom” in *Krasnaia nov'* only a couple of months earlier. On the other hand, putting all the blame on Chukovskii would be simplistic and unfair in that Kuzmin’s state of health had always been precarious. As John Malmstad and Nikolay Bogomolov (1999: 15) point out, “from his earliest years he had faced death.” In spite of this, some of Kuzmin’s contemporaries appear to have associated Chukovskii’s review with the final deterioration of the poet’s health. For instance, Zhirmunskii, in a letter to the publishing house Academia, referred to “the painful effect” that Chukovskii’s article had produced. Zhirmunskii emphasized that “Kuzmin then fell ill.” (See Bursleshin 2008.) Within a few years, many of Kuzmin’s acquaintances would consider him lucky to have died when he did. Had he been alive, he would almost certainly have shared the fate of his lover and companion, the writer and artist Iurii Iurkun, who was arrested and executed in connection with the Pereval case (see Subchapter 2.7). (Malmstad & Bogomolov 1999: 227, 363.) Moreover, had Kuzmin lived a little longer, his sexual orientation might have become a potential danger for him because homosexuality became a criminal offense in Soviet legislation in the 1930s (see Healey 2002: 154).

Chukovskii’s attitude to Kuzmin was probably a matter of common knowledge at the time, and that, in turn, may have biased the reception of his review among his con-

temporaries. Kuzmin's final illness and death coinciding with the publicity around the Shakespeare translation only emphasized the ostensible juxtaposition of the victim and the victimizer. However, Kuzmin was hardly the only one who received similar treatment in *A High Art*. In the same very context, at least as heavy artillery is directed at the editor Rozanov. In the chapter in the 1936 edition titled "The Editor of Shakespeare" ("*Redaktor Shekspira*"), Chukovskii derides Rozanov's introductory articles to the translations, speaking about the editor's "absence of the most elementary taste" (*otsutstvie samogo elementarnogo vkusa*) and about his "inferior esthetics" (*nizkoprobnaia estetika*). Chukovskii also sarcastically notes that although Rozanov "passes over in silence" Shakespeare's ideology, some of his comments suggest that Shakespeare's worldview was almost identical with the Soviet one. Chukovskii particularly scorns Rozanov for his presentation of the magician-protagonist in the play *The Tempest*, Prospero, as comparable with a scientist and for his reference to the play as a "hymn to the glory of science" (see Rozanov 1934: 438; perhaps due to a typographical error, the page number given in Chukovskii's source of reference is 483). (See Chukovskii 1936: 135–139.) In the *Pravda* article, Chukovskii (1934) also suggests that, with Rozanov's "syllogisms," it would be easy to demonstrate, for instance, that *Romeo and Juliet* was written for to glorify the producers' cooperative.

At the end of the chapter, Chukovskii gives his final verdict of the anthology.

Table 102

<p>Таково ли должно быть шекспироведение у нас в СССР в 1934 году? Не пора ли и в этой области упразднить былую дилетантщину и заменить ее строго-научными методами? Не пора ли положить конец чревоуещанию старозаветных шаманов? (Chukovskii 1936a: 139.)</p>	<p>Is this how Shakespeare should be handled in our Soviet Union in 1934? Isn't it time for past dilettantism to be abolished also in this area and replaced with strictly scientific methods? Isn't it time to put an end to the ramblings of ancient shamans?</p>
---	---

The least that can be said about Chukovskii's treatment of Rozanov is that he was not let off any more lightly than Kuzmin. Examining different editions of *A High Art*, it is easy to see that in every edition, there are reviews that stand out as particularly trenchant. In the 1930 edition (pp. 9–20), the target of such treatment is Bal'mont, who gets his fair share also in the 1936 edition (pp. 18–21, 23–26, 47–51). As to Irinard Vvedenskii, Chukovskii (1920: 48; 1930: 61; 1936a: 102; 1941: 186) calls him an "ignoramus" (*nevezhda*) and a "liar" (*vral'*). In the 1941 edition, despite the inclusion of some passages of Kuzmin critique (pp. 13–17), the obvious main target is Anna Radlova (see below).

There is also another matter to be considered. At least in some cases, Chukovskii's seemingly overstated expressions may simply manifest the author's boisterous and unabashed joy of writing. The writer L. Panteleev (2012a: 277) has affectionately called Chukovskii "a gray-haired enfant terrible" and "Huckleberry Finn in an Oxford University Professor's gown." It appears as if Chukovskii sometimes let himself be carried away up to the point of turning into a caricaturist, a role internalized already in his critic days. This caricaturist style of Chukovskii's was often commented by his contemporaries, for instance, by Valerii Briusov in 1908 (see Ivanova 2002a: 15–16) and by Viktor Shklovskii in 1919 (see

Mel'gunov 2005: 6–7). In the literary journal *Novyi mir* in 1958, the critic Oleg Mikhailov characterized Chukovskii's methods as "utmost overemphasizing" (*predel'noe zaostrenie*) and "justified exaggeration" (*opravdannaiia utrirovka*) (see Mel'gunov 2005: 11).

On the other hand, perhaps "method" is not quite the correct word in this context because, for all intents and purposes, the question was not of a deliberately chosen method but rather of the author's innate characteristics. Lidiia Chukovskaia puts it as follows:

Кроме неожиданных мыслей бурными эмоциями полны все его статьи о литературе. (Chukovskaia, L. 2012: 109.)

Except for unexpected ideas, all his articles about literature are filled with ardent emotions.

A significant aspect of Chukovskii's critique of Kuzmin is that, unlike the case of Irinar'd Vvedenskii, the target of the critique was alive and, unlike the case of Konstantin Bal'mont, had not emigrated abroad but still lived in the Soviet Union. Other significant aspects about the article "Iskazhennyi Shekspir" were its timing and the forum in which it was published. As Bursleshin (2008) points out, it appeared on the threshold of the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers in the official mouthpiece of the Party. Bursleshin considers the potential consequences of the article as the most aggravating factor:

И здесь самое важное – факт сообщения об «искаженном Шекспире» не в каком-нибудь узкоспециализированном издании, а в главной газете страны, где самый факт такой публикации мог послужить сигналом для принятия весьма решительных мер против Кузмина и его соратников по цеху, вредительски лишивших героический советский народ правильного советского Шекспира. (Bursleshin 2008.)

And what is most important here is that the report on the "distorted Shakespeare" was not presented in some work of a specialized field but in the country's central newspaper, in which the mere fact of such a publication could serve as a signal for undertaking highly drastic measures against Kuzmin and his fellow translators who had harmfully deprived the heroic Soviet nation of a correct Soviet Shakespeare.

Of course, at the time the article was published, the cultural atmosphere was not yet what it would be a few months later, after Kirov's murder. Nevertheless, there remains the fact that Chukovskii let the article continue living its own life in further publications without moderating it in any way.

The common denominator between Chukovskii's strictures on Kuzmin in the 1936 edition and on Anna Radlova in the 1941 edition of *A High Art* is associated with the old intelligentsia's longstanding division into two camps as concerns their attitudes to "two Annas," Anna Akhmatova and Anna Radlova (see Mandlestam 2011: 121). In her memoirs, Nadezhda Mandel'shtam describes the division as follows:

We were on opposite sides, and in Radlova's house – the meeting place for the "cream of the arts" – it was the thing to denounce Akhmatova. (Mandelstam 2011: 121.)

By the “cream of arts” Mandelstam is citing, with obvious irony, Radlova’s husband Sergei Radlov. The theatre producer had once, reportedly, used those very words when boasting to Osip Mandel’shtam about the guests who gathered around his tea table (see Mandelstam 2011: 121).

An intimate friend and a confidant of Akhmatova’s (see Subchapter 2.8), Lidiia Chukovskaia had a grandstand view of the setup. In her memoirs of Akhmatova, she tells that in private, the poet would refer to Radlova as the “Toad” (*Zhaba*). Akhmatova had a strong antipathy towards Kuzmin, who avidly championed Radlova’s poetry and even dedicated one of his poems to her (see Malmstad & Bogomolov 1999: 345). Akhmatova regarded Kuzmin as an “evil,” “malevolent,” and “rancorous” person “entirely devoid of goodness.” (See Chukovskaia, L. 2013a: 61, 181–182, 312–313.) As memoirists of Kuzmin, Malmstad and Bogomolov (1999: 222) approach this setup from the opposite point of view, but they, too, attribute Akhmatova’s “hostility” towards the poet to his devotion to Radlova, “whom she detested.” (More in Malmstad & Bogomolov 1999: 221–223.)

The contradiction between the two camps is evident in Akhmatova’s comment about the already deceased Kuzmin, recorded by Chukovskaia in 1940:

Меня он терпеть не мог. В его салоне царила Анна Дмитриевна. (Chukovskaia, L. 2013a: 182.)

Me, he could not stand. In his salon, it was Anna Dimitrievna (Radlova; M.S.) who reigned.

This antagonistic setup is relevant for the present study in that it is evident where Chukovskii’s loyalties laid. His diaries testify to a deep friendship with Akhmatova that lasted for decades and only ended with her death in 1966. Reminiscing about Akhmatova in the *Chukokkala* album, Chukovskii (2008b: 344–345) not only marvels at her “vast erudition” but also speaks about her “exceptional kindness.” In this context, Chukovskii recounts how, in 1920, with a severe shortage of food ravaging Petrograd (see Subchapter 2.3), Akhmatova had relinquished a much-needed extra portion of nutrition for the benefit of his baby daughter Murochka. Another similar episode connected with Akhmatova, relating to February 1921, is recorded in Chukovskii’s (2011a: 318) diary.

Chukovskii’s loyalty to Akhmatova is also evident in his diary entry recorded on December 24, 1921 (see Chukovskii 2011a: 371). Paying a visit to the poet, he had found her upset by having been taunted by the critic Valerian Chudovskii in his review of Radlova. Chudovskii’s “generous evaluation” of the poet was published in the journal *Nachala*. At that time, there were those who advocated Radlova as Akhmatova’s serious challenger. (See Hickey 2009: 58–59, 196.) Therefore, Akhmatova must have felt outraged for being publicly juxtaposed with her the way Chudovskii had done. In the diary entry, Chukovskii cites his own words of comfort to his friend as follows:

Я сказал: - Зачем притворяться? Будем откровенны: Чудовский - махровый дурак, а Радлова - негодная калоша. (Chukovskii 2011a: 371.)

“Why not face up to it?” I said. Let’s be frank. Chudovsky is a first-class idiot, and Radlova - a big nothing.” (Erlich 2005: 98)

Unless Chukovskii was only being kind to Akhmatova, the above comment suggests that he did not highly regard Radlova's poetic talent. In *A High Art*, however, Radlova, just like Kuzmin (see above), first appears in a positive context. In the 1936 edition (pp. 63–64), Chukovskii praises the skillful reproduction of the original rhythm in Radlova's translation of Shakespeare's play *King Richard*. The same passage is included in the 1941 edition (p. 102), but Chukovskii there waters the praise down by referring to the "myriad of inaccuracies" the translation otherwise contains (see Table 50 in Subchapter 4.4.2).

Radlova and Smirnov were among the speakers at the Shakespeare Conference (see above), and both severely criticized the old Shakespeare translations (Clark 2011: 184–185). A few days after the conference, the editor of *Pravda* commented on their speeches as follows:

"The main idea of both presentations," [. . .], "was that the old translations did not only distort Shakespeare textologically, but were done mechanically and moreover in a language that was not accessible to the contemporary reader and audience." (See Clark 2011: 184–185.)

Sergei Radlov, too, addressed the conference. Soon afterwards, his production of the play *Othello* in Radlova's translation premiered in Leningrad and Moscow. (Zolotnitsky 1995: 135–136, 139.) The translation was included in the Shakespeare anthology edited by Smirnov and published by Goslitizdat in 1939 (see Smirnov 1939). The same anthology contained Radlova's translations of *Macbeth*, and *Romeo and Juliet*, and other plays translated by Lozinskii, Shchepkina-Kupernik and Aleksandra Kurosheva. In the 1941 edition of *A High Art*, it is Radlova's *Othello* that is given the lion's share of – mostly negative – attention.

Chukovskii's critique of Radlova proceeded in a manner very similar to his critique of Kuzmin. The article "Iskalechennyi Shekspir" (Chukovskii 1939) first appeared in *Pravda*, and soon afterwards, its expanded version "Astma u Dezdemony" (Chukovskii 1940b) was published in the journal *Teatr* (see Subchapter 4.1). The revised article was next included in the discussion about Shakespeare in the 1941 edition of *A High Art*. Almost all the contents of the *Teatr* article are included in the chapter "Intonation – The Fruitlessness of Formalism" (*Intonatsiia. – Besplodnost' formalizma*; pp. 138–181). The other Shakespeare chapter in this edition, titled "About the Methodology of Translating Shakespeare" (*K metodike perevodov Shekspira*; pp. 109–137), is a slightly revised version of the chapter "A Duel with Shakespeare" in the previous edition, but without the first two subchapters that discuss Kuzmin and Rozanov (see above).

From Chukovskii's diary, it turns out that according to the original plan, the forum for the article "Astma u Dezdemony" was intended to be the same as for the article "Edinoborstvo s Shekspirov" five years earlier. The following diary entry was recorded on November 26, 1939:

Вчера в "Правде" напечатан мой фельетон о Радловой. Скоро в "Красной нови" появится большая моя статья на ту же тему – "Астма у Дездемоны". (Chukovskii 2011c: 47.)

My Radlova piece came out in *Pravda* yesterday, and *Krasnaia nov'* will soon be publishing a long article by me, "Desdemona's Asthma," on the same subject. (Erlich 2005: 335–336.)

A couple of weeks later, Chukovskii (2011c: 48) recorded another diary entry that reveals that the decision not to publish the article in *Krasnaia nov'* was made by the head of the Writers' Union Aleksandr Fadeev. In later editions of *A High Art*, Chukovskii (1966: 438; 1968: 204) refers to the incident emphasizing that the article was left out "to Fadeev's great chagrin."

Chukovskii was convinced that, in reality, it was Radlova who was behind the omission. At that time, she was visiting Moscow in order to attend the reading of the upcoming edition of *A High Art* – and also, Chukovskii points out, with the particular intention of "muddying the waters" around his article. The incident apparently marked the beginning of a large-scale feud between Chukovskii and the Radlov couple, as it turns out from the following diary entry recorded on December 12, 1939:

Сегодня Лидя пишет, что Радловы начали в десять рук бешеную травлю против меня, полную клеветы. (Chukovskii 2011c: 48.)

I had a letter today from Lida saying that the Radlovs have started an all-out campaign against me full of slander. (Erlich 2005: 336.)

During that same period, Chukovskii also gave lectures discussing Radlova's Shakespeare translations (see Chukovskii 2009: 301–302, 307). In *A High Art*, he (Chukovskii 1966: 438; 1968: 203) would later reminisce about the furious debates provoked by his "detailed and impartial" (*obstoiatel'nyi i bespristrastnyi*) lecture about the topic at The Union of Theatre Workers (*Vserossiiskoe teatral'noe obshchestvo*).

The proportion of the feud is evident in Chukovskii's letter to his wife Mariia Borisovna, written in December 1939. In the letter, Chukovskii apologizes for the anxiety he had caused her by telling about "all thoses quabbles." He also presents a list of writers, translators, critics, and scholars who are on his side. Among the names on the list is Iogann Al'tman, the editor of the journal *Teatr* (see e.g. Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 470). Chukovskii also assures his wife that not a single authoritative critic would support Radlova. (See Chukovskii 2009: 301.)

Whereas in the 1936 edition of *A High Art*, Chukovskii presented eleven "ways" in which Shakespeare was distorted in Kuzmin's *King Lear* (see above), in the 1941 edition he (Chukovskii 1941: 138–155, 159–166) presents seven "oddities" (*strannost'*) in Radlova's Shakespeare translations. Five of those oddities pertain to the translations themselves, and the remaining two pertain to Soviet critics' reception of Radlova's translations. Introducing the topic in the beginning of the chapter, Chukovskii (1941: 138) mentions only *Othello*, but in the actual review, also other translations by Radlova are discussed.

Like in the case of Kuzmin's "ways of distortion" (see above), the exact number of Radlova's "oddities" is somewhat confusing: in *A High Art*, Chukovskii apparently forgot to specifically name two of them. They can, however, be inferred by comparing the text with the article in *Teatr* (Chukovskii 1940b), although in the case of two oddities the consecutive numbers have been switched between the article and the book. The oversight in *A High Art* may be due to Chukovskii becoming ill in the middle of the editing process (see Subchapter 4.1). In some respects, the article, in fact, seems more consistent and lucid than the corresponding chapter in the 1941 edition.

The first of Radlova's oddities (pp. 138–141) is that, in her translation, the characters appear “demonstratively rude” (*demonstrativno nevezhliivy*). On the whole, vulgar language appears to have been the most conspicuous feature in Radlova's translations. That was what critics usually kept commenting on, but their opinions about this varied. There were those who appreciated the rudeness of the style on the grounds that it matched the rudeness of Shakespeare's original text. One of those critics was Aleksei Gvozdev, who in the early 1930s praised Radlova's translation of *Othello* particularly for its novelty and freshness (see Zolotnitsky 1995: 103).

Chukovskii clearly did not appreciate Radlova's rudeness. In *A High Art*, he (Chukovskii 1940: 140) notes that Renaissance Venice is always associated with refined and referential conduct between people and insists that politeness had an important function in Shakespeare's texts. He therefore calls into question Radlova's grounds for the “continuous brutalizing” (*sploshnoe ogrublenie*) of the original.

Table 103

<p>Светская учтивость, обходительность, «урбани́те», «политессы» были в то время одним из прогрессивных завоеваний европейской культуры. Вычеркнуть из «Отелло» все это «венецйское вежество» значит уничтожить атмосферу эпохи. (Chukovskii 1941: 140.)</p>	<p>Refined courtesy, good manners, “urbanite,” and “politeness” were at that time progressive achievements in the European culture. Omitting from <i>Othello</i> all that “Venetian courteousness” means destroying the atmosphere of the epoch.</p>
--	--

Judging the style of Radlova's translation by the argument shown in the above example, Chukovskii seems to be thinking along lines similar to the critic Iosif Iuzovskii, who particularly appreciated the traditional romanticized Russian renditions of Shakespeare. For instance, among the translations of *Romeo and Juliet*, Iuzovskii preferred the poet Petr Veinberg's very old translation to the one done by Radlova (Zolotnitsky 1995: 120). In *A High Art*, Chukovskii, too, advocates the superiority of Veinberg's translation over Radlova's, although his judgement is based on different arguments (see below).

Even with all the rude features – or rather because of them – Radlova's translations may, indeed, have been more authentic than any embellished versions. Therefore, Chukovskii's negative review of them seems to be at odds with his argument that the original author's “mien” is the most essential aspect to be reproduced in a translation (see e.g. Table 53 in Subchapter 4.4.2). Judging by the comment shown in Table 103 above, the discrepancy might be explained by a romantic and idealized notion of the Shakespearian epoch. Chukovskii may have wanted to focus on its sublime aspects and refused to recognize those that were coarse and crude. On the other hand, he may also have wanted to flaunt his own expertise on the subject matter, having had a chance to acquaint himself with British literature and culture while he was in London as a young correspondent (see Subchapter 2.1).

The second oddity (pp. 141–142) in Radlova's translation is her frequent shortening of the original. Chukovskii provides several examples of her omitting words that are included in Shakespeare's original text. He notes that, for instance, Radlova has discarded thirty-three and twenty-seven epithets from the third and fourth acts of *Othello*, respective-

ly. He also calls attention to a particular, repeating pattern connected with those removals. It turns out that Radlova has discarded almost every epithet of praise and love, whereas almost every vulgar and abusive epithet has been reproduced with “maximal exactitude.” Thus, here, too, the rudeness of Radlova’s translations is one of the fundamental issues.

The third oddity (pp. 142–156) is the fragmentary quality of Radlova’s phrases. Chukovskii describes this oddity as shown in Table 104.

Table 104

<p><i>Почему Анна Радлова заставляет героев Шекспира разговаривать между собой такими отрывистыми, кургузыми фразами? (Chukovskii 1941: 142.)</i></p>	<p><i>Why does Anna Radlova make Shakespeare’s heroes converse with each other using such fragmentary, stumpy phrases?</i></p>
---	--

It was that third oddity that evidently inspired Chukovskii (1940b) in naming his *Teatr* article as “Desdemona’s Asthma.” With a number of examples, he (Chukovskii 1941: 143–144) demonstrates Radlova’s tendency to omit words from the original and replace Shakespeare’s solid (*slitnyi*) and coherent (*sviaznyi*) phrases with “asthmatic language” (*astmaticheskaiia rech’*). He suggests that both Desdemona and all the other characters in Radlova’s translation seem to be suffering from asthma or angina pectoris (*grudnaia zhaba*). This oddity seems quite similar to Kuzmin’s third way of distorting Shakespeare, which Chukovskii described by using the metaphor of “a dog’s barking” (see above). He applies the above new metaphors on Radlova’s translation, but in another instance, he also uses the “dog” metaphor to refer to her style (see Table 109 below).

Chukovskii (1941: 145) notes that the damages that the third oddity does to the text are not confined to esthetic aspects: it also causes the loss of many semantic entities (*smyslovyie edinitsy*). In that regard, Chukovskii (1941: 148–150) prefers Veinberg’s *Othello* to Radlova’s. With the help of several examples, he demonstrates the positive aspects in Veinberg’s translation, its comprehensibility and its equivalence with the original.

Table 105

<p><i>Я отнюдь не говорю, что вейнберговский перевод идеален. Напротив, он очень водянист и болтлив. Давно уже следовало бы заменить его другим переводом. Но все же, при всех своих недостатках, перевод Петра Вейнберга и точнее, и понятнее радловского. (Chukovskii 1941: 148.)</i></p>	<p><i>I do not at all mean to say that Veynberg’s translation is superior. To the contrary, it is watered down and prolix. But with all its shortcomings the translation is more precise and intelligible than Radlova’s. (Leighton 1984: 162.)</i></p>
---	---

To illustrate the extent to which Radlova has shortened Shakespeare’s text, Chukovskii (1941: 145) presents the following numbers: while in the original, 163 lines contain 1156 words, in the translation, the same number of lines contain only 949 words. Chukovskii points out that the loss is further multiplied by the fact that the English language is much more compact than Russian. From the above discussion it turns out that the second and the

third oddity are, in fact, only different aspects of one and the same tendency in Radlova's translation, which is the compression of the original text and the removal of words from it.

The third oddity is given more attention in *A High Art* than all the other oddities added up. The discussion contains a longish passage in which Chukovskii (1941: 155–158) challenges Aleksandr Ostuzhev, the actor who played *Othello* in the Moscow production of the play. As Ostuzhev was deaf, he had acquired special direction for creating the leading role through correspondence with Radlova. (See Zolotnitsky 1995: 136.) Ostuzhev had firmly taken Radlova's side in the controversy about her translations. In a letter to the editors of the journal *Teatr*, he had admonished Chukovskii for his negative review. In *A High Art*, Chukovskii comments on the letter, as shown in Table 106.

Table 106

<p>На его «Письмо в редакцию» я, при всем желании, не могу отвечать, так как оно приписывает мне ряд таких мыслей, каких я никогда не высказывал. (Chukovskii 1941: 156.)</p>	<p>To his "Letter to the Editors" I cannot, with all the best intentions, reply because it attributes to me a number of such ideas that I never expressed.</p>
---	--

Ostuzhev appreciated the "laconism" of Radlova's translation, finding her short phrases ideal for a stage performance. In *A High Art*, Chukovskii heatedly contradicts the actor's statement, pointing out that laconism is not the correct word for verbal "stumps" (*obrubki*) and "stubs" (*kul'tiapki*) and for the "violent severance of essential semantic units (*nasil'stvennoe otsechenie vazhneishikh smyslovykh edinits*). As an extra argument, Chukovskii cites the writer and journalist Vadim Kozhevnikov's open letter to Ostuzhev, which was published in the March 1940 issue of *Teatr*. From the letter, it turns out that by defending Radlova, the actor had infelicitously referred to a line in the original that never existed. The letters discussed above and the column space devoted to them in *A High Art* demonstrate the intensity with which the polemics around Radlova's translations were internalized at that time. (See Chukovskii 1941: 155–157.)

The fourth oddity (pp. 159–161) is Radlova's "obstinate battle with the poetical in Shakespeare's poetry" (*upriamaia bor'ba s poetichnost'iu poezii Shekspira*). In the article "Astma u Dezdemony", Chukovskii (1940b) uses the word *depoetizatsiia* to describe that tendency. Chukovskii argues that the tendency is Radlova's driving force in all her translations. He particularly criticizes Radlova's habit of creating phrases in which the previous word ends and the succeeding word begins with multiple consonants, which results in the text sounding "cacophonous." Referring to Radlova's "unnatural accumulations of sounds" (*protivoestestvennye skopleniia zvukov*), Chukovskii explains this as her cavalier attitude to how Shakespeare sounds in her translation.

As it turns out from the comment shown in Table 107, Chukovskii partly relates even this oddity to the translator's fondness for a crude style. (see above).

Table 107

<p><i>Переводчица как будто задалась специальной целью добиться того, чтобы его стихи прозвучали грубее и жестче. (Chukovskii 1941: 160.)</i></p>	<p><i>It is as if the translator had set herself the goal of making her verses sound ruder and more brutal.</i></p>
---	---

The fifth oddity (pp. 162–163) is Radlova’s tendency to turn into questions such phrases that in the original were statements. Using a certain line of Desdemona’s as an example, Chukovskii elaborates on how the translator’s decision has entirely altered the original tone of speech. In this context, the rude features in Radlova’s translation are not mentioned, but even here they are implicitly present when Chukovskii (1941: 162) remarks that dismissing nuances, she transforms an “amicable” (*liubezny*) comment into a “half-scornful” (*poluprezritel’nyi*) question.

The sixth oddity about Radlova’s Shakespeare translations (pp. 163–165) is shown in Table 108.

Table 108

<p><i>Почему, в самом деле, ее переводы Шекспира вызвали в нашей критике такие восторги? Почему этими переводами так жарко восхищались даже те рецензенты, которые, по их собственным чистосердечным признаниям, ни слова не разумели по-английски? (Chukovskii 1941: 163.)</i></p>	<p><i>Why, as a matter of fact, did her translations of Shakespeare arouse such delight among our critics? Why were these translations so ardently admired even by those reviewers who, by their own frank confession, did not understand a word of English.</i></p>
---	--

The question posed by Chukovskii is interesting because it, too, illustrates the nature of the polemics. It suggests that, in the end, what was at issue was not so much the artistic quality of Radlova’s translations but an intricate web of personal sympathies and antipathies. Chukovskii asks why Radlova’s are generally lauded as the best and the most precise of all Shakespeare translations, even referred to as “masterpieces” (*shedevry*), and also why Lozinskii’s and Shchepkina-Kupernik’s translations in the same anthology have been overlooked by most critics. In this context, Chukovskii particularly singles out Shchepkina-Kupernik, whose “virtuosity” as a translator, he points out, continues to become more and more evident.

Argumenting against Radlova, Chukovskii presents some additional points of view. Here, as in several other places in the the 1941 edition of *A High Art*, his choice of words seems very politically correct.

Table 109

<p><i>Почему только по ее переводам издательства знакомят с этими величайшими произведениями величайшего трагика новую интеллигенцию нашей страны, – интеллигенцию фабрик, заводов, колхозов, Красной Армии, университетов, институтов и школ?.. Почему главным образом при посредстве ее переводов широкие читающие массы приобщаются к поэзии Шекспира? Разве эти массы не нуждаются в таких переводах Шекспира, где не было бы ни астмы, ни рывканья, ни пропуска важнейших элементов стиха. (Chukovskii 1941: 165.)</i></p>	<p><i>Why is it that only through her translations, publishing houses introduce these supreme works of the supreme tragedian to the new intelligentsia of our country – to the intelligentsia of factories, mills, kolkhozes, the Red Army, universities, institutes and schools?... Why is it that mainly through her translations the broad reading masses become familiar with Shakespeare’s poetry? Do not those masses need such translations of Shakespeare in which there is neither asthma, nor barking, and in which the essential elements of the poem have not been removed.</i></p>
---	---

With the above remark, Chukovskii is practically accusing Radlova of corrupting the minds of all the good heroes of Soviet society. His bombastic manner of posing questions brings to mind the rhetorical devices used in his strictures on Rozanov in the 1936 of *A High Art* (p. 139; see Table 102).

The seventh oddity (pp. 165) is also concerned with critics’ reviews of Radlova. Chukovskii calls attention to the fact that the only defect in Radlova’s translations that most critics acknowledge is their excessive rudeness of style, and that even this defect has not aroused any serious critique but rather good-humored chuckling. Moreover, the preciseness of her translation often seems to be measured on the basis of her fidelity in reproducing the vulgar expressions of the original. Once again, Chukovskii notes that Radlova’s precision is confined solely to these crude words.

Table 110

<p><i>Уж если человек так старательно воспроизводит даже эти крутые слова, значит, с какой же точностью воспроизводит он все остальное! Никому и в голову не приходит, что Анна Радлова так аккуратна исключительно в этой области. (Chukovskii 1941: 165.)</i></p>	<p><i>For after all, anyone who reproduces even these extreme words so diligently must have reproduced everything else with the same precision! It never even occurred to any of these critics that Anna Radlova was painstaking in this respect alone. (Leighton 1984: 173.)</i></p>
---	---

When all seven of the oddities of Radlova’s translations have been presented, Chukovskii (1941: 167) moves the discussion to a more general level. The comment shown in Table 110 suggests that, except for the faithful reproduction of the rude features, Chukovskii finds Radlova’s translations imprecise. However, it is her very precision, or, rather, some of its aspects, that Chukovskii finds fault with. Pointing out that Radlova’s “theoretical principles” (*teoreticheskie printsipy*) were defined about a decade ago, he is evidently referring to the literalist methods advocated in the 1920s (see Subchapter 4.4.2).

Once more juxtaposing Radlova’s translation with Veinberg’s (see above), Chukovskii points out that even the very best of the old translations were done amateurishly (*kustarno*) and dilettantishly (*po-diletantski*), without the theoretical principles and the scientific approach that characterize contemporary translation practices. Describing the “canon” of those old days, he points out that translators then only worried about conveying the ideas and images (*mysli i obrazy*) of the original, its beauty and its spirit (*dukha*), but totally ignored its external form. This comment is quite unexpected coming from Chukovskii, who himself particularly emphasizes maintaining those very features (see Subchapter 4.4.2). He, however, elaborates on this remark by noting that form is one of the ingredients that make up the spirit of a poetic work. (See Chukovskii 1941: 167.)

In the subsequent discussion, Chukovskii (1941: 168–170) criticizes Radlova on quite opposite grounds, that is, for sticking to the scientific approach too slavishly. Chukovskii particularly focuses on Radlova’s striving for line-for-line equivalence (*ravnostrochie*; elsewhere in *A High Art*, Chukovskii also refers to it as *ekvilinearnost’*). That, too, is quite surprising in light of his other comments in *A High Art*. For instance, in the example shown in Table 5 in Subchapter 4.3.1, Chukovskii (1936a: 142; 1941: 110) proudly proclaims that line-for-line equivalency is one of “our first requirements” in contemporary translation practice. In the Shakespeare chapter, he (Chukovskii 1936a: 183; 1941: 136) elucidates the idea, though, stressing that the content, intonation, and style of the original must never be sacrificed for the reproduction of an equal number of lines.

Chukovskii (1941: 169) points out that every single page in Radlova’s translation manifests her “formalistic fetishism” (*formalisticheskii fetishizm*). He further notes that such an approach results in great losses on the artistic side.

Table 111

<p>Так что главная беда Анны Радловой не в том, что она соблюдает «научные» принципы художественного перевода стихов, а в том, что только их она и соблюдает, заменяя ими и вкус, и художественно-поэтическое чутье, и темперамент, и восхищение поэтической формой, и тяготение к красоте, к поэтичности. Формальные установки стали для нее самоцелью, а в искусстве это – не прощаемый грех. (Chukovskii 1941: 170.)</p>	<p>Thus, the main problem with Radlova is not in her paying attention to “scientific” principles when translating poetry but in her paying attention only to them, substituting them for taste, for artistic instinct, for temperament, for the delight of poetic form, for the gravitation towards the beautiful and the poetic. The pursuing of formal aspects became for her an end in itself, and in art, that is an unforgivable sin.</p>
---	--

In the same discussion, Chukovskii (1941: 169) emphasizes that although “blind dilettantishness” has no place in poetic translation, mechanical adherence to “ready-made prescriptions” usually proves quite as ill-fated. The comment shown in Table 111 clearly indicates that in discussing the principles of translation, Chukovskii distinguishes the translation of poetry and the translation of prose from each other. Some of the discrepancies found in *A High Art* may, therefore, be due to his failing to always explain that distinction.

In *A High Art*, Chukovskii later commented on Radlova's celebrated translations and also Iuzokovskii's (see above) assessment of them as follows:

Анной Радловой каким-то загадочным образом был организован в печати многоголосый хор восторженных рецензентов и критиков. Ее переводы шекспировских пьес были объявлены высшим достижением искусства. Против этой ложной оценки восстал талантливый критик Ю. Юзовский, выступивший в конце 1935 года в «Литературной газете» (№ 69) с отрицательным отзывом о радловском переводе «Отелло». (Chukovskii 1966: 437.)

By some strange means Anna Radlova organized a loud chorus of reviewers and critics on her behalf in the press. Her translations of Shakespeare's plays were declared the highest achievement of art. The talented critic Yu. Yuzovsky rose up against this false appreciation by coming out at the end of 1935 in *Literary Gazette* (No. 69) with a negative comment on Radlova's translation of *Othello*. (Leighton 1984: 168.)

The above comment vividly evinces Chukovskii's deep resentment toward Radlova, resentment that neither decades nor her death would erase. What readily comes to mind here, is the aspect of professional jealousy. For instance, in the case of Bal'mont (see Subchapter 4.4.3), Chukovskii, in fact, criticized his rival. However, with Radlova there does not seem to have been a similar position of direct rivalry. According to a Russian bibliography of Shakespeare, the only translation done by Chukovskii was the comedy *Love's Labour's Lost* (*Besplodnye usilia liubvi*), which was published for the first time in 1945. (See Levidova 2014.)

In all likelihood, the polemics about Radlova's translations and the division between the camps of the "two Annas" were intertwined with each other in some respects. Another interesting feature in the setup is that it seems to have been accompanied by a whispering campaign around Radlova. Lidiia Chukovskaia tells that Akhmatova was genuinely worried on behalf of Chukovskii when the article "Iskalechennyi Shekspir" appeared in *Pravda*, because she had strong suspicions that Radlova had "connections" in the NKVD. Chukovskaia comments Akhmatova's point of view as follows:

Мне неизвестно, откуда возникли такие подозрения, и я не имею возможности установить, в какой мере они основательны. (Chukovskaia, L. 2013a: 61.)

I don't know where such suspicions sprang from, and I don't have the possibility to find out to what extent they were justified.

What eventually halted – or pushed into the background – the debates over the Shakespeare translations and Chukovskii's "duel with Radlova" (see Burlëshin 2008) was the onset of World War II. In March 1942, the Radlov couple and their theatre company were evacuated from the besieged Leningrad to Piatigorsk, a city located in the lower Caucasus (Chukovskaia, L. 2013a: 313). Lidiia Chukovskaia reports the consequent events as follows:

В августе в город вступили немцы. Радловы не желали (или не успели) уйти из города, а (волей или неволей?) остались в Пятигорске. (Chukovskaia, L. 2013a: 313.)

In August, the Germans marched into the city. The Radlovs did not want to (or did not manage to) leave the city and (either voluntarily or involuntarily) remained in Piatigorsk.

During the Nazi occupation, the theatre company continued to perform in prison camps. Because of his ancestry, Sergei Radlov could have obtained German citizenship, but he consistently refused it. However, rumors soon began spreading about the Radlovs' cooperation with the Germans. Merely their staying behind enemy lines could easily have been interpreted as treason. When the couple returned to the Soviet Union after the war, both were arrested and sentenced to nine years in a labor camp. Radlova died in the camp in 1949, whereas her husband survived and was rehabilitated after Stalin's death. (Muller Cooke 1999: 755.)

Thus, as controversial as it seems, Radlova was seen both as a collaborator of the NKVD and of the Nazis. Whether justified or not, the rumors never quite faded. Neither did Chukovskii's antipathy towards Radlova, as it turns out from a diary entry recorded in 1955. Chukovskii maliciously comments here on Radlova's lost status as the designated Shakespeare translator.

Она гнусно переводила Шекспира. Я написал об этом, доказал это с математической точностью. Малый ребенок мог убедиться, что ее переводы никуда не годятся. Но она продолжала процветать, - и Шекспир ставился в ее переводах. Но вот оказалось, что она ушла в лагерь Гитлера, - и тогда официально было признано, что она действительно плохо переводила Шекспира. (Chukovskii 2011c: 188–189)

Her Shakespeare translations were awful. I wrote about them, making my points with mathematical precision. A child could have told the translations were worthless. But she flourished, and they kept being staged. Not until she went over to Hitler was she acknowledged to be the poor translator she was. (Erlich 2005: 394.)

The polemics around Kuzmin's and Radlova's Shakespeare translations illustrate how public discourse about literature could be influenced not only by genuine artistic aspects but also by very basic and human personal loyalties and hostilities.

4.5 SILENT DIALOGUE

In the 1930s editions of *A High Art*, there are passages that urge the reader to look beyond that which is said into that which is left unsaid. The following two subchapters examine the implicit meanings behind the obvious ones. Between two subsequent editions of *A High Art*, the name of one or another litterateur may disappear. The most obvious reason often seems to be that Chukovskii has revised the book for a new edition with contemporary examples. However, in some cases, the disappearance seems to be connected with

the fate of that particular litterateur in the Soviet system. Subchapter 4.5.1 concentrates on those particular cases. Subchapter 4.5.2 examines Chukovskii's authorial decisions and the motives behind them in the broader framework of his life and values. The possibility of the presence of Aesopian subtexts in *A High Art*, and Chukovskii's attitude to Stalin and to the Soviet regime are also discussed.

4.5.1 The Writer Vanishes

In *A High Art*, the names of some litterateurs seem to keep appearing in one edition after another, and then there are names that disappear without any apparent reason. Furthermore, some of the vanished names may reappear in the book a couple of decades later. In discussing the translation of foreign works in the Soviet Union in the late 1930s and early 1940s, Samantha Sherry (2015: 200) notes that, at that time, the tendency of avoiding political taboos "reached its apogee." Presumably, the same can be said about original works published in the Soviet Union during that period. The vanishing of certain names from *A High Art* is particularly conspicuous between editions 1936 and 1941. This chapter juxtaposes the removal of ten litterateurs from *A High Art* with their respective fates in the Soviet system.

Casualties of a Conspiracy Theory

Benedikt Livshits and Valentin Stenich were both personal friends of the Chukovskii family. They were both sentenced to death in connection with the Pereval case (see Subchapter 2.7). Livshits was arrested in October 1937, according to prosecution material, for being "the leader of a counterrevolutionary group of litterateurs and translators" (*rukovoditel' kon- trrevoliutsionnoi gruppy literatorov-perevodchikov*). Stenich's turn to be arrested was a couple of weeks later, in November of that same year. Both Livshits and Stenich were repeatedly subjected to long-lasting interrogations and eventually sentenced to death. They were executed on the night between September 20 and 21, 1938. (See Shneiderman 1996: 86–87, 89, 119.)

As it would later turn out, Nikolai Chukovskii had been within an inch of being arrested next (see subchapter 2.8). In the interrogation reports that apparently were partly falsified (Shneiderman 1996: 108–113), partly obtained through torture, his name came up frequently. He was alleged to be one of the "passive" members of the group. (See Shneiderman 1996: 91–92, 94–95, 107–108.) The NKVD could probably have made similar accusations against anybody, even against Kornei Chukovskii, had they so chosen. Recent study suggests that the NKVD archives contained enough incriminating material for arresting practically any citizen with even the slightest public significance – and, if necessary, such material could always be fabricated (see Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 319).

In *A High Art*, Livshits and Stenich are discussed in the following editions; 1930 (Livshits p. 68, Stenich p. 63–64) and 1936 (Livshits p. 9, 52, 122, 207–208, Stenich p. 12, 14–16, 52, 93–95). Both are absent from the 1941 edition.

Like Stenich (see Subchapter 4.4.3), also Livshits began his literary career by writing poetry but later confined himself almost exclusively to translation, specializing in French literature (see Sheinker 1988: 512). In the 1930 (p. 68) and 1936 (p. 207–208) editions of *A High Art*, Livshits' name appears in a discussion about translating foreign idioms. Chukovskii first presents a number of mistakenly translated French expressions and then pro-

vides their correct translations. He gives the credit for these corrections to Livshits. The 1941 edition (p. 212) contains the same passage only with minor revisions, but the four lines referring to Livshits have been removed.

The above passage about the French expressions has been omitted altogether in the subsequent edition of *A High Art* (1964), but it reappears in the 1966 (pp. 347–348) and 1968 (p. 114) editions. In those editions, the source of information for the correct translations is once again provided, but it is not the same as it was in the original version.

Table 112

<p><i>Большинство этих замечаний (касающихся французского языка) <u>сделал</u> по моей просьбе <u>поэт Бенедикт Лившиц</u>, много потрудившийся над редактурой чужих переводов. (Chukovskii 1930: 68; 1936a: 207–208 nearly verbatim.)</i></p> <p><i><u>Все эти промахи подмечены мною</u> в середине двадцатых годов при чтении тогдашних переводов с французского. (Chukovskii 1966: 348; 1968: 114.)</i></p>	<p><i>Most of these observations (concerning the French language) <u>were made</u> at my request by the poet <u>Benedikt Livshits</u>, who had done a lot of work editing other people’s translations.</i></p> <p><i><u>I caught all of these blunders</u> in reading translations from French in the mid-twenties. (Leighton 1984: 95.)</i></p>
---	--

Thus, it turns out that not only has Livshits been tidily and permanently discarded from *A High Art*, but, for one reason or another, Chukovskii has appropriated his role for himself. By that time, Livshits had already long since been rehabilitated (see Table of Repressed Intellectuals in Appendix 3), and therefore, Chukovskii’s decision cannot be attributed to his being taboo.

In the 1936 edition of *A High Art*, Livshits is mentioned already in the foreword (see Table 113). The list of translators relates to the discussion of the new Soviet scientific-artistic approach to translation that will overcome all “dilettantism” and “blind inspiration” (Chukovskii 1936a: 8–9; see Table 56 in Subchapter 4.4.2).

Table 113

<p><i>Вспоминим Гейне в переводе Тынянова, или Фирдауси в переводе Михаила Лозинского, или «Сербский эпос» в переводе Кривцова, или переводы Эдуарда Багрицкого, Павла Антокольского, Зоргенфрея, Бенедикта Лившица, Салье. Всюду мастерство перевода сочетается с научным учетом стилистических особенностей переводимого текста. (Chukovskii 1936a: 9.)</i></p>	<p><i>Let’s remember Heine in Tynianov’s translation, or Ferdowsi in Mikhail Lozinskii’s translation, or “Serbian Epic” in Krivtsov’s translation, or translations by Eduard Bagritskii, Pavel Antokol’skii, Zorgenfrei, Benedikt Livshits, Sal’e. Everywhere, the virtuosity of translation is being combined with scientific attention to the stylistic characteristics of the original.</i></p>
---	--

A similar passage is included in the foreword to the 1941 edition of *A High Art* (p. 4–5),

with a revised list of translators. Livshits has been left out there, but he is not the only one. In fact, the only translators included from the original list are Tynianov and Lozinskii. (About Zorgenfrei, see below.)

Further in the 1936 edition (p. 122), Livshits' name comes up in another list presented in a similar context. His renditions of the early 19th century French poet Pierre-Jean de Béranger are included among translations that, in Chukovskii's words, are "not just works of art but works of science." Like the list shown in Table 113, also this one was revised for the 1941 edition (p. 206). Only Lozinskii was included from the original list. Of course, revising *A High Art* Chukovskii would often update his lists of names without apparent ulterior motives. It is, however, noteworthy that any mention of Livshits is absent from the 1941 edition. The same fate concerns Stenich and several other litterateurs (see below).

In the 1936 edition (p. 52), both Livshits and Stenich are included in another list, which consists of such writer-translator pairs that are compatible by their social natures (about the topic, see Subchapter 4.4.3). Table 114 shows that in the 1941 edition (p. 59), Livshits and Stenich, as well as Nikolai Gumilev (see below), have been omitted from the list.

Table 114

<p>Отсюда огромная удача Василия Курочкина, давшего непревосходимые переводы стихов Беранже. Отсюда удача Валерия Брюсова (переводы Верхарна), удача <u>Гумилева</u> (переводы Теофиля Готье), удача Федора Сологуба (переводы Верлена), удача <u>Бенедикта Лившица</u> (переводы Рамбо). Отсюда удача С. Я. Маршак (переводы английских детских стихов). Отсюда удача <u>Вал. Стенича</u> как переводчика романов Дос Пассоса, объясняемая именно тем, что и он и Дос Пассос — люди одной социальной формации, во многих отношениях близнецы. (Chukovskii 1936a: 52.)</p>	<p>Hence the enormous success of Vasilii Kurochkin, who gave us unequalled translations of Béranger. Hence the success of Valerii Briusov (the translations of Verhaeren), the success of <u>Gumilev</u> (the translations of Théophile Gautier), the success of Fedor Sologub (the translations of Verlaine), the success of <u>Benedict Livshits</u> (the translations of Rimbaud). Hence the success of Samuil Marshak (the translations of English nursery rhymes). Hence the success of <u>Valentin Stenich</u> as the translator of Dos Passos — explained precisely by the fact that he and Dos Passos are people of the same social formation, in many respects each other's twins.</p>
<p>Отсюда — в значительной степени — удача <u>Жуковского</u> (переводы Уланда, Геббеля, Соути), удача Василия Курочкина, давшего непревосходимые переводы стихов Беранже. Отсюда удача Валерия Брюсова (переводы Верхарна), удача Федора Сологуба (переводы Верлена), удача <u>Твардовского</u> (переводы Шевченко), удача <u>Елены Благиной</u> (переводы Л. Квитко). Отсюда удача Стефана Малларме (переводы Эдгара По) и т. д. и т. д. (Chukovskii 1941: 59.)</p>	<p>Hence — to a considerable extent — the success of <u>Zhukovskii</u> (the translations of Uhland, Hebbel, Southey), the success of Vasilii Kurochkin, who gave us unequalled translations of Béranger. Hence the success of Valerii Briusov (the translations of Verhaeren), the success of Fedor Sologub (the translations of Verlaine), the success of <u>Tvardovskii</u> (the translations of Shevchenko), the success of <u>Elena Blaginina</u> (the translations of L. Kvitko). Hence the success of Stéphane Mallarmé (the translations of Edgar Allan Poe) etc. etc.</p>

As shown in Table 114, in the 1941 edition, Livshits, Stenich and Gumilev have been replaced with the 19th century translator Vasilii Zhukovskii and with the contemporary translators Aleksandr Tvardovskii and Elena Blaginina. The example about Samuil Marshak's renditions of English nursery rhymes does not appear in the list in this edition. It was moved to the foreword, where Marshak is included in a list of prominent translators of world literature. (See Chukovskii 1941: 4–5). The passage shown in Table 114 was also included the article "Sotsial'naia priroda perevodchika" (see Chukovskii 1940a: 117).

Of Stenich, Chukovskii speaks in complimentary terms in several contexts in the 1936 edition of *A High Art*. Even while demonstrating some lexical errors made by Stenich, Chukovskii (1936a: 15) accentuates their minor significance in relation to his fundamental talent as a translator (p. 15; see Table 67 in Subchapter 4.4.2). When juxtaposed, Tables 67 and 115 show that while the original passage had gone through only minor revisions, Stenich as an individual has been removed and replaced with the faceless and generic expression "translator."

Table 115

<p><i>Бывает, что переводчик делает десятки ошибок, и все же его перевод имеет высокую ценность, если в этом переводе передано самое главное: художественная индивидуальность переводимого автора во всем своеобразии его стиля. (Chukovskii 1941: 10.)</i></p>	<p><i>Sometimes <u>a translator</u> makes tens of mistakes and, in spite of them, his translation is highly valuable if that translation conveys the most important: the artistic individuality of the original author in all the distinctiveness of his style.</i></p>
---	---

In the sequel, Chukovskii (1936a: 15–16; 1941: 10–11) discusses the fundamental difference between the translation of artistic texts and business-related texts. In the latter domain, lexical accuracy is vital, because the primary function of the text is to provide information. In artistic translation, the priorities are entirely different. In the 1936 edition, Chukovskii clarifies his point by presenting as an example Stenich's translations of Dos Passos. Table 116 shows that in the 1941 edition, the passage is included otherwise nearly verbatim, but the paragraph in which Stenich is mentioned has been removed entirely. Here, Chukovskii once again emphasizes the minor significance of lexical errors.

Table 116

<p>[. . .], и те критики, которые пытаются дискредитировать в глазах непосвященных читателей тот или иной перевод при помощи указаний на подобные промахи, пользуются такой демагогией исключительно для развращения читательских вкусов. <u>В самом деле, представьте себе, что в переводах Дос Пассоса, сделанных Вал. Стеничем, каждое английское слово было бы воспроизведено с безукоризненной точностью, но зато ироническая лирика подлинника не нашла бы отражения в русском тексте, — спрашивается, какая была бы цена всей этой безукоризненной точности?</u> Конечно, я не собираюсь выступать на защиту переводческих ляпсусов, я думаю, что с ними надлежит неослабно бороться, но главное все же не в них. (Chukovskii 1936a: 15—16.)</p>	<p>[. . .], and those critics who try to discredit any translation in the eyes of uninitiated readers by indicating blunders like that, use such pedagogy solely for the corruption of those readers' tastes. <u>In fact, imagine that if in Val. Stenich's Dos Passos translations every English word would be reproduced with impeccable accuracy, whereas the ironical lyricism of the original would not be reflected in the Russian text — the question would arise: what is the price of such impeccable accuracy?</u> Of course, I do not intend to advocate blunders in translations, I think that we must persistently fight against them, but still they are not the most important thing.</p>
<p>[. . .], и те критики, которые пытаются дискредитировать в глазах непосвященных читателей тот или иной перевод при помощи указаний на подобные промахи, пользуются такой демагогией исключительно для развращения читательских вкусов. Конечно, я не собираюсь выступать на защиту переводческих промахов, я думаю, что с ними надлежит неослабно бороться, но главное все же не в них. (Chukovskii 1941: 11.)</p>	<p>[. . .], and those critics who try to discredit any translation in the eyes of uninitiated readers by indicating blunders like that, use such pedagogy solely for the corruption of those readers' tastes. Of course, I do not intend to advocate blunders in translations, I think that we must persistently fight against them, but still they are not the most important thing.</p>

As shown in Table 116, the voids caused by the removal of two sentences remain inconspicuous, as the remaining passages can quite naturally be glued together. Only the juxtaposition of the two editions shows the maneuver that was carried out between them.

In the 1930 and 1936 editions of *A High Art*, Chukovskii presents, as an example, an excerpt from Stenich's translation of Charles-Louis Philippe in order to demonstrate a case in which a lexical error does have significant consequences. In that particular case, the error distorts some cardinal elements pertaining to the plot. The same passage is included also in the 1941 edition, but the explicit reference to Stenich has been omitted. Table 117 shows that just like in the example shown in Table 115, Stenich's name has been replaced with the general concept of "translator."

Table 117

<p><i>Известный переводчик Вал. Стенич, переводя с немецкого французский роман Шарля Луи Филиппа, изобразил в переводе, [. . .] (Chukovskii 1930: 63–64; 1936a: 12.)</i></p> <p><i>Один небезызвестный переводчик, переводя с немецкого французский роман Шарля-Луи Филиппа, изобразил в переводе, [. . .] (Chukovskii 1941: 8.)</i></p>	<p><i>The well-known translator Val. Stenich, translating from German a French novel by Charles-Louis Philippe, described in the translation, [. . .]</i></p> <p><i>A not unknown translator, translating from German a French novel by Charles-Louis Philippe, described in the translation, [. . .]</i></p>
--	---

Interestingly, the epithet “well-known” has been replaced with the negated antonym “not unknown.” The paraphrasing appears to dilute the tone of the epithet. In the 1960s editions of *A High Art* (Chukovskii 1964: 10; 1966: 246; 1968: 13), Stenich’s name reclaims its original place in the text, except with a new epithet. In those editions, Chukovskii speaks of Stenich as an “outstanding” (*prevoskhodnyi*) translator.

In discussing the error in Stenich’s translation that distorted the plot (see above), Chukovskii (1930: 64; 1936a: 12) reports that the translator personally informed him about it.

Table 118

<p><i>Знаменательно, что никто даже не заметил его беспримерной ошибки. О ней сообщил мне он сам – в назидание своим собратьям по искусству. (Chukovskii 1930: 64; 1936a: 12.)</i></p>	<p><i>It is noteworthy that nobody even noticed his unequalled error. He informed me about it himself – for the education of brothers-in-art.</i></p>
--	---

In the 1941 edition of *A High Art* (p. 8), the above reference to Chukovskii’s cooperation with Stenich was omitted entirely. Thus, there remains nothing in the text that might suggest of any personal connection between the two litterateurs.

One of Chukovskii’s points is that every great writer has more styles than one, and that the translator must be able to discern them all and reproduce them in the translation. The argument was already presented in the first handbook, and it remains in *A High Art* throughout all the revised editions. (See Chukovskii 1919: 14; 1920: 37; 1930: 46–47; 1936a: 93; 1941: 89; 1964: 129; 1966: 377; 1968: 144.) In the 1936 edition (pp. 93–95), Chukovskii expands on the earlier discussion. Stenich’s translations of Dos Passos are presented as an example to demonstrate the impeccable rendering of the original author’s multiple style. The lengthy discussion, in which Chukovskii describes all four “modes” (*manery*) of Dos Passos, opens with praise for Stenich.

Table 119

<p><i>Сила Вал. Стенича, который дал нам русского Дос-Пассоса, заключается именно в том, что ему удалось ощутить и воспроизвести в переводе всю сложную многостильность подлинника. (Chukovskii 1936a: 93.)</i></p>	<p><i>The strenght of Val. Stenich, who gave us the Russian Dos Passos, is manifested particularly in his ability to distinguish and to reproduce in the translation the entire complex multiplicity of styles in the original.</i></p>
---	---

In discussing the above topic of multiple styles in the 1941 edition of *A High Art* (p. 89–90), Chukovskii has removed the passage about Stenich and Dos Passos. The precedent and subsequent passages remain almost the same, with only minor revisions. The removal was not quite as simple as the one shown in Table 116 above. In order to connect the remaining passages without leaving a visible mark of the removal, Chukovskii had to erase one word.

Table 120

<p><i>Но, к сожалению, переводчики, имея дело с многостильным автором, в большинстве случаев передают лишь какой-нибудь один его стиль, а остальным оказываются слепы и глухи. (Chukovskii 1936a: 95.)</i></p> <p><i>К сожалению, переводчики, имея дело с многостильным автором передают лишь какой-нибудь один его стиль, а остальным оказываются слепы и глухи. (Chukovskii 1941: 89–90.)</i></p>	<p><i>But unfortunately, translators working on a multi-styled writer in most cases convey only one of his styles, remaining blind and deaf to the rest.</i></p> <p><i>Unfortunately, most translators working on a multi-styled writer convey only one of his styles, remaining blind and deaf to the rest.</i></p>
--	--

The conjunction “but” would have appeared disconnected and odd without the positive review of Stenich preceding it. In fact, in the 1941 edition of *A High Art* (p. 89), the phrase shown in Table 120 immediately follows a passage in which Soviet translators are criticized for not being able to reproduce Kipling’s multiple style. The removal of the conjunction entirely changes the point of the remark that originally juxtaposed skilled and unskilled translators. The remark now appears as an after-thought to the previous passage. The connection has been made so naturally that nothing seems to be missing from the one to the other.

Dos Passos is not mentioned in the 1941 edition, either. The simplest and most logical explanation for this would be that in the previous edition he appeared only in the same context as Stenich, as his original author. Even without that connection, it is questionable whether Chukovskii, being as prudent as he evidently was, would have wanted to wave a red flag at the authorities by promoting Dos Passos in those days. There was also another delicate matter about the American writer that Chukovskii was hardly keen to advertize: about a decade earlier, Dos Passos had visited the Chukovskii family.

When Dos Passos was in the Soviet Union in 1928 (See subchapter 4.4.3), his translator Stenich acted as his host (see Safiullina & Platonov 2012: 247). Nikolai Chukovskii's (1989: 234–241) memoirs contain an anecdote about the visit. At that time, the Chukovskii family was vacationing at a dacha settlement in Siverskii, in the vicinity of Leningrad. A chronic insomniac, Kornei Chukovskii had not managed to get a wink of sleep for many nights in a row. Feeling dreary and sick on a rainy morning, he had just laid himself down on the porch to get some rest. All of a sudden, Stenich appeared in the garden with the American writer, who had arrived in the Soviet Union only on the previous day. Dos Passos had wished to see some countryside, and knowing that Chukovskii and his son could speak English, Stenich had considered it a good idea to take his guest to meet them. Furthermore, he thought that being a translator of Whitman and O. Henry, Chukovskii could discuss American literature with Dos Passos. Chukovskii's area of expertise was, however, centered on 19th century writers. In actual fact, he had never even heard of the modernist Dos Passos. On top of it all, Stenich had to return to Leningrad immediately. Turning on his heel, he left his guest in the charge of the Chukovskii family for the rest of the day. (See Chukovskii, N. 1989: 234–235.)

Although Chukovskii was refreshed by conversation with the foreign guest, in the end it was his son Nikolai who ended up entertaining Dos Passos. In the course of that day, the two discussed Russian literature, American literature, and English literature, but not a word was exchanged about the Revolution or about politics in general. Whenever the discussion approached such topics, Dos Passos “clammed up.” This, in his own words, surprised Nikolai Chukovskii, as the very purpose of Dos Passos' visit had been to get acquainted with the Soviet way of life. The American guest was evidently nervous, even scared, and he recoiled at the sight of a policeman sitting nearby in a café. Nikolai was amused by what he considered Dos Passos' prejudice against the Soviet Union, and at the same time, he felt sorry for him. He would later reason that it would have been pointless to try to change the writer's attitude because then the sputnik, the Battle of Stalingrad, and other “concrete, splendid arguments” for the Socialist system were yet to come. (See Chukovskii, N. 1989: 236–241.) Nikolai's comment illustrates his apparently genuine devotion to the Soviet system (see Subchapter 2.8), but it also seems well adapted to the politically correct writing of the early 1960s, at the time of the Cold War. That was when Nikolai Chukovskii's memoirs were first published.

Chukovskii's diary contains no mention of Dos Passos' visit, but on the other hand, there are no entries between June 4th and August 31st of that year anyway. In a postcard dated July 29, 1928, Lidiia Chukovskaia informs her father: “Yesterday, Dos Passos came to Leningrad” (see Chukovskaia, L. 2003: 85). According to Nikolai Chukovskii's memoirs, on that very day Dos Passos was in Siverskii. Unfortunately, Lidiia Chukovskaia's archive has long since been destroyed in various searches and confiscations (see Chukovskaia, E. & Khavkina 2003: 18), and, therefore, Chukovskii's reply to the message is not available. If he ever wrote one, there might have been a mention of Dos Passos.

During the Great Terror, connections – even past connections – with suspicious foreigners could have fatal consequences (Fitzpatrick 2000: 204). For instance, Lev Kamenev's widow was executed not only for “terrorism” but also for having a “counterrevolutionary conversation with a foreign diplomat” (see Conquest 2008: xv), and in the Pereval case, the poet and translator Ivan Likhachev's “constant contacts with foreigners” were brought

up as an incriminating issue (see Shneiderman 2000: 185). The episode about the foreign parcel that Chukovskii (2011c: 479—480; see Subchapter 2.7) recalls in his diary testifies to the atmosphere of panic in 1937. If a gift from an American acquaintance made Chukovskii react as he did, the last thing he probably would have wanted was to be connected with the denounced Dos Passos (see Subchapter 4.4.3).

Another litterateur arrested in connection with the Pereval case was Vil'gel'm Zorgenfrei. He, too, received a death sentence and was executed on the same night as Livshits, Stenich, and Kuzmin's former companion Iurii Iurkun (see Subchapter 4.4.4). (See Shneiderman 1996: 119.) From Chukovskii's (2011a: 364) diary it turns out that he had known Zorgenfrei since the time of the publishing house *Vsemirnaia literatura*, and in the *Chukokkala* album (Chukovskii 2008b: 341), he appears in connection with the House of Arts. In *Chukokkala*, Chukovskii reminisces about the poet as follows:

В Доме Искусств очень часто бывал Вильгельм Александрович Зоргенфрей, поэт и переводчик. Он вспоминается мне как отличный человек, очень молчаливый и скромный, с тихими словами и мягкими жестами. (Chukovskii 2008b: 341.)

In the House of Arts, Vil'gel'm Aleksandrovich Zorgenfrei, a poet and a translator, was often present. I remember him as an exceptional person, very reticent and unassuming, with quiet words and gentle gestures.

As to Zorgenfrei's poems, they did not make any particular impression on Chukovskii, who found them "long-winded, lackluster, colorless" (*rastianuty, vialy, bledny*). Chukovskii also refers to the apparently quite common opinion of Zorgenfrei's writing. There were many of those who thought that in his poetry, he was trying to imitate his idol Aleksandr Blok. (See Chukovskii 2008b: 341—342.)

In the 1936 edition of *A High Art*, Chukovskii, however, recognizes Zorgenfrei's talent a translator. Already in the foreword, the poet is mentioned in a list of the contemporary masters of that trade (p. 9; see Table 113 above). He is also included in the list of "irreproachable workers" for which Chukovskii (1936a: 186) gives credit to Gor'kii (see Subchapter 4.4.4). This entire passage has been removed from the 1941 edition. Zorgenfrei's name is absent from this edition.

Of the three litterateurs discussed above, only Stenich reappears in the 1960s editions of *A High Art*. Zorgenfrei's absence may be due to the fact that even in his own time, he was not very famous as a poet. As regards Livshits, also his name might have been relatively unknown to the younger generation of readers. Since the 1930s, Silver Age literature had been denounced, and in the 1960s, research on it was only beginning to appear. Meanwhile, the regime had done everything it could to safeguard the Soviet people from the "pernicious influence" of the Silver Age. (See Reitblat 2002.)

Just Passing Through

The litterateurs discussed in the 1936 edition of *A High Art* include also Dmitrii Sviatopolk-Mirskii (see Subchapter 4.3.3), due to his aristocratic descent also known as Prince Mirskii, and Mikhail D'iakonov. Both litterateurs are omitted from the 1941 edition of *A High Art*, and neither of them ever reappears in the book.

Mirskii had moved to England after the Civil War, in which he had fought for the White Army. In England, he had established himself as a critic and a scholar of Russian literary history. He later became a supporter of Communism and decided to return to his native country. (Shentalinskii 2007.) When he entered the Soviet Union in 1932, he was a member of the British Communist Party (Chukovskaia, L. 2013a: 262–263).

Edward Hallett Carr was a prominent British historian and diplomat, with whom Mirskii had become acquainted while working at London University (see Haslam 2000: 41). He would later comment on Mirskii's decision to return as follows:

Mirsky had, like a number of patriotic but misguided emigrés fooled by official propaganda, returned to the Soviet Union when conditions had been improving. But now, however, the terror unleashed by Stalin to wipe out all conceivable opposition and potential opposition was working its deadly way across the entire country, through party and state. (Haslam 2000: 76.)

Once in the Soviet Union, Mirskii started publishing articles in which the fundamental idea was that a writer's class origin determines his literary work. In the summer of 1933, he traveled to the White Sea–Baltic Canal site with the writers' expedition. He also participated in the ensuing book project. (Dobrenko 2001: 373; see Subchapter 4.2.)

In an article published in the journal *Litaraturnoe nasledstvo* ("Literary Heritage") in 1934, Mirskii debased the "Soviet Pushkin myth" (see Subchapter 4.2) by calling the national poet a "lackey" and his worldview "alien to the proletariat." On August 28, 1936, David Zaslavskii (see Subchapter 2.8) attacked Mirskii for his views on Pushkin, and the attack soon expanded into a full-fledged campaign. (Petronne 2000: 138.) Karen Petronne explains the underlying factors as follows:

When Mirskii called Pushkin a lackey, he struck a nerve among Soviet literary critics who themselves displayed a high degree of conformity to the dictates of Soviet power. It is possible that Mirskii even meant to provoke these Soviet literary authorities. Ironically, his critics proved their own servility by attacking him. (Petronne 2000: 138.)

Mirskii was forced to publicly recant – twice – but his penance only added fuel to the fire of his attackers. Not only was his provocative criticism considered incriminating, but also his past was reconsidered. (Petronne 2000: 138.)

August 1936 was also marked by "a series of hysterical articles" in *Literaturnaia gazeta* connected with the Zinov'ev-Kamenev trial in that same month (see Subchapter 2.7). According to the authors, a number of "Trotskyite writers" had infiltrated into the Writers' Union. In one of those articles, Mirskii was called a "filthy Wrangelist (after the name of a commanding general in the White Army; M.S.) and White Guard officer." (Conquest 2008: 297–298.) He was eventually arrested in 1937, and he died in a camp two years later (Chukovskaia, L. 2013a: 263). Mirskii's name also came up in the Pereval case. Stenich (see above) had allegedly mentioned him among those who were present at a writers' meeting where plans had been made for killing Stalin (see Nerler 2009).

Long before his arrest, Mirskii must have already recognized that the net was beginning to tighten around him. An episode recorded in Edward Hallett's Carr's biography

vividly illustrates the fear Mirskii was feeling at that time. Visiting Leningrad in May 1937, Carr accidentally came across him in the street. He was bewildered at the initial reaction of his old acquaintance: Mirskii desperately tried to pretend that he did not recognize him. What Carr probably could not understand was that considering his own diplomat past, communicating with him might have had sinister consequences for Mirskii, as they would have had for any Soviet citizen. (See Haslam 2000: 76).

Clark and Dobrenko (2007: 187–188) consider Gor’kii’s death in 1936 and the loss of his patronage as a determining factor in Mirskii’s subsequent fate. In a diary entry recorded on January 27, 1935, Chukovskii (2011b: 559) mentions the “enthusiastic manner” (*vostorzhennyi obraz*) in which Gor’kii discussed Mirskii in *Pravda*. Chukovskii is referring to Gor’kii’s series of articles about contemporary literature, titled “Literaturnye zabavy” (“Literary Entertainments;” see Chukovskaia, E. 2011b: 599). In the same diary entry, Chukovskii (2011b: 559) speaks very fondly of Mirskii, about his erudition, his candour, and his literary talent.

In *A High Art*, Mirskii is mentioned only once. In discussing the transcription of foreign proper names in the 1936 edition, Chukovskii draws examples from Mirskii’s book *Intelligentsia*.

Table 121

<p>Так, в книге Д. Мирского «Интеллиджентсия» – город Кембридж превратился в Кеймбридж, Гексли стал Хаксли, Рескин сделался Раскин, Уолтер Патер – Уолтер Пейтер. (Chukovskii 1936a: 210.)</p>	<p>So, in D. Mirskii’s book “Intelligentsia,” the town Kembridzh [Cambridge] has turned into Keimbridzh, Geksli [Huxley] became Khaksli, Reskin [Ruskin] became Raskin, Uolter Pater [Walter Pater] became Uolter Peiter.</p>
--	---

The above remark was omitted from the 1941 edition. The simplest explanation is that having been published in 1934, Mirskii’s book was current at the time Chukovskii was revising the 1936 edition. Even the campaign against Mirskii had not yet begun. When the 1941 edition was in progress, Mirskii’s book had lost its actuality, but that may not be the only reason for omitting his name from *A High Art*. In light of the other omissions, the removal might as well be connected with his arrest.

Mikhail D’iakonov was a translator, a scholar, and an expert in Norwegian literature. In 1934, he became the editor of the foreign department of the publishing house Goslitizdat. D’iakonov was arrested in October 1936, charged with “anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda,” and executed within a week. (See Shosin 2009.)

Like Mirskii’s, also D’iakonov’s name appears in the 1936 edition of *A High Art* in the context of transcription. Discussing the transcription of Norwegian proper names, Chukovskii (1936: 211–212), brings up new practices recently started at Goslitizdat. He presents a long citation from D’iakonov’s foreword to the newly published anthology of Henrik Ibsen’s poems in translations by the poet Anna Ganzen (see D’iakonov 1935: 21–22). The same passage is included in the 1941 edition, with slight revisions and without a mention of D’iakonov.

Table 122

<p><i>В Ленинградском отделении Гослитиздата редактором иностранного отдела <u>М. А. Дьяконовым</u> недавно была произведена строгая реконструкция норвежских имен на основе норвежской фонетики.</i></p> <p><i>"До последнего времени в русской литературе, – пишет <u>М. А. Дьяконов</u>, – существовала традиция руссифицировать иностранные имена, [. . .]</i></p> <p><i>(Chukovskii 1936a: 211.)</i></p> <p><i>Сколько лет переводят у нас, например, сочинения Ибсена, но характерно для современной эпохи, что лишь теперь, чуть не полвека спустя, мы заметили, что имена его героев искажены. [. . .]</i></p> <p><i>В предисловии к новому изданию Ибсена <u>сказано</u>: "До последнего времени в русской литературе существует традиция руссифицировать иностранные имена, [. . .]</i></p> <p><i>.] (Chukovskii 1941: 215.)</i></p>	<p><i>In the Leningrad branch of Goslitizdat, the editor of the foreign department <u>M. A. D'iakonov</u> lately carried out a rigorous reconstruction of Norwegian names on the basis of Norwegian phonetics.</i></p> <p><i>"Until recently – writes <u>M. A. D'iakonov</u> – "there has prevailed in Russian literature the tradition of Russifying foreign proper nouns, [. . .]</i></p> <p><i>For so many years for instance Ibsen's works have been translated in our country, but it is characteristic of the current epoch that only now, with almost half a century having passed by, we have noticed that the names of his heroes have been distorted. [. . .]</i></p> <p><i>In the foreword to the new edition of Ibsen <u>it says</u>: "Until recently, there has prevailed in Russian literature the tradition of Russifying foreign proper nouns, [. . .]</i></p>
--	--

As shown in Table 122, in the 1941 edition the introductory passage to the topic was altered entirely. Instead of explicitly naming D'iakonov as the primus motor in the implementation of the new transcription practices, like he did in the 1936 edition, Chukovskii – once again (see Subchapter 4.3.1) – refers to the superiority of the present epoch over the past one. The citation itself has been reduced to a third of its original length.

In the 1936 edition, Chukovskii describes Ganzen's reaction when she was informed of the new practices. That passage, too, was revised for the 1941 edition, with D'iakonov's name omitted.

Table 123

<p>Когда <u>М. А. Дьяконов</u> сообщил об этом своим сотрудникам, известная переводчица скандинавских писателей Анна Ганзен, хоть и подчинилась этой слишком жесткой реформе, все же заявила против нее пылкий протест в таких полушутливых строках: [. . .] (<i>Chukovskii 1936a: 212.</i>)</p> <p>Переводы в новом издании старые, принадлежащие известной переводчице А. В. Ганзен. Переводчица охотно подчинилась этой радикальной реформе и в новом издании Ибсена переименовала все привычные имена его персонажей, но все же заявила против этого шутливый протест: [. . .] (<i>Chukovskii 1941: 215–216.</i>)</p>	<p>When <u>M. A. D'iakonov</u> informed his employees about this, the well-known translator of Scandinavian writers Anna Ganzen, albeit submitting to the overly strict reform, however, raised against it a fervent protest in the following half-joking lines: [. . .]</p> <p>The translations in the new edition are old, made by the well-known translator Anna Ganzen. She readily yielded to this radical reform and revised all the customary names of the characters in the new Ibsen edition, but, however, raised against it this joking protest: [. . .]</p>
---	---

Ganzen's "joking protest" is complemented with a poem called "Plach antifonetika" ("The Lament of the Anti-Fonetician;" see Chukovskii 1936: 213; 1941: 216; see also Subchapter 4.5.2). In the 1936 edition (p. 214), Chukovskii points out that the Anti-Fonetician would lament all the more bitterly finding out that, by order of D'iakonov, the polar explorer Roald Amundsen's first name is no more spelled "Roál'd" but "Rúal." The remark was omitted from the 1941 edition, and D'iakonov's name is absent from that edition entirely.

Neither Mirskii's, nor D'iakonov's omission from the 1941 edition of *A High Art* is particularly conspicuous because the missing passages were replaced with new material. The removals are not very easily detected also because some individual paragraphs were reorganized between editions.

Past Sins Recalled

Among those who disappear from *A High Art* in the late 1930s are Osip Mandel'shtam and Nikolai Gumilev. Together with Anna Akhmatova and the poet Sergei Gorodetskii, they were the founding members of Acmeism (*Akmeizm*). Also referred to as "Adamism" (*Adamizm*), the movement emerged in the early 1910s. With its concreteness and clarity of style, it challenged the abstractness and enigmaticness of Symbolism. (See Sukhikh 2008.)

Mandel'shtam was first arrested in May 1934 (Shneiderman 1996: 87). The main reason to the arrest was the epigram of Stalin he wrote in 1933, titled "Kremlevskii gorets" ("The Kremlin Mountaineer"). Mandel'shtam shared the poem only with his trusted friends – but with a considerable number of trusted friends. That eventually led to the epigram's content leaking into the ears of the Soviet authorities. (Kushner 2005.) Aleksandr Kushner comments the inevitable process as follows:

[. . .], был уверен в сочувствии и понимании, – и оно наверняка было. Искать среди них доносчика не хочется и не следует; любая тайна, ставшая достоянием такого количества людей, перестает быть тайной: запоминаются хотя бы несколько строк и под страшным секретом передаются друзьям и знакомым. (Kushner 2005.)

[. . .], he was convinced of their sympathy and understanding – and he was probably right. There would be no point in searching for the informer among them. Made into the property of such a number of people, any secret stops being a secret: for instance a few lines will be remembered and, under absolute secrecy, conveyed to friends and acquaintances.

After his first arrest, Mandel'shtam was expelled from Moscow. He and his wife first went to live in Chedryn, and from there they moved to Voronezh. (See Mandelstam 1999: 32, 95.) During Mandel'shtam's exile, his works were not published. Unlike many other writers in disfavor, he was also denied other writing assignments, even translation. Reminiscing about this period, Nadezhda Mandel'shtam points out: "Even his name was no longer mentionable." (See Mandelstam 1999: 138–140.) As it turns out from an NKVD memorandum recorded in 1935, being however loosely associated with Osip Mandel'shtam – or with Gumilev (see below) – was a grave enough sin to render anybody dubious in the eyes of the regime. In the memorandum, the poet Vsevolod Rozhdestvenskii is labeled as "hostile" and "anti-Soviet." To support the argument, the author of the memorandum mentions Rozhdestvenskii's past connections with Gumilev, "shot in connection with the Tagantsevsky case" and with Mandel'shtam, "exiled for counterrevolutionary activities." (See Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 304.)

Mandel'shtam's three-year exile ended in the spring of 1937, and upon returning to Moscow, the couple tried to re-establish their life (see Mandel'shtam 1999: 212–216). On March 16, 1938, the head of the Writers' Union Vladimir Stavskii wrote to Nikolai Ezhov a letter expressing his unease about the support Mandel'shtam was getting from his colleagues. Stavskii was particularly outraged by the "martyr" status that the poet appeared to have acquired. Referring to Mandel'shtam's "obscene and slanderous verse and anti-Soviet agitation," Stavskii requested Ezhov to "help solve this matter of Mandel'shtam." (Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 332; see also Chukovskii 2009: 284.)

A letter from Chukovskii to Viktor Shklovskii, dated two days before the above letter, contains a laconic remark that testifies to the concern for Mandel'shtam among writers:

Об Осипе мне больно и подумать. Хочу посоветоваться с Вами. (Chukovskii 2009: 282.)

It hurts me even to think about Osip. I want to ask for your advice.

Whatever advice Shklovskii may have given, it was already too late to help Mandel'shtam. He was arrested a second time on May 2, 1938 while he was staying with his wife at a sanatorium near Moscow at the expense of the Writers' Union (Shneiderman 1996: 84). Nadezhda Mandel'shtam (1999: 371) was convinced that the ultimate purpose of granting her husband the holiday was, in actual fact, to situate him in a place where it would be convenient to pick him up:

I have no doubt whatsoever that Stavskii deliberately sent us into this trap. (Mandel'shtam 1999: 371.)

Mandel'shtam's second arrest had connections with the Pereval case, in which his name had repeatedly come up. In the surviving documents of the case, he is labeled as an "active member of the counterrevolutionary assemblages (*kontrrevoliutsionnye sborishchi*)" that supposedly had been gathering in the home of Livshits since 1928. Moreover, Livshits is alleged to have mentioned in the interrogations that Mandel'shtam's "anti-Stalinist" poetry had served as an incentive to terrorist action. (Shneiderman 1996: 898, 104.)

After his second arrest, Mandel'shtam was sentenced to hard labor in the Kolyma camp in the Russian Far East. He, however, perished on the way there while staying at a transit camp in Vladivostok. Nadezhda Mandel'shtam's memoirs provide a detailed document about her husband's fate. She managed to gather information about his death from survivors. Osip Mandel'shtam was posthumously rehabilitated after Stalin's death, but even then his works were not published. Referring to this, Nadezhda Mandel'shtam points out that "there are two types of rehabilitation – M. was given the second-class one" (See Mandel'shtam 1999: 376–380, 395–401.)

In discussing current control over the standard of translations in the chapter titled "The Editing of Foreign Writers" in the 1930 edition (p. 71) of *A High Art*, Chukovskii cites Mandel'shtam's article "Potoki khaltury" (see Subchapter 4.4.1). The 1936 edition (pp. 185–202) contains an expanded version of the corresponding chapter under the slightly revised title "The Editing of Foreign Translations" (*Redaktura inostrannykh perevodov*). Both the reference to Mandel'shtam and the citation were omitted from the latter edition.

Like in the omissions of Mirskii and D'iakonov (see above), the omission of Mandel'shtam is quite unnoticeable because the text was thoroughly revised between editions. Chukovskii's disposition to recycle his own texts (see Subchapter 4.4.2) is particularly evident here. The topic in the 1936 edition is basically the same as it was in the 1930 edition, but the sequence of individual paragraphs has been altered entirely. In the 1930 edition, the chapter is followed by an appendix titled "Defense of Dickens: about Editing" (*V zashchitu Dikkensa: k voprosu o redakture*; pp. 74–86), but in the 1936 edition (pp. 185–202), the content of that appendix has been embedded in the actual chapter. As regards the passage that discusses the transcription of foreign proper names (see above), the case is the opposite. In the 1930 edition (pp. 71–73), the discussion is included in the chapter titled "The Editing of Foreign Writers" (see Subchapter 4.4.1), but in the 1936 edition (pp. 208–214), it appears in an elaborated form in the following chapter, which is titled "Idioms. Typical Errors. The Transcription of Foreign Proper Names" (*Idiomy. Tipicheskie oshibki. Transkriptsiia sobstvennykh imen*).

In the 1930 edition (p. 71) of *A High Art*, the passage that deals with the intensified public control over translations, with the Mandel'shtam quotation included, was positioned in the middle of the chapter. In the 1936 edition (p. 202), the same passage was positioned at the end of the chapter, and the quotation was replaced with the concluding remarks shown in Table 124.

Table 124

<p><i>Дело редакции переводов поставлено на новые рельсы. Есть надежда, что через несколько лет всякая жилкинщина отойдет в невозвратное прошлое. (Chukovskii 1936a: 202.)</i></p>	<p><i>The issue of editing translations is being put on a new track. There is hope that in a few years, all Zhilkinism will be a thing of the ir-retrievable past.</i></p>
--	--

Because of all these revisions, the two versions of the same chapter cannot be directly juxtaposed with each other. Thus, whether intentionally or not, Chukovskii performs a conjuring trick. Only a close examination of both chapters reveals that something that once was there is now missing.

Incidentally, as shown in Table 124, Chukovskii refers to Zhilkin's (see Subchapter 4.4.1) work by the word *zhilkinshchina* ("Zhilkinism"), a derogatory expression analogous with the one that was used in the campaigns against his own children's books (see Subchapter 2.6).

The next time Mandel'shtam reappears in "*A High Art* in the 1966 edition (p. 336). Praising the skill of contemporary Soviet translators, Chukovskii poses the rhetorical question: "Why is it that neither in the United States, nor in England, nor in France has a single translator been found who with such art and with such intense love would translate our Gogol, Lermontov, Griboedov, Krylov, Maiakovskii, Pasternak, Mandelstam, and Blok?" (see Leighton 1984: 86–87). The passage is included nearly verbatim also in the 1968 edition (p. 102).

Unlike the other litterateurs discussed in the present chapter, Nikolai Gumilev was not a victim of the Great Terror. He was executed soon after the Revolution, in 1921. He was charged with involvement in the so-called Tagantsev conspiracy, named after its alleged ringleader, the distinguished scholar Vladimir Tagantsev. In the official documents, the plot was referred to by the abbreviation "PBO" (*Petrogradskaia boevaia organizatsiia* or The Military Organization of Petrograd). Besides Gumilev, a number of other people were shot for the same reason. Among them were intellectuals, scholars, former officers, and even Sisters of Charity. (Fel'dman 2006.)

Efforts to rehabilitate Gumilev began in the late 1950s, after the Twentieth Party Congress (see Subchapter 2.8), but it soon turned out that the end of the Stalin cult had no influence on Gumilev's case. First, Stalin had not even been in power at the time he was executed. Second, in that Leninism was still an essential element of the Soviet ethos, the time was not yet ripe for critical examination of the Tagantsev case. (Fel'dman 2006.)

Later, in the 1960s, the Soviet authorities tried to stifle all discussion of repressions, as "everything had already been said" in the Twentieth Party Congress (Blium 2011). Only during Glasnost did measures for Gumilev's rehabilitation start anew. From the beginning, it became obvious that some kind of a compromise would be required to save the faces of all parties concerned. Disputes about the details included in the statement and about its formulation complicated and slowed the process so long that Gumilev was not officially rehabilitated until August 1991. Yet another year went by before it was officially admitted that the Tagantsev case had been fabricated. (Fel'dman 2006.)

As regards publication, Gumilev's posthumous fate has some peculiar features. Even after his execution, his friends still managed to get some of his works published. When Soviet censorship was organized and centralized under *Glavlit* (see Subchapter 2.6), the

control of all publications became notably tighter. The subsequent separate edition of Gumilev's works was not published in the Soviet Union until 1988. (Blium 2011.) On the other hand, if foreign editions are not counted, not a single book by Gumilev landed on the proscription list of *Glaolit*. Thus, the books continued to be available in libraries and antiquarian bookstores. (Blium 2011.)

While other repressed writers, for instance, Osip Mandel'shtam (see above), became nonpersons, Gumilev's name kept appearing in various publications until the mid-1930s. The Party leader Nikolai Bukharin even cited Gumilev's poetry in his address to the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers in 1934. In most cases, though, Gumilev was mentioned in a negative context. For instance, a literary encyclopedia published in 1930 portrays him as an "active member of a counterrevolutionary conspiracy against the Soviet power." Gumilev's poems were included in textbooks, but supplemented with references to the prerevolutionary ruling classes for which he was presented as a spokesman. In other publications, Gumilev was introduced as a member of the imperialist camp, as an "imperialist conquistador." The critic Vladimir Ermilov, in turn, suggested that anybody studying the rise of the consolidation of Fascist power should draw "instructive conclusions" (*pouchitel'nye vyvody*) from Gumilev's poetry. (See Blium 2011.)

After 1935, Gumilev became taboo. His name practically disappeared from publications – although now and then, authors managed to dodge ignorant censors and slip citations from his poems into their texts. At the same time, Gumilev was wiped out from the history of Russian literature: he was not mentioned in any literary encyclopedias until 1964. Even after that, his name was complemented with a remark referring to the "reactory" features in his works. What Arlen Blium calls the "name-fear" (*imiaboiazn'*) of the Soviet authorities is illustrated by their intervention in the publication of Anna Akhmatova's biography – probably in connection with her death in 1966. The author of the biography was explicitly forbidden to mention that "in 1910 Akhmatova married Gumilev." Instead, Akhmatova was referred to with the following periphrasis: "the wife of the leader of the Acmeist movement." (Blium 2011).

At the time when the *Chukokkala* album was first published in 1979, in a heavily censored version, excerpts of Gumilev's poetry had already been sporadically appearing in print (see Blium 2011). In spite of this, neither Gumilev's entries, nor Chukovskii's article about him were admitted in the book. They were not included until twenty years later, when the first uncensored edition of *Chukokkala* came out. (Chukovskaia, E. 2008: 553–557; see also *Russkii put.*)

When the handbook for translators was compiled at the publishing house Vsemirnaia literatura, Gumilev was Chukovskii's co-author on the project. Titled "Perevody stikhotvornye" ("The Translation of Poetry;" Gumilev 1919: 25–30; 1920: 54–59), his article about the translation of poetry was included only in the two editions of the handbook. Gumilev's name, however, appears in the 1930 and 1936 editions of *A High Art*, in the latter one in several contexts.

In the 1930 edition (p. 63), Gumilev is mentioned in a discussion about precision. Chukovskii insists that in a translation, reproducing the spirit of the original is all that really matters (see Subchapter 4.4.2). To support his point of view, he presents examples in which the translator mistranslated an individual word but the error was insignificant in an otherwise excellent translation. One of those translations was by Gumilev.

Table 125

<p>Гумилев, переводя Теофиля Готье, не понял слова <i>Minet</i> (котенок) и передал его "Четьи Минеи", но все же его перевод «Емалей и камей» сделан с несравненным мастерством. (Chukovskii 1930: 63.)</p>	<p>Translating <i>Théophile Gautier</i>, Gumilev did not understand the word <i>Minet</i> (kitten) and reproduced it as <i>Menaion</i> (the liturgical book of the Orthodox Church; M.S.), but still his translation of <i>Enamels and Cameos</i> has been done with unequalled virtuosity.</p>
---	---

The above comment is also included in the 1936 edition of *A High Art* (p. 28), in a slightly revised form. However, it was omitted from the 1941 edition (p. 31). In the original list of examples, the one about Gumilev was the last, and after that example, Chukovskii turned the discussion on to a general level. In the 1941 edition, the general discussion begins right after the previous example, and, therefore, no conspicuous void is produced by the omission of Gumilev.

As shown in Table 114 (see above), Gumilev was included in the list of compatible writer-translator pairs in the 1936 edition (p. 52) but, like Livshits and Stenich, omitted from it in the 1941 edition (p. 59). Between the two editions, Gumilev's name was also discarded from another list. In discussing translations of Shakespeare (see Subchapter 4.4.4), Chukovskii brings up the general issue of excessive compactness (*kompaktnost'*) when translating poetry. He emphasizes that the translator is never allowed to turn the text into a "more compact verbal mass" that it was in the original because that would only result in unnatural pronunciation, awkward intonation, and a broken syntax. He also remarks that in such a case, even the most accurate reproduction of content and meter cannot undo the damage done. (See Chukovskii 1936a: 182; 1941: 135.) In the 1936 edition, Gumilev is mentioned among the examples of translators who have failed to give heed to this aspect. Table 126 shows how the passage had been revised for the 1941 edition.

Table 126

<p>Об этом критерии точности забыл Фет, когда переводил «Фауста», о нем <u>забыл Н. Гумилев</u>, когда переводил <u>Кольриджа</u> («<u>Мореход старинных времен</u>»), забыл Аксенов, когда переводил Бена Джонсона. (Chukovskii 1936a: 182–183.)</p>	<p>This criterium of precision was forgotten by Fet, when he translated <i>Faust</i>, <u>it was forgotten by Gumilev</u>, when he translated <u>Coleridge</u> (<i>The Rime of the Ancient Mariner</i>), forgotten by Aksenov, when he translated Ben Johnson.</p>
<p>Об этом критерии точности забыл Фет, когда переводил «Фауста», <u>забыла Меркурьева</u>, когда переводила стихотворения <u>Шелли</u>; забыл Аксенов, когда переводил Бена Джонсона. (Chukovskii 1941: 135–136.)</p>	<p>This criterium of precision was forgotten by Fet, when he translated <i>Faust</i>, <u>it was forgotten by Merkur'eva</u>, when she translated <u>the poetry of Shelley</u>; forgotten by Aksenov, when he translated Ben Johnson.</p>

As can be seen in Table 126, the translator Vera Merkur'eva appears in the list and replaces the discarded Gumilev.

In discussing the reproduction of rhythm and syntax, Chukovskii (1936a: 62; 1941: 95) notes that auditory perception (*slukhovoie vospriiatie*) of the text is of vital importance for any translator, and especially for a translator of poetry (see also Subchapter 4.4.2). In the 1936 edition of *A High Art* (p. 62), the discussion is complemented with an example of a Ukrainian translator's rendition of Gumilev's poetry (see Subchapter 4.5.2), but this example was omitted from the 1941 edition (p. 95). Where it once was, there is, instead, a lengthy quotation in which Valerii Briusov discusses the difficulty of translating Virgil.

In the 1936 edition (pp. 151–152), Chukovskii brings up a topic that once caused friction between him and Gumilev. From a following diary entry recorded in the November 1918, it turns out that the two litterateurs disagreed about the fundamental idea of translation:

На заседании была у меня жаркая схватка с Гумилевым. Этот даровитый ремесленник – вздумал составлять Правила для переводчиков. По-моему, таких правил нет. Какие в литературе правила – один переводчик сочиняет, и выходит отлично, а другой и ритм дает, и все, – а нет, не шевелит. Какие же правила? А он – рассердился и стал кричать. Впрочем, он занятный, и я его люблю. (Chukovskii 2011a: 232.)

I had a run-in with Gumilyov at the meeting. A gifted craftsman, he came up with the idea of creating a “Rules for Translators.” To my mind, no rules exist. How can you have rules in literature when one translator ad-libs and the result is top-notch and another conveys rhythm and everything and it doesn't go anywhere? Where are the rules? Well, he lost his temper and started shouting. Still, he's amusing and I like him. (Erlich 2005: 40.)

With the word “craftsman” (*remeslennik*), Chukovskii may be referring to the Acmeist thought patterns. According to the Acmeists, a poet was not a “theurgist” (*teurg*) and a “prophet” (*prorok*) like Mozart, but a “master” and a “craftsman” (*remeslennik*) like Salieri (Sukhikh 2008).

In his memoirs, Chukovskii comments on the literary studios of the revolutionary era (see Subchapter 2.4) as follows:

Тогда было распространено суеверие, будто поэтическому творчеству можно научиться в десять-пятнадцать уроков. (Chukovskii 2001e: 446.)

A prevalent superstition in those days was that the creative work of poetry could be learned in the course of ten to fifteen lessons.

Chukovskii singles out Gumilev's class among the studios that mushroomed in Petrograd at that time. He remarks that although Gumilev's class was far from easy, the pupils were devoted to their tutor. Incidentally, Gumilev's pupils included the teenage Nikolai Chukovskii (see Hickey 2009: 89). For his class, Gumilev had prepared several intricate tables that everybody was supposed to learn by heart: “tables about rhythm, tables about subjects, tables about epithets, tables about poetic images.” Chukovskii compares the tables with medieval dogmas but points out that Gumilev's pupils loved them because “they craved to believe that there exist in this world stable, solid laws of poetics not susceptible to any

kind of modifications.” Chukovskii also notes that Gumilev himself – “fortunately” – never followed the rules dictated in those tables. (Chukovskii 2001e: 446–447.)

The tables play a central role in Gumilev’s article in the translators’ handbook. The author concludes the article by summing up his “nine commandments” (*deviat’ zapovedei*) for translators. They concern 1) the number of lines (*chislo strok*) 2) the meter and measure (*metr i razmer*) 3) the alternation of rhyme (*cheredovan’e rifm*) 4) the nature of the *enjambement* (*kharakter enjambement*) 5) the nature of the rhyme (*kharakter rifm*) 6) the nature of the vocabulary (*kharakter slovaria*) 7) the type of similes (*tip sravnenii*) 8) special devices (*osobyie priemy*), and 9) changes in tone (*perekhody tona*) (English translations by Burnett & Lygo 2013: 20). (See Gumilev 1919: 30; 1920: 59.)

Chukovskii brings up Gumilev’s nine commandments in the 1936 edition of *A High Art* (pp. 151–152). The 1941 edition (p. 16) contains the same passage otherwise nearly verbatim, but without a mention of Gumilev’s name.

Table 127

<p><i>В тех девяти заповедях, которые дал, например, переводчикам <u>поэт Гумилев в своей известной статье о стиховых переводах</u>, были тщательно регламентированы все элементы, обуславливающие адекватное воспроизведение подлинника. Но об интонациях, о ритмо-синтаксических нормах стиха – т. е. о самом основном, самом главном, – там почему-то ни слова. На суровых <u>гумилевских</u> скрижалях было неумолимо начертано, что [. . .]. (Chukovskii 1936a: 151.)</i></p>	<p><i>In the nine commandments given for instance to translators by <u>the poet Gumilev in his well-known article about translations of poetry</u>, were all the elements required for the adequate reproduction of the original. But about intonation, about the poem’s rhythmic-syntactical norms – that is, about the most fundamental, the most important – there was for some reason not a word. In <u>Gumilev’s</u> severe tables of law, it was implacably inscribed that [. . .].</i></p>
<p><i>В тех строгих заповедях, которые давали переводчикам <u>представители формального метода</u> были тщательно регламентированы все элементы, обуславливающие адекватное воспроизведение подлинника. Но об интонациях, о ритмо-синтаксических нормах стиха – то есть о самом главном, – там почему-то ни слова. На <u>этих</u> скрижалях было неумолимо начертано, что [. . .]. (Chukovskii 1941: 116.)</i></p>	<p><i>In the severe commandments given to translators by <u>the spokesmen of the formal method</u>, were all elements required for the adequate reproduction of the original. But about intonation, about the poem’s rhythmic-syntactical norms – that is, about the most fundamental, the most important – there was for some reason not a word. In <u>these</u> tables of law, it was implacably inscribed that [. . .].</i></p>

As can be seen in Table 127, in the revised version of the passage Chukovskii obliquely refers to Gumilev as a spokesman of the formal method, clearly referring to the principles Gumilev taught in his class. Also in the context of the tables, Gumilev’s name has been removed and replaced with the anonymous pronoun “these.”

The older generation of readers would most probably have distinguished Gumilev’s implicit presence in the text, anyway. It can be speculated whether Chukovskii removed

his name before or after the first submission of the manuscript of the 1941 edition (see Subchapter 4.1), or if the removal was done at the publishing house Khudozhestvennaia literatura. The elaborateness of the maneuvers suggests that, whenever they were done, they were done by Chukovskii himself.

The 1941 and 1964 editions of *A High Art* contain no mention of Gumilev. After an absence of 25 years, he reappears in the book in the 1966 edition (p. 516), in which he is briefly mentioned in an anecdote relating to the publishing house Vsemirnaia literatura. It is interesting that during the same period when Gumilev's name was banned, for instance, from Akhmatova's biography (see above), it was allowed to be included in *A High Art*. A plausible explanation would be the carelessness of the censors. The context in which Gumilev is mentioned in this particular edition of *A High Art* is different from the one in which he was mentioned in earlier editions. To be absolutely sure not to miss his name, a censor would have needed to comb through the book practically word for word.

The inclusion of Gumilev's name in the 1968 edition of *A High Art* (p. 264) is all the more interesting because by then, censorship had palpably tightened. Blium describes the impact of the Prague Spring (see Subchapter 4.3.3) on Soviet censorship as follows:

Это был сигнал: "чешская весна" могла состояться благодаря резкому смягчению цензурного режима; советские идеологические надсмотрщики учли этот "опыт".
(Blium 2011.)

It was a signal: the Prague Spring was possible because of a marked relaxation of censorship; the Soviet ideological overseers took heed of this "lesson."

It is possible that all the attention of the censors was centered on Solzhenitsyn (see Subchapter 4.3.3), and they, therefore, missed Gumilev's name in the book.

During the period from the early to mid-1960s, Gumilev's name is included in every one of the diary entries in which Chukovskii (2011c: 351, 368, 371, 404) counts the names of repressed intellectuals (see Subchapter 2.8). Perhaps the aging and ailing Chukovskii, bitterly disillusioned with the Soviet regime, might even have deliberately challenged the censors by inserting Gumilev's name in *A High Art*.

Brother Writers

Between the publication of the 1936 and 1941 editions of *A High Art*, the Georgian poet Tizian Tabidze and the Armenian poet Egishe Charents (see Subchapter 4.3.2) both perished in the Great Terror.

Thanks to Boris Pasternak's praised translations, in the mid-1930s Tabidze was a famous poet in the Soviet Union. He was also invited to address the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers in which Georgian literature was an important theme. (Zemskova 2013: 186–187, 189.) From Chukovskii's diary, it turns out that he had become acquainted with the Georgian poet already a year earlier. While travelling in Georgia in 1933 with his wife Mariia Borisovna, he apparently spent a lot of time in Tabidze's company (see Chukovskii's 2011b: 509–510). From Chukovskii's diary entry recorded on March 25, 1934, it turns out that they later met in Leningrad:

Приехал в Ленинград Табидзе. Я у него в долгу: он очень горячо отнесся к нам в Тифлисе – и надо воздать ему ленинградским гостеприимством. (Chukovskii 2011b: 536.)

Titsian Tabidze is in Leningrad. I am in his debt: he was very warm to us while we were in Tiflis, and I must pay him back with Leningrad hospitality. (Erlich 2005: 299.)

Benedikt Livshits, too, was a friend of Tabidze's. Between 1929 and 1936, he made several visits to Georgia, which he described as his "second poetic home." He also translated some Georgian poetry and was planning to publish an anthology of those poems. From a letter from Livshits to the Editor-in-Chief of the publishing house GIKhL Viktor Gol'tsev, it turns out that while visiting Leningrad in March 1937, Tabidze had taken time to check Livshits' translations of his poems. (See Shneiderman 1996: 82–83, 123.)

Tabidze was arrested in the fall of 1937 (Shneiderman 1996: 83). Charged with being a member of a "national-fascist organization in Georgia," he was executed in December 1937 (Miminoshvili 2015). Because of his friendship with Livshits, Tabidze's name also came up in the Pereval case. During his second interrogation in January 1938, Livshits had allegedly mentioned Tabidze among those writers who had been at his home "discussing arrests and exiles." According to Livshits, the conversation had then turned to the arrest of Mandel'shtam, "whom Tabidze also knew well." Tabidze's name is not, however, included in the list drafted by the NKVD (see Subchapter 2.8) because at the time of the interrogation, he was already dead. (See Shneiderman 1996: 98, 115.)

For a long time, even Tabidze's wife did not know anything about his fate. A close friend of the family, Pasternak gave her a lot of support during those years. From their correspondence, it turns out that until the mid-1950s, both cherished the hope that Tabidze had survived and was alive. (Miminoshvili 2015). Lidiia Chukovskaia comments on the atmosphere of secrecy around the fates of the repressed as follows:

Уже после XX, в самый разгар реабилитаций, Большая Советская Энциклопедия, сообщая в 1957 году, что грузинский поэт Тициан Табидзе был "вдохновенным певцом великих дел советского народа", а грузинский поэт Паоло Яшвили "воспевал героический созидательный труд" – не правда ли, как хорошо? – гибель этих вдохновенных певцов просто обходит молчанием. В скобках против обоих имен стоят даты рождения и "смерти": (1895–1937). (Chukovskaia, L. 2000: 16.)

Already after the Twentieth Party Congress when a number of people were rehabilitated, the Great Soviet Encyclopedia, informing in 1957 that the Georgian poet Titsian Tabidze was an "enthusiastic singer about the great deeds of the Soviet nation" and that the Georgian poet Paolo Iashvili "extolled heroic creative work" – indeed, how great? – simply passed the perdition of these enthusiastic singers over in silence. In parentheses beside both names are the dates of birth and "death:" (1895–1937).

Egishe Charents was a prominent Armenian poet and a translator of Pushkin, Maiakovskii, Gor'kii, and other Russian and Soviet classics. The NKVD began harassing Charents in early 1935, and in September 1936 he was placed under house arrest. At the same time, all his books were withdrawn from libraries and bookstores, and the publication of new

volumes was suspended. In July 1937, Charents was arrested for “anti-Soviet activity,” and he died in captivity only four months later. The prison doctor confirmed the cause of death as “catarrhal lung inflammation and general exhaustion.” Charents’ body was secretly transported from the prison at night, and buried in an unknown site in the mountains. (*Kavkazskii Uzel*.a)

In the mid-thirties, Akhmatova translated Charents’ poems into Russian, but the translations were not published until 1956 (Chukovskaia, L. 2013b: 193). Georgii Kubat’ian suggests that Akhmatova’s decision to undertake the work was influenced by Osip Mandel’shtam’s high opinion of the Armenian poet, who was his long-time friend (see also Mandelstam 1999: 191; 2011; 548). (Kubat’ian 2005.) Ol’ga Lebedushkina sees parallelisms in the fates of Mandel’shtam and Charents. She juxtaposes the “second arrest, camp, death” of the former with the “ostracism, arrest, death” of the latter. As a last resort, both poets also tried to save themselves by writing a poem about Stalin, but to no avail. (Lebedushkina 2006.)

In the 1936 edition (p. 6) of *A High Art*, both Tabidze and Charents are included among the examples of minority nationality writers whose work frequently appeared in *Literaturnaia gazeta* (see Table 12 in Subchapter 4.3.2). Neither of their names is included in the corresponding list in the 1941 edition (p. 3). The absence of Tabidze and Charents cannot unequivocally be connected with their arrests, because the entire list has been thoroughly revised. In fact, the only writer that appears in both versions of the list is Peters Markish. The Soviet Jew poet would perish at the hands of the NKVD, too, only a decade later (see Kay 2005: 550–551).

Three new names, in particular, stand out in the revised list: the Lithuanian Liudas Gira, the Estonian Johannes Vares Barbarus, and the Latvian Vilis Lacis. The Baltic states of Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia had been annexed in the Soviet Union in 1940 (see e.g. Evtuhov et al. 2004: 700). As the manuscript of the 1941 edition had already been submitted in December 1939 (see Subchapter 4.1), the names must have been added into the list afterwards. The addition was, perhaps, made by the editor of the publishing house.

In light of the above discussion, Mikola Voronii’s treatment in *A High Art* seems paradoxical. The NKVD first arrested the Ukrainian poet in 1934, and he was sentenced to a three-year exile. After his return, he was arrested again and executed in 1938. (See *Kievskaiia gorodskaiia biblioteka*.) Neither his arrests nor his rehabilitation in the 1950s seem to have had any influence whatsoever in his appearance in *A High Art*. In the 1936 edition (p. 62), in the discussion about sound patterns (see Subchapter 4.4.2), Chukovskii includes Voronii’s translation of a poem by Afanasii Fet among the examples. The passage, which includes Voronii’s name, also appears in all the subsequent editions of *A High Art* (1941: 101; 1964: 164; 1966: 414; 1968: 179).

Ambiguous and Unambiguous Disappearances

Another paradoxical phenomenon in *A High Art* concerns the treatment of Evgenii Dunaevskii, a lawyer, writer, linguist, and a translator specialized in Persian literature. In 1939, Dunaevskii was arrested as an “English spy” in connection with the case of Rudolf Abikh, a litterateur and Iranist (see Pshebinda). According to the Russian Internet site *Vek perevoda* (“The Age of Translation”), he was probably executed after the onset of Word War II. In his article about the Polish poet Aleksander Wat (“Chitaia Vata. Vospominaniia rusista”), the philologist Gzhegozh Pshebinda mentions Dunaevskii among a group of 25 people who the

NKVD executed in 1941. Referring to Wat's (1977) memoirs, Pshebinda reports that the poet became acquainted with Dunaevskii while the two were cellmates in the Lubyanka prison.

In post-Soviet Russia, Dunaevskii appears to be an unknown figure. New editions of his translations have been published only sporadically because "it cannot be established in publishing houses who he was," and that makes the issue of copyrights and royalties problematic (see *Vek perevoda*).

In the 1930s, Dunaevskii participated in the public discourse about translation by writing for the journal *Literaturnaia ucheba* (1938/8, pp. 22–50) an article with same title as Chukovskii's *Pravda* article three years earlier: "Iskusstvo perevoda" (see *Vek perevoda*). In the 1936 edition of *A High Art*, Chukovskii cites Dunaevskii's review of the recently published Russian translations of Goethe. The passage is also included in the 1941 edition, but the source of the citation has been rendered anonymous. The identity of the author can be inferred only from the parallel examination of the two editions.

Table 128

<p><i>Когда эта глава была написана, в печати появился разбор новых переводов Гете. Автор этого разбора Е. Дунаевский прекрасно сформулировал то требование, которое мы должны предъявлять к переводчикам великих писателей, в том числе и к переводчикам Шекспира. Это требование является в сущности темой всей моей настоящей статьи, но у Дунаевского оно выражено гораздо рельефнее. (Chukovskii 1936a: 183–184.)</i></p> <p><i>Когда эта глава была написана, в печати появился разбор новых переводов Гете. Автор этого разбора отлично сформулировал то требование, которое мы должны предъявлять к переводчикам великих писателей, – в том числе и к переводчикам Шекспира: [. . .] (Chukovskii 1941: 136.)</i></p>	<p><i>When this chapter was already written, a review came out of the new translations of Goethe. The author of the review Evgenii Dunaevskii excellently formulated the requirement that we should present to the translators of great writers, Shakespeare among them. This requirement is essentially the theme of this article, but Dunaevskii expresses it far more lucidly.</i></p> <p><i>When this chapter was already written, a review came out of the new translations of Goethe. The author of the review splendidly formulated the requirement that we should present to the translators of great writers, Shakespeare among them: [. . .]</i></p>
--	--

The passage shown in Table 128 is followed by a lengthy excerpt from Dunaevskii's article, presented as reported speech. In the 1936 edition (p. 184), Chukovskii inserted two reporting clauses in the midst of the citation: "says Dunaevskii" (*govorit Dunaevskii*), and "as absolutely rightly says Dunaevskii" (*kak sovershenno spravedlivo govorit Dunaevskii*). In the 1941 edition (p. 136), the first reporting clause has been replaced with the one "says he" (*govorit on*), with the pronoun "he" referring to the anonymous author of the review (see Table 128). By his and Dunaevskii's common theme, Chukovskii apparently means the discussion about precise translation. In the citation included in *A High Art*, Dunaevskii emphasizes that instead of mechanically reproducing the formal features of the original, the translator should convey its "allure" (*obaianie*) (see Chukovskii 1936a: 184; 1941: 136).

The footnote to the passage about Dunaevskii has been manipulated correspondingly with the body text. According to the footnote in the 1936 edition (p. 184), the source of reference is E. Dunaevskii's article "Perevody klassicheskoi poezii" ("Translations of Classical Poetry") in the journal *Literaturnyi kritik* ("Literary Critic") 1934/11. The 1941 edition (p. 136) contains an otherwise identical footnote, except that the author's name is now missing.

However, Dunaevskii's name does appear elsewhere in the 1941 edition (p. 77). On a general level, the topic is Russification. Chukovskii (1941: 73–80) insists that the translator must be sure to maintain the national features of the original. He illustrates his point of view with several examples, one of which is an excerpt from Dunaevskii's translation of the Kurdish epic, published in the album *Tvorchestvo narodov SSSR* ("The Works of the Nations of the USSR") in 1937. The introduction to the excerpt is shown in Table 129.

Table 129

<p><i>Непреодолимые трудности должен был преодолеть Е. Дунаевский, переводя курдский эпос «Зембиль Фрош», где почти каждая строфа требует четырех рифм: [. . .] (Chukovskii 1941: 77.)</i></p>	<p><i>Insurmountable obstacles must have been surmounted by E. Dunaevskii when translating the Kurdish epic "Zambilfrosh," in which almost every stanza requires four rhymes: [. . .]</i></p>
--	---

Chukovskii comments on Dunaevskii's translation favorably, pointing out that, in it, the national features of the original have not been subjected to Russification.

As it turns out from the above discussion, in one passage Dunaevskii has been – with obvious deliberation – transformed into an anonymous author, whereas in another passage, he is quite openly mentioned by name. Perhaps the censors knew to look for Dunaevskii's name in the same place it had been in the previous edition, whereas in the new edition they accidentally missed it. This would be an easy explanation, except there is another instance in the same edition in which Dunaevskii's person has been effaced (see below).

It is, in fact, quite possible that Chukovskii might have tried his luck by slipping Dunaevskii's name elsewhere in the book. Thirty years later he would conjure a similar trick for the editors of the publishing house *Sovetskii pisatel*.⁷ At that time, the name banned from *A High Art* was Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn (see Subchapter 4.3.3). The following diary entry was recorded on October 1, 1968:

С моей книжкой «Высокое искусство» произошел забавный казус. Те редакторы, которые потребовали, чтобы я изъясил из книги ту главку, где говорится об Александре Исаевиче, - не подозревали, что на дальнейших страницах тоже есть это одиозное имя. Я выполнял их требование, и лишь тогда Шубин указал им, что они ошибались. С Конюховой чуть не приключился инфаркт. (Chukovskii 2011c: 518.)

An amusing affair occurred with my book *A High Art*. Those editors who demanded that I remove from the book the chapter discussing Aleksandr Isaevich never suspected that the offending name appears also on later pages. I carried out their request, and only then did Shubin point out to them that they had made a mistake. Koniukhova nearly had a heart attack.

Lev Shubin was the editor-in-chief and Elena Koniukhova was the deputy editor-in-chief at *Sovetskii pisatel'*. Chukovskii's glee at his having fooled the censors is palpable in his diary entry. It also suggests that the incident was not the first one of its kind.

In discussing the translation of minority nationalities literature in the 1941 edition (pp. 73–74), Chukovskii anonymously cites Dunaevskii's article "Iskusstvo perevoda." A footnote provides the source of reference with the name, issue, and page of the journal, but neither the title of the article, nor the name of its author are mentioned. True, an article by Vsevolod Rozhdestvenskii is supplemented with a similar footnote. The difference between the two cases is, however, that unlike Dunaevskii's, Rozhdestvenskii's name is mentioned in the body text.

Compared with the treatment of Dunaevskii, the treatment of the orientalist and academician Aleksandr Samoilovich in *A High Art* appears quite straightforward. Samoilovich was arrested in 1937, charged with espionage and counterrevolutionary activity, and executed in 1938 (see *Sankt-Peterburgskii gosudarstvennyi universitet*).

In discussing the Kazakh translation of the Communist Manifesto in the 1936 edition of *A High Art* (p. 83*n*1), Chukovskii borrows some examples from an article written by Samoilovich. A proper source of reference is provided in a footnote. The same examples are presented in the 1941 edition (pp. 80–81), but without the footnote or any mention of Samoilovich whatsoever. (See Subchapter 4.4.2.) Here, too, it is tempting to speculate about the haste or the indolence of the censor. Leafing through the manuscript, he may simply have removed the footnote without touching upon the body text. In fact, that seems more probable than supposing that in the fall of 1939, Chukovskii would have known about Samoilovich's execution the previous year. Of course, rumors constantly circulated (see above), but it seems that among Chukovskii's circle of friends the attention would have primarily been on the fate of fellow writers.

Obliquely present in the 1941 edition of *A High Art* are two names that also might be expected to be taboos. They are Khadzhi Gabidullin and Mirza Davud Guzeinov, both repressed during the Great Terror. Gabidullin was executed in 1937 (see Vasil'kov & Sorokina 2004) and Guzeinov in 1938 (see *Kavkazskii Uzel*.b). Neither of the two is mentioned by name in that edition. Instead, Chukovskii (1941: 37) refers to their article "Istoriia odnogo perevoda 'Ob osnovakh leninizma,'" which was published in *Pravda* in 1936. (See subchapter 4.4.3.) Nobody probably even paid attention to the issue of authorship.

The litterateurs discussed in this chapter are listed in the Table of Repressed Intellectuals (see Appendix 3). The table shows the year of arrest, confinement, execution, and rehabilitation of each litterateur, and the presence of their names in different editions of *A High Art*. It can be seen in the table that nine of the twelve writers disappear from *A High Art* between editions 1936 and 1941. The exceptions are Osip Mandel'shtam, whose name disappears after his first arrest in 1934, Evgenii Dunaevskii, and Mikola Voronii, whose name appears to remain immune to becoming taboos. All the litterateurs included in the list were rehabilitated after Stalin's death. In the case of Valentin Stenich, the dates of his arrest and his rehabilitation directly correlate with his disappearance from *A High Art* and his reappearance in it. In most of the other cases, too, the date of a litterateur's arrest seems to be connected with the removal of his name from the book. The correlation between the dates of their rehabilitation and their reappearances in *A High Art* are not as unequivocal. This can be explained with various reasons that are not directly connected with the attitude

of the Soviet authorities to the litterateur in question. One plausible explanation is that as *A High Art* was contemporized for each new edition, some names had simply lost their topicality. For instance Mikhail D'iakonov's name might not have been familiar to many readers in the 1960s. Furthermore, some topics became obsolete in the course of time, and a litterateur mentioned only in that particular context would naturally vanish from the book together with the topic.

Texts retouched

In the following paragraphs, the various maneuvers for removing certain names from *A High Art* are discussed in light of the maneuvers used in the Stalinist period for removing unwanted people from publications, particularly from photographs.

In his work *The Commissar Vanishes. The Falsification of Photographs and Art in Stalin's Russia*, David King (2014) demonstrates these primordial methods of "photoshopping" by which photographs and other works of art were falsified in the Soviet Union to suit the needs of the official line. The practice began immediately after the Revolution, and it notably intensified in the 1930s, particularly after Kirov's murder. Opponents or imagined opponents of the regime were deprived of existence by removing every trace of them from all documents. Not only photographs but also texts were manipulated: to remove dubious contents from a book, entire chapters would sometimes be destroyed. (See King 2014: 10–14.)

In the Soviet publishing houses, the scale of methods ranged from the skillful retouching of a photograph to the simple cutting the offending face out of it. The latter method was called cropping. It was often used by individual Soviet citizens who were terrified of being denounced as "counterrevolutionary" or "anti-Soviet" in a possible house search. Being caught with a photograph of somebody who had "disappeared," or even mentioning his name, might have sinister consequences. In the worst case, the offender might end up being arrested himself. (King 2014: 10–14.)

King points out that the manipulation of photographs usually happened on an "ad hoc basis:"

Orders were followed, quietly. A word in an editor's ear or a discreet telephone conversation from a "higher authority" was sufficient to eliminate all further reference – visual or literal – to the persecuted, no matter how famous she or he had been.

(King 2014: 14.)

In practice, the retouching process entailed cutting the face of the unwanted person out of the photograph with a sharp scalpel, or, alternatively, gluing somebody else's face on top of it. Sometimes it was necessary to airbrush some ink around the edges as a finishing touch, so as to cover up any traces of the operation. (King 2014: 14.)

In a photograph taken in 1920, Lenin is addressing the Red Army troops at a Moscow square. In the original photograph, he is standing on a wooden podium with Trotskii and Kamenev (see Subchapter 2.7) situated on the steps to the right of him. The photograph was circulated all around the world, and it became an emblem of the revolutionary Russia. It continued to be published after Trotskii and Kamenev had fallen out of favor, and, therefore, they were airbrushed out of it. The void they left was made inconspicuous by

painting more steps on the flight of stairs. In 1933, the photograph appeared on canvas in an additionally altered version: two newspaper reporters were inserted where Trotskii and Kamenev had been standing in the original photograph. (See King 2014: 78–83.)

Another famous photograph was retouched with a similar method. In the original photograph from the year 1937, Stalin is portrayed against the background of the Moscow–Volga canal together with Viacheslav Molotov, Kliment Voroshilov, and Nikolai Ezhov. Three years later, the photograph was published again in honor of Stalin’s sixtieth birthday. Meanwhile, Ezhov had been arrested and executed, and, therefore, in the new, retouched version of the photograph all traces of Ezhov have been airbrushed out of the picture. To fill the void, the railing of the bank was complemented and more water was painted in the canal behind it. (See King 2014: 207.)

Sometimes the retouching was left half-finished. In a photograph taken in 1919, Lenin is standing amongst a crowd with Trotskii by his side, the latter with his hand raised to the visor of his cap. Published in the 1980s, a heavily cropped version of the photograph features Lenin alone, with Trotskii and most of the crowd removed. When the photograph is juxtaposed with the original, the vague shape partly covering Lenin’s right side turns out to be Trotskii’s arm, which, like a ghost, has remained without its owner. (See King 2014: 54–55.)

Retouching was not confined to removals only. People would be moved to another position in one and the same photograph, or new people would be added to it with photo montage. There were various reasons for such maneuvers, for instance, to accentuate a united front of solidarity. (See King 2014: 68–69.) In 1920, Stalin was photographed by Evgenii Iano during the celebration of the 12th anniversary of the Revolution. In the photograph, Stalin is standing on top of Lenin’s mausoleum together with a group his henchmen. The photographer later “reinvented his own photograph” by removing from it the former labor union leader Mikhail Tomskii, a victim of the Great Terror (about Tomskii, see Conquest 2008: 102). Moreover, he rendered the photograph even more politically correct by adding a number of prominent representatives of Soviet power and culture with photo montage, Lunacharskii and Gor’kii among them. (See King 2014: 150–151.) With his head crudely pasted on somebody else’s shoulders, Gor’kii, in particular, looks odd and out of place.

Chukovski’s treatment of the repressed litterateurs in *A High Art* suggests that he resorted to similar devices in order to render the book politically correct (in other words, to get it published). Livshits, Stenich, Gumilev, Zorgenfrei, Mirskii, D’iakonov, Dunaevskii, and Samoilovich have all been cropped off the text. In most cases, no particular airbrushing was needed. One obvious case of airbrushing is the removal of the conjunction “but” in the example shown in Table 120. Otherwise it would have remained hanging in the air like Trotskii’s ghostly arm in the cropped photograph. As stated above, the removals from the text of *A High Art*, or at least some of them, may also have been done by the censor.

In Mandel’shtam’s case, the reorganization of individual paragraphs functioned as a strategy that caused him to fade from the text. Another strategy used in many instances is the addition of new people to replace those that were removed. In the 1960s editions, this maneuver was done in an exceptional manner. In those editions, Chukovskii, so to speak, montaged his own face on top of Livshits’ (see Table 112).

When a litterateur’s name is replaced with a general concept like “translator” (Stenich, see Tables 115 and 117), “author” (Dunaevskii, see Table 128), or “spokesman of the formal

method (Gumilev, see Table 127), or simply by using the passive form (D'iakonov, see Table 122), the litterateur, in a certain sense, ceases to be. Therefore, such manipulations of text correspond to the way empty voids in photographs were filled by adding inanimate material where human beings had been in the original.

It does not seem probable that Chukovskii would have consciously adopted devices peculiar to photographs, although the retouching practice was no secret. The metamorphosis of old photographs appearing in the press cannot have gone unnoticed by Soviet citizens. In the spring of 1956 while Stalin was effectively being made a nonperson, Chukovskii recorded the following remark in his diary:

Всеv. Иванов сообщил, что [. . .] Что фото, где Сталин изображен на одной скамье с Лениным, смонтировано жульнически. Крупская утверждает, что они никогда вместе не снимались. (Chukovskii 2011c: 213.)

Vsevolod Ivanov also reports that [. . .] and that the photograph showing Stalin sitting on a bench next to Lenin is an unscrupulous fake: Krupskaya claims they never had their picture taken together. (Erlich 2005: 404–405.)

Having passed away in 1939, Krupskaya was not there to witness the denunciation of Stalin. When she had commented on the photo, and to whom, is left open to speculation. Chukovskii might be referring to a certain crudely montaged photograph that features Lenin and Stalin, supposedly taken in 1922 (see King 2014: 104). In his diary, Chukovskii also observes the removal of Stalin from various public arenas: Stalin's portraits were removed from the Tre'tiakov gallery, and the publication of the new volume of *Bol'shaia sovetskaia entsiklopediia* was suspended because it was exclusively devoted to the former leader (see Chukovskii 2011c: 212–213).

As to Chukovskii's retouching his texts, it is likely that being sensitive to the current conventions he would instinctively have known how to adjust his own discourse accordingly. This kind of cultural competence (see Subchapter 2.7) was necessary to survive the 1930s.

A Friend in Need

Details connected with the disappearances of “nonpersons” from *A High Art* may or may not have survived in Soviet archives. Without further speculation on the actor behind each removal, it would seem fair enough to suppose that if Chukovskii acted as his own censor (see Subchapter 2.6), his actions were most probably dictated by fear.

All the while trying to protect himself and his family, Chukovskii did all he could to help colleagues who had fallen into the clutches of the regime. Lidiia Chukovskaia describes that characteristic of her father as follows:

Besides his capacity for hard work and his talent, he was gifted with a trait which can be termed most accurately as active compassion. (Chukovskaia, L. 1981: 135.)

Chukovskii was concerned about the fates of litterateurs, in particular (Chukovskaia, L. 1981: 136). He is mentioned, for instance, among those intellectuals who intervened on behalf of the poet Nikolai Zabolotskii, who was also arrested in connection with the Pereval

case (Goldstein 1993: 94). The verb “bustle” (*khlopotať*) was in frequent use in the 1930s Soviet Union. It referred to the designated duties of the family members or friends of a person who had been arrested. It entailed a frustrating battle with the Soviet bureaucracy, the gathering of endless documents, the searching for information about the whereabouts of the arrested, and the writing of petitions. It also included practical matters like trying to obtain money, food supplies and warm clothing for somebody being sent to a labor camp.

Two letters written by Chukovskii testify to his bustling for Zabolotskii. One of them was sent in September 1939 to the poet’s wife while Zabolotskii was in a labor camp in the Russian Far East. In the letter, an obviously hopeful Chukovskii (2009: 300) recounts his discussions with Fadeev and the prosecutor in Zabolotskii’s case. As it turns out from another letter, one written to the literary scholar Nikolai Stepanov in February 1940, the bustling was to no avail. In the letter, Chukovskii (2009: 306) asks Stepanov to pass on the lamentable information to Zabolotskii’s wife. Zabolotskii was eventually released in 1944 (Goldstein 1993: 99). In *A High Art*, Zabolotskii is not mentioned until the 1960s editions, first of all as a translator of Georgian poetry but also as a poet in his own right (see Chukovskii 1964: 7, 41, 154, 220, 249, 268–269); 1966: 243, 279–280, 404, 474, 504, 514, 532–533; 1968: 10, 45, 168, 241, 262, 284–286).

Chukovskii’s efforts to help his colleagues are noteworthy in that it would have been simply human to maintain a low profile, particularly because of the precarious circumstances of his children Nikolai and Lidiia (see Subchapter 2.8). As it turns out from Chukovskii’s (2011c: 479–480; see Subchapter 2.7) diary, he also feared for his own safety and probably for a good reason. Many of his friends were repressed during the Great Terror, and he could very easily have been drawn into any of those cases. For instance, his socialization with Tizian Tabidze both in Leningrad and in Georgia (see Subchapter 4.5.1) might have become seriously incriminating issues after the poet was arrested.

Even without any obvious grounds, practically anybody could end up in the Soviet punitive machinery, as, for instance, the fate of Boris Pil’niak testifies to (see Subchapter 2.7). What made the atmosphere in the 1930s all the more ominous was that news about arrests and executions often circulated as rumors long before they became officially public. This is obvious, for instance, in the following excerpt from Nadezhda Mandel’shtam memoirs. In this excerpt, she describes a visit with Stenich in Leningrad in 1937, only a few months before his arrest. By then, Stenich was already “waiting for his turn.” (See Mandel’shtam 1999: 317–319.) Mandel’shtam describes Stenich’s situation as follows:

As we said goodbye on the landing, he pointed to the doors of the other apartments and told us when and in what circumstances their occupants had been taken away by the police. He was the only person on two floors who was still at liberty – if it could be called liberty. (Mandelstam 1999: 318–319.)

Before the late 1950s, Chukovskii does not mention either Stenich’s or Livshits’ fate in his diary. Only then, oblique comments appear in the entries (see Chukovskii 2011c: 258, 368, 371, 404). One of those entries, one mentioning Livshits, was recorded at the time when Pasternak was pressured into declining the nomination for the Nobel Prize (see Subchapter 4.3.3). Faced with an emergency meeting of the Writers’ Union concerning Pasternak’s case, Chukovskii harbored dismal anticipations.

Мне стало ясно, что пощады ему не будет, что ему готовится гражданская казнь, что его будут топтать ногами, пока не убьют, как убили Зоценку, Мандельштама, Заболоцкого, Мирского, Бенедикта Лившица, [. . .] (Chukovskii 2011c: 269.)

There would be no mercy, that was clear. They were out to pillory him. They would trample him to death just as they had Zoschenko, Mandelshtam, Zabolotsky, Mirsky, and Benedikt Livshits, [. . .] (Erlich 2005: 435.)

In a certain sense, it might be appropriate to add Chukovskii's own name to the list. Like his other lists of victims of the regime (see Subchapter 2.8), the above excerpt reflects his deep disillusionment with the system that once was launched with such fanfare and such promise. What was annihilated during the long years of terror was the enthusiastic and idealistic spirit so palpably present in Chukovskii's diary entries recorded during the years of the Revolution.

4.5.2 The Current and the Undercurrent

Research on Aesopian language was one of Chukovskii's ongoing projects in the late 1920s and early 1930s (see Subchapter 3.2). During that same period, he was relentlessly tormented by smear campaigns against his children's books. Apart from this, Soviet censorship was steadily tightening, which made writing a more and more challenging activity. (See Subchapter 2.6.) Therefore, it would not be surprising had Chukovskii deployed in his own writing the Aesopian cryptography that he was so familiar with.

For instance, the utterly conformist diary entries recorded in 1930 (Chukovskii 2011b: 404–405; see also Subchapter 2.7) have some features that were the hallmark of Aesopian language. In one of the first entries, recorded on June 1, 1930 (Chukovskii 2011b: 404), Chukovskii mocks the "idiotic, sentimental, homeopathic" (*idiotskie, santimental'nye, gomeopaticheskie*) means with which the "Populist" writers of the 19th century meant to salvage the Russian peasant. He presents the kolkhoz as the only real salvation – one that the thinkers of the previous century were unable to recognize:

Замечательно, что во всей народнической литературе ни одному даже самому мудрому из народников, даже Щедрина, даже Чернышевскому ни на секунду не привиделся колхоз. Через десять лет вся тысячелетняя крестьянская Русь будет совершенно иной, переродится магически – и у нее настанет такая счастливая жизнь, о которой народники даже не смели мечтать, и все это благодаря колхозам. (Chukovskii 2011b: 404.)

It is remarkable that not one among the wisest of the Populists – not even Shchedrin or Chernyshevsky – came even close to imagining a kolkhoz. Within ten years a millennium of Russian peasant culture will be completely different: it will undergo a magic transformation, and life will be happier than the Populists could ever have imagined – all because of kolkhozes. (Erlich 2005: 244.)

This unabashed praise of the kolkhoz could also be interpreted as parody, particularly considering the time it was written. By then, the catastrophic consequences of the crash

collectivization were already evident. Only a couple of months earlier, on March 2, 1930 Stalin had published in *Pravda* his famous article "Dizzy with Success" ("Golovokruzhenie ot uspekhov"), in which he put the blame on local officials. (See e.g. Brooks 2001: 69; Conquest 2002: 160.)

In the above diary entry, Chukovskii (2011b: 404) mentions several 19th century litterateurs specialized in Aesopian language, Vasilii Sleptsov among them. The names, particularly Sleptsov's, might function as markers of a subtext. During that same period, Chukovskii was concentrating on his cryptography (see subchapter 3.1). The entry also contains a two-line citation from Nikolai Nekrasov's poem "Sasha" (1855). The quotation, too, might have a particular function, possibly containing some recondite allusion for the Aesopian reader to decipher (about the significance of literary excerpts in *A High Art* in general, see below). Both Chukovskii's single-minded advocating of the kolkhoz system as a comprehensive solution and the hyperbole he uses in the above diary entry might be interpreted as the Aesopian device of *reductio ad absurdum* (see Subchapter 3.2). In a peculiarly inverted way, the phrase "life will be happier" echoes the statement "Life has become better, comrades; life has become more joyous," that Stalin would proclaim five years later, in 1935 (see Subchapter 2.8).

The kolkhoz theme continues in the subsequent diary entry recorded on June 5, 1930. In that entry, Chukovskii (2011b: 405) reports on a discussion with Iurii Tynianov. The two litterateurs had marveled at the kolkhoz system and at the genius of its inventor Stalin. Chukovskii also writes that he told his friend, "how much he loved the works of Lenin." Here, too, the presence of a subtext seems possible. Not only the conformist effusion but also the mentioning of Lenin and Stalin in the same context might function as screens or markers. Since the late 1920s, Stalin had been in the process of establishing himself as Lenin's successor and heir by constantly sprinkling his presentations with quotations from the great teacher (Brooks 2001: 64).

Chukovskii refrains from directly commenting on the result of that eulogized collectivization, the famine of 1932–1933 (see Subchapter 3.2). However, a diary entry recorded on October 14, 1932 might be examined as an oblique comment. In the midst of entirely different topics, Chukovskii tells what his Ukrainian barber has to say about the famine. The barber's comments are presented in the form of a direct quotation:

Вчера парикмахер, брея меня, рассказал, что он бежал из Украины, оставил там дочь и жену. И вдруг истерично: «У нас там истребление человечества! Истреб-ле-ние че-ло-вечества. Я знаю, я думаю, что вы служите в ГПУ (!), но мне все равно: там идет истреб-ле-ние человечества. (Chukovskii 2011b: 494)

While the barber was shaving me yesterday, he told me he'd fled the Ukraine, leaving his wife and daughter behind. And suddenly he started screaming hysterically: "Ex-terminating mankind – that's what they're doing there! Ex-ter-min-at-ing man-kind! I know. You work for the GPU. (!) But I don't care. Exterminating mankind – that's what's going on. (Erllich 2005: 278.)

Ukrainian by birth himself (see Subchapter 2.1), Chukovskii must have been disquieted by the rumors about the famine. That Ukraine was ravaged by it was probably no news to

him. However, in the above passage, he is present merely as an onlooker and a reporter. The only personal comment on the part of the author is the exclamation mark relating to the barber's suggestion that he was from the GPU. Such a tactic is a characteristic of Chukovskii, for he was not one to deliberately take unnecessary risks. Maybe he still felt that the issue was too devastating and outrageous to be omitted entirely, and, therefore, decided to mention it under the "mask" provided by his barber. Perhaps even the very existence of that barber or the actuality of the alleged visit might be called into question. Quotation was a frequently used device in 19th century Aesopian language that Chukovskii was very familiar with (see Subchapter 3.2). Therefore, it can be speculated whether in the above diary entry, he is, in reality, commenting on the Ukrainian famine with the help of a fabricated quotation.

Chukovskii's mention about his love for Lenin's works might be interpreted as parody, but it is also possible that he sincerely means what he says. He had no particular reason for ridiculing Lenin. By all appearances, he respected Lenin and was probably flattered by Lenin's positive comments about his study on Nekrasov (see Subchapter 2.2). Gor'kii did not forget to mention these comments in his letter to *Pravda* in 1928, when the campaign against Chukovskii-ism was at its height (see Subchapters 2.6, 2.7). By so doing, Gor'kii managed to forestall the expansion of the campaign that was already well under way, with Krupskaja at the head proclaiming that Chukovskii, in fact, "hated" Nekrasov. (Chukovskaja, E. 2011b: 591; see also subchapter 2.6.)

In Chukovskii's (2011a: 267) diary, the only indication of any personal communication with Lenin is the entry recorded on November 14, 1919, in which Chukovskii reports having spoken to him on the phone (see subchapter 2.3). The report about the occasion creates an image of a jovial and humorous conversation:

Хохочет. Этот человек всегда хохочет. [. . .], но спрашивает: «Что же это вас еще не взяли... Ведь вас (питерцев) собираются взять». (Chukovskii 2011a: 267.)

He laughs. That man is always laughing. [. . .], but asks: "How come you haven't been captured... The plan is to capture you all (in Petrograd)."

In 1919, light-hearted joking about somebody's imminent arrest was still possible. Within less than two decades, a similar comment – particularly from the mouth of a prominent political leader – would have produced quite a different reaction. Then, the words would probably have been all too ominous even to be recorded in a diary.

Had Chukovskii used Aesopian devices in as private a forum as a personal diary, his motives could be speculated. On the one hand, it would probably have given him malicious pleasure to imagine a confiscator leaping through those outwardly innocent passages without detecting the subtext. On the other hand, the very notion of privacy for Soviet citizens might be called into question. In fact, there was no absolutely private forum in the 1930s. At the back of the mind, there constantly loomed the awareness of the omnipresent "agora" (see subchapter 4.2). The Soviet citizen knew that he was publicly answerable for any utterance he made, irrespective of its intended "publicness" or "privateness."

Irina Sanodomirskaja suggests that Chukovskii may have invoked Aesopian devices even in his works about the subject matter:

Chukovskii's interpretation of Sleptsov appears naïve and over-determined at the same time, unless one assumes the role of the 'initiated' reader and supposes that Chukovskii's study about Aesopian language is an Aesopian construction in its own right. (Sandomirskaja 2015: 70.)

Sandomirskaja also remarks that Chukovskii's narration of Sleptsov and his circle might conceal a subtext referring to his own circle, with Sleptsov representing Vladimir Maiakovskii. Assuming that Chukovskii, indeed, advanced a "patent misrepresentation" of Sleptsov's identity," he must have been confident that the initiated audience would know the history of Russian literature well enough to decipher the code. (See Sandomirskaja 2015: 70.)

Chukovskii's using Aesopian subtexts in *A High Art* is a possibility that must be taken into consideration. The topic is interesting and worthy of a study exclusively devoted to it. In the present study, the principal aim is to point out some tips of the iceberg. There are instances in the text that bear the hallmarks of Aesopian language. On the other hand, supposing that there were, indeed, subtexts in *A High Art*, most of them would probably be situated in the literary excerpts Chukovskii presents as examples. After all, considering Chukovskii's studies on Sleptsov and Nekrasov, it was Aesopian language in fiction that he was particularly specialized in. Evidently pleased with his own literary sophistication – and for good reason – Chukovskii might have liked to challenge his colleagues by covering his tracks very carefully. In such a case, the code would not necessarily be in the passage chosen as an example but elsewhere in the same work, or even in another work by the same author. Therefore, a comprehensive search for Aesopian subtexts in *A High Art* would entail the examination of extensive material beyond the limits of the book itself.

The use of quotations, in general, has one significant advantage in that it transfers the responsibility for what is said to the original author of the quotation. In other words, quotations function as masks behind which the actual author can convey forbidden messages. In addition to literary excerpts, Chukovskii might have also used themes and locutions from the current public discourse to create Aesopian subtexts. Juxtaposing Chukovskii's choice of words in *A High Art* with the Soviet public discourse in the 1930s would offer an interesting topic for linguistic study. However, the present study is confined to a general examination of *A High Art* as a product of its own period.

What is particularly striking in the 1930s editions of *A High Art* is the gradual politicization of the text. This tendency is in tandem with the centralization of literature and arts, and may, therefore, at least partly be associated with the updating of *A High Art*. The use of politically correct topics and political vocabulary in *A High Art* increases with each edition during this period. In the 1930 edition, the examples in the chapter "The Social Nature of the Translator" were for the most part drawn from 19th century literature. The rather vague umbrella term that Chukovskii uses about ideological issues in various contexts is "social." The unambiguously political words "Socialist" and "Communist" first appear in *A High Art* in the 1936 edition. The former term is included in a quotation from Gor'kii (see Table 24 in Subchapter 4.3.2), and the latter one is used in the context of the Kazakh translation of the Communist Manifesto (see Subchapters 4.3.2 and 4.4.3).

As discussed in Subchapter 4.4.3, the 1941 edition, in particular, distinguishes itself from the others by its political undertones. One indication of this tendency is the revision

of a single sentence in the foreword. In the foreword to the 1936 edition (p. 10), Chukovskii voiced the need for an authoritative and strictly scientific book about translation (see Table 70 in Subchapter 4.4.2). In the 1941 edition (p. 5), a third requirement has been added: the book should also be "genuinely Marxist." The idea of Chukovskii demanding that his cherished high art, henceforth, be guided by Marxist tenets seems ludicrous. In fact, it is much easier to imagine the censor of the publishing house inserting the politically correct words into the manuscript.

There is political lingo to be found also elsewhere in the 1941 edition. In the context of minority nationalities, Chukovskii (1941: 204) refers to the shared historical destinies of the Russian and Kalmuk people in the "land of Socialism" (see Table 20 in Subchapter 4.3.2). When the discussion turns to Taras Shevchenko, the political aspects of his works gain more ground than earlier. Chukovskii (1941: 246) expresses his appreciation for the "political line of Soviet interpretation" of Shevchenko's poetry (see Table 93 in Subchapter 4.4.3). The issue of precision, too, is, in this edition, connected to a wider ideological framework, as Chukovskii (1941: 33) suggests that the Soviet reader would detect any deviations from the original that are "at odds with the ideological guidelines of Soviet culture" (see Table 94 in Subchapter 4.4.3).

Stalin's name also first appears in *A High Art* in the 1941 edition. Together with Lenin, he is mentioned in the opening line of the book (p. 3; see Table 18 in Subchapter 4.3.2), and he is mentioned the second time in the chapter "The Social Nature of the Translator" (p. 37; see Subchapter 4.3.2). During the Soviet era, a reference to Lenin was often used as a screen (see Subchapter 3.3). Moreover, anything that seems out of place in a text may function as a marker. As an Aesopian device, this would be akin to anachronism (see Subchapter 3.2). However topical a subject Stalin's work *Ob osnovakh leninizma* may have been, discussion about it in a book devoted to literary translation seems outlandish, to say nothing of discussion of the Communist Manifesto or of the works of Marx.

In a certain sense, though, Lenin and Stalin are not so much out of place in the 1941 edition as it would seem at first sight. In both instances, they are mentioned in the context of nationalities translation, which is one of the main topics of that edition. So the reference to the Lenin-Stalin nationalities policy in the foreword is a fitting introduction to the book. The second instance, in turn, is connected to the urgent topic of translating ideological texts into minority nationality languages (see Table 96 in Subchapter 4.3.2). Chukovskii (1941: 37) introduces *Ob osnovakh leninizma* as "comrade Stalin's monumental work" (*monumental'naia rabota tov. Stalina*). Whether referring to the outer or inner grandeur of the work, the word appears rather turgid when used about a brochure of lectures and by someone whose principal interests are oriented to artistic and humanist rather than political values. The authors of the *Pravda* article that Chukovskii cites in the passage, Khadzhi Gabidullin and Mirza Davud Guseinov (1936), in fact, used the epithet "classical" (*klasicheskii*).

Chukovskii's hyperbolic expression is well in accord with the conventions of the late 1930s public discourse. (see also Subchapter 4.2), but it also bears the hallmarks of Aesopian language. It would be tempting to interpret the reference to "comrade Stalin's monumental work" as a parody of Soviet propaganda, which frequently used similar bombastic phrases. Lev Loseff presents a poem by Nikolai Glazkov as an example of Aesopian parody of a similar kind. In the poem, a trivial remark is accompanied by the introductory line

"Was how Lenin brilliantly put it." In the example, the mention of Lenin and the official jargon both serve as Aesopian screens. At the same time, the incompatible combination of the quotation and its introductory phrase "is for the stylistically sensitive reader a marker of Aesopian satire, which takes exception to blind Soviet idolatry." (See Loseff 1984: 101.)

In the discussion about *Ob osnovakh leninizma*, Chukovskii (1941: 37; see Table 97 in Subchapter 4.4.3) refers to the "historical processes" (*istoricheskie protsessy*) that, currently, are subordinated to science. After the February Revolution in 1917, he commented on the power struggles inside the Provisional Government by remarking, possibly tongue in cheek, that "the historical process has been speeded up" (see Subchapter 2.3). It would not be far-fetched to speculate whether here, too, the expression was used in a parodic sense.

A diary entry recorded on December 2, 1967 supports the hypothesis that Chukovskii's ostensibly reverent attitude towards Stalin's *Ob osnovakh leninizma* was more or less feigned, either for Aesopian purposes or out of a pure and simple survival instinct. In an anecdote from the period of World War II, he refers to the "monumental work" in quite a different tenor than he did in *A High Art* twenty-six years earlier:

Очевидно, каждому солдату во время войны выдавалась, кроме ружья и шинели, книга Сталина «Основы ленинизма». У нас в Переделкине в моей усадьбе стояли солдаты. Потом они ушли на фронт, и каждый из них кинул эту книгу в угол моей комнаты. Было экземпляров 60. Я предложил конторе Городка писателей взять у меня эти книги. Там обещали, но надули. Тогда я ночью, сознавая, что совершаю политическое преступление, засыпал этими бездарными книгами небольшой ров в лесочке и засыпал их глиной. Там они мирно гниют 24 года, - эти священные творения нашего Мао. (Chukovskii 2011c: 451.)

It goes without saying that every soldier in the War was issued a copy of Stalin's *Foundations of Leninism* along with his gun and greatcoat. We had some soldiers stationed on my Peredelkino estate, and when they left for the front each of them tossed the book into a corner of my room. There were about sixty copies. I asked the office of the writers' colony to take the books, and they promised they would, but they didn't mean it. So one night, knowing I was committing a political crime, I tossed them into a small ditch in the woods and covered them with dirt, and there those awful holy scriptures of our Mao have been peacefully rotting these twenty-four years. (Erllich 2005: 525.)

It is noteworthy that the incident Chukovskii refers to above took place only a couple of years after the 1941 edition of *A High Art* was published – and moreover, long before the dethroning of Stalin. The above diary entry, particularly the remodeled manner of speaking about the former leader, testifies to Chukovskii's instinctive ability to accommodate his writing to the conventions of the current public discourse.

Regardless of what Chukovskii thought of Stalin's writings, his attitude to the leader remains ambiguous. Jeffrey Brooks (2001: 60) illustrates Stalin's unquestionable charisma by presenting as an example a passage from Chukovskii's diary. The diary entry in question was recorded on April 22, 1936. In it, Chukovskii describes Stalin's unexpected appearance at a Komsomol meeting:

Что сделалось с залом! А ОН стоял, немного утомленный, задумчивый и величавый. Чувствовалась огромная привычка к власти, сила и в то же время что-то женственное, мягкое. Я оглянулся: у всех были влюбленные, нежные, одухотворенные и смеющиеся лица. Видеть его – просто видеть – для всех нас было счастьем. [. . .] Каждый его жест воспринимали с благоговением. Никогда я даже не считал себя способным на такие чувства. [. . .] Домой мы шли вместе с Пастернаком и оба мы упивались нашей радостью... (Chukovskii 2011c: 19–20.)

The hall was in uproar! But HE simply stood there, looking slightly weary, thoughtful, and grandiose. You could feel how accustomed to power and how powerful he was, yet at the same time there was something soft and feminine about him. I looked around and saw nothing but loving, tender, inspired, and smiling faces. Seeing him – just seeing him – was a delight for all of us. [. . .] We followed his every move with veneration. I never thought myself capable of such feelings. [. . .] I walked home with Pasternak. The two of us were exhilarated, intoxicated... (Erllich 2005: 325.)

With all the hyperbole, it would be tempting to interpret the above entry as pure and simple Aesopian parody. The description seems more like an Aesopian parody than even the praise of the kolkhoz six years earlier (see above). The narrative bears a striking resemblance to the way Pasha Angelina (see chapter 4.2) described her first meeting with Stalin. Angelina told about the nearly transcendental joy and happiness she and the others present felt at the sight of “our dear one, Stalin” (see Fitzpatrick 2000: 75). The citation is from Angelina’s book *Liudi kolkhoznykh polei* (1948), but her comments about the occasion, as well as other people’s comments about similar occasions, must have frequently appeared in the press and on the radio.

The above diary entry was written at the time when the Great Terror was had already begun to claim its victims. In that light, such an encominium seems nearly grotesque. The passage, like the other conformist passages, may have been deliberately inserted into the diary for humoring the authorities in case the diary was confiscated in a house search (see also Subchapter 2.7). Robert Conquest describes the controversial situation as follows:

Fear by night, and a feverish effort by day to pretend enthusiasm for a system of lies, was the permanent condition of the Soviet citizen. (Conquest 2008: 252.)

However, it should not be ruled out, either, that like most of his contemporaries, Chukovskii saw Stalin as separate from the Soviet machinery. From the perspective of the 1930s Soviet citizen, nothing probably seemed as it does today. The bad things that were happening were not directly connected with Stalin as a person. The omnipresent terror and fear were “disseminated through denunciation in a climate of popular suspicion and spy mania” (Fitzpatrick 2000: 205). In the press, news about the unmasking of enemies followed one another, and similar rumors were constantly spread among the citizens so as to keep them vigilant and watchful. Some individuals made a veritable art of denunciations, behind which was often personal antipathy but often also plain arbitrariness. (See Fitzpatrick 2000: 207–209.)

In fact, nothing indicates that Chukovskii, unlike most of his fellow Soviet citizens, would have insightfully detected the truth behind all the propaganda and comprehended the leader's active role in the terror. At that time, there were probably relatively few of those who did, even among the intelligentsia. In an entry recorded in March 1956, a couple of months after the Twentieth Party Congress, Chukovskii (2011c: 214), in fact, admits at having once "loved Stalin very much."

The official press actively and effectively portrayed Stalin as the "father of the nation" and the benevolent "friend of children" (Brooks 2001: 69–70; see also subchapter 4.2). The image of Stalin as a father and a friend is vividly illustrated in the letters that private citizens wrote to him. Those letters covered various topics extending from religion and justice to marital problems. (Fitzpatrick 2005: 166.) It turns out that Chukovskii, too, once sent Stalin a letter. In 1943, possibly urged by some teachers, he notified the leader about the enormous number of "neglected" (*beznadzornnye*) and "socially dangerous" (*sotsial'no opasnye*) children that were attending Soviet schools. He pointed out that among them were numerous thieves and aggressors, whom the teachers and the militia were practically unable to control. To salvage their schoolmates from "contamination" (*zaraza*) and "moral decay" (*moral'noe zagnivanie*), he suggested that those "huligans" (*khuligany*) be expelled from the schools and situated into special colonies in which agricultural work under a "severe military regime," according to Anton Makarenko's principles, would transform them into "conscientious, disciplined, and industrious" (*dobrosovestnye, distsiplinirovannye i trudoliubivye*) Soviet people. (See Chukovskii 2009: 343–345.)

At first glance, the suggestion seems outright nefarious, particularly coming from the mouth of a beloved children's writer and an advocate of absurd and anarchistic children's culture. Chukovskii's words probably sound harsher than they actually were. In the letter, he also emphasizes that most of these children are basically gifted and clever and that they, too, must be loved. Incidentally, it is interesting to note how distinctly the letter manifests ethos of transformation and purification of the 1930s (see Subchapter 4.2). Work colonies for delinquent children were far from Chukovskii's own idea. This was borrowed from the prominent pedagogue and writer Makarenko, to whom he also refers in the letter. In the 1920s, Makarenko had headed similar colonies under the auspices of the OGPU. Encouraged by Gor'kii, he had written a book about the experience in the mid-1930s. (See Fitzpatrick 2000: 77.) In his memoir *Sovremenniki*, Chukovskii (2009: 343–346) devotes an entire chapter to Makarenko, with whom he became acquainted in 1936. The two seem to have taken an instant liking to each other, but the "long years of friendly meetings and conversations" that Chukovskii was already looking forward to were interrupted by Makarenko's death in 1939.

Chukovskii's letter to Stalin became a matter of common knowledge in 1997, when it was published in the journal *Istochnik* ("Source"). Its content induced the critic and publicist Vadim Kozhinov to attack Chukovskii in an article that was later republished in several forums. (Chukovskii 2009: 347–348.) It is not surprising that, in the post-Soviet framework of the 1990s, anybody who had suggested that troublesome children be confined to colonies – which suspiciously bring to mind labor camps – would be demonized. However, whether Chukovskii wrote the letter upon request or on his own initiative, by all appearances, it was written with good intentions and out of a genuine concern for children – even for those who were "socially dangerous." Chukovskii's only sin was conforming to the

current ethos and expressing himself according to current conventions – and even that is not a sin but rather part of a survival strategy.

While artistic issues are usually seen as Chukovskii's first priority, in the above episode he distinctly emerges as a civic being, a citizen striving to influence the society he lives in. In fact his conduct during the Civil War was a manifestation of that same tendency. He was not only an organizer in the cultural sphere, but he also attended to various practical and urgent issues. This is evident, for instance, in the following entry recorded in Chukovskii's diary on November 11, 1919:

Потом – заседание «Всемирной Литературы». По моей инициативе был возбужден вопрос о питании членов литературной коллегии. Никаких денег не хватает – нужен хлеб. Нам нужно собраться и выяснить, что делать. (Chukovskii 2011a: 265.)

A meeting of World Lit. The issue of feeding members of the literary community was brought up on my initiative. Money will do no good; we need bread. We need to come together and work out what to do. (Erlich 2005: 57.)

Chukovskii's outrage at Boris Kaplun, who fed his wolf cubs with milk while the children of Petrograd were starving (see Subchapter 2.3), attests to his acute social conscience. His active role in defending persecuted writers (see Subchapters 2.8 and 4.5.1) is yet another manifestation of his aspiration to take on the role of civic being as far as possible in a totalitarian society.

A common denominator in the descriptions of Chukovskii provided by different scholars is his affinity for democratic ideals. According to Evgeniia Ivanova's (2004a: 15) characterization, Chukovskii was a western-minded "zapadnik" who admired American efficiency. Lauren Leighton (1984: xxii) describes him as a "natural democrat and a liberal." Victor Erlich (2005: xii) summarizes Chukovskii's career as follows:

His distinguished if often impeded career, during which recognition alternated and at times coexisted with bureaucratic harassment, is a stark illustration of the predicament of a writer totally dedicated to the literary craft under an increasingly oppressive regime. To put it differently, it is a paradigm of the plight of the socially conscious but essentially apolitical literary intellectual destined to ply his trade in a blatantly and brutally politicized culture. (Erlich 2005: xii.)

Erlich (2005: xii) notes that "Chukovskii's own priorities are clearly indicated" in the diary entry recorded in 1917, in which Chukovskii confesses to being more interested in Stendhal's novel than in the real-life drama of the Revolution (see Subchapter 2.3). On the other hand, at that time, Chukovskii was only 35 years old and had not yet matured into the multifaceted individual and citizen he would eventually become. In a democratic society, Chukovskii might have been inclined to realize his obvious potential as a champion for public causes in a considerably wider framework.

Chukovskii's way of commenting Aleksandr Fadeev's suicide demonstrates that he clearly understood the devastating impact that living in a "blatantly and brutally politicized culture" can have on an individual. In May 1956, after the dethroning of Stalin, Alek-

sandr Fadeev shot himself (see e.g. Clark 1996: 292). In a diary entry recorded on May 13, 1956, Chukovskii (2011c: 214–215) recounts the details connected with Fadeev’s suicide. With remarkable insight, he reflects on the contradiction between what Fadeev was and what he became in service to the Soviet literary institution:

Вся брехня Сталинской эпохи, все ее идиотские зверства, весь ее страшный бюрократизм, вся ее растленность и казенность находили в нем свое послушное орудие. Он – по существу добрый, человечный, любящий литературу «до слез умиления», должен был вести весь литературный корабль самым гибельным и позорным путем – и пытался совместить человечность с гепеушничеством. (Chukovskii 2011c: 215.)

All the lies of the Stalinist era, all its idiotic atrocities, all its horrific bureaucracy, all its corruption and red tape found a willing accessory in him. An essentially decent human being who loved literature “to tears” had ended by steering the ship of literature into the most perilous, most shameful of waters and attempting to combine humanness with the secret-police mentality. (Erlich 2005: 406.)

In the writers’ village in Peredelkino, it was common knowledge that before killing himself Fadeev had left a letter at the Central Committee. The letter was first published in 1990. (Chukovskaia, E. 2011c: 561.) From the letter, it turns out that Chukovskii’s estimation of Fadeev’s motives was remarkably accurate. His comments on Fadeev’s suicide also illustrate how in the course of the spring, his initial confusion over Khrushchev’s revelations (see subchapter 2.8) had gradually incubated into a new understanding of the past. Chukovskii’s reaction and his feelings were probably shared by many of his contemporaries. However, as it turns out from the above diary entry, it is the Stalinist machinery rather than Stalin himself that came to be reconsidered – or more correctly, for the first time openly discussed.

In his diary, Chukovskii would continue to contemplate Fadeev’s ultimate decision. The following diary entry was recorded on November 11, 1962. In it, Chukovskii is incensed because the wife of a Barvikha district official had asked him why Vladimir Maikovskii shot himself:

Я хотел ответить, а почему вас не интересует, почему повесился Есенин, почему повесилась Цветаева, почему застрелился Фадеев, почему бросился в Неву Добычин, почему погиб Мандельштам, почему расстрелян Гумилев, почему раздавлен Зоценко, но, к счастью, воздержался. (Chukovskii 2011c: 351)

I wanted to ask how come she wasn’t interested in why Yesenin hanged himself, why Tsvetaeva hanged herself, why Fadeev shot himself, why Dobychin threw himself into the Neva, why Mandelshtam died, why Gumilyev was executed, why Zoshchenko was persecuted, but fortunately I restrained myself. (Erlich 2005: 476.)

The list is one of many that emerge in Chukovskii’s diary in the late 1950s (see Subchapter 2.8). Chukovskii had acted as a mentor for the writer Leonid Dobychin in the 1920s and early 1930s. Dobychin was also a friend of Nikolai Chukovskii’s. (See Petrova 1993.) As it is stated in the above diary entry, Dobychin had committed suicide by drowning himself.

In some cases, a passage in *A High Art* that at first sight seems to contain an Aesopian subtext may simply be written on the basis of the official truth that was being delivered to Soviet citizens. In light of the information that is available today, it would be tempting to interpret, for instance, the discussion around the Kazakh translation of the Communist Manifesto (1936a: 83; 1941: 80–81; see Table 62 in Subchapter 4.4.2) as parody. Whether or not Chukovskii's observations about Kazakhstan's "economic development and cultural growth" should be taken at face value depends on how much he could see beyond the Soviet propaganda. Overcoming the tsarist era backwardness was part of the 1930s ethos, and the Soviet regime was associated with progress and modernity (see Fitzpatrick 2000: 9, 225). Sheila Fitzpatrick describes the phenomenon as follows:

As far as we can tell, most people accepted the dichotomy of "backwardness" and "culture" and the proposition that the regime was helping the population to become less backward and more cultured that lay at the heart of the Soviet message. (Fitzpatrick 2000: 225.)

Chukovskii's reasons for revising the comment about Kazakhstan between the two editions of *A High Art* may be speculated in that light. However, his choice of words in the 1936 edition seems quite over-optimistic, even naïve, as at the time the edition was being revised, the devastating famine in Kazakhstan was only coming to an end. On the other hand, Chukovskii's sanguine visions of the future are well in accord with the general ethos of the time. At first sight, the idea of Kazakhstan's economic development rapidly enriching the Kazakh language seems like over-simplified reasoning that indicates that Chukovskii may be using the devices of non sequitur and *reductio ad absurdum*. However, complemented with the premise of cultural growth, the pronouncement loses its Aesopian appearance.

In fact, the suggestion that "feodal" and "patrician" would be among the first new Kazakh words (see Chukovskii 1941: 81) seems a lot more like a non sequitur. Chukovskii reports having "no doubt" that the Kazakh language already contained the words lacking at the time the Communist manifesto was being translated. However, just like the optimistic prospects for the future presented in the 1936 edition of *A High Art*, the fundamental idea of the above comment in the 1941 edition is in accord with the current ethos. The public discourse of the late 1930s advocated the idea that the success of the Soviet state had been realized and that the glorious future had already arrived (see Petrone 2000: 6). On the other hand, the revision, the expression "I have no doubt," in particular, might also be interpreted as irony. Perhaps Chukovskii is obliquely commenting on the ideological vocabulary that had reached a supranational level.

A feuilleton of Chukovskii's, published in *Pravda* in January 1936, testifies to his keen observation of the vocabulary of Soviet propaganda. One of its key words was the pronoun "we." Particularly from the mid-1930s on, this pronoun was often used in patriotic contexts. In the feuilleton, Chukovskii tells about a little boy at a zoo asking his mother whom the elephant belongs to. When the mother tells the boy it is the state's, he happily says that then it is partly his, too. Chukovskii reports having been delighted by this comment, which, he points out, illustrates the Soviet children's sense of Socialist property. (See Chukovskii 1936b.)

A diary entry recorded on December 28, 1934 raises questions about whether Chukovskii's enthusiasm was quite as genuine as the above comment suggests. In this entry, Chukovskii refers to his article about Il'ia Repin, which had been accepted by *Pravda* at the same time as his article "Iskusstvo perevoda" (see Chukovskii 1935a):

О Репине я написал с самой неинтересной для меня точки зрения – неинтересной, но необходимой для славы Репина в СССР – на тему: «Репин – наш!» Эта статья даст возможность громко прославить Репина, а то теперь он все еще на положении нелегального. (Chukovskii 2011b: 552.)

I wrote the Repin article from what is the least interesting angle for me but one that is indispensable for his place in the USSR, namely: «Repin is Ours!» The article will make it possible to glorify Repin, who is still considered illegal. (Erlich 2005: 308.)

By Repin's "illegality," Chukovskii is apparently referring to Repin's status of émigré – although Repin had never become an actual nonperson despite that he remained in Kuokkala when the border between Finland and the Soviet Union was closed. He was valued as a representative of the old school of art, and his work regularly appeared in exhibitions and publications. However, with the politization and proletarianization of the arts in the late 1920s (see Subchapter 2.7), he had fallen into oblivion. Repin's death in 1930 was passed over in the major newspapers with a mere one-sentence announcement, but soon afterwards his life and work were totally reconsidered and harnessed into the service of the Stalinist cultural policy. In the process, he was equipped with a new, illusionary image of a politically committed Soviet artist and made an icon of Socialist Realist art. (See Valkenier 2009: 228, 239.)

As it turns out from the above discussion, Chukovskii was cunning enough to manipulate Soviet authorities by deploying their own linguistic devices. The pronoun "we" (*my*) was used in a metaphoric sense already by Lenin, at that time connected, in particular, to class war. By "we," Lenin referred to himself and his supporters, whereas the prosperous owning class, basically the kulaks (see Subchapter 4.2), were "them." (See Brooks 2001: 22–23.) The historian and scholar Sergei Iarov (2007) notes that by using the pronoun "we," Lenin created an illusion of general support and, thereby, underlined the rightness of his ideas.

In Stalinist propaganda, the meaning of the pronoun shifted, as it was adapted to the ethos of a united country. "We" now came to mean the Party, the Soviet state, and the Soviet society all at the same time. In the discourse of sciences and arts, its implication was that their task was to promote Socialist building. (Brooks 2001: 51–52.) David Powelstock (2006: 288) points out that the Soviet identity in the 1930s was defined "in terms of the paranoiac dichotomy between "us" and "them." The adopting of pre-revolutionary heroes into the official canon (see Subchapter 4.3.3) was meant to promote the idea of unity and consensus. One example of the phenomenon was the remodeling of Mikhail Lermontov (see Subchapter 4.3.3) into "one of us," "our Lermontov" (see Powelstock 2006: 289).

Evgenii Zamiatin managed to capture the essence of the future Stalinist "we" while the Soviet state was beginning to take shape. His well-known dystopian novel *My* ("We;" 1920–1921) features a state in which every citizen is harnessed into serving the society,

individual consciousness is considered a sickness, and everybody is under constant and vigilant surveillance. Zamiatin's early attitude to the Revolution was, however, positive, and the novel was probably not written specifically as a protest against the Soviet system. Aleksander Solzhenitsyn suggests that, produced by "artistic intuition," the novel was, instead, meant to warn against dangerous extremism. However, the resemblances of the novel's world with Soviet reality did not pass unnoticed by Soviet authorities. The novel was counted among Zamiatin's sins in the witch-hunt that was conducted against him in the late 1920s (see Subchapter 2.6). (See Solzhenitsyn 1997.) In his letter to Stalin in 1931, Zamiatin expressed his distress about the situation that he was caught in, that a novel written nine years earlier was being judged as his "latest, newest work." Obliquely, he also seems to denounce the novel when he admits that during the few years after the Revolution he had written material that "might serve as grounds for attack." (See Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 109, 111.) As it turns out, the letter produced the desired effect, as Stalin allowed Zamiatin to emigrate (see Subchapter 2.7).

In the lyrical genre of films and songs that emerged in Soviet culture in the 1930s (see Subchapter 4.2), the pronoun "we" was used with a different meaning than in the official discourse. In that context, "we" referred to the Soviet nation as an entity, a "body" (*telo*), a sort of "super-organism" (*sverkhorganizm*). The word "we" frequently appeared in the songs of the 1930s representing what "with a paradoxical combination of words could be called an "intimate mass sense" (*intimnaia massovost*). (Giunter 1997.)

In *A High Art*, Chukovskii uses the collective expression "we" in two different senses or, rather, on two different levels. The pronoun either refers to all Soviet peoples, or to the Russian people, exclusively. In the former case, it often refers to the shared homeland, often appearing in the possessive case *nash* ("our"). In other instances, it is used in the locative case *u nas* ("at us"), for instance in the phrase *u nas v SSSR* ("in our Soviet Union;" literally, "at us in the USSR"). In the foreword to the 1936 edition, alone, an inflected pronoun "we" appears three times (p. 6, see Table 11 in Subchapter 4.3.2; p. 9, see Table 44 in Subchapter 4.4.1; p. 10, see Table 70 in Subchapter 4.4.2). In the same edition, the construction *u nas v SSSR* is included, for instance, in a rhetorical question in the midst of a discussion about Shakespeare (p. 139; see Table 102 in Subchapter 4.4.4). Alternatively, Chukovskii uses the expression *nash soiuz* ("our [Soviet] Union") (p. 9, see Table 44 in Subchapter 4.4.1; p. 52, see Table 9 in Subchapter 4.3.1). Such locutions sharply increase by frequency in the 1936 edition of *A High Art*, coinciding with the rise of Soviet patriotism (see Subchapter 4.2).

In the foreword to the 1941 edition, Chukovskii speaks of "our multilingual country" (*nasha mnogoiazychnaia strana*) (p. 3, see Table 18 in Subchapter 4.3.2), or simply "our country" (*nasha strana*) (p. 4, see Table 14 in Subchapter 4.3.2). The inclusive nature of the homeland is also manifested in a discussion about Shevchenko, in which Chukovskii refers to "all the republics and oblasts making up the Soviet Union" (p. 243, see Table 17 in Subchapter 4.3.2). In both those instances, the expression unequivocally includes all Soviet nations and republics. However, in the foreword to the 1941 edition, "we" is also used in the other sense, juxtaposing the Russian people with the "brother nations" (p. 4, see Table 45 in Subchapter 4.4.1). A similar distinction is made later. In a discussion of the issue of Russification, Chukovskii (1941: 74) poses a rhetorical question asking whether Russification is suitable for "us," and continues by emphasizing that "we" have to be sure not to Russify the works of the brother nations (see Table 13 in Subchapter 4.3.2).

In the passage shown in Table 7 (see Subchapter 4.3.1), Chukovskii (1941: 217) speaks of the respect of the Soviet people for the cultures of other nations. The examples presented in the same context suggest that, in this case, too, both the epithet "Soviet" and the pronoun "we" are equal to Russian.

Table 130

<p><i>Именно поэтому Тифлис переименован в Тбилиси, Эриван в Ереван, Сухум в Сухуми и проч. В звуках собственных имен почти всегда отражается национальная эстетика того или иного народа, и естественно, что в настоящее время мы стремимся передать эти звуки с наибольшей точностью. Переводя, например, чувашских поэтов, мы называем Чебоксары – Шупашкар. (Chukovskii 1941: 214.)</i></p>	<p><i>That is why Tiflis was changed to Tbilisi, Erivan to Erevan, Sukhum into Sukhumi, and so on. The sounds of proper nouns almost always reflect the national esthetics of one or other nation, and it is natural that we, at present, strive to convey those sounds as precisely as possible. Translating for instance Chuvash poetry we call Cheboksary Shupashkar.</i></p>
---	--

Every example in the passage shown in Table 130 was drawn from non-Russian Soviet languages. In the discussion about Shevchenko, a few pages down from the reference to "all the republics and oblasts making up the Soviet Union," Chukovskii (1941: 249) speaks of the respect shown by Soviet poets for the poetic works of brother nations (see Table 30 in Subchapter 4.3.3). However, the list of examples of such poets only includes Russian names (pp. 249–250). The emphasis on the Russian nation produces connotations of a slightly patronizing attitude, like that of a superior nationality to an inferior one. The set-up is vertical rather than horizontal, which supports the idea of the Russians being "the first among equals" (see Subchapter 4.2). Yet the passage, like the 1941 edition in general, seems rather anti-chauvinist. Equaling all Soviet people with the Russians, as in the example above, is most probably due to the point of view. In this passage, Chukovskii is speaking on behalf of himself and his own people, all the while recognizing them as part of a larger community of nations.

On the other hand, for Chukovskii to identify himself as Russian may not have been as self-evident as supposed. Contemporary study reveals that he was Jewish on his father's side (see Chaikovskaia, *Chukfamily.ru*). Apparently, he also knew this, although his father was never actively involved in his life. The following diary entry was recorded on February 3, 1925 while Chukovskii was in Finland collecting the archives that remained at his Kuokkala dacha after the Revolution (see Subchapter 2.6). The sorting of old papers evoked memories of his youth. As can be seen in the entry, he felt deprived not only of a father but also of a national identity:

Я, как незаконнорожденный, не имеющий даже национальности (кто я? еврей? украинец?) – был самым нецельным, непростым человеком на земле. Главное, я мучительно стыдился в те годы сказать, что я «незаконный». (Chukovskii 2011b: 209–210.)

As an illegitimate child, deprived even of nationality (What am I? A Jew? A Russian? A Ukrainian?) I felt I was the most unfinished, unfathomable being on earth. And the main thing was, I was unbearably ashamed of saying at the time that I was illegitimate. (Erlich 2005: 161.)

Chukovskii appears to have been reticent about his background, possibly because of it being associated with painful memories of his illegitimate status. In her memoirs, Lidiia Chukovskaia (2012: 158) recalls that in their home, their paternal grandfather was a taboo subject. The period between the end of World War II and Stalin's death saw a series of anti-Semitic campaigns conducted in the Soviet Union (see Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 209, 464, 468, 472). That may also have been one reason for Chukovskii not to want to proclaim his half-Jewish descent.

The Russian-centered emphasis in *A High Art* is counterbalanced in the 1941 edition. Criticizing the Turkish translation of Stalin's *Ob osnovakh leninizma*, Chukovskii (1941: 37) argues that the erroneous translation of one single word corrupts the entire book and produces a distorted image of the Soviet people. In that context, he uses the phrase "we all, the entire Soviet Union" (See table 97 in Subchapter 4.4.3). The expression unambiguously underlines the uniformity of the multinational Soviet people. In that particular context, the pronoun "we" also implies the notion of ideological unanimity.

There are several ways to interpret such features in *A High Art* that patently echo the Soviet ethos at that time. The simplest explanation would be that it was the censor who rendered the manuscript politically correct through alterations, removals, and addendums, or that the author made these himself with the particular purpose of following the censor's stipulations. If, on the other hand, Chukovskii deliberately revised the text, his motives leave room for speculation. As discussed above, participation in public discourse involved adapting one's texts to current conventions and including current topics in the discussion. Furthermore, as it turns out from Chukovskii's diary and letters, in the 1930s, he still maintained some of the idealistic zest that stemmed from the early years of the Revolution. His writings manifest a will and determination to work for the benefit of Soviet culture, no matter what. For instance the letter he sent to his wife Mariia Borisovna from Kiev in 1939 (see Subchapter 4.3.2) has nothing forced in it, only unabashed exaltation at being part of the Soviet family of nations. Of course, Chukovskii must have been very much aware that the letter could have been opened and read during its journey to its recipient, and, therefore, unorthodox comments would have been out of the question, in any case.

Be that as it may, Chukovskii apparently was able to adapt his love for Russian literature into encompassing the wider framework of the entire Soviet culture. That abiding love and loyalty transcended any political issues, which is also manifested in Chukovskii's infamous letter to Aleksei N. Tolstoi (see Subchapter 2.1). Martha Weizel Hickey describes Chukovskii's motives in the spring of 1922 as follows:

Chukovsky felt a personal responsibility for the fate of Russian literature. As he had written Tolstoy, this sense of obligation was what had motivated his efforts to participate in the literary process, even when the Bolsheviks became its sponsors. (Hickey 2009: 311.)

If, on the other hand, the conformist phrases and the locutions from official language have an Aesopian function in *A High Art*, Chukovskii would have been verbally astute enough to know the right notes to strike. In such a case, he would also have trusted that the sophisticated Aesopian reader would look beyond what seem like banalities in the text. Yet on the other hand, much of that which seems banal today did not seem so in the 1930s. It was simply part of the language of that time.

There are passages in *A High Art* that must be examined in an even broader context than that of the 1930s. One such passage is the one in which Chukovskii pronounces that translation should be based on exact sciences and that translations should be examined using laboratory analysis (see Table 71 in Subchapter 4.4.2). It would be easy to interpret this remark as the Aesopian device of *reductio ad absurdum* or *non sequitor* (see Subchapter 3.2). On the other hand, in the revolutionary era and during the 1920s, the word "laboratory" was used in various abstract senses. In this case, Chukovskii is most probably referring to a selected group of scholars specialized in translation, something similar to the editorial board of the publishing house *Vsemirnaia literatura* (see Subchapter 2.4). The section in his statement about the exact sciences is, in fact, far more ludicrous than the one about laboratory analysis. It seems entirely incompatible with Chukovskii's fundamentally artistic notion of translation, for instance, with his statement that the original author's style "bears infinite resemblance to the color of his hair, to the movements of his eyes, to the turns of his tongue, to the beating of his heart" (see Table 53 in Subchapter 4.3.2).

By and large, *A High Art* abounds in similar discrepancies. The discrepancies, the distinctly emotional undertone, the prominent presence of the author, and the occasionally apparent bias in the book are all at odds with conventional scholarly style. If those features in *A High Art* were examined as deliberately chosen stylistic contradictions, they would be hallmarks of the Aesopian device of *shift* (see Subchapter 3.2). However, it is obvious that Chukovskii never meant *A High Art* to be a scholarly book in the first place. Calling for a "strictly scientific" book about translation, Chukovskii (1936a: 10; see Table 70 in Subchapter 4.4.2) was clearly not referring to *A High Art*. He acknowledged that the book was not to be included in the scientific genre. As regards Chukovskii's studies of Aesopian language, Lev Loseff makes similar observations when referring to their informal and essayist style (see Subchapter 3.2). Finally, in the foreword to the 1964 edition of *A High Art*, Chukovskii (1964: 8; see Subchapter 2.5) explicitly points out that the author of the book is neither a linguist nor a scholar, but a critic who reserves the right to express his emotions, be they positive or negative. In light of the above, speculation about stylistic contradictions in the book is irrelevant. The style is very much the same with which the young critic Chukovskii once astounded the reading audience of Saint Petersburg (see Subchapter 2.1).

One idea to toy with is that Chukovskii might have used the device of "laying a veil" in *A High Art*, in other words, concocted ostensibly conformist passages the only function of which was to mislead censors and conceal one or another non-conformist message (see Subchapter 3.2). In the 1936 and 1941 editions, in the latter one, in particular, the chapter "The Social Nature of the Translator" (Chukovskii 1936a: 37–53; 1941: 37–59) is the most blatantly conformant to the public discussion of 1930s. It might be speculated whether this chapter, or some part of it, was actually meant as noise (see Subchapter 3.2). If that is the case, then it follows that the same would apply to Chukovskii's (1940a) much-criticized article by the same title, and that speaks against the hypothesis. Concentrating on such a

specialized field as translation, *A High Art* was targeted at a relatively limited audience. Editing it, Chukovskii might have wanted to give the censors what (Sandomirskaja 2015: 63) refers to as a “tweak.” It is, however, questionable whether he had been disposed to take his chances in *Literaturnaia ucheba*, a major journal with a much wider audience.

The idea that *A High Art* consists of nothing but noise, like for instance Belinkov’s book *Iurii Tynianov* (see Subchapter 3.2), is ludicrous in light of the history of the book. Moreover, Chukovskii’s devotion to the topic of translation is evident – irrespective of whether or not he felt professionally fulfilled as a translation scholar. This was one of the roles he was constrained to in the post-revolutionary literary life, one of his masks (see Subchapter 4.2). As can be seen in the foreword to the 1964 edition of *A High Art*, Chukovskii never quite felt at home in that role. On a general and abstract level, it might be contemplated whether Chukovskii’s compliance in revising *A High Art* according to the prevalent cultural policy was in itself a particular kind of noise. Under cover of that noise, Chukovskii could continue his mission to the benefit of Russian literary translation and advocate an outlook on the subject that never fundamentally changed.

In many cases, there seems to be a perfectly innocent explanation to this or that “oddity” in *A High Art*. At first sight, for instance, the poem “Plach antifonetika” (see Subchapter 4.5.1), or rather the revision made to it between editions, seems to contain an Aesopian subtext. The poem both begins and ends with the phrase “Oh evil, evil times!” (see Chukovskii 1936a: 213; 1941: 216). No source reference is provided for the poem, but concluding from the context, the author is Anna Ganzen. In the 1941 edition, the year 1935 was added in parentheses at the end of the poem. It is easy to draw a line between the revision and Chukovskii’s (2005: 603) description of one of Nekrasov’s Aesopian devices, which creates a subtext by supplementing a poem with the year it was written. That way, the reader could connect the poem with the real-life events that were obliquely commented on (see Subchapter 3.2).

The date added to Ganzen’s poem might be interpreted in line with a similar model, as an indication of the Aesopian device of shift (see Subchapter 3.2). In that case, the dramatic opening and finishing lines could be connected with the aftermath of Kirov’s murder and to the beginning of the Great Terror. During the early 1935, the first Zinov’iev-Kamenev trial (see Subchapter 2.7) gained a lot of publicity. Judging by the comments in Chukovskii’s (2011b: 555–556) diary, he was utterly confused and upset by the “disclosure” of Kamenev’s alleged duplicity. Seen from this perspective, the “evil times” might refer to revelations like this and to Chukovskii’s general disillusionment. Of course, it is also possible that Chukovskii actually exaggerated his feelings of shock in the diary entry to cover his back if the diary were confiscated.

The simplest explanation to Chukovskii’s decision to add the extra information afterwards is that, by then, the topic had already lost some of its actuality. In fact, he also added a footnote to the anonymous quotation taken from Mikhail D’iakonov (p. 215; see Table 122 in Subchapter 4.5.1). The footnote specifies the “new Ibsen edition” as an anthology translated by Ganzen and published in 1935. The discussion about the new way to transcribe proper names considered that Ibsen volume, in particular. Supplementing the poem with the year, Chukovskii may simply have wanted to underline the context.

With hindsight, imagination, and somewhat simplistic reasoning, several individual words that appear in *A High Art* could be interpreted as hidden allusions. For instance, the

discussion about Shakespeare (see Subchapter 4.4.4) leaves a lot of room for such speculation. In his criticism of Kuzmin for “retouching” (*retushirovat’*) and “sanitizing” (*podchishchat’*) Shakespeare’s colorful and unfettered language, Chukovskii (1936a: 175; 1941: 130) chose an example from Kuzmin’s translation of *King Lear*.

Table 131

<p>Отчего хотя бы тот же Кузмин, найдя в «Короле Лире» выражение: «Изменник, пятнами покрытый словно жаба», выбрасывает в своем переводе и «пятна» и «жабу» и ставит примелькавшийся штамп: Изменник гнусный! (Chukovskii 1936a: 175; 1941: 130.)</p>	<p>Why does for instance Kuzmin, coming across the following expression in <i>King Lear</i>: “A most toad-spotted traitor” discard in his translation both the spots and the toad and use the commonplace cliché: “Vile traitor”! (The original line is from Shakespeare 1984: 859. M. S.)</p>
---	--

It is easy to find here an association with Stalin, whose face had been scarred by smallpox suffered in childhood. At first sight, the absence of Shakespeare’s original line supports the suggestion of an Aesopian subtext. An overall examination of the chapter, however, reveals that in the examples of translations, the original texts are provided quite erratically also elsewhere, not only in this particular passage. Another slightly peculiar feature that only appears in the 1936 edition is that although the title of the subchapter in question is “The New *Tempest* and the New *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* (*Novaia “Buria” i novyi “Son v letniuiu noch’*), the discussion opens with examples from Kuzmin’s *King Lear* (pp. 175–176). In the 1941 edition, this passage is included in the chapter “About the Methodology of Translating Shakespeare.”

Assuming that there were an Aesopian subtext in the above passage, there would still remain the question about the reference of the word *izmennik* (“traitor”). Had the passage appeared two decades later, Stalin would have been a good candidate for that role. Had it appeared even only a few years later, the idea of Stalin as a traitor might have been connected to the Stalin Constitution (see Subchapter 4.2), which, just like the Tsar’s Emancipation Manifesto of 1861 (see Subchapter 3.2), promised a lot but delivered little. However, by the time the constitution was ratified, the 1936 edition of *A High Art* had already been published. The manuscript had been left at the publishing house even before the draft constitution was submitted for circulation. On the other hand, the word *izmennik* might also allude to *izmena* (“treason”), which was a very current and ominous notion in the 1930s (see Subchapter 2.7).

Inserting political concepts and topics into a discussion about artistic translation might also be recognized as an anomaly akin to anachronisms (see Subchapter 3.2). However, as can be seen in the above discussion, many details in *A High Art* that at first sight appear “suspicious” end up having alternative, less complicated explanations – at least if literary excerpts are excluded. As stated above, the existence of subtexts on any level of *A High Art* cannot be ruled out. If the subtexts were targeted on political matters, this would support Lauren Leighton’s (1984: xiv) characterization of Chukovskii as a “literary and political polemicist such as one would not want to meet in a dark alley of a literary and political night”

(emphasis added by M. S.). Chukovskii's biography and his writings seem to manifest humanistic rather than political tendencies. On the other hand, literature and politics cannot be examined as separate entities from each other. Literature often mirrors current politics, a phenomenon that is vividly illustrated in the revision of *A High Art*.

With reference to Aesopian language, perhaps the most intriguing passage in the 1936 edition of *A High Art* is to be found in the chapter titled "The Translator's Hearing – Syntax" (*Slukh perevodchika – Sintaksis*; pp. 54–72). In discussing a translator's phonic perception of the original, Chukovskii (1936a: 62) illustrates his point of view by presenting a stanza from Nikolai Gumilev's poem "Rabochii" ("Workman") as an example and its Ukrainian translation by the critic and scholar Boris Iakub'skii. The poem was first published in the newspaper *Odesskii Listok* ("Odessa Page") in April 1916 while Gumilev was serving in a regiment billeted in Germany along the river Dvina (Blium 2011). Despite being exempted from service for health reasons, Gumilev had volunteered for the front immediately after the outbreak of World War I. Within a few months, he had been decorated with both a 3rd and a 4th class St. George's Cross and had advanced to the rank of officer. (Hellman 1984: 23–24.)

In his article "A Hour in Paradise. Nikolaj Gumilev and the War," Ben Hellman (1984: 22–34) contemplates Gumilev's personality as a poet. Gumilev's cavalier and romantic attitude to war is manifested in his works, in which death is a recurring motive. Gumilev identified himself with the hero-ideal of an explorer, warrior and conquistador. He abhorred a peaceful and predictable life and was always looking for danger. For Gumilev, the war was "Russian roulette" and a "personal challenge," and dying in the battlefield, according to him, was the best way to die. Many contemporaries witnessed his deliberate risk taking in battle. Underlying Gumilev's bravery, Hellman distinguishes a strong death wish, which before the war also manifested itself in suicide attempts. It was the possibility of imminent death that made Gumilev feel alive. (See Hellman 1984: 27–28; 31–33.)

Death and suicide have been traditional themes throughout Russian literature. In works situated in Saint Petersburg, the representation of suicide has often been connected with ideology and contemporary reality. For instance, Aleksandr Blok featured suicide in many of his poems. (Lilly 1994: 403, 405, 419–421.) The influence of Western Decadence rendered death as an essential feature of Symbolism. Dmitrii Merezhkovskii, Zinaida Gippius, Viacheslav Ivanov, Fedor Sologub, and Andrei Belyi, among others, portrayed death in their works. Before the founding of the Acmeist movement (see subchapter 4.5.1), Gumilev was closely associated with the Symbolists. Both he and Osip Mandel'shtam were among the young poets Ivanov mentored and supported in the 1910s. (Peterson 1993: 17, 28, 33, 52, 79, 129, 138.)

Igor' Sukhikh characterizes Gumilev's poetry as follows:

Его основным жанром становится баллада, фабульное стихотворное повествование. [. . .] Героями баллад поэт обычно выбирает сильных людей, путешественников, авантюристов, подвижников, рыцарей, преодолевающих трудности, смело глядящих в лицо опасности и даже смерти. (Sukhikh 2008.)

His basic genre is a *ballad*, a narrative poem with a plot. [. . .] The heroes of ballads are usually *strong people*, travelers, adventurers, warriors, or knights who surmount obstacles and fearlessly face dangers and even death.

In the poem “Rabochii,” the protagonist is not a knight but a blacksmith, a meek old man who toils at his anvil unaware that he is a link in a chain of death. Chukovskii has chosen the fourth stanza of the poem as an example (see Table 132). In the original text, the river is called the “grey, foamy Dvina,” but in the English translation, it has been replaced with the phrase “Russian river.”

Table 132

<p><i>Пуля им отлитая, просвищет Над седою, вспененной Двиной, Пуля, им отлитая, отыщет Грудь мою, она пришла за мной. (Chukovskii 1936a: 62.)</i></p>	<p><i>His bullet will whistle across this Russian river, will find my heart. It has come to find me. (Gumilev 1972: 97.)</i></p>
--	--

Five years later, Gumilev was executed by a firing squad (see Subchapter 4.5.1). As his way of dying eerily coincided with the words of his poem, a legend would prevail long afterwards about his somehow having presaged his fate. (See Blium 2011.)

In principle, the name “Dvina” can refer to two rivers, the Northern Dvina (*Severnaia Dvina*) in Russia, and the Western Dvina (*Zapadnaia Dvina*), a major river in present-day Latvia and northern Belarus. At the time of Perestroika, some journalists assiduously tried to re-situate the poem to the setting of Gumilev’s death, going as far as to change the name of the river to Neva (Blium 2011).

From the perspective of Aesopian language, Chukovskii’s choice of this particular stanza seems loaded with insinuation. Of course, unlike the hero of the poem, Gumilev was not killed by the enemy but for *belonging* to the enemy, epitomized by the counterrevolutionary conspiracy that he allegedly belonged to. The subsequent stanza in the poem “Rabochii” goes as follows:

*Упаду, смертельно затоскую,
Прошое увижу наяву,
Кровь ключом захлещет на сухую,
Пыльную и мятую траву.
(Gumilev 1999: 103.)*

I will fall, twisting, I will see
history as history was,
while my blood will rush
like a fountain on the dusty, beaten grass.
(Gumilev 1972: 97.)

By the mid-1930s, there was an increasing number of people who could not help seeing history “as history was” even if they did not want to. Chukovskii was probably one of these. What less than twenty years ago had started with promises of liberty had turned into steadily tightening restrictions for the intelligentsia, and a euphoric atmosphere of new beginnings (see Subchapter 2.4) had been replaced with fear of being arrested for some

unpredictable reason. At the time the 1936 edition of *A High Art* was published, terror and death were becoming omnipresent elements in Soviet society. In that sense, Gumilev's role in the Aesopian subtext might be that of a harbinger of what was to come.

The passage that discusses Gumilev's poem "Rabochii" in the 1936 edition of *High Art* is relatively short. Except for the examples and the introductory sentences to them, there is only one paragraph in which Chukovskii comments on the translation.

Table 133

<p><i>Тут переданы не только словесные повторы в нечетных строках, тут передан эн- jambement из третьей строки в четвертую и пауза в четвертой строке, характери- зующая неотвратимость неприятельской пули. (Chukovskii 1936a: 62.)</i></p>	<p><i>Reproduced are not only the repetitions of words in the odd lines. Also reproduced are the enjambement from the third line to the fourth one, and in the fourth line, the pause that characterizes the inevitability of the en- emy bullet.</i></p>
--	---

After this comment of praise, Chukovskii (1936a: 62–63) moves on to examples from Mikola Voronii's translation of Afanasii Fet (see Subchapter 4.5.1), and from Aleksandr Sokolovskii's and Anna Radlova's translations of Shakespeare (see Subchapter 4.4.2). It is worth noting that the latter three examples appear in that edition with carefully detailed footnotes, whereas the reference to Gumilev's *Rabochii* has no source of reference whatsoever. If the lack of a footnote was intentional, it could be interpreted as the Aesopian device of ellipsis or "demonstrative silence" (see Subchapter 3.3.). The device, in this case, would have been intended to direct the reader's attention to the connection between the stanza and Gumilev's fate. The date of Gumilev's poem is particularly conspicuous because of its absence. An Aesopian reader would know to replace the year it was written with the year 1921 of his execution.

The absence of a footnote suggests the presence of a subtext particularly because Chukovskii most often provides footnotes when citing another text. However, the stanza from "Rabochii" is far from the only exception to that rule. In fact the example from Voronii's translation (Chukovskii 1936a: 62) lacks the source of reference as well. If a common link were to be found between Gumilev and Voronii, the only one seems to be that they were both repressed (see Subchapter 4.5.1). In 1936, though, Voronii had not yet been executed but lived in exile. Even that connection is rather superficial because, by all appearances, the Ukrainian poet was no personal friend of Chukovskii's. For instance, in Chukovskii's diary, his name is never mentioned. It seems that had Chukovskii felt the urge to comment on somebody's exile, the subject might rather have been Osip Mandel'shtam, who was deported the same year as Voronii.

The poem "Rabochii" later caught the attention of the gatekeepers of the regime, but for reasons that were connected with the interpretations discussed above. At the second arrest of Ekaterina Boronina (see Subchapter 2.8) in 1950, a number of books with "anti-Soviet content" were confiscated from her library, and three of them contained Gumilev's poetry. A committee of experts was assigned to evaluate the confiscated books. (See Razumov 1999.) In the report of the committee, Gumilev and his works were commented on as follows:

Октябрьскую революцию встретил враждебно. В 1921 г. расстрелян за участие в контрреволюционном заговоре. Творчество его насквозь чуждо и враждебно советскому человеку. Оно наполнено мистикой, ненавистничеством к простым людям, предчувствием гибели своего дворянского класса. В стихотворении «Рабочий» ГУМИЛЕВ представляет рабочего который не спит:

«Все он занят отливанием пули,
Что меня с землею разлучит».

Перечисленные выше сборники в списках изъятой [из библиотек] литературы не значатся. Их безусловно необходимо изъять. (Razumov 1999.)

His attitude to the October Revolution was hostile. He was executed in 1921 by a firing squad for participation in counterrevolutionary conspiracy. His works are thoroughly alien and hostile to the Soviet people. They are full of mysticism, hatred for the simple folk, and premonition of the destruction of the entire ruling class. In the poem “Workman,” GUMILEV presents a workman who does not sleep:

“Casting the bullet
That will cut me away from the earth”.

The anthologies enumerated above do not appear on the lists of works confiscated [from the library]. It is absolutely necessary to confiscate them.

Thus, according to the interpretation of the committee, Gumilev’s poem was written to scorn the simple working man and to prophesy the destruction of an entire class, not the poet’s own death. The attention given to this particular poem evokes speculation on whether its presence and its significance in the 1936 edition of *High Art* had been noted, discussed, and even possibly recorded somewhere. The allusion, the congruence of the poem with the poet’s fate, is quite obvious, which speculations around it testify to (see above). Perhaps it was the censor who removed the passage from the 1941 edition. When the committee of experts evaluated the poem in 1950, they may have purposely avoided accentuating Gumilev’s romantic role as a martyr in their interpretation of the prophesy.

The reference to Gumilev’s fate in the 1936 edition of *A High Art* is almost too obvious to be a hallmark of Aesopian language. If it was intended as an allusion, the presence of the reference would manifest significant audacity and defiance towards the regime. It is enigmatic why Chukovskii would have wanted put himself at risk by touching on such a delicate topic. Although Chukovskii appreciated Gumilev professionally, they did not have a close friendship like Chukovskii had with Stenich. It could, perhaps, be speculated whether Mandel’shtam’s deportation and exile during the same period as Chukovskii revised the 1936 edition of *A High Art* would have outraged and provoked him enough to recall the fate of Gumilev, who had been closely associated with Mandel’shtam in the Acmeist movement. In that case, the existence of a link between Gumilev and Voronii might not be quite as far-fetched an idea, as mentioned above.

The passage that includes “*Rabochii*” appears in *A High Art* only in the 1936 edition. As discussed in Subchapter 4.5.1, Gumilev’s name is entirely absent from the 1941 edition. Even if mentioning his name had been allowed, it is doubtful that Chukovskii would have included the passage in the new edition. The atmosphere in the late 1930s was quite different from what it had been while he revised the 1936 edition. Denunciations, arrests,

disappearances, and rumors all undermined any sense of security among the intelligentsia. With his son-in-law arrested and the fates of his children Nikolai and Lidiia, apparently, on a knife edge (see Subchapter 2.8), Chukovskii probably would not have been willing to show the *pravado* that an allusion to Gumilev's death would have manifested.

A considerably more innocuous issue that Chukovskii might have wanted to comment on with the help of Aesopian subtexts was the stilted and petrified official language of the Soviet era. In his study *Zhivoi kak zhizn'* ("Live as Life;" 1962), one chapter is particularly devoted to the critique of "officialese" (*kantseliarit*), the bureaucratic travesty of his beloved Russian language (see Chukovskii 2001d: 105–132). With Chukovskii's acumen, it would have been an easy game for him to parody the various propagandistic locutions heard in official announcements and public discourse. Because of his linguistic talent, he probably had a definite advantage over the average censor.

As regards other possible topics, it is worth considering that Chukovskii never was a political dissident in the strictest sense of the word. He resented the bureaucracy and censorship and the centralization of power in literature, but at the same time, he seems to have been dedicated to Soviet culture and even optimistic about it developing past its teething problems. For him, like for so many others, fundamental disillusionment did not come until Stalin's crimes came to light.

On the other hand, by the 1930s, Chukovskii had already seen, for instance, his own daughter harassed by Soviet authorities (see Subchapter 2.8). He had friends and colleagues arrested, deported, and executed. His work had been restricted, and his children's books had been prohibited. Frustrating and humiliating battles with the Soviet literary institution had become part of his work as a litterateur. Another question is whether he would have been predisposed to touch on such delicate topics in *A High Art*, even obliquely. In such a case, the risk would have been considerably higher, and the use of Aesopian language would at least have entailed utmost caution.

In his foreword to Chukovskii's diary, Victor Erlich calls attention to the scarcity of entries in it during certain periods in the 1930s and 1940s:

Although Chukovsky kept soldiering on and recording his manifold activities and ordeals, the brutal pressures under which he and his confrères were laboring began to register through significant omissions, gaps, and silences: [. . .] (Erlich 2005: xiv.)

Similar "omissions, gaps, and silences" tell their own story in *A High Art*. Even if there are no intended and deliberate subtexts in the book, the gaps are subtexts of their own kind. The editing process of the book produced self-induced subtexts as by-products, even without the author's particular intention. The 1941 edition contains several instances in which Chukovskii avoids mentioning taboo names by resorting to either ellipses or paraphrases. As discussed in Subchapter 4.5.1, some of the repressed writers simply vanished from *A High Art*, ceased to be, whereas some others are referred to with various euphemisms. When the periphrases used about Stenich are given closer examination, what strikes the eye is Chukovskii's use of the double negation "not unknown" (see Table 117 in Subchapter 4.5.1). A similar rhetorical device (*litotes*) is frequently used in the Russian language: affirmation is emphasized by supplementing it with the negation of its opposite. On the other hand, both the use of antonyms and stylistic deflation are also typical Aesopian devices

(see Loseff 1984: 96). In such a case, Chukovskii's choice of words might be interpreted as a veiled reference to Stenich's fate, or as a marker to alert the reader's attention to the absence of his name from the passage. However, it seems unlikely that Chukovskii would have deliberately wanted to remind the readers of his connections with Stenich at that time.

The nature of the ellipses and periphrases in *A High Art* is ambiguous. If the censor of the publishing house or Chukovskii's own "inner editor" (see Subchapter 2.6) forbade him to mention certain names, he had two choices: either to omit the entire passage from the new edition or to resort to the devices discussed above. From this perspective, many of the revisions might rather be practical arrangements than actual Aesopian subtexts. On the other hand, a subtext automatically emerges as a by-product precisely because of such arrangements.

A crucial difference between Chukovskii and the 19th century Aesopian authors is a matter of their vantage points. Nekrasov and his kindred spirits were fearless proclaimers who would rather go to prison than relinquish their convictions. At the same time, in a certain sense, their vantage point was that of an outsider. Most of them lived in a very different world than the lowest social stratum of people they were battling for. Chukovskii, in contrast, lived in the reality now described with expressions like "the Great Terror." Terror was an omnipresent factor that touched everybody either directly or indirectly and dominated people's minds with fear. Even when nothing was actually happening, that which *might* happen or *could* happen kept everybody on edge and on alert. In that light, it seems doubtful that Chukovskii could have objectively analyzed the general phenomenon of Stalinism as if from the outside and commented it in subtexts. The entries in his diary that appeared in the 1950s and 1960s indicate that only when the Stalinist period was over, did he seriously begin to contemplate on the past, to figure out connections, and to make conclusions.

5 Discussion

In the present study, the cultural phenomenon called Kornei Chukovskii emerges as a multifaceted and complex individual and citizen. He is neither a hero nor a villain in his role in Soviet culture but simply a human being capable of the good and the bad. In the first place, Chukovskii tried to ply his trade and find sense and continuity in senseless and unpredictable circumstances. As a litterateur, he was in a constant dialogue with the surrounding culture and strove to maintain a balance between his own ideals and those dictated from above.

Examining *A High Art* from today's point of view is a dialogue of its own kind. Involved in it are Chukovskii's voice in the text on the one hand, and the researchers foreknowledge and prejudices about the 1930s Soviet Union on the other. Many of the phenomena that from the present bird's eye view can easily be categorized, for instance, as conformism acquire different interpretations when examined in the context of their own epoch. That which Chukovskii did when he revised the 1930s editions of *A High Art* for publication was, essentially, sculpting his work into such a form that it would fit into the slot it was allowed in the literary terrain of that period.

If the handbooks of the publishing house Vsemirnaia literatura are included in the count, *A High Art* was published in eight different editions during Chukovskii's lifetime. From a temporal point of view, the eight editions can be divided into three distinctly separate groups, of which the 1919 and 1920 editions constitute the revolutionary era group, the 1930, 1936, and 1941 editions constitute the 1930s group, and the 1964, 1966, and 1968 editions constitute the 1960s group. Each one of those groups was produced under the influence of a different chronotope.

The revolutionary era chronotope was marked by circumstances that manifested themselves in chaotic conditions on the one hand, and in quite unrestrained freedom on the other. Wartime famine and other shortages were counterbalanced with optimism and enthusiasm at the endless prospects that the future appeared to have in store. The darkest aspect in the general confusion was that the new regime already employed severe repression against certain groups and certain individuals. Among the targets of the Bolshevik terror were also intellectuals like, for instance, Nikolai Gumilev. However, the fates of these intellectuals may have been considered as individual misfortunes and accidents, perhaps even as misunderstandings. Chukovskii and his confrères in Gor'kii's projects appear to have maintained a generally positive outlook on the inchoate proletarian culture.

The revolutionary era was politically charged to a high degree. However, working at Vsemirnaia literatura and contributing to other projects, Chukovskii appears to have chosen among the values of that time those that were close to his heart, without giving a lot of concern to the rest. He was obviously never very interested in politics. Even his short sidestep to political satire in his young days might be ascribed to excitement at the newly acquired freedom of speech rather than to any actual pursuit of political ambitions. The enlightenment of the people ethos, which was prevalent in the revolutionary era, is likely to have agreed well with Chukovskii's personal set of values. Considering his own background, extending literary sophistication to the broad masses must have particularly ap-

peeled to him. In compiling the translators' handbook, political issues did not have much relevance, and Chukovskii's work was evidently based on purely artistic premises.

In principle, revolutionary values were still valid in the chronotope of the 1930s, but they were at that time interpreted anew and adjusted to the purposes of Stalinist rule. That which had fundamentally changed was the amount of influence that the current set of values had on an individual litterateurs's work. Whereas in the revolutionary era, it was possible to be selective about values, this luxury was not permitted in the 1930s. Every public utterance, whether written or spoken, was measured with ideological guidelines dictated from above. What made the situation especially challenging for an individual litterateur was that those guidelines were not fixed but in a constant flux. Nobody could know entirely for certain if the rules endorsed one day would remain valid the next day.

Although terror was already unmistakably present during the revolutionary era, it was relatively detached from everyday life. In the course of the 1930s, however, terror acquired new pertinence, and nobody could ignore it anymore. As the decade passed, the more neighbours, friends, or family members had been repressed. Fear had become a more or less predominant feature in daily life. There was no way to guard oneself against the wrath of Soviet authorities that would have guaranteed one hundred percent personal safety. A potential enemy could lurk anywhere, among strangers or among the very closest friends. Added to this, under prolonged torture, practically anybody might become a denouncer, as it turned out, for instance, from the development of the Pereval case. What drove Chukovskii to denounce himself in 1929 and again in 1943 was, in fact, prolonged torture. In the long run, mental pressure can be nearly as effective as crushing fingers.

Between the revolutionary era editions and the 1930s editions of *A High Art*, the intended audience of the book multiplied. The self-evident reason to this was that while the handbooks had been meant exclusively for the translators of the publishing house Vsemirnaia literatura, the expanded editions of the 1930s were targeted at a wider audience of readers. Furthermore, at that time, there was a new, secondary audience to be taken into consideration. It consisted of the ideologically oriented censors and editors of the publishing house. They were the gatekeepers whose approval the publication of a book depended on. Finally, there were the highest wardens of ideological orthodoxy for whom the gatekeepers themselves were liable. Their liability, however, in no way nullified the writer's ultimate responsibility for his own text. Therefore, every writer had to constantly keep in mind the presence of those two additional levels of critical readers and tailor his utterances accordingly.

In *A High Art*, the focus is not specifically on political topics, and changes in the sanctified ideological guidelines did not necessarily arouse the need to radically change its actual content. Therefore, the politically correct material in the book can be considered to be a layer of frosting that has to be peeled off in order to reveal the cake that contains the author's actual message. What comes into view when that is done to the 1930s editions of *A High Art* is that Chukovskii's principles of artistic translation had remained quite the same as they were during the revolutionary era, when he wrote his very first article for the translators' handbook.

Compared with the chronotope of the 1930s, the chronotope of the 1960s appears to include more intellectual and artistic freedom. The worst of the terror had subsided, and the dethroning of Stalin had influenced the cultural atmosphere in the Soviet Union by bringing many formerly unstated truths into open. However, the dynamics of the society

in the 1960s were fundamentally the same as they had been before. Disobedience to Soviet ideological guidelines did not go unnoticed or unpunished, as, for instance, the trials of Andrei Siniavskii and Iulii Daniel' demonstrate. Another example of the regime's continuous firm grip on cultural matters was the pressure brought on Chukovskii in connection with the 1968 edition of *A High Art*. In order to eventually get it published, Chukovskii was compelled to succumb to the censor's order and remove every trace of his friend Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn from the book.

Behind each group of the editions of *A High Art*, including the revolutionary era group, the 1930s group, and the 1960s group, there is the same and yet a different author. During the revolutionary era, Chukovskii was in his own element in a way that he would probably never be again. He had a multitude of roles to play in the new proletarian culture under creation, the roles of author, editor, and educator, among others. What is particularly significant is that he shared many administrative duties with Gor'kii, although, in that respect, he has been left in the shadow of his more renowned colleague. Dating from the summers spent at his Kuokkala dacha, Chukovskii had a wide circle of friends and acquaintances among the intelligentsia who had, at some point, enjoyed his hospitality. This, complemented by Chukovskii's lack of interest in political issues, earned him the role of confidant among intellectuals irrespective of their political dispositions.

In his diary, Chukovskii expresses his outrage at the Merezhkovskii couple's plea for him to speak to the Bolsheviks on their behalf. However, it is assumable that, at heart, he was flattered and gratified by his newly acquired status. His matter-of-fact account of the telephone call shared with Lenin is another token of the prestige he enjoyed at the time. Chukovskii's role as an intermediary between the intelligentsia and the regime was a very concrete manifestation of his dialogue with the prevailing culture. His consultation with Stalin about the issue of delinquent children in 1943 testifies to the fact that this particular kind of dialogue was not confined to the revolutionary era. Although on a smaller scale, this kind of dialogue continued throughout Stalin's rule.

The ardor and energy that Chukovskii's new responsibilities generated in him is evident in his diary entries recorded during the years of the Civil War. At times, he appears to be in a nearly euphoric state of mind. There is so much to do that he happily and tirelessly works for days on end and often through the night, too. Of course, there are also entries in which the hunger, the cold, and the entire desperate material situation are palpably present. However, the foremost impression left by Chukovskii's diary of that time is deep professional satisfaction. For the Chukovskii of the revolutionary era, only the sky was the limit.

During the decade that passed between the first and second group of editions of *A High Art*, there were many changes in Chukovskii's professional life. His efforts to revive his pre-revolutionary career as critic had come to a dead end. He was harassed for his children's rhymes. Furthermore, in the institutionalized Soviet culture, there was no place for such individual actors and organizers in the capacity of which he had so successfully performed during the revolutionary era. From the early 1930s on, Chukovskii apparently resigned himself to the current situation and tried to make the best of it as permitted by circumstances. In the public discourse of that period, he came forth as a critic, but not as the outspoken and presumptuous young critic of his youth. He had to play the role of Soviet critic at that time, a role that was determined by official guidelines. Out of sheer necessity, he learned to carefully weigh his words.

During the latter part of the 1930s, the aspect of fear seems to have become a relevant factor in Chukovskii's decisions and actions. The primary issue was no longer getting published and receiving royalties. The primary issue became his personal survival and the survival of his family. Chukovskii's dexterity in his role of intermediary had been an asset to him during the revolutionary era, and it was an advantage in the 1920s, when he managed to help his daughter Lidiia and her friend Ekaterina Boronina get released from exile. In the late 1930s, the fate of an individual depended on such relentless and unpredictable forces that even that asset lost its significance. Chukovskii had no way of saving Matvei Bronshtein because, as it would later turn out, all the while he was making every effort to save his son-in-law, the latter was already dead.

In a certain sense, however, Chukovskii played a role in the 1930s culture similar to the one he had played in the culture of the revolutionary era, although the circumstances were very different. Both periods were marked with cultural reorganization, and during both periods, Chukovskii was one of the principal actors. During the revolutionary era, he had contributed to the creation of a brand new culture. In the 1930s, he participated in the creation of order in an already existing culture. All his utterances in the public discourse of that time can be regarded as contributions to that end. Although during the Civil War, Chukovskii had nominally worked for Lunacharskii and Gor'kii, in reality, he had been a relatively free agent. In this respect, his position in the 1930s was completely different. Like all the cultural actors of that period, he was, ultimately, held answerable to the Soviet regime.

In his various organizational duties during the first years after the Revolution, Chukovskii emerged, first and foremost, as a civic being. Even during Stalin's rule, he took an active role in the society. This is evident, for instance, in his decision to file appeals on behalf of colleagues in need. Chukovskii was also acting in the role of civic being when he approached Stalin about the problem with juvenile delinquents. Chukovskii's desire to influence public issues suggests that, despite all, he continued to nurture a fundamental belief in Soviet society.

In fact, the Soviet citizen did not have very many choices. Probably the easiest choice was to actively, deliberately believe the truth that everybody was indoctrinated with. In theory, there was also the choice of open opposition. Everybody was well aware of the consequences of the latter alternative, however. Of course, it was possible to privately recognize the injustices and insanities, and there were many of those who did. For them, the recognition probably caused a painful inner conflict. Moreover, what today is called Stalinism did not fall on Soviet citizens all of a sudden. The shift was so gradual and subtle that nobody would have noticed exactly when the promise of a better and prosperous society turned into a reality of suspicion and fear.

Perhaps, on a certain level, cherishing the ideals and dreams that so vividly colored the revolutionary era made it easier for Chukovskii to accept the reality of the 1930s. These ideals and dreams may have given some purpose to the predicaments at that time. After all, the alternative would have been quite frightening. For Chukovskii, that would have meant that his dedication to Soviet culture had been for nothing. Thus, in a certain sense, the 1930s may have been for Chukovskii easier to bear than the late 1950s and the 1960s would be. The dethroning of Stalin was a deliverance in many ways, but, at the same time, it destroyed whatever illusions anybody might still have nurtured of the fundamental purpose of the ordeals that Soviet citizens had suffered during his reign. It is likely that members

of the intelligentsia had already long since realized that a great part of the official truth consisted of a web of lies, but living in a lie can sometimes be less painful than facing the truth. Aleksandr Fadeev's fate is a tragic example of this.

During the 1960s, gradually deepening disillusionment becomes conspicuous in Chukovskii's diary entries. It seems that the more time he has to reflect on the years that have passed, the more cruelly he realizes the falsity of the set of values which decades of his life's work have been built on. Of course, Chukovskii's priority was always literature, not any political system. It was, first and foremost, Russian literature and language that he worked for all his life. In spite of this, completely losing faith in Soviet society would have been painful, considering all the personal and professional sacrifices he had encountered in the course of years. The diary entries recorded during Chukovskii's declining years have the appearance of a reckoning. It seems as if he felt an urgent need to write everything down before his death. The repeatedly emerging lists of repressed intellectuals present a very concrete manifestation of this tendency. At that late stage of his life, Chukovskii unequivocally drew a parallel between tsarist repression and Soviet repression.

The 1960s editions of *A High Art* bear traces of the chronotopes of the previous groups of editions. The fundamental outlook on the subject matter does not substantially change, and the earlier chronotopes are also present in the vertical dialogue that Chukovskii conducts with those earlier editions. Chukovskii's recollections about the publishing house Vsemirnaia literatura, his response to Fedor Batiushkov's opinion about his metaphors, and his comment on the 1930s and 1940s enthusiasm for scientific translation are all part of that vertical dialogue. For each new edition, original ideas were elaborated and supplemented with contemporary examples. What made those ideas so special is that they once arose from creativity and artistic zest rather than rational and theoretical reasoning. Even in the 1930s, with the scientific aspects of translation particularly highlighted, *A High Art* most strikingly manifests the pure and optimistic idealism of the revolutionary era.

When and whether Chukovskii's career as critic actually ended is an ambiguous question to contemplate. Judging by her comments on the issue, Lidiia Chukovskaia considered the Revolution and the centralization of Soviet literature to have been a death blow to that sphere of her father's career. For instance, Aleksandr Lavrov appears to share Chukovskaia's opinion. In the 1920s, Chukovskii, himself, lamented that his critic-self had been silenced. On the other hand, he continued as a critic of translations. When Chukovskii's participation in Soviet public discourse is examined, it is the role of critic in which he most emphatically performs. Moreover, he never stopped considering himself a critic, as can be seen in the foreword to the 1964 edition of *A High Art*. Indeed, it seems natural to classify *A High Art* as a work of literary criticism. In his work on Nekrasov, Chukovskii emerges first and foremost as a scholar, but the detailed forewords to the poet's collected works also manifest his capacities as a critic. In fact, it would be more facile to point out the genres that can *not* be fitted into the mold of literary criticism. These would be Chukovskii's translations of foreign literature and his fairy tales for children.

What the Revolution definitely put an end to was the purely dialogic nature of literary criticism. Pre-revolutionary criticism consisted of dialogue between the critic and the reader, and there were no interfering actors between them. Of course, the prevailing chronotope always has an influence on the thought patterns of individual people, but during the pre-revolutionary era, that would have been an unconscious process rather than a con-

scious one. The critic did not need to actively watch his every word so as to avoid trouble with the authorities. He could say practically whatever he saw fit, express whatever opinions he had, also when they were not in tandem with generally accepted ideas.

Moreover, falling into disfavor with the authorities seldom had such sinister consequences before the Revolution as it would have in the 1930s. Chukovskii's detention in connection with his satirical journal *Signal* is one example of that. In the end, the experience was not even entirely negative for Chukovskii in that he was provided with the chance to immerse himself in the artistic activity of literary translation. In the 1930s public discourse, circumspection was literally a matter of survival, and the aspect of survival changed the very nature of writing. Whereas the earlier editions of *A High Art* can be examined as Chukovskii's dialogue with his readers, in the 1930s editions, the communication acquires the nature of dialogue. The third participant in it is that which Chukovskii calls "the ideological guidelines of Soviet culture."

Beginning with his early career as litterateur, Chukovskii was bestowed with the gift to sense different nuances in a cultural atmosphere and to meet the expectations of his current audience. In the 1930s, that gift helped him distinguish the features of the setting and adjust his own performance accordingly. From that, it follows that every one of Chukovskii's utterances in the 1930s editions of *A High Art* can be examined as his horizontal dialogue with Stalinist culture. That Chukovskii succeeded in maintaining that dialogue on a safe level and simultaneously remained true to his own convictions on issues that really mattered is not only due to his astuteness but also to his great verbal talent. Together with a natural survival instinct, these characteristics guided him to curb himself and censor his own statements.

On the other hand, even in the 1930s editions of *A High Art*, there seems to be present the enfant terrible of literary criticism who, in his younger days, managed to outrage the old cultural elite of Saint Petersburg. Traces of several genres of Chukovskii's pre-revolutionary repertoire can be discerned in *A High Art*, those of the critical review and the writer portrait, and even those of the feuilleton. The author challenges his reader, tosses questions in the air, and goes on to answer them himself. The pre-revolutionary critic Chukovskii also manifests himself in the use of humoristic metaphors and in some quite unreasonable exaggerations.

Chukovskii's manner of expression fluctuates between the polemic, the poetic, and the scholarly, and his opinions considering translation sometimes seem quite inconsistent with each other. In some passages of *A High Art*, a translator's most important task appears to be a thorough scientific study and analysis of the original text, whereas in other passages, the emphasis is on the translator's ability to emotionally identify with the original author, to assume his personality. Perhaps it is Chukovskii's choice of words that sometimes produces the effect of contradiction. This is particularly evident as concerns the notion of precision, which frequently appears in *A High Art*. It becomes clear that in speaking about precision, Chukovskii is not referring to literal translation. Instead, he equates the precision of a translation to its maximal approximation with the spirit of the original. To that end, Chukovskii is disposed to allowing a translator a considerable amount of artistic freedom. This is indicated, for instance, by the presence of Irinard Vvedenskii as a role model in *A High Art*. Although Chukovskii kept adapting his essays to current ethos, in his perception, translation remained a fundamentally creative high art.

In general, Chukovskii's attitude to language, literature, and translation appears to be utterly emotional. For instance his tendency to use such emotionally charged words like "violence" in connection with translation attests to an artistic rather than scholarly approach to the subject matter. Chukovskii considers a slipshod translation to be a criminal act against the Soviet reader, and, at times, it appears that he also takes such a translation as a personal insult. As he points out in the foreword to the 1964 edition, in *A High Art* he takes the liberty to openly express his joy, his dissatisfaction, and his sorrow. According to Vladimir Bibler, such emotional aspects are all part of a wider conception of culture. On the subject of *A High Art*, these aspects can, therefore, be examined as supplementary to the author's chronotope that is primarily determined by the norms and values of the prevailing chronotope of Soviet culture.

In connection with *A High Art*, Chukovskii is sometimes referred to with the epithet "translation theorist." The prominence of emotional aspects is one feature that indicates that the book at hand is not a theoretical study, and it seems obvious that Chukovskii never intended it as such, either; that domain he voluntarily left for Andrei Fedorov and others. In fact, rather than as a theorist, Chukovskii emerges in *A High Art* as a preacher who encourages the translator to use his own instinct for guidance about the correct interpretation of the original author. Even the rhetorical devices that Chukovskii uses in his argumentation often have distinct similarities with those heard in a religious sermon.

It appears that apart from being an important forum for discussion about translation, *A High Art* functioned for Chukovskii as a guise, a mask behind which he could realize his potential as a literary critic and fulfill his true vocation. Of course, the material significance of the book for Chukovskii cannot be downplayed, either. Revising *A High Art* provided an important part of his income, considering the number of editions that were published during his lifetime. Chukovskii's fairy tales had been his main source of income in the 1920s, but in the 1930s, his career as children's writer was faced with a serious threat. The 1930s were an auspicious time to publish of a book like *A High Art* also from another perspective. The ongoing public discourse about literature and translation, the founding of the Writers' Union, and the organization of the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers and the First All-Union Conference of Soviet Translators all rendered translation an extremely actual topic. Chukovskii was probably sufficiently insightful to recognize the perfect niche for frequently revised editions of *A High Art*.

It is noteworthy that although public discourse about translation was surveyed and controlled from above, it remained highly dialogical by nature. For instance, in the First All-Union Conference of Translators, the floor was also given to those who represented an outlook that was diametrically opposed to the officially sanctioned line. In *A High Art*, Chukovskii maintains that same diversity. If this was deliberately chosen policy, it may have been part of Chukovskii's survival strategy. Perhaps, by then, he was already conscious of the unpredictability of the regime's moods. By remaining within the golden mean, he could salvage *A High Art* from total unorthodoxy, wherever the winds might blow next. Chukovskii clearly had some abilities similar to a chameleon, although not in the fickle or devious sense that his enemies apparently had in mind when they used these characteristics as a weapon against him in connection with his Lenin prize candidature. Like a chameleon that camouflages itself by changing the color of its skin, Chukovskii maneuvered *A High Art* under seemingly conformist camouflage. He took great care that

his writing would not conspicuously stand out in the event that new rules would suddenly appear to nullify the old ones.

At times, Chukovskii seems to be engaged in a dialogue with himself, weighing up different conventions and different tendencies within his own mind. He presents his principles of artistic translation so ambiguously that both the exponents of literal translation and the exponents of free translation could use them effectively for supporting their respective positions. The literalists could, for instance, cite those passages in which Chukovskii emphasized scientific precision and truthfulness. Their opponents, in turn, could single out some lyrical expressions, for instance, the one in which an author's style is equated with the color of his hair and the beating of his heart. In actual fact, what made *A High Art* so easy to accommodate to new and different chronotopes was its very elasticity.

Conducting a vertical dialogue with the earlier editions of *A High Art* in the 1960s, Chukovskii refers to the 1930s outlook on translation from a marked distance, as if he were an outsider. This impression is emphasized by the passive form he uses when referring to the propensity for strictly scientific methods that prevailed in those days. On a closer look, it appears that for Chukovskii, there were two different notions of scientific precision. On the one hand, precision was a positive phenomenon, quite abstract and undefined, and associated with revolutionary and Soviet slogans rather than with actual methods. At the same time, however, Chukovskii provided practical advice how to attain optimal precision, for instance, by suggesting that a board of editors should examine every translation alongside the original before the translation was published. On the other hand, scientific methods were discussed in a distinctly negative light and equaled with Formalism. The negative aspects were particularly emphasized in connection with Anna Radlova's translations, although, as regards Radlova, the aspect of personal antipathy probably intermingled with Chukovskii's professional assessment of her work.

Such intermingling of personal aspects with professional ones is what emerges as the darker side of the principally straight and unbribable critic Chukovskii. It may have been this same tendency that once prompted Chukovskii to make a parody of Mikhail Kuzmin. Of course, occasional partiality can be considered to be a human foible and pardonable as such. As human being, Chukovskii appears to have been full of contradictions. In one context, he emerges as an idealist who endeavors to save the world, and in another one, as a ruthless and scathing critic unable to disassociate personal bias from his reviews.

In *A High Art*, the fact that different translators are judged by different measures makes the text all the more ambiguous. On the other hand, ever since the 19th century, the broadness of the Russian litterateur's job description has caused literary criticism to resemble a peculiar kind of sport in which the competitors themselves act as judges assessing each others' performances. In *A High Art*, that set-up is most blatantly manifested in the discussion about Konstantin Bal'mont. Chukovskii's caustic comments about Bal'mont acquire special meaning when examined in light of the competitive position between the two renowned translators of Walt Whitman.

Although in the above discussion, the politically correct material in *A High Art* is referred to as noise, and although Chukovskii may have used the device for camouflage, this does not mean that it was inserted into the book with markedly goal-oriented deliberation. Quite the contrary, the process was probably largely unconscious. Chukovskii cannot have been totally immune to the chronotope under which he lived and worked, no more than

any individual in any culture could. Chukovskii must have been frustrated when the organization of literature in the 1930s subordinated writers directly under the Soviet state, but at the same time, the chronotope of the Stalinist period inevitably influenced his own worldview. Chukovskii's double role in the 1930s public discourse vividly illustrates the horizontal nature of cultural dialogue. However authoritarian the culture, delivering ideas is always reciprocal to a certain extent. Even in a discourse apparently steered from above, ideas will be unobtrusively revised in the bidirectional chain of utterances.

Adopting the values of the Stalinist period may not have been all that difficult for Chukovskii. Many of those values bore distinct echoes of the same revolutionary ethos that so inspired him and his colleagues at the House of Arts and at the publishing house Vsemirnaia literatura. The idea that a new era was dawning was an essential part of that ethos, and the same idea is manifest in the 1930s editions of *A High Art*. All in all, the book manifests the revolutionary notion of time, which is "now." The tsarist era has been swept aside, and the new era begins at that moment. In this sense, *A High Art* deviates from the Stalinist notion of time. The present is not bypassed but rather highlighted, and the reason to that is the vantage point taken in the book. The Soviet regime promoted the promise of a better future, so that people would happily endure the hardships of that time and would not be aggravated by these hardships. In *A High Art*, Chukovskii lifts the veil and shows the readers glimpses of the literary sophistication that would soon be within the reach of everybody. In that sense, the glorious future is already there, in the book. In some instances, Chukovskii makes politically correct references to the future, for instance, to the "future classless society." However, the general emphasis is definitely on the present day, on the present standards, and on the present achievements.

By and large, those manifestations of the Stalinist time chronotope in *A High Art* that are directly associated with literature may be the purest and the most genuine from the author's point of view. For Chukovskii, both the translator and the consumer of literature were positive heroes. That attitude, too, dates back to the revolutionary era, when Chukovskii enthusiastically took part in the education of new consumers of literature. It was the same ideal and same aspiration that remained his driving force all through his career as litterateur. He was genuinely devoted to his mission, and he probably considered devotion to literature an ultimate heroic act. For Chukovskii, literature presented something for which he was prepared to make superficial concessions to the Soviet authorities. Therefore, he was prepared to revise *A High Art* according to whatever conventions those authorities might dictate.

As regards literary tradition, two opposite approaches can be distinguished in *A High Art*. Past translation practices are reconsidered in light of Soviet standards and found inferior. Even while some past masters are given praise, their success is explained by their inherent talent and artistic instinct rather than by any general principles they may have followed. Vvedenskii is one example of such masters. In most cases, however, past translators are juxtaposed with present ones in a negative light, and, it seems, the farther past the translator worked, the harder the language used against him. Chukovskii evidently avoided denouncing contemporaries, with the exception, perhaps, of Radlova and Kuzmin and some editors. The positive aspects of tradition are represented by the renaissance of pre-revolutionary classics and their inclusion in the Soviet canon of literary heroes in the 1930s. This tendency must have been warmly welcomed by Chukovskii because it provided him with an official blessing to discuss his favorite writers in *A High Art*. Pushkin,

Lermontov, Tolstoi, and others balanced the bleak picture presented by the models and ideals of Socialist Realism.

In a sense, the Friendship of the Peoples ethos compensated for the international ethos of the revolutionary era. The main point of both was belonging to a greater whole that shares the same ideals and values. Chukovskii appears to have genuinely absorbed the idea of being part of the great Soviet family of peoples. Interpolating current slogans and pieces of Soviet propaganda into *A High Art* is one thing, but there seems to be nothing feigned in the way Chukovskii marvels at the variety of the ethnic cultures, not just in *A High Art* but also in personal letters. His comments suggest that he really believed in friendly equality between all Soviet peoples. Such an image would not have allowed for assertive manifestations of national identity, any more than for the aggressive measures taken by the Soviet regime to quell such manifestations. Chukovskii was not naïve by any means, but it appears that, at times, he may have chosen to look away from truths that were too ugly and remain in the safe sphere of literature, where everything was predictable insofar as it was controlled by the author. Chukovskii's tendency to search for a haven in literature is demonstrated, for instance, in his preference to concentrate on Stendhal's novel rather than to observe the events of 1917 in Petrograd.

Chukovskii's treatment of the Friendship of the Peoples ethos demonstrates how he was unconsciously influenced by the prevalent choronotope of the Stalinist period. In discussing minority nationalities, he underlines the equality and unity of the brother nations. However, the overall impression that the reader is left with is that the great Russian nation, "the best among equals," benevolently accepts into its bosom the smaller and inferior nations – that is, as long as they play by the rules and confine manifestations of their national identity to literature, music, and dances. In this context, too, *A High Art* mirrors the culture and the values of the 1930s Soviet Union. The image that was propagated at that time showed millions of people from various ethnicities happily collaborating for the benefit of Socialism and for a united Soviet state. This image seems to have appealed also to those who were not convinced by basic political propaganda. Unpolitical intellectuals, Chukovskii among them, may have welcomed the image of a big friendly Soviet nation particularly because, in that propaganda, most of the emphasis was given on cultural aspects.

Of all the revisions made to *A High Art* in the 1930s, the most striking is the discussion about the social nature of the translator. As the reception of Chukovskii's article about this topic indicates, in that particular case, his acumen for cultural trends may have betrayed him. Chukovskii's manner of approaching his subject matter, both in the article and in *A High Art*, suggests that while trying to adapt his text to prevalent conventions, he failed to notice that the winds had already changed. The patently politicized outlook on translation that some passages in *A High Art* manifest was denounced as vulgar sociology. Thus, he had unintentionally sided with the proponents of a tendency that had definitely fallen in disfavor with the regime. By the time Aleksandr Shtein's attack on Chukovskii was published in *Pravda*, the 1941 edition of *A High Art* had already been submitted. Therefore, it was already too late to remove the material that had proved offending. Of course, the audience of *A High Art* was considerably narrower than that of the journal *Literaturnaia ucheba*. After the 1941 edition, the chapter "The Social Nature of the Translator" no longer appears in the book, but in the 1960s, the topic would probably have been obsolete, in any case.

As it turns out from the above discussion, the chronotope of the revolutionary era remains present in the 1930s editions of *A High Art*, albeit embedded within the one prevalent during the Stalinist era, examined, in the present study, as the Stalinist time chronotope. When scratched, the layer of Stalinist ethos in *A High Art* proves quite thin. Maintaining the ideals of the earlier chronotope made the unpredictable and, in many ways, contradictory Soviet culture of the 1930s easier to endure. It seems that there were many of those who thought that the bad things that happened during the revolutionary era were, in the first place, teething problems of the infant Soviet system rather than its permanent features. Therefore, the reverberation of the revolutionary chronotope would have been advantageous also for the regime. In fact, Stalin's juxtaposing himself with Lenin can also be examined as one way of maintaining that reverberation.

On the subject of the presence of Aesopian language in *A High Art*, Chukovskii's unpolitical disposition is a pertinent aspect to be considered. There seems to be no reason to believe that the ultimate function of the book was to provide Chukovskii with a forum for expressing dissident opinions. He genuinely took it as his mission to elevate the standard of Russian literary translation. This does not, however, exclude the possibility of the existence of subtexts in the book. Had Chukovskii wanted to obliquely comment some current phenomena in *A High Art*, the subtext would most likely be associated with literature or language, issues that were so important to him. Moreover, these topics were never actual taboos, and, therefore, touching on them would not have been considered particularly incriminating.

Of course, it can be speculated whether mentions of Lenin, Stalin, Marx and Engels in *A High Art* are connected with the contemporization of the book without other ulterior motives, or if Chukovskii was parodying the current habit of dropping politically correct names in a variety of contexts. It is also possible that the name dropping served both of those functions for Chukovskii. From the point of view of Aesopian language, perhaps the most interesting passage in *A High Art* is to be found in the 1936 edition. In that passage, Chukovskii, quotes the stanza in which Nikolai Gumilev describes his own imaginary death. This authorial decision appears almost reckless on the part of the normally quite circumspect Chukovskii. If there is a subtext there, it may be intended to juxtapose the Red Terror of the revolutionary era with the repressive measures of that time. Perhaps, some recent incident had outraged Chukovskii enough for him to leave caution aside. The 1936 edition of *A High Art* was submitted well before the arrests of Chukovskii's friends Benedikt Livshits and Valentin Stenich, and, therefore, the litterateur who first comes to mind is Osip Mandel'shtam. His first arrest, actually, occurred during the time Chukovskii was revising this edition. Perhaps Chukovskii somehow perceived the Mandel'shtam arrest as the ultimate concretization of the persecution of writers that had been underway during the most recent years.

The Livshits and Stenich arrests were precarious issues for Chukovskii, in particular, because his son Nikolai was associated with the case against these two litterateurs. It seems unlikely that Chukovskii would have been inclined to play with fire, which however oblique comments on the fates of his two friends would inevidently have meant. Bronshtein's arrest and execution closely coincided with those of Stenich and Livshits. At that same time, Lidiia Chukovskaia and Nikolai Chukovskii were both in real danger of being arrested, too. It seems reasonable to suppose that, in those circumstances, Chukovskii would have maintained as low a profile as ever possible. As it turns out, by their very absences Stenich and Livshits powerfully contribute to the emergence of a subtext in *A High*

Art. The elaborate omission of their names proclaims their fate more powerfully than any words could. The same pertains to other omissions from *A High Art*. Thus, rendering the book politically correct and cleaning it of taboo topics eventually led to the creation of an Aesopian subtext in it. Whether that kind of a subtext is intentional or unintentional, it has one definite advantage for the author. At least ostensibly, it relieves him from the responsibility related to steering the reader's thoughts in a certain direction.

In fact, it seems more likely that Chukovskii would have concealed Aesopian subtexts in *A High Art* in the 1960s than in the claustrophobic 1930s. In the 1960s, the evil spell had already been broken in more ways than one. First, at that time Chukovskii evidently felt the urge to utter that which may have lingered in his unconscious for a long time. He refused to wear blinders anymore in terms of the wrongdoings of the Stalinist period and the defects of Soviet cultural policy. Second, although dissident writers like Siniavskii and Daniel' continued to be taken to trial and convicted, the penalties were not as severe as they had been in the 1930s. Chukovskii did not need to worry any longer about the possible consequences for his children, even in the event that he would get into trouble because of some forbidden issue discussed in *A High Art*. If being associated with the Pereval group in the 1930s is not counted, Nikolai Chukovskii seems to have been on quite good terms with the authorities up until his untimely death. As to Lidiia Chukovskaia, she was very well capable of taking care of herself. Moreover, an obstinate writer would be more likely to be expelled from the Writers' Union than actually arrested. Like her father, Chukovskaia had the courage to stand up and defend dissident colleagues harassed by Soviet authorities. All things considered, particularly in the 1960s, Chukovskii might have been prone to communicate hidden messages to his readers by using Aesopian language.

Chukovskii's diary entries recorded in the 1960s might also contain Aesopian language because at that time, he was clearly assessing the Stalinist period in a new light. In the entries of that period, Chukovskii quite openly expresses his thoughts and feelings, but there may have remained some taboo issues too dangerous to utter. In this context, the idea of using Aesopian language in a private diary seems quite possible. In the life of the Soviet citizen, privacy was a limited notion. The citizen was essentially a public being and, as such, open to public assessment. As regards the Soviet citizen as a civic being, there was a distinct dichotomy between the propagated image of citizens actively building Socialist society and the reality of restricted civil rights and restricted freedom of speech. Those circumstances posed a constant challenge to Chukovskii's work and to his obvious efforts to act for the benefit of Soviet culture.

Chukovskii's way of revising *A High Art* not only attests to his internalization of the guidelines of Soviet culture but also to his internalization of its arts of accommodation. On the subject of the omission of certain writers from the 1941 edition, it is interesting to contemplate how deliberately and consciously Chukovskii took the retouching measures that he applied to the book. The simplest explanation would be that it was the censor that dictated the omissions of those names and that Chukovskii simply did as he was told. On the other hand, participants in Soviet public discourse in the 1930s were probably quite aware of what could or could not be uttered, be the forum a newspaper, a journal, or a book. By then, the Soviet writer had already become his own censor. In fact, the same applies to the Soviet citizen in general. Not only were books and photograph albums retouched. If necessary, the Soviet citizen was capable of retouching his job history, his roots, and his family

– more or less his entire life. A striking phenomenon that emerges in *A High Art* during the Great Terror is the systematic removal of apparently taboo names using methods similar to those used for retouching photographs. If the 1936 and 1941 editions are juxtaposed with each other, a distinct undercurrent and underlying motive can be discerned in the latter one. Manifested in ellipses and periphrases, there is a subtext of a peculiar kind that informs the reader of that which cannot be openly uttered.

Chukovskii had an excellent ability to adapt himself to change. This ability helped him land on his feet and find his own place in the Soviet cultural framework in different circumstances. Unlike many of his contemporaries, Chukovskii, apparently, never even contemplated leaving the Soviet Union. Instead, he stayed and continued his literary work under the guidelines of the current chronotope. Examining Chukovskii's activities during the revolutionary era and also in the 1930s, it would probably not be too far-fetched to guess that given the opportunity, he would have acted in a similar way under any regime, whether tsarist or Soviet.

Chukovskii survived through the 1930s without being arrested and without getting into serious trouble with Soviet authorities. On the other hand, he never sold his soul to the system and always managed to maintain his fundamental values. Even in old age, he continued to feel deep remorse and self-contempt for publicly denouncing those values in *Literaturnaia gazeta* in 1929. For Chukovskii, that incident, like the removal of Solzhenitsyn's name from *A High Art*, was an unmistakable nadir in his litterateur's career. This indicates that all the while he accommodated himself to the current chronotope, he never lost his personal integrity.

Chukovskii's treatment as a children's writer deserves special attention. There were some purgatorial elements of his treatment. This impression is accentuated by the fact that after all the denouncement and critique, the publication of his fairy tales continued. Thereby, Chukovskii was made into a model of the new Soviet man. Through punishment, repentance, and atonement he was purged of his grave sin, which basically was presenting Soviet children with un-utilitarian art for the sake of art. The ultimate purpose may not have been to turn Chukovskii into a servile puppet of the regime but rather to bring him into line and stifle any pronounced deviations from the prevailing rules. In fact, Chukovskii's purgatory lasted throughout Stalin's rule. The status of authority granted him in the sphere of translation may also have had another function. It delivered a message to the intelligentsia that the authorities would always, in the end, be prepared to embrace the prodigal son to its bosom in the event he is chastened and corrects his ways.

As a matter of fact, the arrangement appears to have had advantages for both parties. The regime thought it could steer the Soviet culture of translation as it saw fit through the ostensibly compliant Chukovskii. The latter, on the other hand, was rewarded with the chance to promote his own ideas in areas that mattered to him. It can be suggested that Soviet authorities were satisfied to hold a grip on Chukovskii considering his children's literature and, therefore, allowed him more liberty in his other literary activities. It seems quite possible that with reference to *A High Art*, the process of censorship was more or less superficial. After all, what would be simpler and easier from the point of view of the censor than to merely scan the manuscript through and remove a few offending names.

It seems that there was mutual dependence between Chukovskii and the Soviet regime. Chukovskii needed the principally quite harmonious relationship in order to be able to do his work. Another, even more urgent motive for him was obviously the will to protect him-

self and his family from persecution. As noted above, the regime also had its own agendas in regard to writers like Chukovskii. With his diplomatic manner of adapting his writing to the current ethos, Chukovskii, in a certain sense, helped Soviet authorities save face. He managed to maintain the necessary amount of pluralism in Soviet literary culture for it to remain a credible and living phenomenon. At the same time, he consented to wearing a mask that ostensibly conformed to the official line.

However, for instance, the fate of Boris Pil'niak testifies to the fact that if the regime was set on eliminating a writer, no amount of conformist writing could save him. Considering the unpredictability of the arrests and the fact that there were three litterateurs in the Chukovskii family, it seems miraculous that all three escaped from the severe repression targeted at writers during the Great Terror. In the worst-case scenario, Bronshtein's arrest alone could have caused a snowball effect of consecutive arrests among his family members. Moreover, Chukovskii and both his son and daughter all had connections that could easily have been proved incriminating in a Soviet court in the 1930s. Although Chukovskii has acknowledged the fear he felt for himself at that time, it seems that his children Lidiia and Nikolai were in a considerably more serious danger than he ever was. Their survival may partly have been due to the fact that the regime needed their father. Soviet authorities were probably sufficiently astute to realize that Chukovskii's compliance was, to a great degree, based on his having something valuable to lose. Infringing upon his family might have proved a very short-sighted decision on the part of the authorities.

It is also unlikely that the authorities would have been willing to sacrifice Chukovskii without a crucial reason and, thereby, to upset his readers. The fact that Chukovskii's children's books continued being published despite their discordance with the current canon suggests that his public denouncement did nothing to diminish his popularity. It seems reasonable to believe that, at the time when it was urgent to bolster patriotic sentiment among Soviet citizens, the significance of a beloved children's writer as a national treasure would have been appreciated. On a certain level, Chukovskii may have acknowledged the insurance provided by his fame. Maybe that even gave him the courage to defend his repressed colleagues. In any case, it is remarkable that he took part in the appeals for Nikolai Zabolotskii, considering that the poet's case was uncomfortably associated with his own friends, and with his son's circle of friends, in particular.

On the other hand, if Stalin had wanted to liquidate Chukovskii, he would certainly have had the means to cover his tracks. Gor'kii's suspicious death is one piece of evidence of this, in the event that it was, indeed, orchestrated by Stalin. Another question is what reason would Stalin have had to get rid of Chukovskii. Unlike Gor'kii, Chukovskii was not a person with any political significance, and unlike Gor'kii, he never openly challenged Stalin. In fact, Chukovskii's accommodating policy represented a diametrically opposed tendency.

In light of the above discussion, Chukovskii's dialogue with the Stalinist time chronotope can be characterized as tightrope walking. Chukovskii took great care not to deviate too far in either direction from the center line between conformism and dissidence. As regards *A High Art*, it seems that either consciously or unconsciously, Chukovskii used the ambiguous and paradoxical features in the book as part of his survival strategy. *A High Art* presents an optical illusion like those black and white pictures in which the eye can discern either a rabbit with long ears or a duck with a long bill, depending on the orientation of the viewer. Neither picture is exhaustively true or exhaustively false.

6 Conclusion

The observations made in the present study demonstrate the revisions made to the 1930, 1936, and 1941 editions of *A High Art* as Chukovskii's balancing act between promoting his own artistic ideals and catering to the demands posed by the hierarchical Soviet cultural policy. In a broader framework, those revisions can also be examined as part of Chukovskii's personal survival strategy.

The 1930s editions of *A High Art* bear distinct hallmarks of Stalinist culture. This concerns the latter two editions, in particular, which is natural because the 1930 edition was published while Stalinist culture was only beginning to take shape. Revising *A High Art*, Chukovskii aptly weaves the discussion about literary translation into current public discourse, and at the same time, he carefully watches his words so as not to conspicuously deviate from the guidelines dictated for Soviet literature at the time.

A High Art is a survival story in more ways than one. Not underestimating the contribution of its royalties to Chukovskii's financial situation, the book also provided him with a forum for fulfilling his vocation as critic in a more independent forum than a major newspaper or journal. Furthermore, *A High Art* is a survival story in that Chukovskii managed to navigate it through what can be regarded as the most harrowing and dangerous time of the entire Soviet era. By revising the 1930, 1936, and 1941 editions of *A High Art*, Chukovskii demonstrated remarkable acumen and diplomacy on the one hand, and incorruptibility and courage on the other. This strategy rewarded him with a relative amount of individual freedom in his work as a litterateur and with a status of authority in Soviet literature. Moreover, it apparently played a part in his survival of the Great Terror.

From the 1930s editions of *A High Art*, it turns out that Chukovskii's basic principles of artistic translation had not much changed from what they had been at the time the very first translators' handbook was compiled. The ambiguity of those principles made it easy to adapt them to different cultural frameworks. Because of that ambiguity and also because of Chukovskii's informal style of authoring, the notion of translation theory is not applicable to *A High Art*. More accurately, the book can be characterized as the literary critic Chukovskii's personal dialogue with his readers, be they professional translators or ordinary consumers of literature. The author's utterances are not filled to the brim with absolute truths. Instead, room is left for the reader to complement the meaning of the text with his own ideas. This feature of *A High Art* may have protected Chukovskii from finding himself stranded on the wrong side in the event that the rules governing literature had unexpectedly changed.

Chukovskii's escape from the Great Terror was partly due to his capacity to camouflage himself by wearing different masks. Ostensibly, he was the quintessential Soviet writer making the right moves and saying the right things. Inside, he maintained his independence and nurtured a purely artistic concept of literature, one that was not connected with political issues. There is a lot of politically correct material in the 1930s editions of *A High Art*, but that material does not appear to be an integral part of the book. Instead, it appears as if it was added as a superficial layer on top of the actual content. Thus, although *A High Art* was adjusted according to the changing values and conventions of the Soviet cultural framework, its essence remained the same.

The systematic removal of taboo names from *A High Art* corresponds with the Soviet practice of retouching photographs. The act creates a subtext loaded with messages that cannot be openly uttered and that the author may not even have intended to utter. Thus, it is obvious that Aesopian language is capable of living its own life independently, regardless of the author's intention. From this proposition, it follows that every text ever submitted to censorship is likely to contain self-induced Aesopian language.

In a certain sense, Chukovskii's surviving the Great Terror may have depended on what he was rather than what he did. A pertinent factor was his fame as a children's writer. Chukovskii's much-maligned fairy tales were his life insurance, and his wide and loving audience was his security guard. Chukovskii's fairy tales were unorthodox by Soviet standards, but by persecuting him to a certain extent, the authorities could allow him to continue publishing them and save their own faces in the process.

Chukovskii's relationship with the Soviet regime can be described as mutual dependence. In order to fulfill his potential as a litterateur with a minimum of harassment, it was essential for Chukovskii to remain on good terms with the regime. The regime, in turn, needed Chukovskii to present the image of an independent yet suitably obsequious Soviet writer. While the significance of Chukovskii's inherent abilities must not be underestimated with reference to his survival, an important role was also played by his status in Soviet culture.

All things considered, rendering *A High Art* politically correct in the 1930s was part of the complex framework of strategies that both supported Chukovskii's status as a literary authority and sustained him through that hard and perilous decade. However, there are clear indications that Chukovskii not only concerned himself with the issue of survival. As totalitarian and hierarchical as the Soviet machinery may have been, Chukovskii never gave up trying to influence it from below in the role of civic being. In that wider framework, his efforts for the standard of literary translation can also be perceived as a Soviet citizen's contribution to the public good.

Literature

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Chukovskaia, Lidiia. 1981. Chukovskii, Kornei Ivanovich. Harry B. Weber (ed), *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet Literatures*. Vol 4. Gulf Breeze, FL: Academic International Press, 126—137.
- Chukovskaia, Lidiia. 2000. *Sochineniia v 2 tomakh*. Protsess isklucheniia. Publitsistika. Otryvki iz dnevnika. Stikhotvoreniia. Pis'ma. V. 2 t. T. 2. Moskva: Gud'ial-Press.
- Chukovskaia, Lidiia. 2003. *Kornei Chukovskii. Perepiska. Lidiia Chukovskaia. 1912—1969*. Moskva: NLO.
- Chukovskaia, Lidiia. 2012. *Pamiati detstva*. Elena Chukovskaia & Evgeniia Ivanova (sost.), *Vospominaniia o Kornee Chukovskom*. Moskva: Nikeia, 11—196.
- Chukovskaia, Lidiia. 2013a. *Zapiski ob Anne Akhmatovoi. 1938—1941*. V 3 t. T. 1. Moskva: Vremia.
- Chukovskaia, Lidiia. 2013b. *Zapiski ob Anne Akhmatovoi. 1952—1962*. V 3 t. T. 2. Moskva: Vremia.
- Chukovskaia, Lidiia. 2013c. *Zapiski ob Anne Akhmatovoi. 1963—1966*. V 3 t. T. 3. Moskva: Vremia.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 1917. *Angliia nakanune pobedy*. Petrograd: A. F. Marks.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 1919. *Perevody prozaicheskie*. Kornei Chukovskii & Nikolai Gumilev. *Printsipy khudozhestvennogo perevoda*. Peterburg: Vsemirnaia literatura, 7—24.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 1920. *Perevody prozaicheskie*. Kornei Chukovskii & Nikolai Gumilev & F. D. Batiushkov. *Printsipy khudozhestvennogo perevoda*. Peterburg: Vsemirnaia literatura, 24—53.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 1929. *K sporam o detskoj literatury*. *Literaturnaia gazeta* 30.12.1929. No. 37, 2.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 1930. *Printsipy khudozhestvennogo perevoda*. Kornei Chukovskii & Andrei Fedorov. *Iskusstvo perevoda*. Leningrad: Academia, 7—86.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 1934. *Iskazhennyi Shekspir*. *Pravda* 12.8.1934. No 221, 3.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 1935a. *Iskusstvo perevoda*. *Pravda* 1.3.1935. No 59, 8.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 1935b. *Edinoborstvo s Shekspiom*. *Krasnaia nov'* 1935. No 1, 182—196.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 1935c. *Vysokoe iskusstvo (Otryvki iz budushchei knigi)*. *Krasnaia nov'* 1935. No 3, 235—247.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 1936a. *Iskusstvo perevoda*. Leningrad: Academia.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 1936b. *Velikoe v malom*. *Pravda* 9.1.1936. No 9, 4.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 1938. *Iskoverkannyi perevod T. G. Shevchenko*. *Pravda* 21.11.1938. No 321, 4.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 1939. *Iskalechennyi Shekspir*. *Pravda* 25.11.1939. No 326, 4.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 1940a. *Sotsial'naia priroda perevodchika*. *Literaturnaia ucheba* 1940. No 4-5, 103—117.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 1940b. *Astma u Dezdemony*. *Teatr* 1940. No 2, 98—109.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 1941. *Vysokoe iskusstvo*. Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia Literatura.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 1964. *Vysokoe iskusstvo. O printsipakh khudozhestvennogo perevoda*. Moskva: Iskusstvo.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 1966. *Vysokoe iskusstvo. Sobranie sochinenii v shesti tomakh*. V 6 t. T. 3. Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 1968. *Vysokoe iskusstvo*. Moskva: Sovetskii pisatel'.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 1988. *Vysokoe iskusstvo*. Moskva: Sovetskii pisatel'.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 2001a. *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. Proizvedeniia dlia detei. V 15 t. T. 1. Moskva: Terra.

- Chukovskii, Kornei. 2001b *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. Ot dvukh do piati; Literatura i shkola; Serebrianyi gerb. V 15 t. T. 2. Moskva: Terra.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 2001c. *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. Vysokoe iskusstvo; Iz anglo-amerikanskikh tetradei. V 15 t. T. 3. Moskva: Terra.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 2001d. *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. Zhivoi kak zhizn'; O Chekhove; Il'ia Repin. V 15 t. T. 4. Moskva: Terra.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 2001e. *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. Sovremenniki; Portrety i etudy. V 15 t. T. 5. Moskva: Terra.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 2002a. *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. Literaturnaia kritika (1901—1907); Ot Chekhova do nashikh dnei; Leonid Andreev bol'shoi i malen'kii; Nesobrannye stat'i (1901—1907). V 15 t. T. 6. Moskva: Terra.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 2002b. Stikhotvoreniia. Redaktor M. S. Petrovskii. Sankt-Peterburg: Gumanitarnoe agenstvo "Akademicheskii proekt."
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 2003. *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. Nat Pinkerton i sovremennaia literatura; Iz knigi "O Leonide Andreeve"; Iz sbornika "Kniga o sovremennykh pisatel'iakh; Iz knigi "Litsa i maski"; Nesobrannye stat'i (1908—1915). V 15 t. T. 7. Moskva: Terra.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 2004a. *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. Iz knigi " Futuristy; Aleksandr Blok kak chelovek i poet; Dve dushi M. Gorkogo; Rasskazy o Nekrasove. Stat'i (1918—1928). V 15 t. T. 8. Moskva: Terra.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 2004b. *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. Liudi i knigi; Prilozhenie. V 15 t. T. 9. Moskva: Terra.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 2005. *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. Masterstvo Nekrasova; Stat'i (1960—1969). V 15 t. T. 10. Moskva: Terra.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 2006a. *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. Dnevnik (1901—1921); Konspekty po filosofii; Korrespondentsii iz Londona. V 15 t. T. 11. Moskva: Terra.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 2006b. *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. Dnevnik (1922—1935). V 15 t. T. 12. Moskva: Terra.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 2007. *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. Dnevnik (1936—1969). V 15 t. T. 13. Moskva: Terra.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 2008a. *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. Pis'ma (1903—1925). V 15 t. T. 14. Moskva: Terra.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 2008b. *Chukokkala: Rukopisnyi al'manakh Kornei Chukovskogo*. Sostavlenie E. Chukovskoi. Izdanie 2. Moskva: Russkii put'.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 2009. *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. Pis'ma (1926—1969) V 15 t. T. 15. Moskva: Terra.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 2011a. *Dnevnik 1909—1921*. Sostavlenie E. Chukovskoi. Moskva: PROSAiK.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 2011b. *Dnevnik 1922—1935*. Sostavlenie E. Chukovskoi. Moskva: PROSAiK.
- Chukovskii, Kornei. 2011c. *Dnevnik 1936—1969*. Sostavlenie E. Chukovskoi. Moskva: PROSAiK.
- Chukovsky, Kornei. 1969. Chukovsky on Translating Walt Whitman. <http://www.chukfamily.ru/Humanitaria/Whitman/Translation.htm> (accessed 27.2.2016).

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Alexandrov, Daniel A. & Struchkov, Anton. 1993. Bakhtin's Legacy and the History of Science and Culture: an Interview with Anatoli Akhutin and Vladimir Bibler. *Configurations*. Volume 1. No. 3, 335—386.
- Andreev, Leonid. 2013. *Iuda Iskariot. Povesti, rasskazy*. Moskva: Eksmo.
- Andronikov, Iraklii. 2008. Kornei Ivanovich i ego "Chukokkala". Kornei Chukovskii,

- Chukokkala: Rukopisnyi al'manakh Kornei Chukovskogo*. Izdanie 2. Moskva: Russkii put', 5—10.
- Baberowski, Jörg. 2003. The Road to Terror: Stalin and the Self-Destruction of the Bolsheviks, 1932—1939, and: Stalinism as a Way of Life: A Narrative in Documents (review). *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*. 2003. Volume 4. No. 3, 752—759.
- Baer, Brian James. 2010. Literary Translation in the Age of the Decembrists: The Birth of Productive Censorship in Russia. Denise Merkle & Carol O'Sullivan & Luc van Doorslaer & Michaela Wolf (eds.), *The Power of the Pen. Translation & Censorship in Nineteenth-century Europe*. Vienna and Berlin: LIT Verlag, 213—239.
- Baer, Brian James & Olshanskaya, Natalia. 2013. Introduction. Brian James Baer & Natalia Olshanskaya (eds.), *Russian Writers on Translation: An Anthology*. London and New York, NY: Routledge, iii—xiv.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. 2011. *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays*. Edited by Michael Holquist. Austin TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. 2013. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Edited by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Translated by Vern W. McGee. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Balina, Marina. 2005. Fairy Tales of Socialist Realism: Introduction. Marina Balina & Helena Gosילו & Mark Lipovetsky (eds.), *Politicizing Magic: An Anthology of Russian and Soviet Fairy Tales*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 105—121.
- Baranov, Vadim. 2003. Vokrug smerti Gor'kogo. Dokumenty. *Novyi zhurnal* 2003. No. 232. <http://magazines.russ.ru/nj/2003/2321/baram.html> (accessed 19.3.2016).
- Barnes, Steven A. 2011. *Death and Redemption. The Gulag and the Shaping of Soviet Society*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Batiushkov, F. D. 1920. Zadachi khudozhestvennykh perevodov. Iazyk i stil'. Kornei Chukovskii & Nikolai Gumilev & F. D. Batiushkov. *Printsipy khudozhestvennogo perevoda*. Peterburg: Vsemirnaia literatura, 7—23.
- Belaia, Galina. 2000. Stilevoi regress: O stilevoi situatsii v literature sotsrealizma. Khans Giunter & Evgenii Dobrenko (red.), *Sotsrealisticheskii kanon*. Sankt-Peterburg: Gumanitarnoe agenstvo "Akademicheskii proekt", 556—568.
- Bemong, Nele & Borghart, Pieter. 2010. Bakhtin's Theory of the Literary Chronotope: Reflections, Applications, Perspectives. Nele Bemong & Pieter Borghart & Michel De Dobbelaar & Kristoffel Demoen & Koen De Temmerman & Bart Keunen (eds.), *Bakhtin's Theory of the Literary Chronotope: Reflections, Applications, Perspectives*. Gent, Belgium: Academia Press, 3—16.
- Bershtein, Evgenii. 2005. M. Kuzmin. Dnevnik. 1905—1907; 1908—1915. *Kriticheskaia Massa* 2005. No 2. <http://magazines.russ.ru/km/2005/2/be21.html> (accessed 29.1.2016).
- Bibler, Vladimir. 1991. *Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin ili Poetika kul'tury*. Moskva: Progress.
- Blitstein, Peter A. 2001. Nation-Building or Russification? Obligatory Russian Instruction in the Soviet Non-Russian School, 1938—1953. Ronald Grigor Suny & Terry Martin (eds.), *A State of Nations. Empire and Nation-Making in the Age of Lenin and Stalin*, 253—274.
- Blium, Arlen. 2009. Inostrannaia literatura v spetskhreane. *Inostrannaia literatura* 15.12.2009. No 12. <http://magazines.russ.ru/inostran/2009/12/bl9-pr.html> (accessed 26.9.2015).
- Blium, Arlen. 2011. Igry v adu. *Neva* 2011. No 4. <http://magazines.russ.ru/neva/2011/4/bl10.html> (accessed 27.11.2015).
- Bogdanova, O. V. 2011. "Literaturnyi Sankt-Peterburg. XX vek. Prozaiki, poety, dramaturgi, perevodchiki. Entsiklopedicheskii slovar". V 2 t. T. 2. Sankt-Peterburg: Filologicheskii fakul'tet SPbGU.
- Bogomolov, Nikolai. 2015. "Tragediia o korole Lire" v perevode Mikhaila Kuzmina. *Novyi mir* 15.5.2015. No 5. http://magazines.russ.ru/novyi_mi/2015/5/13bog.html (accessed 5.11.2015).

- Brandenberger, David & Platt, Kevin M. F. 2006. Introduction: Tsarist-Era Heroes in Stalinist Mass Culture and Propaganda. Kevin M. F. Platt & David Brandenberger (eds.), *Epic Revisionism: Russian History and Literature as Stalinist Propaganda*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 3—14.
- Brik, Boris. 2009. *Shamil'*. MakhachKala, Dagestan: Epokha. http://bookz.ru/authors/boris-brik/6amil__884/1-6amil__884.html (accessed 18.11.2015).
- Brooks, Jeffrey. 2001. *Thank You, Comrade Stalin! Soviet Public Culture from Revolution to Cold War*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Burds, Jeffrey. 2007. Ethnicity, Memory, and Violence: Reflections on Special Problems in Soviet and East European Archives. Francis X. Blouin & William G. Rosenberg (eds.), *Archives, Documentation, and Institutions of Social Memory: Essays from the Sawyer Seminar*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Burleshin, Aleksei. 2008. ...Interesno imet' u sebia takuiu otvetstvennuiu rabotu... *NLO* 14.8.2008. No 95. <http://magazines.russ.ru/nlo/2009/95/bu26.html> (accessed 29.2.2016).
- Burnett, Leon & Lygo, Emily 2013. Introduction. Leon Burnett & Emily Lygo (eds.), *The Art of Accommodation. Literary Translation in Russia*. Russian Transformations: Literature, Thought, Culture. Volume 5. Bern: Peter Lang, 1—29.
- Cavendish, Philip. 2000. *Mining for Jewels: Evgenii Zamiatin and the Literary Stylization of Rus*. London: Manay Publishing for the Modern Humanities Research Association.
- Chaikovskaia, Irina. Gde byl ChiZHik? Chukovskii i Zhabotinskii. <http://www.chukfamily.ru/Kornei/Biblio/ChaikovskayaChizh.htm> (accessed 18.3.2016).
- Chernetsky, Vitaly. 2011. Nation and Translation. Literary Translation and the Shaping of Modern Ukrainian Culture. Brian James Baer (ed.), *Contexts, Subtexts, and Pretexts. Literary Translation in Eastern Europe and Russia*. Amsterdam, Netherlands and Philadelphia PA: John Benjamins, 33—53.
- Christesen, Nina. 1987. Lydia Korneevna Chukovskaya. Her Life and Work by Bella Hirshorn. Introduction. <http://www.chukfamily.ru/Lidia/Biblio/Introduction.htm> (accessed 12.2.2016).
- Chukovskaia, Elena. 2001a. Kommentarii. Kornei Chukovskii, *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadtsati tomakh*. Proizvedeniia dlia detei. V 15 t. T. 1. Moskva: Terra, 572—593.
- Chukovskaia, Elena. 2001b. Kommentarii. Kornei Chukovskii, *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadtsati tomakh*. Ot dvukh do piati; Literatura i shkola; Serebrianyi gerb. V 15 t. T. 2. Moskva: Terra, 631—636.
- Chukovskaia, Elena. 2001c. Kommentarii. Kornei Chukovskii, *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadtsati tomakh*. Sovremenniki; Portrety i etudy. V 15 t. T. 5. Moskva: Terra, 464—468.
- Chukovskaia, Elena. 2008. Pro etu knigu. Kornei Chukovskii, *Chukokkala: Rukopisnyi al'manakh Kornei Chukovskogo*. Izdanie 2. Moskva: Russkii put', 553—558.
- Chukovskaia, Elena. 2011a. Kommentarii. Kornei Chukovskii, *Dnevnik 1901—1921*. Moskva: PROSAiK, 513—554.
- Chukovskaia, Elena. 2011b. Kommentarii. Kornei Chukovskii, *Dnevnik 1922—1935*. Moskva: PROSAiK, 573—604.
- Chukovskaia, Elena. 2011c. Kommentarii. Kornei Chukovskii, *Dnevnik 1936—1969*. Moskva: PROSAiK, 545—589.
- Chukovskaia, Elena. 2012. Nobelevskaia premiia Pasternaka. Elena Chukovskaia & Evgeniia Ivanova (sost.), *Vospominaniia o Kornee Chukovskom*. Moskva: Nikeia, 365—368.
- Chukovskaia, Elena & Ivanova, Evgeniia. 2012. Kommentarii. Elena Chukovskaia & Evgeniia Ivanova (sost.), *Vospominaniia o Kornee Chukovskom*. Moskva: Nikeia, 427—509.
- Chukovskaia, Elena & Khavkina, Zh. O. 2003. Ot sostavitelei. *Kornei Chukovskii. Perepiska. Lidiia Chukovskaia. 1912—1969*. Moskva: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 18—19.

- Chukovskaia, E. & Lorie, M. & Balestro, B. & Kriuchkov, P. 2001. Kommentarii. Kornei Chukovskii, *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. Vysokoe iskusstvo; Iz anglo-amerikanskikh tetradei. V. 15 t. T. 3. Moskva: Terra, 582—603.
- Chukovskii, Nikolai. 1989. *Literaturnye vospominaniia*. Sostavlenie M. N. Chukovskoi. Moskva: Sovetskii pisatel'.
- Chukovskii, Nikolai. 2012. *Iz vospominanii*. Elena Chukovskaia & Evgeniia Ivanova (sost.), *Vospominaniia o Kornee Chukovskom*. Moskva: Nikeia, 247—266.
- Clark, Katerina. 1996. *Petersburg, Crucible of Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.
- Clark, Katerina. 1998. Socialist Realism in Soviet Literature. Neil Cornwell (ed.), *Reference Guide to Russian Literature*. London and Chicago, IL: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 55—59.
- Clark, Katerina. 2000. *The Soviet Novel. History as Ritual*. 3rd edition. Bloomington and Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Clark, Katerina. 2003. Socialist Realism and the Sacralizing of Space. Evgeny Dobrenko & Eric Naiman (eds.), *The Landscape of Stalinism: the art and ideology of Soviet space*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 3—18.
- Clark, Katerina. 2011. *Moscow, the Fourth Rome. Stalinism, Cosmopolitanism, and the Evolution of Soviet Culture, 1931—1941*. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.
- Clark, Katerina & Dobrenko, Evgeny. 2007. *Soviet Culture and Power: A History in Documents, 1917—1953*. Documents compiled by Andrei Artizov & Oleg Naumov; translated from Russian by Marian Schwartz. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Clark, Katerina & Holquist, Michael. 1984. *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Conquest, Robert. 2002. *The Harvest of Sorrow. Soviet Collectivisation and the Terror-Famine*. London: Pimlico.
- Conquest, Robert. 2008. *The Great Terror. A Reassessment*. London: Pimlico.
- Cooke, Raymond. 1987. *Velimir Khlebnikov: A Critical Study*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- David-Fox, Michael. 2012. *Showcasing the Great Experiment. Cultural Diplomacy and Western Visitors to the Soviet Union, 1921—1941*. Oxford and New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- D'iakonov, M.A. 1935. Ot redaktora. Khenrik Ibsen, *Izbrannye dramy*. Perevod Anna Ganzena. Sankt-Peterburg: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 21—22.
- Dobrenko, Evgeny. 2001. *The Making of the State Writer. Social and Aesthetic Origins of Soviet Literary Culture*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Dobrenko, Evgeny. 2005. *Aesthetics of Alienation: Reassessment of Early Soviet Cultural Theories*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Dobrenko, Evgeny. 2011. Literary Criticism and the Transformations of the Literary Field during the Cultural Revolution, 1928—1932. Evgeny Dobrenko & Galin Tihanov (eds.), *A History of Russian Literary Theory and Criticism. The Soviet Age and Beyond*. Pittsburg, PA: University of Pittsburg Press, 43—63.
- Dobrenko, Evgeny & Tihanov, Galin. 2011. Introduction: Toward a History of Soviet and Post-Soviet Literary Theory and Criticism. Evgeny Dobrenko & Galin Tihanov (eds.), *A History of Russian Literary Theory and Criticism. The Soviet Age and Beyond*. Pittsburg, PA: University of Pittsburg Press, ix—xvi.
- Dowling, Robert. 2004. Jay Parini and Phillip W. Leininger (eds.), John Dos Passos. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of American Literature*. Volume 1. Oxford and New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 394—399.
- Elektronnaia biblioteka*. Mikhail Alekseevich D'iakonov (1885—1938). http://www.belousenko.com/wr_Dicharov_Raspyaty2_Dyakonov.htm (accessed 8.6.2014).
- Emerson, Caryl. 2008. *The Cambridge Introduction to Russian Literature*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Emerson, Caryl. 2011. Literary Theory in the 1920s. Four Options and a Practicum. Evgeny Dobrenko & Galin Tihanov (eds.), *A History of Russian Literary Theory and Criticism. The Soviet Age and Beyond*. Pittsburg, PA: University of Pittsburg Press, 64—89.
- Erlich, Victor. 1980. *The Russian Formalism*. 4th edition. Edited by C. H. van Schooneveld. The Hague, Neatherlands: Mouton Publishers.
- Erlich, Victor. 1994. *Modernism and Revolution: Russian Literature in Transition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Erlich, Victor (ed.). 2005. *Kornei Chukovsky. Diary, 1901–1969*. Translated by Michael Henry Heim. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Ermolaev, Herman. 1991. Portrayal of Nationalities in Russian Soviet Literature. *The Search for Self-definition in Russian Literature*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 21—32.
- Ermolaev, Herman. 1997. *Censorship in Soviet Literature 1917—1991*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Evtuhov, Catherine and Goldfrank, David and Hughes, Lindsey and Stites, Richard. 2004. *A History of Russia: Peoples, Legends, Events, Forces*. Boston, MA and New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Fedorov, Andrei. 1930. Priemy i zadachi khudozhestvennogo perevoda. Kornei Chukovskii & Andrei Fedorov, *Iskusstvo perevoda*. Leningrad: Academia, 87—235.
- Fel'dman, David. 2006. Krasnye belye: sovetskie politicheskie terminy v istoriko-kul'turnom kontekste. *Voprosy literatury* 15.8.2006. No 4. <http://magazines.russ.ru/voplit/2006/4/fe1.html> (accessed 25.11.2015).
- Finer, Emily. 2013. Dickens in Twentieth-Century Russia. Michael Hollington (ed), *The Reception of Charles Dickens in Europe*. Volume 1. New York, NY: Bloomsbury, 103—120.
- Fitzpatrick, Sheila. 1992. *The Cultural Front. Power and Culture in Revolutionary Russia*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Fitzpatrick, Sheila. 1994. *Stalin's Peasants. Resistance and Survival in the Russian Village After Collectivization*. Oxford and New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Fitzpatrick, Sheila. 2000. *Everyday Stalinism: ordinary life in extraordinary times: Soviet Russia in the 1930s*. Oxford and New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Fitzpatrick, Sheila. 2002. *The Commissariat of Enlightenment. Soviet Organization of Education and the Arts Under Lunacharsky October 1017—1921*. Soviet and East European Studies. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Fitzpatrick, Sheila. 2005. *Tear Off the Masks! Identity and Imposture in Twentieth-Century Russia*. Princeton, NJ and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Forsh, Ol'ga. 2011. *Sumashedshii korabl'*. Moskva: Astrel'.
- Frede, Viktoriia. 2001. Istoriia kollektivnogo razocharovaniia: druzhba, npravstvennost' i religioznost' v druzheskom krugu A. I. Gertsena – N. P. Ogareva 1830—1840-x gg. (per. s angl. S. Silakovoi). *NLO* 2001. No 3(49). <http://magazines.russ.ru/nlo/2001/49/frede-pr.html> (accessed 25.1.2016).
- Friedberg, Maurice 1997: *Literary Translation in Russia. A Cultural History*. University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Gabidullin, Khadzhi & Guseinov, Mirza-Davud. 1936. Istoriia odnogo perevoda «Ob osnovakh leninizma». *Pravda* 11.6.1936/159, 4.
- Garzonio, Stefano & Zalambani, Maria. 2011. Literary Criticism during the Revolution and the Civil War, 1917—1921. Evgeny Dobrenko & Galin Tihanov (eds.), *A History of Russian Literary Theory and Criticism. The Soviet Age and Beyond*. Pittsburg, PA: University of Pittsburg Press, 1—6.
- Gillespie, David. 1998. Thaws, Freezes and Wakes: Russian Literature, 1917—1991. Neil Cornwell (ed.), *Reference Guide to Russian Literature*. London and Chicago, IL: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 59—64.
- Giunter, Khans. 1997. Poiushchaia rodina (Sovetskaia massovaia pesnia kak vyrazhenie arkhetaipa materi). *Voprosy literatury* 14.7.1997. No 4. <http://magazines.russ.ru/voplit/1997/4/gunter.html> (accessed 17.1.2016).

- Goldstein, Darra. 1993. *Nikolai Zabolotsky. Play for Mortal Stakes*. Cambridge, Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Gorelik, Gennady & Frenkel, Victor. 1994. Matvei Petrovich Bronstein and Soviet Theoretical Physics in the Thirties. Afterword to the English edition. Half a Century Later. http://ggorelik.narod.ru/Gloria/MPB-afterword_94_e.htm (accessed 13.2.2016).
- Gor'kii, Maksim. 1915. O futurizme. *Zhurnal zhurnalov* 15.4.1915. No 1. http://az.lib.ru/g/gorxkij_m/text_0360.shtml (accessed 18.1.2016).
- Gredina, Irina Valer'evna. 2000. *Vospriatie Dikkensa v Rossii (1860—1888 gg.): Na material russkoi i angloiazychnoi kritiki*. <http://www.dissercat.com/content/vospriatie-dikkensa-v-rossii-1860-1880-gg-na-materiale-russkoi-i-angloyazychnoi-kritiki> (accessed 12.1.2014).
- Grimsted, Patricia Kennedy (ed.). 2015. *Archives in Russia: A Directory and Bibliographic Guide to Holdings in Moscow and St. Petersburg*. Volume 1. London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gumilev, Nikolai. 1919. Perevody stikhotvornye. Kornei Chukovskii & Nikolai Gumilev. *Printsipy khudozhestvennogo perevoda*. Peterburg: Vsemirnaia literatura, 25—30.
- Gumilev, Nikolai. 1920. Perevody stikhotvornye. Kornei Chukovskii & Nikolai Gumilev & F. D. Batiushkov. *Printsipy khudozhestvennogo perevoda*. Peterburg: Vsemirnaia literatura, 54—59.
- Gumilev, Nikolai. 1972. *Selected Works of Nikolai S. Gumilev*. Translated by Burton Raffel & Alla Burago. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Gumilev, Nikolai. 1999. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v desiati tomakh*. Stikhotvoreniia. Poemy. (1914—1918) v 10 t. T. 3. Rossiiskaia akademiia nauk. Institut russkoi literatury. Moskva: Voskresen'e.
- Günther, Hans. 2011. Soviet Literary Criticism and the Formulation of the Aesthetics of Socialist Realism, 1932—1941. Evgeny Dobrenko & Galin Tihanov (eds.), *A History of Russian Literary Theory and Criticism. The Soviet Age and Beyond*. Pittsburg, PA: University of Pittsburg Press, 90—108.
- Haslam, Jonathan. 2000. *The Vices of Integrity: E.H. Carr, 1892-1982*. London and New York: Verso.
- Healey, Dan. 2002. Sexual and Genre Dissent. Homosexuality as Resistance in Stalin's Russia. Lynne Viola (ed.), *Contending with Stalinism: Soviet Power and Resistance in the 1930s*. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press, 139—169.
- Hellman, Ben. 1984. A Hour in Paradise. *Studia Slavica Findandesia*. Tomus 1. Helsinki: Neuvostoliittoinstituutti, 22—37.
- Hellman, Ben. 2013. *Fairy Tales and True Stories: The History of Russian Literature for Children and Young People (1574—2010)*. Leiden: Brill.
- Hickey, Martha Weitzel. 2009. *The Writer in Petrograd and the House of Arts*. Studies in Russian Literature and Theory. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Hodgson, Katharine. 2013. Heine and Genre: Iurii Tynianov's Translations of Heine's Poetry. Leon Burnett & Emily Lygo (eds.), *The Art of Accommodation. Literary Translation in Russia*. Russian Transformations: Literature, Thought, Culture. Volume 5. Bern: Peter Lang, 117—139.
- Hosking, Geoffrey. 1992. *The History of the Soviet Union 1917—1991*. London: Fontana Press.
- Iarov, Sergei. 2007. Ritorika vozhdai: V. I. Lenin and N. V. Stalin kak oratory. *Zvezda* 2007. No 11. <http://magazines.russ.ru/zvezda/2007/11/ia11.html> (accessed 6.1.2016).
- Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine*. Black Hundreds. <http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%5CB%5CL%5CBlackHundreds.htm> (accessed 27.4.2016).
- Ionov, I. 1930. Zemlia i fabrika. *Literaturnaia entsiklopediia*. V 11 t. T. 4. <http://feb-web.ru/feb/litenc/encyclop/le4/Le4-3351.htm?cmd=p&istext=1> (accessed 14.4.2016).
- Iur'ev, Oleg. 2007. Khronika sovremennoi literatury. Zapolnennoe ziianie. *NLO* 20.12.2007. No 89. <http://magazines.russ.ru/nlo%20/2008/89/ur20-pr.html> (accessed 1.7.2015).

- Iustus, Ursula. 2000a. Vozvrashchenie v rai: sotsrealizm i fol'klor. Khans Giunter & Evgenii Dobrenko (red.), *Sotsrealisticheskii kanon*. Sankt-Peterburg: Gumanitarnoe aganstvo "Akademicheskii proekt", 70—86.
- Iustus, Ursula. 2000b. Vtoraia smert' Lenina: funktsii placha v period perekhoda ot kul'ta Lenina k kul'tu Stalina. Khans Giunter & Evgenii Dobrenko (red.), *Sotsrealisticheskii kanon*. Sankt-Peterburg: Gumanitarnoe aganstvo "Akademicheskii proekt", 926—952.
- Ivanova, Evgeniia. 2002a. Neizvestnyi Chukovskii. Kornei Chukovskii, *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. V 15 t. T. 6. Moskva: Terra, 5—26.
- Ivanova, Evgeniia. 2002b. Kommentarii. Kornei Chukovskii, *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. V 15 t. T. 6. Moskva: Terra, 557—612.
- Ivanova, Evgeniia. 2003. Gody izvestnosti Chukovskogo-kritika. Kornei Chukovskii, *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. V 15 t. T. 7. Moskva: Terra, 5—26.
- Ivanova, Evgeniia. 2004a. Chukovskii posle semnadsatogo. Kornei Chukovskii, *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. V 15 t. T. 8. Moskva: Terra, 5—26.
- Ivanova, Evgeniia. 2004b. Kommentarii. Kornei Chukovskii, *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. V 15 t. T. 9. Moskva: Terra, 470—475.
- Ivanova, Evgeniia. 2008. Pis'ma Chukovskogo. Kornei Chukovskii, *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. V 15 t. T. 14. Moskva: Terra, 5—24.
- Ivanova, Evgeniia. 2009. Pis'ma K. Chukovskogo kak shtrikhi k ego portretu. Kornei Chukovskii, *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. V 15 t. T. 15. Moskva: Terra, 5—23.
- Ivanova, Evgeniia & Mel'gunov, B. V. 2004. Kommentarii. Kornei Chukovskii, *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. V 15 t. T. 8. Moskva: Terra, 585—636.
- Ivanovskii, Ignatii. 2005. Vospominaniia o Mikhaile Lozinskom. *Neva* 2005. No 7. <http://magazines.russ.ru/neva/2005/7/ii17.html> (accessed 28.10.2015).
- Jameson, Fredric. 2003. Nostalgia for the Present. Frank Lentricchia and Andrew DuBois (eds.), *Close Reading. The Reader*. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press.
- Jansen, Marc. 1982. *A Show Trial Under Lenin. The Trial of the Socialist Revolutionaries, Moscow 1922*. Translated by Jean Sanders. International Institute of Social History Amsterdam. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Karals, Dmitrii. 2006. Literaturnaia galereia. *Neva* 2006. No 12. (<http://magazines.russ.ru/neva/2006/12/ka15.html>) (accessed 1.7.2015).
- Kaverin, Veniamin. 2011 (1988). Dnevnik K. I. Chukovskogo. Kornei Chukovskii, *Dnevnik 1901—1921*. Moskva: PROSAiK, 5—12.
- Kavkazskii Uzel*.a. Egishe Charents (Sogomonian Egishe Abgarovich). <http://www.kavkaz-uzel.ru/articles/229129/> (accessed 7.12.2015).
- Kavkazskii Uzel*.b. Guzeinov Mirza Davul Bagir ogly. <http://www.kavkaz-uzel.ru/articles/27171/> (accessed 29.2.2016).
- Kay, Devra. 2005. Markish, Peretz (1885—1952). Glenda Abramson (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Modern Jewish Culture*. Volume 1. London and New York, NY: Routledge, 550—551.
- Kelly, Catriona. 2001. *Refining Russia: Advice Literature, Polite Culture, and Gender from Catherine to Yeltsin*. Oxford and New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kelly, Catriona. 2007. *Children's World: Growing Up in Russia, 1890-1991*. New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press.
- Keunen, Bart. 2010. The Chronotopic Imagination in Literature and Film. Bakhtin, Bergson and Deleuze on Forms of Time. Nele Bemong & Pieter Borghart & Michel De Dobbeleer & Kristoffel Demoen & Koen De Temmerman & Bart Keunen (eds.), *Bakhtin's Theory of the Literary Chronotope: Reflections, Applications, Perspectives*. Gent, Belgium: Academia Press, 2010, 35—55.
- Keunen, Bart. 2011. *Time and Imagination: Chronotopes in Western Narrative Culture*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Khlevniuk, Oleg V. 2015. *Stalin: New Biography of a Dictator*. Translated by Nora Seligman Favorov. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

- Kievskaia gorodskaia biblioteka. Mikola Voronii. <http://lib.misto.kiev.ua/UKR/BIOGRAPHY/voronni1.dhtml> (accessed 27.4.2016).
- King, David. 2014. *The Commissar Vanishes. The Falsification of Photographs and Art in Stalin's Russia*. Mustang, OK: Tate Publishing.
- Klark, Katerina. 2000. Marksistko-leninskaia estetika. Khans Giunter & Evgenii Dobrenko (red.), *Sotsrealisticheskii kanon*. Sankt-Peterburg: Gumanitarnoe agenstvo "Akademicheskii proekt", 352—361.
- Klimoff, Alexis. 1997. *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich: A Critical Companion*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Kobriniskii, Aleksandr. 2011. OBERIU: istoriia i poetika. Svetlana Timina (red.), *Russkaia literatura XX veka*. Moskva: Academia, 181—213.
- Komissarov, Vilen N. 2011. Russian tradition. Baker, Mona & Gabriela Saldanha (eds.): *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. 2nd ed. London and New York, NY: Routledge, 517—524.
- Kornienko, Natalia. 2011. Literary Criticism and Cultural Policy during the New Economic Policy, 1921—1927. Evgeny Dobrenko & Galin Tihanov (eds.), *A History of Russian Literary Theory and Criticism. The Soviet Age and Beyond*. Pittsburg, PA: University of Pittsburg Press, 17—42.
- Kostiukova, Natal'ia. 2012. Vspominaia deda (2007, 2012). Elena Chukovskaia & Evgeniia Ivanova (sost.), *Vospominaniia o Kornee Chukovskom*. Moskva: Nikeia, 289—294.
- Kubat'ian, Georgii. Pereklichka, tozhdestvo i skhodstvo. *Druzhba narodov* 15.10.2005. No 10. <http://magazines.russ.ru/druzhba/2005/10/ku10.html> (accessed 7.12.2015).
- Kuhiwczak, Piotr. 2009. Censorship as a collaborative project: a systemic approach. Eiléan Ní Chuilleanáin & Cormac Ó Cuilleanáin & David Parris (eds.), *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication Interference*. Dublin: Four Courts Press.
- Kushner, Aleksandr. 2005. Eto ne literaturnyi fakt, a samoubiistvo. *Novyi mir* 15.7.2005. No 7. http://magazines.russ.ru/novi_mi/2005/7/ku9.html (accessed 6.3.2015).
- Kuzmin, Mikhail. 1998. *Dnevnik 1934 goda*. Pod redaktsiei Gleba Moreva. Sankt-Peterburg: Izdatel'stvo Ivana Limbakha.
- Lanin, Boris. 1998. Experiment and Emigration: Russian Literature, 1917—1953. Neil Cornwell (ed.), *Reference Guide to Russian Literature*. London and Chicago, IL: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 41—55.
- Lavrov, Aleksandr. 2003. Khorosho zabytyi Kornei Chukovskii. *NLO* 16.7.2003. No 60. <http://magazines.russ.ru/nlo/2003/60/lavrov.html> (accessed 1.12.2014).
- Lebedushkina, Ol'ga. 2006. Zapolnenie zazorov. *Druzhba narodov* 15.8.2006. No 8. <http://magazines.russ.ru/druzhba/2006/8/le24.html> (accessed 7.12.2015).
- Leighton, Lauren G. 1982. Whitman in Russia: Chukovsky and Balmont. <http://www.chukfamily.ru/Humanitaria/Whitman/leighton.htm> (accessed 6.9.2015).
- Leighton, Lauren G. 1984 (ed.). *The Art of Translation. Kornei Chukovsky's A High Art*. Knoxville, TN: The University of Tennessee Press.
- Lenin, Vladimir I. 1967. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*. Izdanie 5. V 55 t. T. 20. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury.
- Levidova, I. M. 2014. Shekspir. Bibliografiia russkikh perevodov i kriticheskoi literatury na russkom iazyke (1748—1962). *Lib.ru/klassika*. http://az.lib.ru/s/shekspir_w/text_0220.shtml (accessed 3.3.2016).
- Levina-Parker, Masha. 2007. "Dve krainie tochki" Mikhaila Kuzmina. *NLO* 22.8.2007. No 87. <http://magazines.russ.ru/nlo/2007/87/le6.html> (accessed 29.1.2016).
- Levitskii, L. 2012. Vpechatlenie ot dnevnika (1995). Elena Chukovskaia & Evgeniia Ivanova (sost.), *Vospominaniia o Kornee Chukovskom*. Moskva: Nikeia, 420—421.
- Lilly, Ian K. 1994. Imperial Petersburg, Suicide and Russian Literature. *The Slavonic and East European Review*. Volume 72. Issue 3. July 1994. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4211549?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents (accessed 22.12.2015).

- Lonergan, Jennifer. 1998. Aleksandr Vasil'evich Druzhinin. Neil Cornwell (ed.), *Reference Guide to Russian Literature*. London and Chicago, IL: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 263—264.
- Loseff, Lev. 1984. *On the Beneficence of Censorship. Aesopian Language in Modern Russian Literature*. Arbeiten und Texte zu Slawistik. Band 3. München: Verlag Otto Sagner in Kommission.
- Lovell, Stephen. 2009. *The Soviet Union: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford and New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lygo, Emily. 2013. Free Verse and Soviet Poetry in the Post-Stalin Period. Leon Burnett & Emily Lygo (eds.), *The Art of Accommodation. Literary Translation in Russia*. Russian Transformations: Literature, Thought, Culture. Volume 5. Bern: Peter Lang, 265—284.
- Makaryk, Irena Rima (ed.). 1995. *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory: Approaches, Scholars, Terms*. Toronto, Buffalo, NY and London: University of Toronto Press.
- Malli, Linn. 2000. Kul'turnoe nasledie proletkul'ta: odin iz putei k sotsrealizmu? Khans Giunter & Evgenii Dobrenko (red.), *Sotsrealisticheskii kanon*. Sankt-Peterburg: Gumanitarnoe agenstvo "Akademicheskii proekt", 183—192.
- Malmstad, John E. & Bogomolov, Nikolay. 1999. *Mikhail Kuzmin: A Life in Art*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mandelstam Nadezhda. 1999 (1970). *Hope Against Hope: A Memoir*. Translated by Max Hayward. New York, N.Y: Modern Library.
- Mandelstam Nadezhda. 2011 (1972). *Hope Abandoned. A Memoir*. Translated by Max Hayward. London: The Harvill Press.
- Markov, P. A. 1977. *O teatre. Dnevnik teatral'nogo kritika 1930—1976*. V 4 t. T. 4. Moskva: Iskusstvo.
- Marsh, Rosalind. 2000. Literary Representations of Stalin and Stalinism as Demonic. Pamela Davidson (ed), *Russian Literature and Its Demons*. Studies in Slavic Literature, Culture & Society. Volume 6. New York, NY and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 473—511.
- Martin, Terry. 2001. *The Affirmative Action Empire. Nations and Nationalism in the Soviet Union, 1923—1939*. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press.
- McDermott, Kevin. 2008. 'To the Final Destruction of All Enemies!' Rethinking Stalin's Terror. Brett Bowden & Michael T. Davis (eds.), *Terror: From Tyrannicide to Terrorism*. Queensland: Queensland University Press, 175—189.
- Mel'gunov, B. V. 2005. Kniga, kotoraiia zariazhaet liubov'iu k literature i nauke. Kornei Chukovskii, *Sobranie sochinenii v piatnadsati tomakh*. V 15 t. T. 10. Moskva: Terra, 5—14.
- Mentsel', Birgit. 2000a. Traditsii i novatorstvo. Khans Giunter & Evgenii Dobrenko (red.), *Sotsrealisticheskii kanon*. Sankt-Peterburg: Gumanitarnoe agenstvo "Akademicheskii proekt", 492—502.
- Mentsel', Birgit. 2000b. Sovetskaia lirika stalinskoi epokhi: Motivy, zhanry, napravleniia. Khans Giunter & Evgenii Dobrenko (red.), *Sotsrealisticheskii kanon*. Sankt-Peterburg: Gumanitarnoe agenstvo "Akademicheskii proekt", 953—968.
- Mentsel', Birgit. 2000c. Vse bel'kanto trudiashchimsia, ili opera stalinskoi epokhi. Khans Giunter & Evgenii Dobrenko (red.), *Sotsrealisticheskii kanon*. Sankt-Peterburg: Gumanitarnoe agenstvo "Akademicheskii proekt", 980—998.
- Miller, Frank J. 1990. *Folklore for Stalin: Russian Folklore and Pseudofolklore of the Stalin Era*. New York, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Miminoshvili, Nataliia. 2015. Gruzinskii tekst russkoi literatury. *Druzhba narodov* 15.8.2015. No 8. <http://magazines.russ.ru/druzhba/2015/8/26m-pr.html> (accessed 6.12.2015).
- Mochulsky, Fyodor Vasilevich. 2011. *Gulag Boss: A Soviet Memoir*. Translated and edited by Deborah Kaple. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Mokienko, V. M. & Nikitina, T. G. 1998. *Tolkovyi slovar' iazyka Sovdepii*. Sankt-Peterburgskii gosudarstvennyi universitet. Sankt-Peterburg: Folio-Press.

- Morris, Paul D. 2005. *Representation and the Twentieth-century Novel: Studies in Gorky, Joyce and Pynchon*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.
- Muller Cooke, Olga. 1999. Anna Radlova (1891—1949). Christine D. Tomei, *Russian Women Writers*. Volume 1. New York and London: Taylor & Francis, 753—762.
- Neliubin, L. L. & Khukhuni, G. T. 2006. *Nauka o perevode: istoriia s drevneishikh vremen do nasikh dnei*. Moskva: Flinta.
- Nerler, Pavel. 2009. Okol'tsovannyi Mandel'shtam. *Literaturnaia kritika* 2009. No 6. <http://magazines.russ.ru/october/2009/6/ne10.html> (accessed 28.3.2014).
- Nikoliukin, A. N. (red.) 2003. *Literaturnaia entsiklopediia terminov i poniatii*. Rossiiskaia akademiia nauk. Institut nauchnoi informatsii po obshchestvennym naukam. Moskva: NPK "Intelbak".
- Obukhova, Mariia. 2007. *K. I. Chukovskii i S. Ia. Marshak v kontekste biografii i avtobiograficheskoi prozy*. <http://www.dissercat.com/content/ki-chukovskii-i-sya-marshak-v-kontekste-biografii-i-avtobiograficheskoi-prozy> (accessed 9.1.2016).
- O'Dell, Felicity Ann. 2010. *Socialisation Through Children's Literature: The Soviet Example*. London, New York NY and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Oginskaia, Larisa. 2011. Maiakovskii prodolzhaetsia. Ne iubileinoe. I ne tol'ko vospominaniia. *Voprosy literatury* 15.10.2011. No 5. <http://magazines.russ.ru/voplit/2011/5/og17.html> (accessed 12.7.2015).
- Otkrytyi tekst*. Elektronnoe Periodicheskoe izdanie. 1917—1921. <http://www.opentextnn.ru/censorship/russia/sov/law/snk/1917/?id=566> (accessed 22.1.2016).
- Ozhegov, S. I. & Shvedova, N. Iu. 2006. *Tolkovyi slovar' russkogo iazyka*. Rossiiskaia akademiia nauk. Institut russkogo iazyka im. V. V. Vinogradova. Izdanie 4. Moskva: OOO "ITI Tekhnologii".
- Paklina, L. Ia. 1971. *Iskusstvo inoskazatel'noi rechi. Ezopovskoe slovo v khudozhestvennoi literature i publitsistike*. Saratov: Izdatel'stvo Saratovskogo universiteta.
- Panova, Lada. 2007. Mezhdunarodnaia nauchnaia konferentsiia "K reinterpretatsii russkogo modernizma: sluchai Mikhaila Kuzmina". *NLO* 21.10.2007. No 88. <http://magazines.russ.ru/nlo/2007/88/pa32.html> (accessed 29.1.2016).
- Pantelev, L. 2012. Sedovlasyi mal'chik (1972). Dve vstrechi (1973). Elena Chukovskaia & Evgeniia Ivanova (sost.), *Vospominaniia o Kornee Chukovskom*. Moskva: Nikeia, 267—288.
- Pasternak, Evgenii. 2008. Khronika proshedshikh let. *Znamia* 15.2.2008. No 12. <http://magazines.russ.ru/znamia/2008/12/pa12.html> (accessed 10.7.2015).
- Pechko, L. P. Nikolai Semenovich Tikhonov. *Bol'shaia sovetskaia entsiklopediia 1969—1978*. <http://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/bse/139953/> (accessed 5.12.2014).
- Perrie, Maureen. 2006. The Terrible Tsar as a Comic Hero. Mikhail Bulgakov's *Ivan Vasil'evich*. Kevin M. F. Platt & David Brandenberger (eds.), *Epic Revisionism: Russian History and Literature as Stalinist Propaganda*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 143—178.
- Peterson, Ronald E. 1993. *A History of Russian Symbolism*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: Benjamins.
- Petrone, Karen. 2000. *Life Has Become More Joyous, Comrades: Celebrations in the Time of Stalin*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Petrov, Petre M. 2015. *Automatic for the Masses: The Death of the Author and the Birth of Socialist Realism*. Toronto, Buffalo, NY and London: University of Toronto Press.
- Petrova, Aleksandra. 1993. Vy moi edinstvennyi chitatel'. O pis'makh L. Dobychina k K. Chukovskomu. <http://www.chukfamily.ru/Kornei/Biblio/dobychin.htm> (accessed 21.3.2016).
- Petrovskii, Miron. 1966. *Kniga o Kornee Chukovskom*. Moskva: Sovetskii pisatel'.
- Powelstock, David. 2006. Fashioning "Our Lermontov": Canonization and Conflict in the Stalinist 1930s. Kevin M. F. Platt & David Brandenberger (eds.), *Epic Revisionism: Russian History and Literature as Stalinist Propaganda*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 283—307.

- Pshebinda, Gzhegozh. Chitaia Vata. Vospominaniia rusista. <http://www.novpol.ru/index.php?id=1754> (accessed 8.12.2015).
- Pursglove, Michael. 1998. Gleb Ivanovich Uspenskii. Neil Cornwell (ed.), *Reference Guide to Russian Literature*. London and Chicago, IL: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 859—860.
- Razumov, Anatolii. 1999. Pamiati iunosti Lidii Chukovskoi. *Zvezda* 1999. No 9. <http://magazines.russ.ru/zvezda/1999/9/rasum.html> (accessed 22.12.2015).
- Reitblat, A. I. 2002. “<...> chto blestit”? (Zametki sotsiologa). *NLO* 2002. No 1(53). <http://magazines.russ.ru/nlo/2002/53/rein.html> (accessed 20.11.2015).
- Remnev, V. I. 2000. Ganzen, A. V.: Biograficheskaia spravka. *Lib.ru/Klassika*. http://az.lib.ru/g/ganzen_a_w/text_0010.shtml (accessed 24.6.2014).
- Reynolds, Andrew. 1998. Osip Emil'evich Mandelstam. Neil Cornwell (ed.), *Reference Guide to Russian Literature*. London and Chicago, IL: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 534—537.
- Rogachevskii, Andrei. 2000. V preddverii Soiuza pisatelei CCCR: FOSP i institutsional'nye ramki ob'edineniia sovetkikh pisatelei v 1920-e gody. Khans Giunter & Evgenii Dobrenko (red.), *Sotsrealisticheskii kanon*. Sankt-Peterburg: Gumanitarnoe aginstvo “Akademicheskii proekt”, 267—278.
- Rozanov, M. N. (red.). 1934. *Izbrannye dramy v novykh perevodakh. Gamlet. — Makbet. — Korol' Lir. — Son v letniuiu noch'. — Buria*. Moskva/Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury.
- Rozental', Bernis. 2000. Sotsrealizm i nittsheanstvo. Khans Giunter & Evgenii Dobrenko (red.), *Sotsrealisticheskii kanon*. Sankt-Peterburg: Gumanitarnoe aginstvo “Akademicheskii proekt”, 56—69.
- Russkii put'*. “Chukokkala” i sovskaia tsenzura. <http://www.rp-net.ru/book/vystavki/chukokkala.php> (accessed 30.11.2015).
- Safiullina, Nailya & Platonov, Rachel. 2012. Literary Translation and Soviet Cultural Politics in the 1930s: The Role of the Journal *Internacional'naja Literatura*. *Russian Literature*. Volume 72. Issue 2, 239—269.
- Sandler, Stephanie. 2006. The 1937 Pushkin Jubilee as Epic Trauma. Kevin M. F. Platt & David Brandenberger (eds.), *Epic Revisionism: Russian History and Literature as Stalinist Propaganda*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 193—213.
- Sandomirskaja, Irina. 2015. Aesopian language: the politics and poetics of naming the unnameable. Petre Petrov & Lara Ryazanova-Clarke (eds.), *The Vernaculars of Communism. Language, Ideology and Power in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe*. London and New York, NY: Routledge, 63—88.
- Sankt-Peterburgskii gosudarstvennyi universitet*. Biografika SPbGU. Samoilovich, Aleksandr Nikolaevich. <http://bioslovhist.history.spbu.ru/component/fabrik/details/1/570-samojlovich.html> (accessed 2.5.2016).
- Scherr, Barry B. 2009. Chukovskij's Whitmans. *Russian Literature*. Volume 66. Issue 1. <http://www.chukfamily.ru/Kornei/Biblio/Scherr.htm> (accessed 4.2.2013).
- Schwartz, Lawrence. 2000. *Marxism and Culture: The CPUSA and Aesthetics in the 1930s*. Lincoln, NE: Authors Choice Press.
- Schwartz-Gastine, Isabelle. 2008. *Coriolanus* in France from 1933—1977: Two Extreme Interpretations. Dirk Delabastita & Jozef de Vos & Paul Franssen (eds.), *Shakespeare and European Politics*. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 124—142.
- Shakespeare, William. 1984. *The Illustrated Stratford Shakespeare*. London: Chanchellor Press.
- Sheinker, Mikhail. 1998. Benedikt Konstantinovich Livshits. Neil Cornwell (ed.), *Reference Guide to Russian Literature*. London and Chicago, IL: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 511—512.
- Shtentalinskii, Vitalii. 2007. Rasstel'nye nochi. *Zvezda* 2007. No 5. <http://magazines.russ.ru/zvezda/2007/5/sh6.html> (accessed 4.12.2015).
- Shepherd, David. 2001. Bakhtin and the Reader. Ken Hirschkop & David Shepherd (eds.), *Bakhtin and Cultural Theory*. 2nd edition. Manchester and New York, NY: Manchester University Press, 136—154.

- Sherry, Samantha. 2015. *Discourses of Regulation and Resistance: Censoring Translation in the Stalin and Khrushchev Era Soviet Union*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. EPUB file.
- Shneiderman, Eduard. 1996. Benedikt Livshits: arrest, sledstvie, rasstrel. *Zvezda*, 1996. No 1, 82—126.
- Shneiderman, Eduard. 2000. "U sledstviia razygralsia appetit..." Zhaloba I. A. Likhacheva general'nomu prokuroru SSSR. *Zvezda* 2000. No 1, 184—193.
- Shoshin, Vladislav. 2009. Mikhail Alekseevich D'iakonov. (1885—1938) *Lib.ru/Klassika*. http://az.lib.ru/d/dxjakonow_m_a/text_0030.shtml (accessed 5.12.2015).
- Shtein, Aleksandr. 1940. Chemu učit "Literaturnaia ucheba"? *Pravda* 29.12.1940/360, 4.
- Shulezhkova, Svetlana. 2011. "I zhizn', i slezy; i liubov'..." *Proiskhozhdenie, znachenie, sud'ba 1500 krylatikh slov i vyrazhenii russkogo iazyka*. Moskva: Flinta.
- Shul'man, Mikhail & Klein, Ioakhim. 2005. Belomorkanal: literatura i propaganda v stalinskoe vremia. *NLO* 4.1.2005. No 71. <http://magazines.russ.ru/nlo/2005/71/kl14-pr.html> (accessed 12.2.2016).
- Shvarts, Evgenii. 2012. Nekomnatnyi chelovek, ili belyi volk (1957). Elena Chukovskaia & Evgeniia Ivanova (sost.), *Vospominaniia o Kornee Chukovskom*. Moskva: Nikeia, 221—240.
- Smirnov, A. A. (red.) 1939. *Izbrannye proizvedeniia Vil'iam Shekspir*. Leningrad: Goslitizdat.
- Smith, Jeremy. 2013. *Red Nations: the Nationalities Experience in and after the USSR*. Cambridge, New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Solov'eva, N. S. 1993. Sergei Solov'ev. Detstvo. Glavy iz vospominanii. *Novyi mir* 1993. No 8(820). http://magazines.russ.ru/novyi_mi/1993/8/solov.html (accessed 28.10.2015).
- Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr. 1997. Iz Evgeniia Zamiatina. "Literaturnaia kolleksiia". *Novyi mir* 15.10.1997. No 10. http://magazines.russ.ru/novyi_mi/1997/10/solgen-pr.html (accessed 5.1.2016).
- Sukhikh, Igor'. 2008. Russkaia literatura. XX vek. Serebrianyi vek: liki modernizma. 1890—1910e gody. *Zvezda* 2008. No 10. <http://magazines.russ.ru/zvezda/2008/10/su19.html> (accessed 2.12.2015).
- Swayze, Harold. 1962. *Political control of literature in the USSR, 1946-1959*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Tammi, Pekka. 1999. *Russian Subtexts in Nabokov's Fiction*. Tampere Studies in Literature and Textuality. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Tarasenkov, A. K. & Turchinskii, L. M. 2004. *Russkie poety XX veka: 1900—1955: Materialy dlia bibliografii*. Moskva: Iazyki slavianskoi kul'tury.
- Thompson, Ewa M. 1991. Soviet Russian Writers and the Invasion of Poland in September 1939. *The Search for Self-definition in Russian Literature*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 158—166.
- Time, G. A. (red.). 2006. *XX vek. Dvadsatye gody. Iz istorii mezhdunarodnykh sviazei russkoi literatury*. Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka.
- Tomei, Christine D. 1999. *Russian Women Writers*. Volume 1. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Trofimov, Rem. 1994. Perechityvaia "Dnevnik" Suvorina... *Novyi Mir* 1994. No 1(825). http://magazines.russ.ru/novyi_mi/1994/1/knoboz02.html (accessed 8.8.2015).
- Trotsky, Leon. 2005 (1925). *Literature and Revolution*. Translated by Rose Strunsky. Edited by William Keach. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books.
- Tucker, R. C. 1999. The Cunning of Reason in Hegel and Marx. Bob Jessop & Russell Wheatley (eds.), *Karl Marx's Social and Political Thought. Critical Assessments of Leading Political Philosophers*. 2nd series. Volume 5. London and New York, NY: Routledge, 134—155.
- Tyrrell, Maliheh S. 2000. *Aesopian Literary Dimensions of Azerbaijani Literature of the Soviet Period, 1920—1990*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Uspenskii, Pavel. 2010. Kak trudno voskreshat' v pamiati sobytia... *Neva* 2010. No 8. http://www.nasledie-rus.ru/red_port/Sten00.php (accessed 5.4.2014).

- Uspenskii, Pavel. V. O. Stenich: biografiia, denezizm, teksty... *Nashe nasledie*. http://www.nasledie-rus.ru/red_port/Sten00.php (accessed 25.9.2015).
- Valkenier, Elisabeth Kridl. 2009. Ilia Repin and His Critics. Carol Adlam & Juliet Simpson (eds.), *Critical Exchange. Art Criticism of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries in Russia and Western Europe*. Volume 12. Bern: Peter Lang, 227—241.
- Vasil'kov, Ia. V. & Sorokina, M. Iu. 2004. *Liudi i sud'by. Bibliograficheskii slovar' vostokovedov-zhertv politicheskogo terrora v sovetskii period (1917—1991)*. <http://memory.pvost.org/pages/gabidullin.html> (accessed 29.2.2016).
- Vek perevoda*. Evgenii Dunaevskii. <http://www.vekperevoda.com/1887/dunaevsky.htm> (accessed 9.12.2015).
- Ventslova, Tomas. 2001. Igra s tsenzorom. *Staroe literaturnoe obozrenie* 2001/1. <http://magazines.russ.ru/slo/2001/1/tomvench-pr.html> (accessed 9.4.2014).
- Viola, Lynne. 1999. *Peasant Rebels Under Stalin. Collectivization and the Culture of Peasant Resistance*. Oxford and New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Wachtel, Andrew B. 2006. The Adventures of a Leskov Story in Soviet Russia. Kevin M. F. Platt & David Brandenberger (eds.), *Epic Revisionism: Russian History and Literature as Stalinist Propaganda*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 117—139.
- Wat, Aleksander. 1977. *Moj Wiek: Pamiętnik Mówiony*. London: Polonia Publishing.
- Werth, Paul. 2007. Changing Conceptions of Difference, Assimilation and Faith in the Volga-Kama Region, 1740—1870. Jane Burbank & Mark von Hagen & Anatolyi Remnev, *Russian Empire. Space, People, Power, 1700—1930*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 169—195.
- White, Hayden. 2010. *The Fiction of Narrative. Essays on History, Literature, and Theory 1957—2007*. Edited by Robert Doran. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Witt, Susanna. 2011. Between the lines. Totalitarianism and translation in the USSR. Brian James Baer (ed.), *Contexts, Pretexts and Subtexts. Literary Translation in Eastern Europe and Russia*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia PA: John Benjamins, 149—170.
- Witt, Susanna. 2013. Arts of Accommodation: The First All-Union Conference of Translators, Moscow, 1936, and the Ideologization of Norms. Leon Burnett & Emily Lygo (eds.), *The Art of Accommodation. Literary Translation in Russia*. Russian Transformations: Literature, Thought, Culture. Volume 5. Bern: Peter Lang, 141—184.
- Yekelchik, Serhy. 2014. *Stalin's Empire of Memory: Russian-Ukrainian Relations in the Soviet Historical Imagination*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Zemskova, Elena. 2013. Translators in the Soviet Writers' Union: Pasternak's Translations from Georgian Poets and the Literary Process of the Mid-1930s. Leon Burnett & Emily Lygo (eds.), *The Art of Accommodation. Literary Translation in Russia*. Russian Transformations: Literature, Thought, Culture. Volume 5. Bern: Peter Lang, 185—211.
- Ziolkowski, Margaret. 2013. *Soviet Heroic Poetry in Context: Folklore or Fakelore*. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press.
- Žižek, Slavoj. 2008. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London and New York, NY: Verso.
- Zolotnitsky, David. 1995. *Sergei Radlov. The Shakespearian Fate of a Soviet Director*. Luxembourg: Harwood Academic Publishers.

Appendixes

APPENDIX 1: BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

A

- Abikh Rudolf Petrovich (1901–1940). Azerbaijani scholar, Iranologist. Repressed.
Aksenov Ivan Aleksandrovich (1884–1935). Poet, translator, literary scholar, critic.
Alekshev Mikhail Pavlovich (1896–1981). Literary scholar.
Al'tman Iogann L'vovich (1900–1955). Literary and theatrical scholar and critic.

B

- Belinkov Arkadii Viktorovich (1921–1970). Writer, literary critic.
Belousov Ivan Alekseevich (1863–1930). Poet, children's writer, translator.
Berg Nikolai Vasil'evich (1823–1884). Poet, journalist, historian, translator.
Bezymenskii Aleksandr Ilich (1898–1973). Poet.
Bibler Vladimir Solomonovich (1918–2000). Philosopher, cultural scholar
Blaginina Elena Aleksandrovna (1903–1989). Poet, translator.
Boronina Ekaterina Alekseevna (1907–1955). Children's writer. Friend of Lidiia Chukovskaia.
Borovoi Lev Iakovlevich (1900–1970). Philologist, literary scholar, translator
Brik Boris Il'ich (1904–1942). Poet, translator. Repressed.
Brik Lili (Liliia Iur'evna, 1891–1978). Muse and lover of Vladimir Maiakovskii.
Bronstein Matvei Petrovich (1906–1938). Theoretical physicist. Married to Lidiia Chukovskaia. Repressed.

C

- Charents Eghishe (pseudonym of Egishe Abgarovich Sogomonian, 1897–1937). Armenian writer, poet and translator. Repressed.
Chikovani Simon Ivanovich (1902–1966). Georgian poet.
Chudovskii Valerian Adol'fovich (1882–1938). Literary scholar and critic. Repressed.
Chukovskaia Lidiia ("Lida") Korneevna (1907–1996). Writer, editor, close associate of Anna Akhmatova. Daughter of Kornei Chukovskii.
Chukovskaia Maria («Masha») Borisovna (1880–1955). Wife of Kornei Chukovskii.
Chukovskaia, Maria ("Murochka") Korneevna (1920–1931). Daughter of Kornei Chukovskii. Died in childhood of tuberculosis.
Chukovskii, Boris ("Boba") Korneevich. (1910–1941). Civil engineer. Son of Kornei Chukovskii. Killed in World War II.
Chukovskii Nikolai («Kolia») Korneevich (1904–1965). Writer, translator. Son of Kornei Chukovskii.

D

Daniel' Iulii Markovich (1925—1988). Writer, poet, translator.

D'iakonov Mikhail Alekseevich (1885—1938). Writer, translator. Repressed.

Dobychin Leonid Ivanovich (1894—1936). Writer.

Druzhinin Aleksandr Vasil'evich (1824—1864). Writer, translator, editor.

Dunaevskii Evgenii Viktorovich (1889—1941). Lawyer, linguist, writer, translator of Persian literature. Repressed.

Dzhabaev Dzhambul (1846—1945). Kazakh traditional folksinger.

E

Erenburg (born Koznitsova), Liubov' Mikhailovna (1899—1970). Artist. Wife of Il'ia Erenburg.

Ermilov Vladimir Vladimirovich (1904—1965). Literary critic.

Evgen'ev-Maksimov Vladislav Evgen'evich (1883—1955). Leningrad university professor, Nekrasov scholar.

F

Fedorov Andrei Venediktovich (1906—1997). Literary scholar, translator. Chukovskii's co-writer in the 1930 edition of *A High Art*.

Finkel' Aleksandr Moiseevich (1899—1968). Ukrainian linguist, literary critic, translator, and translation theorist.

Frankovskii Adrian Antonovich (1888—1942). Translator, editor.

G

Gabidullin Khadzhi Zagidullovich (1897—1937). Tatar literary scholar, Turkologist. Repressed.

Ganzen Anna Vasil'evna (1869—1942). Translator.

Gira Liudas (1884—1946). Lithuanian poet, writer and literary critic.

Glazkov Nikolai Ivanovich (1919—1979). Poet.

Gol'tsev Viktor Viktorovich (1901—1955). Scholar specialized in Georgian literature, editor.

Gruzenberg Oskar Osipovich (1866—1940). Prominent defence attorney.

Guseinov Mirza Davud (1894—1938). Azerbaijani Party functionary. Repressed.

Gvozdev Aleksei Aleksandrovich (1887—1939). Theatrical and literary scholar and critic.

I

Iakubs'kii Boris Vladimirovich (1889—1944). Ukrainian literary scholar and critic.

Iasenskii Bruno (pseudonym of Wiktor Zysman, 1901—1938). Soviet poet of Polish origin. Repressed.

Iashchenko Aleksandr Semenovich (1877—1934). Journalist.

Iashvili Paolo (Pavel) Dzhibraelovich (1895—1937). Georgian poet. Repressed.

Iavno Evgenii Ionovich (1894—1971). Photographer.

Iurkun Iurii Ivanovich (pseudonym of Iosif Iurkunas, 1895—1938). Writer, artist. Companion of Mikhail Kuzmin. Repressed.

Iuzovskii Iosif Il'ich (1902—1964). Theatrical and literary scholar and critic.

K

- Kaplun Boris Gitmanovich (1894—1937). Civil engineer. Member of the Petrograd Soviet administration. Repressed.
- Kashkin Ivan Aleksandrovich (1899—1963). Poet, translator, literary scholar and critic.
- Khanin David Markovich (1903—1937). Editor. Director of the children's department of the publishing house Gosizdat. Repressed.
- Koltonovskii Andrei Pavlovich (1862— after 1934). Poet.
- Koni Anatolii Fedorovich (1844—1927). Lawyer, academician.
- Koniukhova Elena Nikolaevna (1916—1982). Editor.
- Kozhevnikov Vadim Mikhailovich (1909—1984). Writer, journalist.
- Kozhinov Vadim Valerianovich (1930—2001). Critic, publicist.
- Krestovskii Vsevolod Vladimirovich (1840—1895). Writer, poet, literary critic.
- Krivtsov Vladimir Nikolaevich (1914—1979). Writer, translator, literary critic,
- Kupala Ianka (pseudonym of Ivan Dominikovich Lutsevich, 1882—1942). Belarusian poet and writer.
- Kurosheva Aleksandra Ivanovna (1891—1962). Translator.
- Kurochkin Vasilii Stepanovich (1831—1875). Satirical poet, translator, journalist.
- Kvitko Lev Moiseevich (1890—1952). Yiddish poet. Repressed.

L

- Lacis Vilis (1904—1966). Latvian writer and statesman.
- Lakhuti Abolgasem Akhmedzade (1897—1957). Tadjik poet.
- Lavretskii, A. (pseudonym of Iosif Moiseevich Frenkel', 1893—1964). Literary scholar.
- Leonidze Georgii (Girgi) Nikolaevich (1899—1966). Georgian poet.
- Levinson Andrei (André) Iakovlevich (1887—1933). French journalist.
- Likhachev Vladimir Sergeevich (1849—1910). Poet, translator.
- Loseff Lev Vladimirovich (born Lev Lifshits, 1937—2009). Emigrant Russian writer and scholar.
- Lozinskii Mikhail Leonidovich (1886—1955). Poet, translator.

M

- Markish Perets Davidovich (1895—1952). Yiddish poet and playwright. Repressed.
- Merkur'eva Vera Aleksandrovna (1876—1943). Poet, translator.
- Mikhailov Mikhail Larionovich (1829—1865). Poet, journalist, publicist.
- Minikh-Maslov Aleksandr Viktorovich (1903—1941?). Poet.

N

- Nabokov Vladimir Dmitrievich (1870—1922). Editor, publicist, statesman. Father of the Russian-American writer Vladimir Nabokov.

O

- Ol'denburg Sergei Fedorovich (1863—1934). Orientalist.
- Ostuzhev Aleksandr Alekseevich (1874—1953). Actor.

P

- Pantelev L. (pseudonym of Aleksei Ivanovich Eremeev, 1908—1987). Writer.
Polevoi Petr Nikolai (1839—1902). Writer, translator, editor, literary scholar and critic.
Polonskii Viacheslav Pavlovich (pseudonym of Viacheslav Pavlovich Gusev, 1886—1932).
Editor, literary scholar and critic.

R

- Radlov Sergei Ernestovich (1892—1958). Theatre producer.
Radlova Anna Dmitrievna (1891—1949). Poet, translator. Wife of Sergei Radlov.
Razin Ivan Mikhailovich (1905—1938). Editor. Head of the children's section of the publishing house Molodaia gvardiia. Repressed.
Rifat Khaidar. Turkish 20th century translator.
Rozanov Matvei Nikanorovich (1858—1936). Literary scholar, academician.
Rubakin Nikolai Aleksandrovich (1862—1946). Bibliographer, writer.

S

- Sal'e Mikhail Aleksandrovich (1899—1961). Orientalist, translator.
Samoilovich Aleksandr Nikolaevich (1880—1938). Orientalist, academician. Repressed.
Shishmareva Mariia Andreevna (1852—1939). Translator.
Shtein (pseudonym of Rubinshtein) Aleksandr Petrovich (1906—1993). Playwright, journalist.
Shtorm Georgii Petrovich (1898—1978). Writer, literary scholar.
Shubin Lev Alekseevich (1928—1983). Literary scholar, editor-in-chief at the publishing house Sovetskii pisatel'.
Slavinskii Maksim Antonovich (1868—1945). Ukrainian poet, translator, publicist and politician.
Sleptsov Vasilii Alekseevich (1836—1878). Writer, publicist.
Smirnov Aleksandr Aleksandrovich (1883—1962). Literary scholar and critic, translator.
Sokolovskii Aleksandr Lukich (1837—1915). Writer, translator.
Solov'ev Vasilii Ivanovich (1890—1939). Party functionary. Head of Gosizdat. Repressed.
Spasskii Sergei Dimitrevich (1898—1956). Poet, writer, translator, literary critic.
Suleiman Stal'skii (1869—1937). Dagestani poet.
Stavskii (pseudonym of Kirpichnikov) Vladimir Petrovich (1900—1943). Writer, literary functionary. Head of the Union of Soviet Writers in the 1930s.
Stenich (pseudonym of Smetanich) Valentin Iosifovich (1898—1938). Poet, essayist, translator. Repressed.
Stepanov Nikolai Leonidovich (1902—1972). Literary scholar.

T

- Tagantsev Vladimir Nikolaevich (1889—1921). Geographer, academician. Repressed.
Tager Elena Mikhailovna (1895—1964). Writer, poet, translator.
Tsvelev Vasilii Alekseevich (1907—1985). Poet, writer, translator.
Tychina Pavel Grigor'evich (1891—1967). Ukrainian poet and Party functionary.

V

Veinberg Petr Isaevich (1831—1908). Poet, translator, literary scholar.

Velichko Vasili L'vovich (1860—1903). Poet, publicist, translator.

Voronii Mikola Kindratovich (1871—1938). Ukrainian poet, journalist and theatre director.
Repressed.

Vvedenskii Irinard Ivanovich (1813—1855). Writer, literary critic, translator.

W

Wat (pseudonym of Khvat) Aleksander (1900—1967). Polish Futurist poet and writer.

Z

Zhabotinskii-Zeev Vladimir Evgen'evich (1880—1940). Poet, writer, Zionist leader.

Zaslavskii David Iosifovich (1880—1965). Publicist, literary scholar and critic.

Zelinskii Kornelii Liutsianovich (1896—1970). Literary scholar and critic.

Zhilkin Ivan Vasil'evich (1874—1958). Journalist, editor, Party functionary.

Zorgenfrei Vil'gel'm Aleksandrovich (1882—1938). Poet, translator. Repressed.

APPENDIX 2: ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

- GIKhL = *Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury* (State Publishing House of Literature).
- GIZ = Gosizdat = *Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo* (State Publishing House).
- Glavlit = *Glavnoe upravlenie po delam literatury i izdatel'stv* (Main Administration for Literary and Publishing Affairs). The board of censors.
- Goslit = Goslitizdat *Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury* (State Publishing House of Literature).
- GPU = *Gosudarstvennoe politicheskoe upravlenie* (State Political Board = the secret police in 1922–1923).
- Gulag = *Glavnoe upravlenie lagerei* (State Camp Administration).
- GUS = *Gosudarstvennyi uchenyi soviet* (State Council of Scholars). A branch of the People's Commissariat of Education
- Komsomol = *Kommunisticheskii soiuz molodezhi* (Communist Youth League).
- Narkompros = *Narodnyi komissariat prosveshcheniia* (Commissariat of Enlightenment).
- NEP = *Novaia ekonomicheskaiia politika* (New Economic Policy).
- NKVD = *Narodnyi komissariat vnutrennikh del* (People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs = the secret police in 1934–1946).
- OBERIU = *Ob''edineniie real'nogo iskusstva* (Society for Real Art).
- OGPU = *Ob''edineonnoe gosudarstvennoe politicheskoe upravlenie* (Joint State Political Directorate; the secret police in 1923–1934).
- Proletkul't = *Proletarskaia kul'tura* (Proletarian Culture). A cultural movement active in 1917–1920.
- RAPP = *Rossiiskaia assotsiatsiia proletarskikh pisatelei* (Russian Association of Proletarian Writers)
- Sovnarkom = *Sovet narodnykh komissarov* (Council of the People's Commissars)
- TsK VKP(b) = *Tsentral'nyi komitet Vsesoiuznoi kommunisticheskoi partii (bol'shevikov)* Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party [Bolsheviks]
- Upravlenie propagandy i agitatsii Tsk VKP(b)* (The Central Committee Directorate for Propaganda and Agitation)
- VAPP = *Vserossiiskaia assotsiatsiia proletarskikh pisatelei* (All-Russian Association of Proletarian Writers)
- VChK = *Cheka = Vserossiiskaia Chrezvychnainaiia komissiia po bor'be s kontrrevoliutsiei, sabotazhem i spekulatsiei* (All-Russian Extraordinary Commission for Combating Counter-Revolution, Sabotage, and Speculation = the secret police in 1918–1922).
- VSP = *Vserossiiskii soiuz pisatelei* (All-Russian Union of Writers)
- ZiF = *Zemlia i Fabrika* ("Land and Factory"), a publishing house operating in the 1920s

APPENDIX 3: TABLE OF REPRESSED INTELLECTUALS

Name	Birth & Death	Arrest	Exile/Camp Prison	Executed	Rehabilitated	Ed. 1930	Ed. 1936	Ed. 1941	Ed. 1964	Ed. 1966	Ed. 1968	Ed. 2001
Charents E.	1897—1937	1937	1936—1937		1954		x					
D'iakonov M. D.	1885—1938	1938		1938	1956		x					
Dunaevskii E.	1889—1941	1939		1941	x		x	x				
Gumilev N.	1886—1921	1921		1921	1991	x	x			x	x	x
Livshits B.	1887—1938	1937		1938	1957	x	x					
Mandel'shtam O.	1893—1938	1934, 1938	1934—1937		1956	x				x	x	x
Samoilovich A.	1880—1938	1937		1938	1956		x					
Stenich V.	1898—1938	1937		1938	1957	x	x		x	x	x	x
Sviatopolk-Mirskii D.	1890—1939	1937	1937—1939		1962		x					
Tabidze T.	1895—1937	1937		1937	1954		x				x	x
Voronii M.	1871—1938	1934, 1938		1938	1957		x	x	x	x	x	x
Zorgenfrei V.	1882—1938	1938		1938	1958		x					

PUBLICATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EASTERN FINLAND
DISSERTATIONS IN EDUCATION, HUMANITIES, AND THEOLOGY

1. Taru Viinikainen. *Taipuuko "akrobaatti Aleksandra"? Nimikekonstruktio ja nimikkeen taipuminen lehtikielessä 1900-luvulta 2000-luvulle*. 2010.
2. Pekka Metso. *Divine Presence in the Eucharistic Theology of Nicholas Cabasilas*. 2010.
3. Pekka Kilpeläinen. *In Search of a Postcategorical Utopia. James Baldwin and the Politics of 'Race' and Sexuality*. 2010.
4. Leena Vartiainen. *Yhteisöllinen käsityö. Verkostoja, taitoja ja yhteisiä elämyksiä*. 2010.
5. Alexandra Simon-López. *Hypersurrealism. Surrealist Literary Hypertexts*. 2010.
6. Merja Sagulin. *Jälkiä ajan hiekassa. Kontekstuaalinen tutkimus Daniel Defoen Robinson Crusoen suomenkielisten adaptaatioiden aatteellisista ja kirjallisista traditioista sekä subjektikäsityksistä*. 2010.
7. Pirkko Pollari. *Vapaan sivistystyön kieltenopettajien pedagogiset ratkaisut ja käytänteet teknologiaa hyödyntävässä vieraiden kielten opetuksessa*. 2010.
8. Ulla Piela. *Kansanparannuksen kerrotut merkitykset Pohjois-Karjalassa 1800- ja 1900-luvuilla*. 2010.
9. Lea Meriläinen. *Language Transfer in the Written English of Finnish Students*. 2010.
10. Kati Aho-Mustonen. *Group Psychoeducation for Forensic Long-term Patients with Schizophrenia*. 2011.
11. Anne-Maria Nupponen. *»Savon murre» savolaiskorvin. Kansa murteen havainnoijana*. 2011.
12. Teemu Valtonen. *An Insight into Collaborative Learning with ICT: Teachers' and Students' Perspectives*. 2011.
13. Teemu Kakkuri. *Evankelinen liike kirkossa ja yhteiskunnassa 1944-1963. Aktiivinen uudistusliike ja konservatiivinen sopeutuja*. 2011.
14. Riitta Kärkkäinen. *Doing Better? Children's and Their Parents' and Teachers' Perceptions of the Malleability of the Child's Academic Competences*. 2011.
15. Jouko Kiiski. *Suomalainen avioero 2000-luvun alussa. Miksi avioliitto puretaan, miten ero koetaan ja miten siitä selviydytään*. 2011.
16. Liisa Timonen. *Kansainvälisty tai väisty? Tapaustutkimus kansainvälisyysosaamisen ja kulttuurienvälisen oppimisen merkityksenannoista oppijan, opettajan ja korkeakoulutoimijan pedagogisen suhteen rajaamissa kohtaamisen tiloissa*. 2011.
17. Matti Vääntinen. *Oikeasti hyvä numero. Oppilaiden arvioinnin totuudet ja totuustuotanto rinnakkaiskoulusta yhtenäiskouluun*. 2011.
18. Merja Ylönen. *Aikuiset opin poluilla. Oppimistukikeskuksen asiakkaiden opiskelukokemuksista ja koulutautumishalukkuudelle merkityksellisistä tekijöistä*. 2011.
19. Kirsi Pankarinkangas. *Leskien keski-iässä tai myöhemmällä iällä solmimat uudet avioliitot. Seurantatutkimus*. 2011.
20. Olavi Leino. *Oppisopimusopiskelijan oppimisen henkilökohtaistaminen ja oppimismahdollisuudet työpaikalla*. 2011.
21. Kristiina Abdallah. *Translators in Production Networks. Reflections on Agency, Quality and Ethics*. 2012.
22. Riina Kokkonen. *Mittarissa lapsen keho ja vanhemmuus – tervettä lasta sekä "hyvää" ja "huonoa" vanhemmuutta koskevia tulkintoja nyky-Suomessa*. 2012.
23. Ari Sivenius. *Aikuislukion etos opettajien merkityksenantojen valossa*. 2012.

24. Kamal Sbiri. *Voices from the Margin. Rethinking History, Identity, and Belonging in the Contemporary North African Anglophone Novel*. 2012.
25. Ville Sassi. *Uudenlaisen pahan unohdettu historia. Arvohistoriallinen tutkimus 1980-luvun suomalaisen romaanin pahan tematiikasta ja "pahan koulukunta" –vuosikymmenmääritteen muodostumisesta kirjallisuusjärjestelmässä*. 2012.
26. Merja Hyytiäinen. *Integroiden, segregoiden ja osallistaen. Kolmen vaikeasti kehitysvammaisen oppilaan opiskelu yleisopetuksessa ja koulupolku esiopetuksesta toiselle asteelle*. 2012.
27. Hanna Mikkola. *"Tänään työ on kauneus on ruumis on laihuus." Feministinen luenta syömishäiriöiden ja naissukupuolen kytköksistä suomalaisissa syömishäiriöromaaneissa*. 2012.
28. Aino Äikäs. *Toiselta asteelta eteenpäin. Narratiivinen tutkimus vaikeavammaisen nuoren aikuisen koulutuksesta ja työllistymisestä*. 2012.
29. Maija Korhonen. *Yrittäjyyttä ja yrittäjämäisyyttä kaikille? Uusliberalistinen hallinta, koulutettavuus ja sosiaaliset erot peruskoulun yrittäjyyskasvatuksessa*. 2012.
30. Päivikki Ronkainen. *Yhteinen tehtävä. Muutoksen avaama kehittämissyönteily opettajayhteisössä*. 2012.
31. Kalevi Paldanius. *Eläinlääkärin ammatti-identiteetti, asiakasvuorovaikutuksen jännitteiden hallinta ja kliinisen päättelyn yhteenkietoutuminen sekapraktiikassa*. 2012.
32. Kari Korolainen. *Koristelun kuvailu. Kategorisoinnin analyysi*. 2012.
33. Maija Metsämäki. *Influencing through Language. Studies in L2 Debate*. 2012.
34. Pål Lauritzen. *Conceptual and Procedural Knowledge of Mathematical Functions*. 2012.
35. Eeva Raunistola-Juutinen. *Äiti ja nunna – Kirkkojen maailmanneuvoston naisten vuosikymmenen ortodoksiset naiskuvat*. 2012.
36. Marja-Liisa Kakkonen. *Learning Entrepreneurial Competences in an International Undergraduate Degree Programme. A Follow-Up Study*. 2012.
37. Outi Sipilä. *Esiliina aikansa kehyksissä – moniaikaista tekstiilikulttuuria ja representaatioita kodista, perheestä, puhtaudesta ja käsityöstä 1900-luvun alkupuolen Suomessa*. 2012.
38. Seija Jeskanen. *Piina vai pelastus? Portfolio aineenopettajaopiskelijoiden ammatillisen kehittymisen välineenä*. 2012.
39. Reijo Virolainen. *Evankeliumin asialla - Kurt Frörin käsitys evankelisesta kasvatuksesta ja opetuksesta Saksassa 1930-luvulta 1970-luvulle*. 2013.
40. Katarzyna Szal. *Finnish Literature in Poland, Polish Literature in Finland – Comparative Reception Study from a Hermeneutic Perspective*. 2013.
41. Eeva-Liisa Ahtiainen. *Kansainvälistymisen ja laadunvarmistuksen yhteys ammatti-korkeakoulun asiakirjateksteissä. Tapaustutkimus*. 2013.
42. Jorma Pitkänen. *Fides Directa – Fides Reflexa. Jonas Laguksen käsitys vanhurskauttavasta uskosta*. 2013.
43. Riitta Rajasuu. *Kuopiossa, Oulussa ja Turussa vuosina 1725–1744 ja 1825–1844 syntyneiden kastenimet*. 2013.
44. Irina Karvonen. *Pyhän Aleksanteri Syväriläisen koulukunta – 1500-luvun luostarihistoriaa vai 1800-luvun venäläiskansallista tulkintaa?* 2013.
45. Meri Kytö. *Kotiin kuuluvaa. Yksityisen ja yhteisen kaupunkiaänitilan risteymät*. 2013.
46. Jörg Weber. *Die Idee von der Mystagogie Jesuimgeistigen Menschen: Einführung in die »christliche Theosophie« des Corpus Areopagiticum*. 2013.
47. Tuija, Lukin. *Motivaatio matematiikan opiskelussa – seuranta tutkimus motivaatiotekijöistä ja niiden välisistä yhteyksistä yläkoulun aikana*. 2013.

48. Virpi Kaukio. *Sateenkaari lätäkössä. Kuvitellun ja kerrotun ympäristöestetiikka*. 2013.
49. Susanna Pöntinen. *Tieto- ja viestintäteknologian opetuskäytön kulttuurin diskursiivinen muotoutuminen luokanopettajaopiskelijoiden puheessa*. 2013.
50. Maria Takala-Roszczenko. *The 'Latin' within the 'Greek': The Feast of the Holy Eucharist in the Context of Ruthenian Eastern Rite Liturgical Evolution in the 16th–18th Centuries*. 2013
51. Erkki Nieminen. *Henki vastaan alkoholi: AA-toiminnan synty ja kehitys Lahdessa 1950-1995*. 2014.
52. Jani Kaasinen. *Perinnerakentaminen käsitteenä ja osana teknologiakasvatusta - opettaja-opiskelijoiden käsitykset, käsitysten jäsenyisyys ja muutos perinnerakentamisen opintojakson aikana*. 2014.
53. Gerson Lameck Mgaya. *Spiritual gifts: A sociorhetorical interpretation of 1 cor 12–14*. 2014.
54. Pauli Kallio. *Esimiehen muuttuvat identiteetit: Narratiivinen tutkimus keskijohdon identiteeteistä ja samastumisesta organisaatiomurroksessa*. 2014.
55. Sirpa Tokola-Kemppi. *Psykoanalyttisen psykoterapian merkityksiä kirjailijahaastattelujen valossa*. 2014.
56. Dhuanu Affleck. *How does Dialogical Self Theory appear in the light of Cognitive Analytic Therapy? Two approaches to the self*. 2014.
57. Teemu Ratinen. *Torjuttu Jumalanlahja. Yksilön kamppailu häpeällistä seksuaalisuutta vastaan*. 2014.
58. Päivi Löfman. *Tapaustutkimus itseohjautuvuudesta sairaanhoitajakoulutuksen eri vaiheissa*. 2014.
59. Päivi Kujamäki. *Yhteisenä tavoitteena opetuksen eheyttäminen. Osallistava toimintatutkimus luokanopettajille*. 2014.
60. Henriikka Vartiainen. *Principles for Design-Oriented Pedagogy for Learning from and with Museum Objects*. 2014.
61. Päivi Kaakkunen. *Lukudiplomin avulla lukemaan houkuttelemisen yläkoulussa. Lukudiplomin kehittämistutkimus perusopetuksen vuosiluokilla 7–9*. 2014.
62. Jari Kukkonen. *Scaffolding inquiry in science education by means of computer supported collaborative learning : pupils' and teacher students' experiences*. 2015.
63. Petteri Nieminen. *Unified theory of creationism — Argumentation, experiential thinking and emerging doctrine*. 2015.
64. Esa Antikainen. *"Me olemme postipaketteja": tutkimus Helsingin vammaiskuljetuksista vuosina 2002-2007*. 2015.
65. Anna Logrén. *Taiteilijapuheen moniäänisyys. Tutkimus mediavälitteisen ja (kuva)taiteilijalähtöisentaiteilijapuheen muotoutumisesta*. 2015.
66. Päivi Virkki. *Varhaiskasvatus toimijuuden ja osallisuuden edistäjänä*. 2015.
67. Terhi Nevalainen. *Pinkit piikkikorot. Chicklit -kirjallisuuden postfeministiset sisällöt ja lukijat niiden merkityksellistäjinä*. 2015.
68. Soile Tikkanen. *Development of an empathic stance. Dialogical sequence analysis (DSA) of a single case during clinical childneurological assessment procedures*. 2015.
69. Erja Laakkonen. *Aikuisuuden kulttuuriset kuvat 25-35-vuotiaiden naisten haastattelupuheissa ja naistenlehtiteksteissä*. 2015.
70. Wu Enqin. *What Does Design Expose? A Comparative Study of Finnish Modern Furniture and Chinese Ming-style Furniture*. 2015.

71. Vuokko Malinen. *Uuspari, uusperheen parisuhde ja koulutuksellisen interventio mahdollisuudet sen tukemiseen*. 2015.
72. Juhana Venäläinen. *Yhteisen talous: tutkimus jälkiteollisen kapitalismin kulttuurisesta sommittumasta*. 2015.
73. Johanna Hokkanen. *Kotien lääkekasvatus*. 2015.
74. Eveline Omagano Anyolo. *Implementing Education for Sustainable Development in Namibian Schools*. 2015.
75. Satu Tuomainen. *Recognition and Student Perceptions of Non-formal and Informal Learning of English for Specific Purposes in a University Context*. 2015.
76. Jari Ruotsalainen. *Iholle kaiverrettu. Tatuoimisen kulttuurinen murros Suomessa*. 2015.
77. Sanna Hillberg. *Relativization in Scottish standard English: a corpus-based study on newspaper language*. 2015.
78. Virpi Turunen. *Pellavalangan neulonta kotineulekoneella*. 2015.
79. Emilia Valkonen. *"Me myymme ja markkinoimme kursseja" Markkinaorientaation piirteet kansalaisopistoissa*. 2015
80. Petri Haapa. *Suomalaisen peruskoulun rehtori koulun tietokonepohjaisen hallinto ohjelman käyttäjänä*. 2016.
81. Helena Valkeapää. *Maahanmuuttaja-afgaanien kotitalouden toiminta ja akkulturaatio*. 2016.
82. Airi Hakkarainen. *Matematiikan ja lukemisen vaikeuksien yhteys toisen asteen koulutuspolkuun ja jatko-opintoihin tai työelämään sijoittumiseen*. 2016.
83. Maria Kok. *Varjon kielipillistuminen: itse-sanana paradigman rakenne ja merkityksenkehitys itämerensuomessa*. 2016.
84. Päivi Vesala. *Koulupiikan merkitys alakoulun oppilaille. Lapsen ja ympäristön vastavuoroisen suhteen analyysi*. 2016.
85. Izabela Czerniak. *Anglo-Scandinavian Language Contacts and Word Order Change in Early English*. 2016.
86. Serja Turunen. *Matkalla musiikkiin. Fenomenologinen tutkimus peruskoulun 3.-4. -luokkalaisten taidemusiikin kuuntelukokemuksista koulun musiikkikasvatuskontekstissa*. 2016.
87. Minna Parkko. *Stailaaminen: työtehtävät, osaaminen ja sijoittuminen*. 2016.
88. Kaisa Pihlainen. *Merkityksellisyyttä, vastuullisuutta ja uuden luomista – Erityistä tukea tarvitsevan lapsen ja vanhemman toiminnasta teknologiakerhossa*. 2016.
89. Peppi Sievers. *Uskonnollisten ja hengellisten kysymysten käsittely suomalaisissa psykoterapioissa*. 2016.
90. Matti Mäkelä. *Kun häpeästä tuli kunniaa ja provokaatio. Näkökulmia tabuja rikkovaan taiteeseen*. 2016.
91. Minna Kumpulainen. *Learning translation. An empirical study into the acquisition of interlingual text production skills*. 2016.
92. Mustapha Kharoua. *Traumatic Realism in Diasporic African Writing*. 2016.
93. Merja Suomi. *Metamorphoses of a Text within the Stalinist Context. Kornei Chukovskii's "A High Art" in the 1930s*. 2016.

MERJA SUOMI

Väitöskirjan aiheena ovat venäläisen kirjailijan, kääntäjän ja kriitikon Kornei Tšukovskin selviytymiskeinot 1930-luvun neuvostokulttuurissa. Tšukovski muokkasi kaunokirjallista kääntämistä käsittelevien esseiden kokoelmaansa Vysokoe iskusstvo ("Ylevä taide") jokaista uutta editiota varten. Teokseen 1930-luvulla tehdyt korjaukset kuvastavat aikakauden julkiselle keskustelulle asetettuja sääntöjä ja odotuksia. Samalla ne ilmentävät Stalinin ajan arvoja ja maailmankuvaa.



UNIVERSITY OF
EASTERN FINLAND

uef.fi

PUBLICATIONS OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF EASTERN FINLAND
Dissertations in Education, Humanities, and Theology

ISBN 978-952-61-2268-7
ISSN 1798-5625