

The Impact on the Presentation of Soviet Censorship Creativity N. Leskova Readers of the 20th Century

¹Elena V. Gaeva and ²Habiba S. Shagbanova

¹Kurgan State University, Kurgan, Russian Federation

²Tyumen State Oil and Gas University, Tyumen, Russian Federation

Abstract: The study is devoted to an analysis of censorial editing of Russian writer of the 19th century Nikolai Leskov's artistic creativity. At the beginning the study notes types of artistic works editing for the ideological reasons: falsification of the original by a translator; the author's self-editing; lifetime editing by censors; posthumous editing by textual critics. Further we consider the editing cases which are conducted by textual critics during Soviet times in N. Leskov's texts on the ideological reasons and it is noted that this type of editing is first of all characteristic for Church lexicon and phraseology. It is also noted that dictionary notes as a special case of the explanatory dictionary were also exposed to adjustment for the ideological reasons. These corrections (both in texts and in notes) are also in new reprintings of N. Leskov's works (even in thirty-volume complete works of N. Leskov which is published since 1996) that testifies that not all texts are compared with lifetime publications and not all comments are checked on dictionary sources. Posthumous ideological editing of N. Leskov's texts of art during Soviet times is not obvious: separate lexical and phraseological units are here and there refreshed but when the material is collected together, it is visible how the work was purposefully conducted. On the last kind of editing of texts we will concentrate having addressed to N. Leskov's modern editions which are earlier not studied from this point of view.

Key words: Soviet ideology, artistic texts, comments, censorship, view

INTRODUCTION

Several researches are devoted to the problem of ideological editing in the text of art. Let's remind some types of such editing: falsification of the original text by the translator. K.I. Chukovsky in the chapter 2 of the book "Vysokoe iskusstvo" ("A High Art") shows how the translator distorts the original text to please his ideological and political views: "Falsification of the original text is occasionally made under the influence of political, party additions of this or that translator. In extreme cases it comes to deliberate distortion of the texts" (Chukovsky, 2014). And the illustrative material to this statement is mainly Korney Ivanovich's translations of the 19th century in Russia (A.V. Druzhinin's translations of Shakespeare's "The Tragedy of Coriolanus" and "King Lear", V.I. Zhukovsky's translation of Homer's "The Odyssey", etc.); the researcher's self-editing. A.L. Grishunin in his monograph "Issledovatel'skie aspekty tekstologii" ("Research Aspects of Textual Criticism") considers different types of processings of the text of art and in

particular, elaborates on the author's self-editing for the ideological reasons in the 40-50th years of works for the first time published in the 20-30th years of the 20th century (A.A. Fadeyev "Razgrom" ("Defeat"), M. A. Sholokhov "Podnyataya Tselina" ("Virgin soil upturned") and "Tikhly Don" ("The Quiet Don"), A. Bagritsky "Stikhi o poete i romantike" ("Verses of the poet and romance") Grishunin (1998); lifetime editing by censors. Editing of texts by censors during lifetime of the author was not a rarity both in pre-revolutionary and in the Soviet Russia. One of new certificates is the message in the newspaper "Komsomolskaya Pravda" of February 27, 2014 of a journalist N. Krivets with the reference to Sergey Shapran, a researcher of V. Bykau's creativity that in the story "Mertvym ne bolno" ("The Dead Feel No Pain") a national writer of Belarus in 1965 the Soviet censors has made 200 notes and only to a writer's anniversary the text for the first time appears without ideological editing Werbach, Paperno, Moran. posthumous editing by textual critics. To please to a regime the texts were cut off and substituted not only in the period of writers' life. In earlier mentioned A. L. Grishunin's research posthumous editing

for ideological reasons by the Soviet censors of texts of the Russian pre-revolutionary classic is narrated (V.G. Korolenko's study "Poltavskie prazdnestva" ("The Poltava festivals") in the Soviet editions 1948 and 1955 of years, A.P. Chekhov's letters in twenty-volume collected works in the 40th year of the last century) (Lewis, 1977). "To mutilate and mangle the works of art for a peculiar understood political idea was craze of the whole "Soviet" era" (Grishunin, 1998).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

When we conceived to create the dictionary of rare words "Gosti iz proshlogo" ("Guests from the Past") Gaeva on P. Boborykin's (1836-1921), N. Leskova (1831-1895), B. Markevich (1822-1884) works of art, he quotation material was mainly assigned on lifetime collected works. During the period of material collecting (1997-2004) because of the absence at that time in Russia of electronic library systems the work was quite slowly conducted: the material from collected P. Boborykin's (1884-1887, 1897) and B. Markevich's works at first were manually assigned in the library and then was brought to our computer base. If during the Soviet period P. Boborykin's works were practically not published, B. Markevich's works were completely not published, N. Leskov's texts in the modern graphics were available. For this reason during the work with N. Leskov's texts a bit different mechanism of collecting material was used. Owing to the large volume of rare words which are found in N. Leskov's works we considered irrational to write out lexemes from lifetime editions because it would be reduced to texts rewriting practically without notes.

Therefore, N. Leskov's dictionary block at first was prepared according to modern editions by scanning and later everything was verified according to lifetime publications. Having recorded the discrepancy of a written-out quote with a quote from the lifetime edition, in order to exclude scanning errors we addressed to the Soviet and Post-Soviet N. Leskov's editions. As a result of such work there is the material given below. A textual and critical analysis of N. Leskov's works accumulates philosophical views of the East and West by that Russian literature and literary thought are characterized in general Gilazov *et al.* (2015). During the research the inductive method (collecting and documenting of concrete facts with their subsequent generalization), the comparative method, the method of linguistic supervision and description of the language facts, the method of "linguistic modeling of an internal picture of the world of the language personality" Karabulatova (2013). Moreover, the methods of a statistical analysis showing the volume of made corrections making this or that change to perception of the author's text were used.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

First of all, lexemes which were semantic connected with the religious subject have been changing and were even jumped out for the ideological reasons. In particular, in a novel for the anti-clerical reasons the word "blagodeystvie" ("welfare") Leskov (1889) in a recipe of the Jerusalem balm which a doctor Rozanov reads was replaced with welfare in the edition of 1956. And only such tracing is now observed in all publications: [...] benefits from all the afflictions of mental and physical together; who will use it and the wonderful Art "samiam" "blagodeistvie" will understand.

In the other place in modern publications of the same novel the lexeme "Divine" is lowered as a result in collected N.S. Leskov's works of 1956-1958, 1993 and proceeding since 1996 the complete works windows look already not "na svet Bozij" (Leskov, 1889) but just birth: [...] the other four [windows] with civil self-confidence looking "at the light only" one "melkoshibchatymi" oak frames with green glass. Only in "Collected works in 12 volumes" of 1989 windows again look ià "The light of God" (Leskov, 1889). It is the unambiguous certificate that the authors of this edition really tried to address to lifetime collected works (but unfortunately very inconsistently) unlike the authors of the Post-Soviet "Collected works in 6 volumes" of 1993 and "Complete works which is published, since 1996 in 30 volumes" which obviously used the text of a novel "No way out" from "Collected works in 11 volumes" of 1956 without any collation.

As after the October revolution in value of lexemes like "God, the Lord", etc. a sacral sense was shaded, in the Soviet collected N.S. Leskov's works of 1956-1958 all these words begin with a small letter. And since 1989 on a wave of return of church "in a bosom of the state" the authors corrected the writing of similar words having mainly counted upon the experience and practically without relying on pre-revolutionary publications of N.S. Leskov's texts. As a result, the lexeme "Bog, Gospod, Sozdatel" "God, the Lord, the Creator" and derivatives are composed now with a capital letter (but not always) and the words little-known today which are also relating to the church sphere and written earlier with a capital letter - with a small letter. In the examples given below the writing on lifetime collected works is given, let's see the schedule in modern editions in interlinear notes: [...] saying, "Father" and have mercy on me, "God", [...] (Leskov, 1889); He [...] I was happy that the government is now allowed to work for the benefit of the "Words of God" unto other evangelical pastors Leskov (1889). And Dmitry Rostov on Myrrhbearers all lords straight in the eye said that we in the noble people do not find Christ [...]. In N.S. Leskov's lifetime editions it is also possible to meet the foreign-language compliances which are printed with a

capital letter (quite often in Russian graphics) to our lexeme “Bog” (“God”) (Latin Deo; German Gott; French Dieu and Polish Pan Bog). We do not find any more such graphics not only in editions of Soviet times but also the Post-Soviet period: all earlier allocated lexemes are printed with a small letter, only in the edition of 1993 instead of “Pan Bog” it is printed “pan bog”. Today writing of such pronouns with a capital letter is completely ignored by the authors of collected works, therefore a sense of texts is quite often darkened (Leskov, 1889). In some cases it is completely difficult to explain for what purpose editing of church texts is made. Now the epigraph to the story “Pagubniki” (“Ruinous”) looks the following way: Woe unto the world from the “temptations, obache” the mountain side of the road to the man, he is tempted to come. Woe unto the world from the “temptation, obache” the mountain side of the road to the man, he is tempted to come. However, in the “Nov” magazine for 1885 the epigraph is printed a little bit different: Woe unto the world from the “temptation, obache” the mountain side of the road to the man, he is tempted to come.

This phrase is the inexact quote from Church Slavonic version of the Gospel from Matfey The Holy Bible. A word form “soblazn” (“temptation”) at the beginning of the phrase “gore miru ot soblazna” (“woe to the world of temptation”) [...] is the old form of a genitive case of plural at nouns of the II-nd inducement therefore in this case an attempt “to transfer” the phrase which is unintelligible from the point of view of textual critics, to the modern harmony is at least clear though such arbitrariness is very surprising. But replacement of Church Slavonic “obache” (“and but, however” Dyachenko (2001) with nonexistent “Oboche” testifies, in our opinion, about linguistic incompetence of textual critics. The replacement of the lexeme “agitatsiya” fixed in lifetime collected works is also explained by political trends (Leskov, 1889), a phonetic way “azhitatsiya” in modern publications of the novel “No way out”: Rozanov was the Marquise for a moment and found her in a terrible “azhitatsiya”. She sat up on the ottoman, twisted striped straws and all pahitosnoy twitched as in Rodimtsev. It is thought that the main reason for replacement of a letter “G” to a letter “Zh” roots that today in consciousness of Soviet and Post-Soviet person the word “agitatsiya” is connected only with the political sphere and the authors have preferred just to correct Leskov’s text though the author has used a unit “agitatsiya” (agitation) in its primordial meaning (“excitement, excitement, concern”) which still is in French (agitation) (Gak and Ganshina, 1998). Not only N. Leskov’s texts but also notes have experienced editing for the ideological reasons. It is possible to recognize dictionary notes to the text of art as a kind of the explanatory dictionary. As in the Soviet dictionaries the ideological component is observed and it

is also in notes. In particular, in the story “Ostrovityane” (“Islanders”) N.S. Leskov uses the adjective “konfortativnyi” arguing on vasileostrovsky artists: [...] in the creation, the service of sensuality and the inability to understand in round absolutely no problems of art, in addition to the political problems of dry, fine or konfortativnyh, resolved in favor of its subjectivity (Leskov, 1889). In comments concerning the lexeme “konfortativnyi” with some variations it is unanimously specified: “ukrepitelnyi” (Fr. Conforter) “ukrepitelnyi” (fastening) (Fr. to strengthen conforter) “Konfortativnyie” are toning, strengthening means (Fr. Conforter to strengthen) Kazakova, Stolyarova, Chudnova, Serman while under the certificate of AThe dictionary of Russian made by the Second Department of the Imperial “cademy of Sciences” the adjective “konfortativnyiy” goes back to new Latin confortativum and means “exciting sexual lust” SAN. In the same dictionary the noun “konfortativ” is fixed: (Fr. Confortatif). Strengthening, renewing sexual force and exciting sexual lust means (The same reference).

So, we will consider how Soviet textual critics transformed the substance of the text of art for ideological reasons. It is necessary to say that nowadays this tradition is going on in Russian literature as well (Ostrovskaya *et al.*, 2015). Firstly, in Soviet times on a wave of the general anticlerical orientation the language units with a religious component were actively improved the following way: the title writing of religious lexicon was abolished (“Pan God, Wives Sepulchre, He who, etc.”). In N. Leskov’s Post-Soviet editions this feature of spelling is only partially restored. Such editing is the most widespread, in particular, V.N. Zakharov testifies to it in relation to F.M. Dostoyevsky’s texts: “Abolition in the twenties of the title writing of religious lexicon has led to the loss of nuances of the sense, a game with word meanings: a capital letter is not only a sign of the culture and the history of language but text metaphysics.

Our Amilitant atheism” became militant ignorance” (Zakharov, 2009) as a part of the word a component concerning the church sphere was replaced (“bogodeystvie blagodeystvie”); the structure of the phraseological unit by ejection from its structure of the word with religious subject collapsed (“look at the light of God see the light”); owing to ignorance of the features of Church Slavonic language the church texts were corrected with many spelling mistakes (Woe unto the world from the “temptations, obache” mountain to the man, he is tempted to come? Woe unto the world from the “temptations, obache” mountain to the man, he is tempted to come). Secondly, owing to the general political orientation of life of Soviet person textual critics instead of explaining in notes the old meaning of the lexical unit having a pronounced political connotation in the Soviet Union this unit was replaced by the kindred from etymological point

of view and stylistically neutral word (“agitatsiya ? azhitatsiya”). The opposition of speech of the elite and the layers of general public, the application of methods of conscious simplification of speech and even premeditated use of the “low” style was and is now the characteristic of various levels of society and some characters become nominal such as Jane Psaki, Ksyusha Sobchak whose speech behavior becomes the object of jokes. Deliberate style decrease which Tatyana Tolstaya uses to a certain degree continues N. Leskov’s traditions in the description of life of ordinary Russian (Ostrovskaya *et al.*, 2015).

Thirdly, Soviet ideological editing is connected not only with the political sphere but also with ethical, in particular, during Soviet times it was forbidden to mention and discuss publicly the subjects connected with sex and therefore at the explanation in comments of lexical units the “undesirable” information (“konfortativnyiy”) was left. Later in comments of 1989 and 1999 textual critics followed the path of the least opposition and just noncritically borrowed the material from the earlier source (Kimmage, 1998). At the same time, recently the questions of “the search of an ideal”, intimate relations are actualized both in the world and in Russian literature of present times (Karabulatova *et al.*, 2015) where purely physiological desires of a person are on the foreground. If in the 19th century such physiology was a prerogative of men-writers, then in the 21st century such accentuation on physiology of love, sex became a characteristic feature of art creativity of women (Khachmafova *et al.*, 2015). Thus, we can say about the evolution of the Russian style in literature.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, posthumous ideological editing of N. Leskov’s texts of art during Soviet times is not obvious: separate lexical and phraseological units are here and there refreshed but when the material is collected together, it is visible how the work was purposefully conducted. As the material shows, Post-Soviet editions of N. Leskov’s texts of art did not get rid of consequences of ideological editing: it is impossible to no critically use even the texts of N. Leskov’s “Complete works which is published since 1996 in 30 volumes” (now there were 12 volumes) which applies for academism, non-critically because in this edition the publications from Leskov’s “Collected works in 11 volumes” of 1956-1958 which is completely subordinated to ideological editing of Soviet times are taken as the basis of some works.

REFERENCES

- Chukovsky, K.I., 2014. High Art Principles of the Literary Translation: Alphabet. Azbuka-Attikus. SPb, California, USA., Pages: 448.
- Dyachenko, G., 2001. The Full Church Slavonic Dictionary. Publishing Department of the Moscow Patriarchy, Moscow, Russia, Pages:1120.
- Gak, V.G., and K.A. Ganshina, 1998. The New French-Russian Dictionary. Russian-German Dictionary for Architecture, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 1195.
- Gilazov, T.S., I.S. Karabulatova, F.S. Sayfulina, C.M. Kurakova, and G.M. Talipova, 2015. Between the east and the west-phenomenon of tartar literary criticism in the lingvo-cultural aspect. *Mediterr. J. Soc. Sci.*, 6: 508-517.
- Grishunin, A.L., 1998. Research Aspects of Textual Criticism. Heritage Publisher, Delhi, India, Pages: 416.
- Karabulatova, I.S., 2013. The problems of linguistic modeling of new Eurasian linguistic personality in multilinguistic and mental environment (by example of onomasphere). *Middle-East J. Sci. Res.*, 17: 791-795.
- Karabulatova, I.S., Z.R. Khachmafova, M.M. Bricheva, T.T. Nescheretova and A.K. Bersirova, 2015. Linguo-pragmatic aspect of "Search for the ideal" in the discourse of female fiction as a reflection of matrimonial-demographic and sexual behavior in contemporary Russian society. *Rev. Eur. Stud.*, 7: 35-45.
- Khachmafova, Z.R., I.S. Karabulatova, S.A. Lyausheva, E.N. Luchinskaya and G.V. Osipov, 2015. Gender features of discourse in women's literature as a reflection of changes in the modern society. *Mediterr. J. Social Sci.*, 6: 476-481.
- Kimmage, D., 1988. Open stacks in a closed society? Glasnost in soviet libraries; Part one of two. *Am. Libraries*, 19: 570-575.
- Leskov, N.S., 1889. *Ostrovityane*. Vol. 10, A.S. Souvenirs Printing House, Davao, Philippines, Pages: 219.
- Lewis, B.E., 1977. Soviet taboo. *Eur. Asia Stud.*, 29: 603-606.
- Ostrovskaya, T.A., I.S. Karabulatova, Z.R. Khachmafova, S.A. Lyausheva and G.V. Osipov, 2015. The discourse of the russian elite in the ERA of Liquid modernity as a problem of ethnic, social and cultural security. *Mediterr. J. Social Sci.*, 6: 147-154.
- Zakharov, V.N., 2009. Textual Criticism as The Technology Â: Problems of Textual Criticism. In: *Problems of Textual Criticism of the Novels*, Dostoyevsky, F.M. (Ed.). Petrgu's Publishing House, Petrozavodsk, Russia, pp: 3-26.