Idyllic and Chaotic Chronotopes as Spatiotemporal Basis of *The Squabble* by N. Gogol

Anna Pavelieva
Department of Germanic Philology and Translation
National University "Yuri Kondratyuk Poltava Polytechnic"
Pershotravnevyj Ave. 24, Poltava, 36011, Ukraine
Email: kunsite.zi@gmail.com

Abstract The article considers idyllic and chaotic chronotopes as the spatio-temporal basis of "The Squabble" or "The Tale of How Ivan Ivanovich Quarreled with Ivan Nikiforovich" written by Russian-Ukrainian writer Nikolai Gogol. This short story, being the last one in the cycle "Mirgorod" is one of the most interesting ones as for chronotopical organization. The terms "chaotic chronotope" and "idyllic chronotope" are used in the article as specific spatio-temporal items, which form the chronotopical basis of the short-story and its plot-line. These two kinds of time and space combination are considered as the main ones in the whole cycle "Mirgorod." Therefore, the author analyses socio-historical and chronicle-everyday chronotopes, mythological, cyclical, daily, calendar, socio-historical time; loci of the church, the puddle, the steppe space, chronotopic images of the house, wattle fence, the local court, the motive of food, spatial and temporal oppositions "present / past," "external / internal space," "closed / open space"; the sound filling of the space and its changes with the developing of the plot. The author also proves that the doings of the main characters are reflected at the spatial level and have spatial consequences and examines the author's and the narrator's points of view on the unravelling of the plot.

Keywords chronotope; time; space; locus; motive

Author **Anna Pavelieva,** Candidate of Philological Sciences, is the Associate Professor of the Department of Germanic Philology and Translation at National University "Yuri Kondratyuk Poltava Polytechnic." Her main research interests are: world literature, literary theory, literary history, linguistics, translation and interpretation studies.

Introduction

Spatiotemporal organization of Gogol's literary works is always complex and usually consists of a combination of different types of space, time, chronotopes (interfusion of time and space), spatial and temporal motives.

The spatial image of Ukraine is the main character of the first cycles by Nikolai Gogol. Accordingly, spatio-temporal framework of all his works is extremely important for the structure of the whole cycles in general and of every short-story in particular. Besides, in Gogol's works, time and space are always closely connected with the system of characters and with the so-called "author's" and "narrator's points of view" on unravelling of the plot.

"The Tale of How Ivan Ivanovich Quarreled with Ivan Nikiforovich" (from this point onward—"THIIQWIN" for short), published in 1835, is the final tale in the "Mirgorod" collection of short-stories, written by Russian-Ukrainian writer Nikolai Gogol. It is known as one of his most humorous stories.

The object of research is the spatio-temporal organization of the most controversial and unusual short-story of the second cycle by Nikolai Gogol "Mirgorod'—"The Squabble" or "The Tale of How Ivan Ivanovich Quarreled with Ivan Nikiforovich."

The goal of research is to consider the structure of the main chronotopes of the mentioned literary work—the "idyllic" and the "chaotic" ones as the spatio-temporal basis of the short-story, as well as other types of space, time, loci chronotopic images, chronotopic motives and temporal oppositions; the sound filling of the space and its changes with the developing of the plot, the interrelation between these chronotopes and the characters.

The Idyll and Its Destruction Reflected on Spatiotemporal Level

The terms "chaotic chronotope" and "idyllic chronotope" we use in this article as antonyms, taking as a basis the judgment of Yu. M. Lotman. According to the researcher, in this short-story "Mirgorod, overcome with egoism, *ceased to be space*—it fell apart into separate particles and became chaos" (Lotman 643). Thus, if "idyllic" chronotope is, to our opinion, single-piece, wholesome, harmonious space and the time of love, friendship and mutual understanding, then "chaotic" chronotope, respectively, is fractured, fragmented space and time of hostility, pettiness, egoism and heartsinking.

The idyllic chronotope in the tale "THIIQWIN" has similarities with space-time in the short-story by Nikolai Gogol "Old World Landowners," where Tovs-

toguby's estate is the patriarchal world, "our own," idyllic space of love and understanding. Such is the space of Mirgorod in the tale "THIIQWIN" before the two friends split up—it is also "our own," harmonious space, the space of friendship.

Ivan Nikiforovich's house is small in size and is similar to those houses that the narrator described with tenderness in the tale about Afanasy Ivanovich Tovstogub and his wife, Pulkheria Ivanovna: "In front of the house was a pretty porch with a roof supported by two oak posts—unreliable protection from the sun, which at that season in Little Russia doesn't joke but leaves the walker streaming with hot sweat from head to foot" (Pevear 142). I. A. Poplavskaya indicates the similarity of the Tovstogubov's house and the houses of the two Ivans, noting that the spatial vector in the image of the house receives mainly centrifugal orientation, that "in the language of artistic topography can express the dialectics of personal and suprapersonal imperatives, which largely determine the behavior of the main characters of "Mirgorod" cycle" (Poplavskaya 43).

When depicting space, the author uses the point of view of the narrator and the so-called literary device—"the narrator's mask": "A wonderful man, Ivan Ivanovich! What a house he's got in Mirgorod!." The impression of the city of Mirgorod is formed not by its history, its residents, etc., but by Gogol's ironic remarks about the buildings in it: "A wonderful town, Mirgorod! What buildings it has! And with thatch, or rush, or even wooden roofs; a street to the right, a street to the left, excellent wattle fences everywhere; hops twine over them, pots hang on them, from behind them the sunflower shows it sunlike head, poppies redden, fat pumpkins flash… Magnificent! A wattle fence is always adorned with objects that make it still more picturesque: a hanging apron, or a shift, or balloon trousers" (Pevear 151).

Unlike the stories which make up the cycle "Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka," in which Gogol briefly characterized the heroes with the help of several felicitous remarks, in the collection of stories "Mirgorod" (in particular, in the tales "Old World Landowners," "Taras Bulba," "The Tale of How Ivan Ivanovich Quarreled with Ivan Nikiforovich") the images of the characters are revealed mainly through spatio-temporal characteristics, for example, through the space of the house. V. Sh. Krivonos justly notes that Gogol's county characters and the county town ("uyezd" in Russian—the chief town of a district) are so reflected in each other that they form a truly unique unity of a man and a place (Krivonos 182).

The House Motive in "The Tale of How Ivan Ivanovich Quarreled with Ivan Nikiforovich"

The chronotope of the house is an indispensable component of the idyllic chrono-

tope in the early prose of Nikolai Gogol. Describing the space of the house in the "THIIQWIN," the author, as in his "Old World Landowners," gives an indirect description of the owners of these buildings. "What we perceive as the furniture and its elements is originally a character" (Freidenberg 181). Pleasant impression of the characters is created by the writer even before they appear on the pages of the short stories. The characters of the story and the narrator like not the man himself, not Ivan Ivanovich as a person, but the house first and, as a result, its owner. So, for example, the author emphasizes that "the late judge of Mirgorod always looked at Ivan Ivanovich's house with admiration," and the narrator remarks admiringly: "Yes, it's not a bad little house at all." It is symbolic that the description of the hero's house and garden in the last story of Gogol's second cycle begins and ends with an exclamation: "A wonderful man, Ivan Ivanovich!"

The house motive is one of the key motives in this literary work. In the chronotopic world model of romantic writers, the space of the house is endowed with special emotional, value-based and symbolic meaning. Examining the image of the landowner's house in Gogol's literary works, Russian researcher V. F. Pereverzev noted that the estate and the house reflected the character of its owner to the smallest features (Pereverzev 95). In Gogol's short stories a house is not only the spatial embodiment of its owner, the "face" of Ivan Ivanovich or Ivan Nikiforovich. Traditionally, it is a symbol of shelter, refuge, fortress. Ivan Ivanovich hides in the house after he has secretly ruined Ivan Nikiforovich's goose pen: "Grabbing his saw, terribly frightened, he went running home and threw himself on his bed" (Pevear 150). And after an unsuccessful attempt at reconciliation, Ivan Ivanovich "locked himself up in his house" for a whole month, as he is afraid of his former comrade's revenge. But he is in fear of not bodily harm, not verbal abuse, not meanness, but he has a dread of destruction of his house: "He fancied that Ivan Nikiforovich's entire household had gathered […] they were all coming to devastate and destroy his house" (Pevear 150). Ivan Ivanovich even in a lawsuit expressed his fear that Ivan Nikiforovich allegedly "nurses in his heart the wicked intention of setting fire to me in my own house" (Pevear 154).

Both the house and the courtyard of Ivan Ivanovich make idyllic impression. However, the narrator is fascinated even by his magnificent garden: "What apples and pears he's got right under his windows! Just open the window—the branches burst into the room. That's all in front of the house; but you should see what he's got in his garden!" (Pevear 137). With the help of the literary device of recitation, the narrator gives the impression of "density," the tightness of space, its saturation with trees, buildings, etc.: "What hasn't he got in it! Plums, cherries, black cherries, all

kinds of vegetables, sunflowers, cucumbers, melons, beans—even a threshing floor and a smithy" (137).

The reader perceives the second hero of the story through the prism of characteristics of Ivan Ivanovich: "Ivan Nikiforovich is also a very good man. His yard is next to Ivan Ivanovich's yard. Never yet has the world produced such friends as they are with each other" (Pevear 138).

Chronotopic Charactetistics of the Main Characters

The images of heroes are revealed by the author through chronotopic images of the house, garden, wattle, county town. At the same time, it seems that Ivan Nikiforovich is just as good a man only because his yard is located next to the yard of Ivan Ivanovich.

It is noteworthy that Ivan Nikiforovich's yard is presented by the narrator in a completely different way than the yard of his friend-neighbor, without admiration. In the territory belonging to Ivan Nikiforovich everything acquires the features of some randomness, his yard was "a colorful mixture of Indian pigeons, fed by Ivan Nikiforovich's own hand, melon and watermelon rinds, an occasional green patch, an occasional broken wheel or barrel hoop, or an urchin lying about in a dirty shirt—a picture such as painters love! The shadow of the hanging clothes covered almost the whole yard and lent it a certain coolness" (Pevear 141). This spatial disharmony gives the reader cognitive dissonance, ruins the enjoyment of the external idyllic character of Migorod as a whole and the friends' yards in particular.

In the "Mirgorod" cycle, the "encirclement" of a character with household items, things, and spatial landmarks is a special literary device. Gogol scholar A. M. Dokusov rightly observes that in order to create a full-blooded, life-truthful character, Gogol "attaches" a person to everyday life, to that small world that surrounds him. "The external conditions of each character are reproduced by him to the finest details. These smallest details of daily life, dwelling, furnishings, clothes, etc., make up integral part of Gogol's literary images, its integral element,"—the researcher writes (Dokusov 20). It can be said that Gogol's heroes densely "grow" into space, harmoniously complement it and correspond to their spatial environment. Also, the space characterizes the hero. In a broad sense, a man and the world in Gogol's early prose are inseparable and intercomplementary.

The distinguishing characteristic of space of Mirgorod in the "THIIQWIN" is that it has specific character. This is an animate county town with a square, a local court and yards hedged off with wattle fences. The narrator, who is obviously a native of Mirgorod, describes his hometown in detail. For example, the lane between

the yards of two friends does not play a significant role in the narrative. However, the narrator mentions that this lane was "so narrow that if two carts, each drawn by one horse, chanced to meet in it, they'd be unable to pass each other and would stay in that position until they were seized by the rear wheels and pulled in opposite directions back out to the street. And a passer-by on foot would get himself adorned, as if with flowers, with the burrs that grew along the fences on both sides" (Pevear 141). A distinctive feature of this space is its narrowness. Similar lanes are typical of county (district) towns of the beginning of the nineteenth century. But the author does not accidentally mention such a spatial feature of this lane. Gogol emphasizes the proximity of Mirgorod's inhabitants, their awareness of each other's life. In this provincial town, news spreads at lightning speed. "Hard though they tried to conceal the matter in court, by the next day the whole of Mirgorod knew that Ivan Ivanovich's sow had stolen Ivan Nikiforovich's petition" (Pevear 163). Thanks to the animals—a brown sow and dogs—the district locus of Mirgorod takes on the meaning of "wildness." According to the modern researcher, the most important property of this fragmented space is ontological emptiness (in the sense of human presence), which is identical to not-being, nothingness, because in Mirgorod it is easier to meet animals than people (Krivonos 183).

And yet, despite some typicality of this district town, Gogol's Mirgorod is peculiar. "The houses, big and small," the building of the local court, a puddle in the middle of the square and dogs—these are its main spatial references. "Ivan Ivanovich got dressed, took his blackthorn in case of dogs, because in Mirgorod you meet more of them than of people in the streets, and went" (Pevear 141). With this small sentence, the author masterfully turns Mirgorod from an ordinary Little Russian county town into an amazing city, unlike any other in the world, even if only by the number of dogs living in it.

The idyllic space of Mirgorod is characterized by special sound filling. The barking of numerous dogs, as a feature of the rural space, does not irritate the ear at all. The author emphasizes that in there even meat products are special. So, the judge, talking with the secretary, mentions how he was treated to balyk [cured fillet of beef]. "A balyk—one of a kind! Yes, not like our balyk, which"—here the judge clucked his tongue and smiled, while his nose sniffed from his usual snuffbox—which our Mirgorod grocery treats us to" (Pevear 152).

Substitution of Traditional Value Orientations on the Spatial Level

Gogol creates the image of a quiet provincial town, where "there is neither thievery nor crookery," and in which live friends, similar to whom the world has never

produced. In this ideal, at first glance, space, not only people are goodly and pretty, but also the buildings and even the puddle on the city square. "When you get to the square, you're sure to stop for a while and admire the view: there is a puddle in it, an astonishing puddle! the only one like it you'll ever chance to see! It takes up almost the whole square. A beautiful puddle! The houses, big and small, which from afar might be taken for haystacks, stand around marveling at its beauty" (Pevear 151). Since in this short story the depicted space is the birthplace of the storyteller who lives far from his native places and recalls them with warm feelings and tenderness, this space is presented as "his own," close to his heart and spirit. The narrator admires the world of Mirgorod, but for the author it is the symbol of deadlock and wasteland. When Gogol clarifies that the police chief tenderly calls this puddle a "lake," there is clear irony in his words. Taking into account the description of the puddle and the like, some researchers (V. Sh. Krivonos, V. Schukin) talk about the "meaninglessness" of Mirgorod space, which serves as the embodiment of soullessness and absurdity (Krivonos 181, Schukin 64).

We believe that the author does not accidentally mention this puddle in such an ironic context. After all, a puddle (micro-swamp) in Slavic mythology acted as a haven for evil spirits. In Gogol's short story, this "micro-swamp" together with the local court (the court is a symbol of labyrinth) takes the place of the church, which should tower in the city square, but nothing is said about its location in Mirgorod and its architecture. The local court, on the contrary, is described carefully and in detail and gives the impression of the most beautiful building in the city, on the site of which, again, the church should have risen. Yet at the beginning of the story, Gogol with irony mentions "what a pious man Ivan Ivanovich is!" This remark receives meaningful continuation when Ivan Ivanovich, who attends church on Sundays, and Ivan Nikiforovich, whose piety is not mentioned at all, become frequent visitors of the court. Instead of going to church and repenting, the heroes go to court and exacerbate their quarrel. As in the short-story "Viy," the spatial and value substitution of the church with a court and a puddle shows the collapse of the world order, the loss of spiritual values, and implies that the heroes position themselves incorrectly not only in physical space, but also in spiritual, ethical and moral ones. A weak glimmer of hope is the meeting of the narrator with Ivan Ivanovich and Ivan Nikiforovich in the church at the end of the short story. However, even in consecrated space, in a sainted place, many years on, the heroes think only of their lawsuit and revenge, which drives the narrator into despondency and sorrowful reflections: "It's dull in this world, gentlemen!." It is no coincidence that the author ends the tale with a meeting in the church, underlining that "the

quarrel between the two characters loses any sense against the background of destructive effect of time" (Poplavskaya 48).

The Symbolism of Mirgorod

In "The Tale of How Ivan Ivanovich Quarreled with Ivan Nikiforovich" the name of the city itself is symbolic. After all, the idyllic nature of this space is already evidenced by the fact that the two friends mentioned in the short-story live in MIR-gorod (in direct translation from Russian the name of the city will be "the Peace-city"). Here, all issues should be resolved, judging by the name of the city, peacefully, out of court. The police chief agrees not to take Ivan Ivanovich's sow to the police as a violator of order in exchange for sausages with pork blood and fat, the city folk try to reconcile the two friends, who had broken up, and the lawsuit was not put into action, so as not to harm anyone. M. Ya. Weisskopf traces the etymology of Gogol's Mirgorod to Mir-gorod (the translation of the word "Jerusalem" used by a famous Ukrainian philosopher G. S. Skovoroda). So, the researcher mentions that in Skovoroda's works one effects an ascent of a mountain "from meanness to the mountain [...] from sow pools to mountain springs" (Weisskopf 215). Accordingly, in his opinion, Gogol's realities came from Skovoroda's works—a sow and a puddle, and Gogol gives the place of the mountain Zion to the church, to which the main characters go on Sundays, "as if mimicking the eternal friends-travelers from Skovoroda's works." Thus M. Ya. Weisskopf believes that Gogol sets *the conversation about peace* in opposition to *the story of a quarrel* (Weisskopf 216*)*. V. Sh. Krivonos also considers that Gogol's Mirgorod "does not become a true city-world (in the meaning of "well-organized human world") in Gogol's tales (Krivonos 179).

It is worthy of note that "cracks" are noticeable in the idyllic space of Gogol's Mirgorod, as contrasted with the idyllic old-world estate, from the very beginning of the short story. It seems that chaotic chronotope in "The Tale of How Ivan Ivanovich Quarreled with Ivan Nikiforovich" at first "puts on" an idyllic mask in order to manifest itself later with even greater tragedy. V. Sh. Krivonos has a theory that when creating the image of Mirgorod, Gogol does not resort to chronicles, but to the utmost generalization, which "reveals the properties of an ontologically abnormal world inherent in a county town" (Krivonos 178).

The idyllic space of Mirgorod in the times of friendship of the two Ivans is uninterrupted and even. It is not separated even by the wattle, which in this case is not the usual border between the internal ("ours") and external ("alien") space, as, for example, in Gogol's short story "Old World Landowners." This is a decorative element of space. "Excellent wattle fences everywhere; hops twine over them,

pots hang on them, from behind them the sunflower shows it sunlike head, poppies redden, fat pumpkins flash… Magnificent!" (Pevear 151) The author underlines the fact that this wattle fence delights the eye, as it is always adorned with objects that make it still more picturesque: a hanging apron, or a shift, or balloon trousers. And, as there is neither thievery nor crookery, everybody hangs up whatever he likes on those wattle fences.

The last phrase explains not only the location of borders in Mirgorod, but also the nature of relationship between its inhabitants. There is no crime in this ideal little world, so the wattle is not necessary, it neither protects nor preserves, but is only a formality, the illusion of separation of this single idyllic world order.

Before the quarrel between the two friends, the low wattle fence between their yards was not considered as a border. They could visit each other, stepping over it, instead of going around the street. Being in his own yard, one character can see what is going on in the yard of another one: "Ivan Ivanovich fell to thinking; and meanwhile his eyes sought new objects, stepped over the fence into Ivan Nikiforovich's yard, and involuntarily became occupied with a curious spectacle" (Pevear 140).

The wattle fence in this short story loses its usual delimiting and separating function. On the contrary, it seems that in the "The Tale of How Ivan Ivanovich Quarreled with Ivan Nikiforovich" before the quarrel of two friends, the wattle fence "sews" the space, connects the yards in Mirgorod. After the quarrel, the wattle fence as a part of space begins to perform a different function. So, when Ivan Ivanovich decided to go to his neighbor for a gun, he did not climb over the wattle fence, but went around, over the street, despite all the inconveniences associated with it: dogs and burdocks growing on the roadside. Nevertheless, going through all the formalities of the official visit, he, fittingly, entered the friend's yard through the gate.

Destruction of Idyllic Space of Mirgirod

The quarrel between Ivan Ivanovich and Ivan Nikiforovich destroyed not only friendly, good-neighborly relations between the characters, but also "fragmented" the idyllic space of Mirgorod. Dissonances in space appear immediately after the quarrel between friends: Ivan Ivanovich left the house of Ivan Nikiforovich, "slamming the door behind him, which creaked hoarsely and opened again" (Pevear 147). That is, the sound component of space was "mistuned" as soon as it passed from the category of idyllic ("friendly") to chaotic ("hostile") space.

After the quarrel the town came apart. "Everything looked different now: if a

neighboring dog happened to get into the yard, it was beaten with whatever came to hand; the children who climbed over the fence came back screaming, their shirts tucked up, with traces of a birching on their backsides" (Pevear 149). The wattle fence has become an inviolable border that could not be trespassed: "Ivan Ivanovich saw the woman already setting her foot on the wattle fence, intending to climb into his yard, when Ivan Nikiforovich's voice suddenly rang out: "Come back! come back! never mind!" (Pevear 148) The situation has reached the stage of absurdity. The namesakes redivided not only the land between their yards, but also the steppe space. So, Ivan Nikiforovich began to fault the neighbor for the fact that his oxen grazed not on his territory: "Your oxen graze on my steppe, and I've never once borrowed them from you. When you go to Poltava, you always ask for the loan of my cart, and what—did I ever refuse? Children from your yard climb over the fence into mine and play with my dogs, and I say nothing: let them play, so long as they don't touch anything! let them play!" (Pevear 144) The behavior of the character (Ivan Nikiforovich), according to V. Sh. Krivonos, represents the structure of the place with which he merges. "The fragmented space is mythologically identified with the essence of the character, imposing on him both a lifestyle and a style of behavior, action pattern,"—the researcher writes (Krivonos 182). The characters become petty and, accordingly, the space surrounding them fractionizes and disintegrates, and time becomes ruthless to them. After the quarrel between two friends, "a person's living space narrows to his yard, his house, and in the final reckoning—to his lonely, unwanted, useless and uninteresting personality" (Nikolaev 175).

In the finale of the short-story, the space of Mirgorod appears from the words of the narrator to be fragmented and destroyed: "Some sort of unnatural green—the creation of dull, ceaseless rains—covered the fields and meadows with a thin net, which was as becoming as pranks to an old man or roses to an old woman. […] I hadn't seen Mirgorod for twelve years. Here, in touching friendship, there had then lived two singular men, two singular friends. And how many notable people had died! The judge Demyan Demyanovich was dead by then; Ivan Ivanovich, the one with the blind eye, had also bid the world farewell. I drove into the main street; poles with bunches of straw tied to their tops stood everywhere: some new project was under way! Several cottages had been demolished. The remnants of palings and wattle fences stuck up dejectedly" (Pevear 171). Even the church, despite the feast day, was empty. Moreover, the author points out that the church was gloomy, obscure and sombre. It vaguely resembles the dark temple from another Gogol's short-story—"Viy": "The church was empty. Almost no people. One could see that even the most pious were afraid of the mud. The candles in that bleak, or, better to say,

sickly daylight, were somehow strangely unpleasant; the dark vestibule was melancholy; the oblong windows with round glass poured down rainy tears" (Pevear 171). Perhaps, after the church in the estate of the Cossack chief in the short story "Viy," this is the darkest image of the church in Gogol's cycles "Evenings on a Farm Near Dikanka" and "Mirgorod." Such a decrease in sacredness, when the church is depicted almost as a utility-type building (which is unusual of Russian literature) symbolizes the moral lapse, spiritual and moral descent of the characters, the deformation of their inner (spiritual) space, which should be filled with love and forgiveness. The image of the church in the short story is the new "face" of Mirgorod, its new appearance "in bad times." In broken-down, fragmented space, even the temple of God cannot resist this meaningless enmity; it also changes and necrotizes with the inhabitants of Mirgorod and former comrades. Here not only the church, but even the nature itself is gloomy, and for the first time in Gogol's cycles the sky was "tearful and without a bright spot." In the view of I. A. Esaulov, the feast day turns into "boring" and "sickly," the windows of the church "poured down rainy tears," and the sky was "tearful and without a bright spot" as a result of breaking the gospel-precepts (Yesaulov 76).

Spatio-Temporal Characteristics of the Short Story

Thus, spatio-temporal relations play an important role in characterizing the two friends that are represented in the plot time before the quarrel and after it, as well as in the space of their "small yards" and "small houses." In addition, their disagreement is also presented in the chronotopic way. Ivan Ivanovich is outraged at the fact that this pen, repulsive to him, "was built with devilish speed—in a single day." It is also noteworthy that this goose pen appeared at the place where former friends used to climb over the wattle fence: "Finally, to crown all the insults, his hateful neighbor had a goose pen built directly facing him, where they used to climb over the wattle fence, as if with the special purpose of aggravating the insult" (Pevear 149) [In Ukraine, goose pen is a metaphorical phrase for the earth closet].

Ivan Ivanovich's revenge is also expressed with the help of spatial characteristics. He does not verbally respond to his former friend but destroys the odious goose pen. Due to the quarrel between two Mirgorod residents, not only they themselves suffer, but the space belonging to hem also changes.

Human relations in this short story are revealed through spatial characteristics, or rather through the objects filling it: a house, goose pen, a wattle fence, etc. Destroyed buildings symbolize the breakdown of relations and broken destinies of the characters, and spatial barriers—wattle fence, building-up of the border between the

yards of the two neighbors symbolize the breach in relations of old friends, fragmentation of feelings, the decay of space, chaos. The space of Mirgorod was divided into "ours"—the one in which this or that character was located, and "alien" space, in which his foe appeared. Former friends did not want to be in the same place: "It's already two years, God bless us, since they quarreled with each other […] and where the one is, the other won't go for anything!" (Pevear 165)

Calendar Time in "The Tale of How Ivan Ivanovich Quarreled with Ivan Nikiforovich"

In his short story Gogol clearly indicates calendar time—July 7, 1810. It should be noted that this is the first tale, in which the author accurately indicated the date, important for the narrative. However, readers and critics, keen on the twists and turns of litigation, lose the sight of it. But this is the mystical feast of Ivan Kupala, known in Christian tradition as the day of John the Baptist. As in the short-story "St. John's Eve," decisive events that influenced the future life of the characters occurred on this day. Mind you, there calendar time does not have such mystical significance as in "St. John's Eve," but nevertheless, we think that the author did not accidentally choose this day. Using accurate dating the author creates the illusion of "truthiness." Its main function is to present the described events as those that really took place in the life of the narrator and in the history of Mirgorod. In addition, this textual detail has its own semantic implication: two Ivans quarreled on a holy day, moreover, on the day of their namesake—John (Ivan), because "the significance expressed in the character's name and, therefore, in its metaphorical essence, unfolds in the action that makes up the motive ..." (Freidenberg 223).

With the help of exact dating and some things filling the space, it is possible to restore the historical time of the short story. So, an expensive iron gun, which became an apple of discord between two friends, was bought by Ivan Nikiforovich about twenty years ago, when he "some twenty years before, when he was preparing to join the militia and even let his mustache grow" (Pevear 140). If we take twenty years from 1810, we will get 1790, and it becomes clear why Ivan Nikiforovich did not become a military man. By decree of Catherine the Great in 1791, Zaporozhian Host was destroyed, and this, apparently, hindered Ivan Nikiforovich's military career. His cossack past is evidenced by the outfit and a gun, which were hanged on the line for airing: "an old uniform top with frayed cuffs spread its sleeves in the air and embraced a brocade jacket, after which another stuck itself out, a gentleman's, with armorial buttons and a moth-eaten collar," "a dark blue Cossack beshmet," "a sword […] looking like a steeple sticking up in the air" and "an ancient saddle

with torn-off stirrups, scuffed leather holsters for pistols, a saddle blanket once of a scarlet color, with gold embroidery and bronze plaques" and, finally, his nankeen balloon trousers (Pevear 140). These nankeen balloon trousers are not only the symbol of Ivan Nikiforovich's Cossack past, historical past of Ukraine, but also emblematize bravery. Accordingly, antithesizing the characters of the two friends, the narrator admits that "Ivan Ivanovich is of a somewhat timorous character; Ivan Nikiforovich, on the contrary, has such wide gathered trousers that, if they were inflated, the whole yard with its barns and outbuildings could be put into them" (Pevear 139). All the things filling the space of two friends' "small yards" play an important role in the short-story. V. N. Toporov rightly points out that "Gogol gave things an opportunity to talk about themselves, without referring to the authority of a man ..." (Toporov 101), and G. N. Pospelov emphasizes that, thanks to similar descriptions in this story, the reader has a vivid idea of not only household items, "but (and most importantly!) of people who own these items" (Pospelov 139). The tight, intimate connection of things with their owners in Gogol's literary works was also noted by V. F. Pereverzev (Pereverzev 95). Undoubtedly, the objects filling Ivan Ivanovich's yard, and the objects which are hanged on the line for airing in Ivan Nikiforovich's yard, carry important semantic charge. This is purely Gogolian use of the literary device of aposiopesis: without the help of author's comments, the reader can make very reliable suppositions about the past of the two neighbors, about their characters, morals, and habits.

Daytime in this short story is presented as ordinary, while in depiction of night time, Gogol traditionally highlights the charm of the night, and his prose text takes on poetic character: "Oh, if I were a painter, I would wondrously portray all the loveliness of the night! I would portray how all Mirgorod lies sleeping; how countless stars gaze motionlessly down on it; how the visible silence resounds with the near and far-off barking of dogs; how the amorous beadle races past them and climbs over the fence with chivalrous fearlessness; how the white walls of houses enveloped in moonlight turn still whiter, the trees above them turn darker, the shadow of the trees falls blacker, the flowers and hushed grass grow more fragrant, and the crickets, indefatigable cavaliers of the night, with one accord begin their chirping songs in all corners.…" (Pevear 149-150). The picturesque night—the time of sleep and rest—is described in romantic tones and tangibly resembles the "charming," "divine" night in the tale "May Night, or the Drowned Maiden," and the clergyman-sinner in it is somewhat similar to the priest Afanasy Ivanovich from the short-story "The Fair at Sorochyntsi," who also climbed over the wattle fence, like the amorous beadle from "The Tale of How Ivan Ivanovich Quarreled with Ivan Nikiforovich." "I would por-

tray how, in one of these low clay cottages, a dark-browed town girl with quivering young breasts tosses on her solitary bed dreaming of a hussar's mustache and spurs while moonlight laughs on her cheeks" (Pevear 150). This text fragment is relatable to the episodes from "Christmas Eve," in which the author depicts the appearance in Oksana's soul of tender feelings for the blacksmith Vakula.

Chronicle-everyday time prevails in the idyllic space of the short story. This is slow paced, restful, customary Mirgorod life. The main characteristic of chronicle-everyday time is its cyclical nature. Therefore, Ivan Ivanovich eats melons "*as soon as* he finishes dinner"; he *always* treats Gapka's children, who "*often* run about in the yard," to melons: Ivan Ivanovich "*always* gives each of them a bagel, or a slice of melon, or a pear." *Every Sunday* he puts on his bekesha and goes to church, where he "*usually* installs himself in the choir and sings along very well in a bass voice" (Pevear 137). The two friends *every day* used to "send to inquire after each other's health, and often talked with each other from their balconies, and said such pleasant things to each other that it was a heart's delight to listen to them. On Sundays, Ivan Ivanovich in his thick woolen bekesha and Ivan Nikiforovich in a yellowbrown nankeen jacket *used to* go to church all but arm in arm" (Pevear 148) and etc.

It stands to mention, how often (29 times) Nikolai Gogol uses the adverbs of time "usually" and "always" and its derivatives. Ivan Ivanovich went out "as usual, to lie on the gallery," he *usually* had a word with beggars near the church, he "*usually* asks" them questions, he "*usually* replies" them and then "the old woman *usually* holds out her hand" and etc. Ivan Ivanovich had the "*usual* custom of going for a walk only in the evening." And if Ivan Nikiforovich "says an improper word in decent conversation," Ivan Ivanovich "*usually* gets up from his place and says:"Enough, enough, Ivan Nikiforovich, sooner take to the sunlight than speak such ungodly words. If Ivan Ivanovich "treats you to snuff, he *always* licks the lid of the snuff box with his tongue first." When Ivan Nikiforovich lies on the porch. he *usually* puts his back to the sun" (Pevear 139) and Anton Prokofievich Pupopuz "used to say that the devil himself had tied Ivan Nikiforovich and Ivan Ivanovich to each other with a piece of string" (Pevear 138) and etc. *Every day*, when the judge Demyan Demyanovich quarrels with his sister his mother uses the friendship between Ivan Ivanovich and Ivan Nikiforovich as an example.

And although in the first three paragraphs of the short-story the narration is conducted in the present tense, in Russian the narrator gradually switches to imperfective verbs in the past tense, preparing the reader for the fact that this idyll will soon be destroyed. Introducing the friends to the reader and characterizing Ivan Nikiforovich, Gogol hints at the forthcoming quarrel between two friends, which was

aptly rendered into English with the help of "would + infinitive" construction, which is used to describe past habits, things that happened regularly in the past but do not happen now: "In the old days, he *would sometimes* call on Ivan Ivanovich" (Pevear 139). The collocation "used to" is used repeatedly by the author in the third chapter of the short story in order to emphasize the dramatic change in the habits and affairs of two friends after their disagreement. The literary device of contrast creates painful impression: the narrator draws parallels between how "it used to be" before and how it became "now." Friendship of the two namesakes was considered in Mirgorod as the personification of stability, durability, permanence. The news of their enmity amazed the narrator so much that he asked disappointedly: "Is there anything solid left in this world?" (Pevear 148). According to V. Sh. Krivonos, the doings of the characters of the analyzable short story look strange and illogical for the storyteller, "who feels his identity with the mythological place that suddenly loses its intrinsic integrity as the world" (Pevear 181).

Temporal Organization of "The Tale of How Ivan Ivanovich Quarreled with Ivan Nikiforovich"

The organization of plot time in this short-story can be defined as "dotty." Unessential timepoints are omitted in it, as evidenced by the names of the chapters in which the author gives a brief summary of the main events depicted in them.

An important role in the short-story is played by the temporal opposition "past / present," in which the past is the time of friendship between the two Ivans, happy and carefree "idyllic" time, and the present is the dreary times of litigation and quarrel. The present time in this literary work is also cyclical. "The document was marked, recorded, assigned a number, filed, signed, all on one and the same day, and the case was put on a shelf, where it lay and lay and lay—a year, another, a third" (Pevear 164). A lot of things have changed in the city during this time: "A host of brides managed to get married; a new street was laid in Mirgorod; the judge lost a molar and two eyeteeth; Ivan Ivanovich had more kids running around the yard than ever—where they came from God only knows! Ivan Nikiforovich, to reprove Ivan Ivanovich, built a new goose pen, though a bit further away than the former one, and got himself completely built off from Ivan Ivanovich, so that these worthy people hardly ever glimpsed each other's faces—and the case went on lying, in the very best order, on the shelf, which ink blots had turned to marble" (Pevear 164). The above-mentioned details are depicted ironically, they cause a smile, but at the same time they emphasize that life goes on, while Ivan Ivanovich and Ivan Nikiforovich for two years have been doing the same thing—they are suing each other.

After an unsuccessful attempt to conciliate, everything went on in the usual way. Time flies for Mirgorod residents, everything changes, and even warring neighbors grow old. And only when Ivan Ivanovich received the news that a "case" would be decided tomorrow, he dared to leave the house. "Alas! since then, the court has informed him daily for the past ten years that the case would be concluded the next day!" (Pevear 171). The heroes wasted a whole decade on enmity. Every day, Ivan Ivanovich and Ivan Nikiforovich expect a court decision in their favor, and every day for them ends in disappointment.

As alleged by to I. A. Yesaulov, in the famous final phrase of the short story—"It's dull in this world, gentlemen!"—there is no longer any temporal dynamics and "all hope for time perspective is finally annihilated." The Mirgorod cycle "is crowned with an emotionally-static formula of world perception" (Yesaulov 74).

So, in "The Tale of How Ivan Ivanovich Quarreled with Ivan Nikiforovich" we can distinguish cyclical time ("usually"), calendar, daily, historical time of the Cossacks, but these types of literary time play a secondary role in the short story. The predominant types of the chronotopes in the short story are idyllic (the uninterrupted space of Mirgorod before the quarrel of two friends) and chaotic (the fragmented space of Mirgorod after their disagreement, that is, after July 7, 1810). Gogol depicted the chronicle-everyday chronotope of Mirgorod as typical of a Little Russian county town of the beginning of the nineteenth century.

Chronotopic images of the house, wattle fence, local court, as well as the images of a symbolic character, are the main components of the key motive of the story—the quarrel motive—and contribute to the depiction of the characters of Ivan Ivanovich and Ivan Nikiforovich. The attribute of historical time—the gun—becomes the deal breaker of friendly relations, and the quarrel itself has spatial consequences: the destruction of the goose pen, the seizure of land, the building-up of the border between the yards of two friends, the division of space into "friendly" and "hostile," the loss by Mirgorod of its spatial integrity and unity of the patriarchal world order.

Conclusion

The space-time in N. V. Gogol's short story "The Tale of How Ivan Ivanovich Quarreled with Ivan Nikiforovich" can be divided into two types. In the first two chapters it is the idyllic chronotope of a county town of the early 19th century. In the third–seventh chapters (starting from the moment of the quarrel between the characters, that is, from July 7, 1810), the nature of the chronotope changes: the idyllic chronotope is replaced by the chaotic one.

So, the plot-making, dominant forms of literary time and space are idyllic, chaotic, socio-historical chronotopes. An equally important role in the composition of the short-story is played by the chronicle-everyday chronotope, as well as mythological, cyclical, daily, calendar, socio-historical time; loci of the church, the puddle, the steppe space, chronotopic images of the house, wattle fence, the local court, the motive of food. The oppositions "present / past," "external / internal," "closed / open" space acquire special, symbolic significance in the structure of the text under consideration. The space is also characterized by specific sound filling and color scheme.

The author's usage of the idyllic and chaotic chronotopes is due to the plot features of the tale and the writer's intention to diversify the picture of life, to outline certain characters. Through the prism of spatio-temporal coordinates, Gogol conveys the psycho-emotional state of the characters, their moral character, the author's point of view on the events described, indirectly reflects the socio-historical processes taking place in society. Temporal and spatial milestones on the way of Gogol's heroes often have symbolic connotation, being the metonyms of a certain way and style of life, traditions and customs.

Works Cited

Dokusov A.M. *"Mirgorod" N. V. Gogol*. Lectures from the special course "N. V. Gogol" L., 1971.

Freidenberg O.M. *Poetics of the Plot and Genre*. M.: The Publishing House "Labyrinth", 1997.

Krivonos V.Sh. *Mythology of the Place in the District Stories of V. Odoyevsky and Gogol. N.V. Gogol and His Literary Environment*. M.: The Publishing House ANO "Firstpartner", 2008. pp. 177-186.

Lotman Yu.M. *Art space in Gogol's prose. About Russian literature*: Articles and studies (1958-1993). History of Russian prose. Theory of literature. SPb.: The Publishing House "Art-SPB", 1997. pp. 621-658.

Nikolaev B.I. *Organization of space in the "Ukrainian" stories of N. V. Gogol.* Gogol and modernity (on the 185th birthday). K.: The Publishing House "Rus'", 1994. pp. 170-175.

Pereverzev V. F. *Creativity of Gogol*. Ivanovo-Voznesensk: The Publishing House "The Basis", 1928.

Pevear R., Volokhonsky L. Gogol', Nikolaĭ Vasil'evich, 1809-1852. Translations into English. Random House; Reprint edition, 1999.

Poplavskaya I.A. *Poetic Principles in the Narrative Structure of "Mirgorod"*. Gogolovedenie studiï: vol. 17. Nizhyn: NDU named after. N.V. Gogol, 2008. pp. 42-54.

Pospelov G.N., Nikolaev P.A., Volkov I.F. *Time and space in literature. Introduction to literary criticism.* M.: The Publishing House "Higher School", 1983.

Schukin V.G. *Romantic Urbanism and Semantic Coordinates of Gogol's Urban Space.* Gogol as a Phenomenon of World Literature. M., 2003. pp. 61-66.

Silantyev V.I. *The Poetics of Space in the Works of N. V. Gogol, A. P. Chekhov and O. Mandelstam.* Gogol and Modernity (on the 185th birthday): K.: The Publishing House "Rus'", 1994. pp. 72-76.

Toporov V.N. *Thing in an Anthropocentric Perspective (Plyushkin's apology).* Myth. Ritual. Symbol. Image: Mythopoetic Studies: Favorites. M.: The Publishing House "Progress"— "Culture", 1995. pp. 7-112.

Weisskopf M.Ya. *Gogol's plot: Morphology. Ideology. Context*. M., 1993.

Yesaulov I.A. *The Image of Two Types of Apostasy in the Artistic Prose of N. V. Gogol (Mirgorod and Dead Souls).* The Category of Collegiality in Russian Literature. Petrozavodsk: The Publishing House of the Petrozavodsk University, 1995. pp. 61-82.