





This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

RECEPTION OF GOGOL ' IN ENGLISH-
LANGUAGE LITERARY CRITICISM: 1915-1991

presented by

MOONHWANG KIM

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D degree in Russian Literature

Munir Fouad

Major professor

Date 19 April 1994

LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
APR 12 2001 122100	_____	_____
JUN 07 2001 49807	_____	_____
MAR 17 2003 150	_____	_____
JAN 24 2005 080104	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

MSU Is An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

c:\circ\date\due.pm3-p.1

**RECEPTION OF GOGOL' IN ENGLISH-
LANGUAGE LITERARY CRITICISM: 1915-1991**

By

Moonhwang Kim

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Linguistics and Germanic, Slavic,
Asian and African Language

1994

ABSTRACT

RECEPTION OF GOGOL' IN ENGLISH- LANGUAGE LITERARY CRITICISM: 1915-1991

By

Moonhwang Kim

This dissertation consists of seven parts -- Introduction; Chapter One ("Gogol' in English-Language Literary Criticism (1915-1991): Shifts and Changes"); Chapter Two ("Annotated Bibliography of Major English-Language Criticism"); Conclusion (author's own criticism of criticism); Subject Index; Author Index; and Bibliography (recording 570 entries). Criticism has assiduously examined Gogol, as writer and human being, finding innumerable hitherto unexplored qualities of Gogol's craft, associating him with various "isms" (Romanticism, Symbolism, and Formalism); analyzing him within countless disciplines (psychology, philosophy, theology, linguistics, etc.); focusing on his personality (through themes of incest, necrophilia, homosexuality, impotence, anxiety, and fear); and juxtaposing him to other writers and artists, Russian and foreign. Religious approaches are also examined and credited for their contribution to the study of the relationship between Gogol's art and worldview. The dissertation concludes that criticism, despite slight Russian influence, has contributed new, substantive, remarkable, and lasting scholarship to Gogol, for its variety, depth and constant shifts and changes. Enumerated are many innovative approaches and methodologies, with psychological analyses receiving special mention for their originality and viability. The wealth of comparative criticism linking Gogol to numerous writers and poets bears witness to Gogol's eminent position in

world literature. The dissertation also examines the especially broad body of criticism of Gogol's poetics, discussing "internal elements" and stylistic devices of his literary skills -- thematic patterns, plot, structure, narrative devices ("skaz," picaresque, etc.), digressions (saturated with value judgments), vaudeville, imagery (metaphor, similes, and hyperbole, in particular), sound instrumentation, grotesque, absurdity, black humor, parody, satire, "reverse symbolism," intertextuality, a myriad of semantic virtuositities, and typification of characters. Criticism has discerned *Dead Souls* and *The Overcoat* as Gogol's most prominent accomplishments. The profusion and thoroughness of the criticism notwithstanding, a definitive interpretation of Gogol has not yet been produced.

Copyright by
MOONHWANG KIM
1994

To the memory of my father
who inspired in me dreams for higher education

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation and gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Munir Sendich, for his advice, guidance, suggestions, and encouragement throughout this study. His encouragement and belief in me will always be remembered. I wish also to express my sincere gratitude to the members of my committee, Dr. David Prestel, Dr. Frank Ingram, and Dr. Felix Raskolnikov. Without their corrections and comments, this final manuscript would not have been possible.

I am also indebted to my father and mother for their love, and their financial and spiritual support. I believe my father, who passed away on Nov. 25th 1993, shall be very proud of my achievement from Heaven.

Finally, I am deeply indebted to my wife, Mira, and my three children, David, Elizabeth, and Daniel. Along with the support of my three children, Mira's love, prayers, and encouragement made this goal a reality.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE: GOGOL' IN ENGLISH-LANGUAGE LITERARY CRITICISM (1915-1991): SHIFTS AND CHANGES	5
CHAPTER TWO: ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF MAJOR ENGLISH-LANGUAGE LITERARY CRITICISM: (1915-1991)	33
CONCLUSION	140
SUBJECT INDEX	157
AUTHOR INDEX	164
BIBLIOGRAPHY	166

INTRODUCTION

A definitive interpretation of Gogol' has never been reached, although a great variety of interpretations have appeared in the 150 years since his death. During the nineteenth century, Gogol' was considered to be a social observer or a realist, due mainly to the tremendous influence of Vissarion Belinskij. This idea was strongly supported by the social, political, and philosophical writings of Nikolaj Černyševskij, Nikolaj Dobroljubov, Dmitrij Pisarev, and Konstantin Aksakov in the years immediately following. In the twentieth century, many critics have explored Gogol', shedding light on innumerable unexplored aspects of Gogol's art, analyzing his works within various literary movements. Most English criticism has challenged Belinskij's views, producing significant shifts and changes in Gogol' criticism. This dissertation explores these shifts and changes, carefully examining criticism written in English from 1915 through 1991.

Chapter One of the dissertation focuses on how Gogol' has been interpreted by critics writing in English from 1915 through 1991, and how their critiques and views on Gogol' contributed to shifts and changes in Gogol' criticism. Chapter Two presents the most valuable English-language criticism as well as prominent Russian criticism, translated into English. I strived to maintain a strict objectivity while summarizing the contents of articles and books when making an exhaustive annotated bibliography of Gogol'. The annotated bibliography was divided into decades from the 1910s through the 1990s, then the entries were classified and numbered by alphabetical order within each decade. In the conclusion, my own comments on these shifts and changes from 1915 through 1991 are presented. The conclusion is followed by alphabetical subject and author indexes listing all

the titles, authors, and important subjects of Gogol's artistic world including poetics, stylistic devices, genres, and others. The bibliography at the end of the dissertation is the most extensive and comprehensive Gogol' bibliography (contains 570 entries) published to date, worldwide (Philip Frantz's *Gogol: A Bibliography*, published in 1989, contains only 351 entries).

In the process of searching, collecting, and compiling the bibliography, I have consulted the following bibliographic sources:

1. The American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies.
2. American Book Publishing Record.
3. Arts and Humanities Citation Index.
4. Australian Books in Print.
5. Book Review Digest.
6. British Humanities Index.
7. Canadian Periodical Index.
8. Canadian Theses.
9. Dissertation Abstracts International.
10. East European Languages and Literatures; A Subject and Name Index
to Articles in English Language Journals.
11. Humanities Index.
12. Index Book Review.
13. International Index to Periodicals.
14. MLA International Bibliography.
15. New York Times Index.
16. Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature.
17. Social Science and Humanities Index.

18. Twentieth Century Literary Criticism.

I have consulted Kate Turabian's *A Manual for Writers* in compiling bibliography, and followed the transliteration method of Thomas Shaw's transliteration system III:

А ---- a	Р ---- r
Б ---- b	С ---- s
В ---- v	Т ---- t
Г ---- g	У ---- u
Д ---- d	Ф ---- f
Е ---- e	Х ---- x
Ё ---- ё	Ц ---- c
Ж ---- ž	Ч ---- č
З ---- z	Ш ---- š
И ---- i	Щ ---- šč
Й ---- j	Ъ ---- "
К ---- k	Ы ---- y
Л ---- l	Ь ---- ' (soft sign)
М ---- m	Э ---- e
Н ---- n	Ю ---- ju
О ---- o	Я ---- ja
П ---- p	

This system is used consistently in the dissertation with the following exceptions:

1. Titles and authors presented in original reference.

2. Geographical names in widely accepted usage in Anglicized spelling.
(e.g., Moscow, St. Petersburg)

CHAPTER ONE

GOGOL' IN ENGLISH-LANGUAGE LITERARY CRITICISM (1915-1991): SHIFTS AND CHANGES

The body of twentieth-century English-language criticism of Gogol' is enormous and multi-faceted. To begin with, it has linked Gogol's craft to various, even polar, literary movements -- Romanticism, Romantic Realism, Realism, Symbolism, and Formalism. It has analyzed Gogol's works within different disciplines -- psychology, philosophy, theology, and linguistics, among others. Many critics have painstakingly scrutinized Gogol's art in all its complexity. Others emphasized Gogol's affinity with various writers -- Russian and foreign -- such as Homer, Aristophanes, Flaubert, Cervantes, Dickens, Kafka, Hasek, Poe, Scott, Irving, De Quincey, Belyj, Puškin, Turgenev, Čexov, and Bulgakov, to name but a few. Others have focused on Gogol's Ukrainian "connections," comparing Gogol's stories with Ukrainian fairy tales, ballads, fables, love songs, and Ukrainian folklore in general. Still others have examined specific features of Gogol's text, interpreting Gogol' as the most eccentric stylist in the language and seeing Gogol's poetics as above all defined by his hyperboles, similes, illogical/absurd linguistic devices, penchant for the grotesque, collisions, "perceptual categories," and other such qualities. Gogol's personality has also been the subject of many critiques emphasizing his neuroses and focusing on incest, necrophilia, homosexuality, impotence, anxiety, and fear as hallmarks of Gogolian themes. Some critics have even argued over the periodization of Gogol's writings, dividing his works into two periods (before and after 1840) or classifying the works into three categories -- early Ukrainian stories, the St. Petersburg tales, and the *Dead Souls* and *Selected Passages* period. English-language

criticism of Gogol' is indeed multifarious; it is saturated with shifts and changes that will be examined in more detail below.

Studies comparing Gogol' to other writers have formed a constant stream of new English-language literary criticism. Some critics traced other writers' influence on Gogol, while others pointed out similarities and differences between Gogol's works and other writers'.

In the 1910s, two critics compared *Dead Souls* to Dickens's *Pickwick Papers*, emphasizing affinity and differences. One critic (1915: 1)* compared the two works' external features, while the other (1916: 2) examined their internal elements. The former pointed out that neither work has a major heroine, and that carriages play a significant role in both works: for the Russian, the troika embodies enthusiastic love of excitement and careless desire for change, while for the Englishman it represents slow and gradual social progress. The similar backgrounds of both writers were also pointed out, with Gogol's experience in a government office likened to Dickens' experience in a lawyer's office. The latter critic, on the other hand, emphasized similar features in the structure, plot, and setting of both works: the looseness of their structures, the simplicity of their plots, and the motif of coach travel. He found that both writers present their characters in bold outline. He also found the two works to differ in that Dickens discussed the social evils of his time in the hope of reform, while Gogol' simply laughed in self-defense to keep from weeping at tragic hopelessness.

* This and all subsequent references are keyed to annotated bibliographic entries (in Chapter Two). The first four digits refer to the year of publication, with number(s) following the colon keyed to entry enumeration within each section in the annotated bibliography.

Comparative studies which traced the influence of others on Gogol' included one in which *Nevskij Prospekt* was thought to be directly influenced by De Quincey's *Confessions of an English Opium-Eater*. Among the several similarities found between the two works (1931: 3) were their portrayals of the main streets of big cities -- Nevskij prospekt in St. Petersburg and Oxford Street in London -- their similar ball scenes, and their protagonists' escape from the reality of life into ecstatic dreams. Another critic (1937: 2) noted similarities and differences between *Evenings on a Farm Near Dikanka* and Poe's *Tales of the Folio Club*. Underlining the influence of Hoffman's *Serapionsbrüder* upon both writers, this critic insisted that Poe's fantasy is modified by his supernatural rationality, while Gogol's imagination is controlled by his humor. He found that both writers' personal inferiority developed into an egotism of superiority and a tendency toward distortion and exaggeration, contending that both writers died because they lost their will to live.

In another comparative study, a critic (1934: 1) suggested that in Gogol's consciousness lie obsessive ideas about the Devil, which might be linked to his religious complex. Contrasting Gogol's Devil with Dante's Lucifer, Milton's Serpent, Goethe's Mephisto, Byron's Satan, and Lermontov's Demon, Brasol considered Gogol's Devil closest to Dostoevskij's Devil: a clairvoyant of human souls, a good-natured and gregarious creature. Another critic (1954: 8) pointed out similarities between *Dead Souls* and the anonymous Hispanic novel *Lazarillo de Tormes*, noting that the episode in part two of *Dead Souls* is especially similar to the that of the third part of *Lazarillo de Tormes*. The views of Birkhead and Bowen in the 1910s that *Dead Souls* was influenced by Dickens' *Pickwick Papers*, discussed above, were disputed by one critic (1956: 3) who suggested that the source of structural similarities between the two works comes from a common tradition exemplified by Cervantes, Lesage, and Fielding, finding no specific connections between thematic or stylistic features in both works and noting that the

technique of expressive personal names in both works' characters had been employed by many forerunners of Dickens.

There has also been criticism treating Ukrainian influence upon Gogol' (1960: 3), noting that Gogol' adapted four epigrams from Ukrainian works, and finding in Gogol' such Ukrainian ingredients -- as harsh humor, idealization of woman and the past, and fantastic elements redolent of fairy tales, ballads, and fables. In 1962 two more critics focused on comparative studies. One (1962: 33) explored "pošlost" in both *Dead Souls* and the Czech writer Hasek's *Good Soldier Schweik*. He insisted that "pošlost" permeates both works, making laughter turn to tears of despair and ultimately possessing not only the heroes, but also the authors of both works. Another critique (1962: 17), concentrating on the Gogol'-Kafka-Nathanael West relationship, stressed affinities among the three writers. The critic pointed out similarities among the three protagonists -- Kovalev in *The Nose*, Samsa in *The Metamorphosis*, and Simpson in *The Day of the Locust*, contending that the three authors make impossibilities become possibilities, then probabilities, which wind up as inevitabilities.

One critic (1965: 20) analyzed the relationship between *Taras Bulba* and Homer's *Iliad* with respect to parallel themes as well as similar motifs and stylistic devices: humor in the framework of a heroic epic, decapitations described without pity, death implied by escape of souls, immolation of the heroes' bodies, exchange of mockery and sneering before battle, and Homeric similes in Gogol's second version of *Taras Bulba*. Another writer found to have influenced Gogol' was Washington Irving (1968: 22), whose themes, motifs, and manner of narration were seen to presage much in Gogol's work, such as its complicated systems of narrators, a method developed by Irving and Scott. Parallels and contrasts were drawn between Irving's *Dolph Heyliger* and the *Mysterious Picture* and Gogol's *The Portrait*. The critic also traced Gogol's well-known narrative device, "skaz,"

back to Irving's works. Another critic (1969: 30) showed how Gogol' in *Taras Bulba* interweaves Ukrainian humor, melodies, and spirit into the texture of his language, finding, for example, that Gogol's poetic and melodious style recalls musical "bandura" chords in Ukraine "dumas," or historical and love songs. Another source of influence found by criticism on Gogol' was Bulgarin's satirical novel *Ivan Vyžigin* (1961: 1), with such common features as depictions of the external characteristics of two cities, feminine Moscow and masculine St. Petersburg, as well as depictions of provincial officialdom, landowners, and a petty functionary ("МЕЛКИЙ ЧИНОВНИК").

A significant portion of Gogol' criticism has been devoted to Gogol's considerable influence upon many Russian writers. One critic (1969: 25) compared the function of insanity of the protagonists in Čexov's *The Black Monk* and *The Diary of a Mad Man*. He points out that Gogol' is more disturbed by the mental nature of his protagonist than is Čexov. Seeing tension between Gogol's conception of art and his idea of the Christian message, he insists that at the bottom of Gogol's disturbance lies a failure to absorb the Christian message. Contrasting Čexov's literary type, concerned with the achievement of happiness, with Gogol's literary type, saturated with the awareness of man's high destiny, the critic asserts that the insanity in both works overcomes the limitation of the literary type. In another study tracing Gogol's influence within the pantheon of Russian writers, one critique (1972: 66) revealed links between *Dead Souls* and Gončarov's *Oblomov*, including similarities of the structural techniques of character introductions, delayed biography, rhetorical questions and interrupted narrative in characterization, the use of animal imagery to create the effect of grotesque, and the use of metonymic elements as leitmotifs. Furthering the study of Gogol's Russian connections, another critique (1972: 39) focused on similarities in the internal structures of *Nevskij Prospekt* and Čexov's *An Attack of Nerves*, asserting Čexov to be under the influence of Gogol's syllogistic technique. He pointed out similarities such as use of idealism as both thematic and

structural factors, authors' unsentimentalized sympathy for their characters, and authors' vision of art as a vital life force.

Gogol's affinity and differences with Nabokov in the use of black humor were explored by another critic (1974: 47). He discovered frequent use of topics which are considered unsuitable, indelicate, and impermissible such as sex, excrement, insanity, and death, often generating an effect of black humor. He also pointed out several differences insofar as Nabokov pays more attention to suicide than simple death and Gogol treats insanity as an internal disorder, while Nabokov treats it as a sinister conspiracy from without. Not that other Russians' influences on Gogol were neglected during this period. Another critic (1974: 50) considered Nikolaj Pavlov's *The Demon* as a source for *The Overcoat*. She pointed out similarities in both works: a theme of confrontation between the "little man" and the social system, and both protagonists' characteristics --poor clerks of unspecified lower rank, copying in a certain department of bureaucracy in St. Petersburg, living in isolation from real society. Nor were influences on Gogol confined to Russian borders. Another comparison (1976: 42) focused on the role and behavior of Orestes' ghost in Aristophanes' comedies -- *The Birds*, *The Acharnians* -- and those of Akakievich's ghost in *The Overcoat*: both ghosts appear at night in a large city (Athens and St. Petersburg respectively) to strip people of clothing. Another critic (1977: 22) compared *Dead Souls* to the Hispanic picaresque novel --Cervantes' *Don Quixote*, *Entremeses*, and *Novelas ejemplares*. The critic pointed out typical features of the Hispanic picaresque novel in *Dead Souls*: a protagonist who travels from inn to inn plotting, scheming, and living by his wits, a series of unrelated adventures which are interwoven by a protagonist, and three type of women -- a young innocent maiden, an aggressive manipulator, and a foolish gossipmonger. Another comparative study (1977: 31) likened *Dead Souls* to Mervyn Peake's *Titus Groan* and *Gormenghast*, focusing on the creation of their characters: both writers have a common interest in dazzling visual effects.

Neither Gogol' nor Peake are seen to concern themselves with the depiction of the human being, and this results in a methodical dehumanization by means of nomenclature. The critic notes how the characters in the novels are given distinctive and exaggerated characteristics for humorous effect, describing how animals in both authors' novels are frequently given human identity and inanimate objects often take on aspects of human life.

Comparative studies occupied the main stream of criticism of the 1980s. *Taras Bulba*, considered a historical romance, was linked to Panteleimon Kuliš's *Black Council*, with both works focusing on the Cossacks (1980: 3). The study claimed that in *Taras Bulba* historical characters and events are idealized and fantasized while in *Black Council* historical personages and events are depicted in a detailed and individualized way. Gogol's main source for *Taras Bulba* is seen as his own mythical conceptions drawn from folklore and oral literature. *Black Council*, by contrast, depicts real historical events, personages, and social struggles. Another comparative study (1980: 41) focused on similarities and differences between Kazimierz Orlos' *A Marvelous Hangout* and Gogol's *Dead Souls* and *The Inspector General*: the plot and atmosphere of grotesque farce in *A Marvelous Hangout* is similar to Gogol's works, and both writers depict human vices from a highly moralistic and puritan viewpoint. Gogol's grotesque characters are unique reflections of his imagination while those of Orlos are the result of distortion by vice. He also pointed out that Gogol' attributes what is bad in life to spiritual poverty among the people, while Orlos appeals to basic Christian value, charity, honesty and respect for life. One critic compared Gogol' to Turgenev (1982: 44), suggesting that both writers were influenced by the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century German philosophy and by vaudeville and puppet theaters, and both writers shared the desire to reform the Russian stage and create a new drama which would reveal the negative, corrupted side of Russian society. The critic also pointed out that two themes -- nature and woman -- are a permanent fixture for both writers. Gogol's influence on Vladimir Vojnovič was also explored (1984:

28) by a critic who placed Vojnović's *Žizn' i neobyčajnye priklučenija soldata Ivana Čonkina* in Gogol's satirical tradition by virtue of its use of parody, stylization, allusion, digression, and the motif of mistaken identity. Vojnović used the device of digression to introduce the characters of his novel just as Gogol did; both writers' narrative technique is marked by a whimsical tone of feigned ignorance. The motif of mistaken identity is both a mainspring of the plot of Vojnović's novel, and a consistent element in its structure. Similarities between *Dead Souls* and Vojnović's novel are also found on the thematic level, with their complicated networks of deception and falsification.

Some critics paralleled Gogol' with Scott, Bulgakov, and Belyj. One critic (1989: 2) asserted that Walter Scott influenced Gogol', pointing out a consistent thematic parallel between Scott's *Redgauntlet* and *The Lost Letter*: both protagonists travel into hell for a missing document, with their paths directed by strangers. Their depictions of hell are similar as well, including a banquet with music and dance, and their descriptions of the return to earth from hell are almost identical word for word. One critique found Bulgakov to be the true heir to the Gogolian tradition (1989: 24). The critic explored Bulgakov's biographical, thematic, and stylistic connections to Gogol', finding that Bulgakov used Gogolian works to explore his own creativity. Recounting Bulgakov's struggle to stage *Dead Souls* in the early 1930's, he defined the Bulgakovian vision as a modernization and bureaucratization of Gogol's folkloric Ukraine; the vaudeville element is fully articulated and clearly a forerunner of the demonic scenes in *The Master and Margarita*. He found Bulgakov to be intensely aware of the resemblance between his age and Gogol's and pointed out their mutual longing for Italy as well as Bulgakov's adoption of Gogol's gastrocentric universe. Connections and affinities between Belyj and Gogol' were also treated (1989: 19). The critic contended that Belyj used Gogolian narrative ambiguities in his *Silver Dove*, which has some structural and stylistic features common to Gogol's narrative fiction and also has inter-textual affinities with *Evenings on a Farm near*

Dikanka and *Mirgorod*. Another critique (1989: 8) focused on the role of the sorcerers in *The Terrible Vengeance* and in Belyj's *Moscow*, pointing out the basic difference in depiction of sorcerers: that Gogol' prefers a Christian cosmology, while Belyj favors Eastern religion and its principle of karma. Belyj's sorcerer's hateful crimes -- murder, incest, rape, bondage, madness -- far surpass those of Gogol's sorcerer, and the former offers a vision of redemption while the latter leaves no hope. The critic concluded that Belyj does not imitate Gogol', but creates a newly resurrected Gogol' in his world. Another critic explored the influence of vaudeville and the transformation of the vaudeville tradition in *The Inspector General* and *The Marriage* (1989: 39), insisting that vaudeville had a strong influence upon acting styles as well as audience expectations in the Russia of the 1830s-40s. The critic pointed out that Gogol' owes a debt to the vaudeville tradition for the swift pacing of *The Inspector General* and *The Marriage*, although he claimed Russian circumstances unsuitable to vaudeville. He contended that Gogol' rejected the vaudeville tradition and adapted such vaudevillian trappings as complications of plot, static dialogue, and comic devices to his own artistic purpose.

Through the examination of both text and context, some critics have explored the main characteristics of Gogol's artistic world and his views on art and literature -- thematic patterns, features of humor and satire, views of Romantic, Realism, and Symbolism.

One critic (1925: 1) focused on contextual and inter-textual aspects of Gogol's art, concentrating on stylistic, psychological, ethical, and religious features. The critic insisted that Gogol's art is characterized by a romantic escape from as well as an indictment of the reality that Gogol' could not accept. Asserting that Gogol' wished for a renewal of life by means of ethical and religious values, he also pointed out several of Gogol's stylistic features: concentration on character at the expense of an involved plot, presentation of trivial details, agitated style, elements of "skaz." One critique of the integrity of Gogol's

art (1944: 1) made a huge impact on Gogol' criticism with its claims that Gogol' is neither a humorist nor a realistic painter of Russian life. The critic's sought to restore the aesthetic elements to Gogol' criticism and to maintain the balance that was lost when social criticism changed the course of Gogol' criticism. The critic centered on stylistic devices such as digression, absurdity, irrationality, and the grotesque, in which Gogol's real art is seen to lie. He saw Gogol's work as poetry in which the irrational is perceived as rational, a shift he saw as the basis of Gogol's art. Among the stylistic features pointed out were the digressive paragraphs injected into the narrative of *Dead Souls* with lack of concern for relevance, producing fleeting yet vivid characterizations. From the stylistic point of view, he saw the climactic troika passage of *Dead Souls* as merely a conjurer's patter enabling Čičikov to disappear, claiming that this patter is an integral feature of Gogol's style. Contending that Gogol's world is invented and has nothing to do with reality, the critic considered Gogol' a visual writer who primarily excels as a stylist, and approached Gogol's work as a phenomenon of language, not of ideas. Such an emphasis on the stylistic aspect of Gogol's art heralded a shift in criticism, bringing about a sensational attack on Belinskij's views.

Another critic (1952: 9) explored thematic patterns in Gogol's works -- *The Overcoat*, *Nevskij Prospekt*, *The Diary of a Madman*, *The Inspector General*, and *Dead Souls* -- such as yearning, temporary illusion of possession, and finally frustration, for example, the thwarted, illusory, or temporarily gratified desires of Piskarev, Popriščin, Xlestakov, Čičikov and Akakij Akakievič. The critic also pointed out the triangular plot of *The Overcoat*: Akakij is attacked first by robbers, then by the Very Important Person, and the VIP is attacked by Akakij's ghost. He saw the last attack as Akakij's posthumous vengeance and triumph over the VIP. He claimed that Gogol's original purpose stemmed from his own compulsions, which developed as a result of demands from his contemporaries for greatness and immortality. The critic made the point that Gogol' tried

to create a work the likes of which had never been made; however, his work did not satisfy his purpose, and only frustration remained. Another critic's study (1955: 4) examined features of humor and paranoia in Gogol's short stories, seeing Gogol's humor and mockery as the result of an interplay between personal paranoia and dissatisfied social tension in accordance with Freud's formulation of a situation in which three persons are involved -- a narrator, a mother, and a father.

Shifts and changes in Gogol's criticism were mercurial, never taking a single direction or coalescing around a dominant pole of criticism. One critique (1956: 12) of *Dead Souls* tended to return to Belinskij's views, considering it a universal depiction of human reality, with the world of serfs embodying tragic reality and the world of the nobility that of comedy and pseudo-reality. Another critic (1957: 5) focused on stylistic analyses of Gogol's works, with links to Gogol's biography and personality. He pointed out some important characteristics of style, noting that Gogol invented a new narrative style by assigning the narrative function to the beekeeper in *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka*, which allowed the author to be a contradictory and ironic observer. Rejecting Nabokov's view (1940s: 1) in favor of Belinskij's, a critic (1961: 15) saw *The Overcoat* as a satirical description of a poor clerk's relation to a corrupt bureaucracy. He contended that the main poles of the story are the satiric and sympathetic, although there is absurdity throughout the story. He also asserted that the absurdity of Gogol's world derives from an absurd bureaucracy, and the poor clerk's destiny shows that he has lived and died in a country where there are no provisions for protecting human rights, honor, or property.

Another critic (1965: 23) contended that Gogol's world contains characteristics of Realism, underlining the uniqueness of Gogol's style and language -- the digressions, sudden changes of mood, contradictions, and the labyrinthine and twisted psychology of Gogol's world. He asserted that Gogol, like Flaubert, uses language to protect himself

from the conflict between his art and his life, and depicts the world's negative aspects despite his desire to create a positive art. He contended that Gogol's world depicts the suffering of the Russian people and nation, pointing out that Gogol's exaggeration, caricature and farce express the reality of life at that time. In 1968, however, another critic pronounced Romanticism the main characteristic of Gogol's art. This critic (1968: 27) proclaimed the view that Gogol's work contains Romantic elements much more than Puškin's or Lermontov's, refuting the view that Gogol's work is full of realistic elements. Suggesting that Romanticism is primarily the distortion of reality by fantasy, he insisted that the world of *Dead Souls* is a psychological world which reflects the changing form and structure of society.

Gogol's views on art and literature were also explored through new approaches to *Selected Passages from a Correspondence with Friends* (1976: 56), noting that Gogol' was concerned about his views of art and literature throughout his life, with concern especially shown in *Selected Passages* and *Author's Confession*. It was pointed out that the fundamental motif of the *Selected Passages* is the juxtaposition of two views of life: the ideal and heroic ("подвиг") and real, everyday life ("пошлость"). Gogol' believes the main function of art and literature is to confront man with constant conflicts between the real world and the ideal world. The critic endorsed Gogol's view that an artist is endowed with divine gifts and has the power to uplift. Another critique explored Gogol's art by analyzing the creative process and the world of vision and perception in Gogol's works (1976: 48). It asserted that Gogol's writing contains two significant features; an imagination which discloses reality, and a Romantic art which is characterized by fears, escapes, distorted reflections, multiple realities, hyperbole, grotesques, antitheses, and reversals. Pointed out were three techniques in Gogolian world -- reverse vision, false focus, and precarious logic -- on which Gogolian Romanticism is established. Through reverse vision, the good turns into the bad, the dead into the alive, imagination into reality,

absence into presence, day into night. False focus is presented as a mixture of deceptions, altered appearances, and dual identities, making the reader aware of a deceptive reality. The effects of precarious logic range from absurd humor to insight into reality.

Gogol's art was a subject of another study (1979: 17) emphasizing the unique features of Gogol's artistic world -- metamorphosis, identity, recognition, and evasion. The critic claimed that figurative metamorphosis exists everywhere in Gogol'. Observing comic elements which consist of a distinctive play of antitheses between something meaningful and something meaningless, the critic claimed that these antitheses alternate, with non-sense proving to be sense, or vice versa. The nature of identity is also central to Gogol's writings: changes of identity occur in *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka*, and mistaken identity figures prominently in *Nevskij Prospekt*, *The Diary of a Mad Man*, *The Nose*, *The Inspector General*, and *Dead Souls*. The motif of vision plays an important role in Gogol's creations, especially in his early works. Gogol's shortsighted characters are vitalized by means of the creator's own vision. The idea that the role of the creator is distinct from that of the narrator, with the former remaining above the process of presentation as carried out by the narrator, carries the implication that the creator has some larger enterprise of his own, as enigmatic as Čičikov's. Emphasizing Gogol's text, context, and life, another critic offered a careful analysis of Gogol's artistic world (1981: 26). The critic saw Gogol's artistic personality as driven by three elements: 1) sexual fears in the early period, 2) concern about identity and status in the middle period, 3) anxiety about art and literature in the later period. He insisted that the motif of old woman, sexual anxiety, and death is encountered in *Vij*, *The Terrible Vengeance*, *The Fair at Soročincy*, and *The Old-World Landowners*. Natural description in Gogol's early stories is not naturalistic, but contains sexual symbolism which later yields to fear. He contended that Gogol's artistic view was a negative reconciliation with life in his early years, later

becoming a positive reconciliation as a result of his pursuit of the meaningfulness of art and his growing religious conviction.

Another critique (1982: 42) explored symbolic elements in Gogol's works, finding a pattern in which the illogical becomes the logical through symbolism. Discerning the harmonious symbolic elements in five works --*Ivan Fedorovič Šponka and His Aunt*, *The Old-World Landowners*, *The Nose*, *The Overcoat*, and *The Carriage*, he found at the core of these works a vision of evil and human imperfection allegorically presented in the form of sexual conflicts. Arguing that the Formalists' approach to the conventional associations between words cannot arrive at a harmonious artistic exegesis, he contended that behind a mask of digression, absurdity, punning, grotesque, etc., lie symbolic meanings, which form the basis of Gogol's works. He asserted that these meanings create a harmony through the logic of their repeated patterns. Disorder has been seen as an essential element for pro-creativity (production) in Gogol's world (1989: 43). The critic asserted that both Šponka's orderly behavior in the face of the feminine threat and Akakij Akakievič's copying a document are anti-creativity, while Piskarev's disorderly studio in *Nevskij Prospekt* reflects the creativity of an artist. The critic contended that gender disorder and grotesque are so plentiful in Gogol's world as to be pro-creativity.

Some critics explored Gogol's art with emphasis on an individually selected text. One critic (1984: 36) asserted that *Dead Souls* managed to divide the reading public, as its comic details were intended to destroy a devitalized way of life. Suggesting that the social events which bring the characters together, such as visits, dinners and balls, are important elements of polite society, he insisted that the ideology of polite society forms and molds the space, the scene, the characters, and their languages through Čičikov's journey in *Dead Souls*. He contended that *Dead Souls* plays a double game with the ideology of polite society, which makes a spectacular pseudo-event of its death, and also suggests that the

self-satisfied world has been dead all along. In another study focusing on a single work, a critic (1987: 15) examined the theme of boredom and spiritual impoverishment in *How Ivan Ivanovič Quarreled with Ivan Nikiforovič* with respect to Gogol's artistic view. Pointing out that the story makes the antithesis of the two Ivans' appearance and characteristics a basic structural principle, he contended that this structure is opposed to the story's texture. He found a dramatized declension from diversity to simplicity, presented gradually as the two protagonists' opposing characteristics converge, to be a basic theme of the story.

Another critique contains contradictory views of Gogol's anachronism in *Taras Bulba* (1991: 3). The critic considered the second edition of the tale as Gogol's attempt to restore chronological precision. After a careful examination of Ukrainian history, he suggested that the story in *Taras Bulba* begins in 1596 and ends in 1639. He contended that Gogol intended to synthesize the events of a half-century to create a historical fiction, and that he analogized the conclusion of the tale. Another critic (1989: 27) focused on the mirror-like, invented world of Gogol's early stories, *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka* and *Mirgorod*. He contended that incest and self-deception are hidden in Gogol's early stories, arguing that even a surface "beauty" masks hidden demonic forces. He insisted that these early stories not only contain humor and absurdity, but also have landscapes and figures which are threatened by hidden satanic forces. Another critique analyzed Gogol's "pošlost'" (1988: 25). Considering Gogol's language and art as an exuberant medieval style of Baroque, the critic insisted that Gogol as a religious thinker and creative Baroque artist discovered "pošlost'." He pointed out that Gogol never created "pošlost'" in his characters, and Gogol has difficulties overcoming "pošlost'" because of his tendency toward monolithic unity and his Platonic aesthetics of harmony and "благообразие." Another critic (1989: 14) explored the comfortable yet isolated inside world of "habit and order" in *The Old-World Landowners*. This inside world is characterized as rustic,

peaceful, pleasant, and remote, with the relationships among its inhabitants innocent and untroubled. Contrasting this inside world with the outside world of the house and its garden, the critic pointed out that the space of the narrator and this outside space interrelate, representing contrasting realms of habit and passion. The outside world of passionate intensity and time were seen as a threat to the peaceful inside world. *The Marriage* has also been the subject of analysis as a multi-faceted play within a play, with the main protagonist not only directing but also playing a part within his own play (1990: 2). The critic pointed out several devices of characterization in Kočkarev's play: reduction (simplified appearance), exaggeration (exaggerated appearance), and repetition (recurrent behaviors). He asserted that *The Marriage* is only a literary artifice which reveals a world of absurdity, and art can still function in the absence of any social message.

Some critics have mined the riches of Gogol's language and stylistic devices, producing studies of poetic features from Gogol's text such as narrative style, composition, similes, imagery, the grotesque, digression, hyperbole, absurdity, intertextuality, pun, and so on.

One critic (1965: 7) concentrated on several features in the composition of *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka*, *Mirgorod*, and *The Overcoat*. He praised Gogol's mastery of composition as manifest in his use of two narrators in *Evenings*. He also claimed that anxiety is a main subject of Gogol's world, taking various forms not only in his work, but also in his life. He also proposed that Gogol's illness fulfilled a multiple function in his life, facilitating the coexistence of anxiety, narcissism, self-dramatization, self-pity, and guilt. *The Overcoat* is deemed a story of an unhappy love, through which Akakij Akakievič discovers himself and comes to life. The critic took the view that realistic details are drawn into fantasy, thus creating a fake realism -- a joke, the grotesque, or dead reality. Exemplifying the volatile nature of much Gogol' criticism,

another critic (1965: 28) claimed that exaggerated biographism is irrelevant in judging Gogol's works as works of art. The critic analyzed Gogol's works in chronological order, emphasizing the influence of German Romanticism, Puškin, Stern, and Jules Janin, and pointing out Gogol's intentional mixing of all elements of tone and expression. He furthermore explored Gogol's stylistic devices of absurdity and hyperbole, rejecting the view that Gogol' reflected Russian reality in *Dead Souls*. Another critic (1967: 21) focused on aspects of Gogol's similes, imagery, and value judgments. He focused on the types of similes described in *Dead Souls*, including the origin and meaning of Gogol's Homeric similes and the function of his many humorous similes. He presented a comparative examination of simile and Homeric simile in *Taras Bulba* and *The Iliad*, pointing out that Gogol' had a tendency to decrease hyperbolic and grotesque similes in the final version compared with earlier variants. He contended that the important role played by similes in *Dead Souls* is enhanced by their relation to other images in the work. Another critic (1967: 36) examined stylistic technique in *The Overcoat*, pointing out several types of contrast, including not only juxtaposition of the comic and solemn, but also repeated confrontations between affirmation and negation. He assigned to some adversative conjunctions ("но," "а," "да," etc.) the function of concentration and emphasis, while other adversative conjunctions ("однако," "впрочем," etc.) were seen as accentuating the adversative intonation, with concessive clauses introduced by "хотя," "хоть," and "что," displaying tension or contrast. The frequency of direct and indirect questions and the mass of indefinite words (indefinite pronouns, pronominal adjectives and adverbs) is seen to play an important role in the story's deliberate vagueness. Such a combination of indefinite words and the adversative intonation is seen as the story's main feature.

A new study centering on the grotesque in Gogol's works was performed by a critic (1969: 5) who claimed that a characteristic of the grotesque is its tension between

the comic and the tragic, the "laughter through tears" which Gogol' regarded as the essence of his own humor. Comparing two contrasting interpretations of the nature of the grotesque -- Wolfgang Kayser's and Mixail Baxtin's -- the critic emphasized Gogol's own interpretation of *The Inspector General*: to create on the stage a living symbol of evil in order to destroy it with laughter, bringing about a spiritual rebirth and preparing the audience for the coming of Jesus Christ. He asserted that disbelief in God is the source of the oppressive grotesque in Gogol'. Another critic (1969: 9) focused on the grotesque in a general study of Gogol's life and works. He found that Gogol' is one of the best writers to condense the grotesque imagination fully and boldly. Introducing various artists' views of the grotesque, such as those of historian Wolfgang Kayser, Wieland, Wilhelm Busch, and Lee Byron Jennings, the critic examined this element in Gogol's works, pointing out some examples from *Ivan Fedorovič Šponka and His Aunt*, *The Old-World Landowners*, *The Inspector General*, and *Dead Souls*. He concluded that Gogol' is a great impersonator, and rejected psychological approaches to Gogol's personality. The essence of Gogol's laughter and its relation to his personality was treated in one critic's study (1971: 23); noted were several comic devices such as digression, incongruity, irrelevance, and anticlimax, which play a significant role in creating humor. The critic pointed out that Gogol's comic manner is an escape from his personal life and idealistic self, as well as a consequence of his deep depression. The duality of laughter and tears in Gogol's complex humor suggest that through laughter Gogol' revenges himself on Russian society for the humiliations he had experienced, and this revenge takes the form of anti-heroes whom Gogol' endows with his personal neuroses.

Another study (1973: 13) focused on the relationship between author and reader and the varieties of narrative style in *The Tale of How Ivan Ivanovič Quarreled with Ivan Nikiforovič*. The critique found in the narrative two voices, that of the beekeeper Rudyj Pan'ko from Dikanka, and that of a writer of popular romantic literature. The former

addresses a local audience; the latter, a mass one. Noting the Ukrainian expressions and grammar, church related colloquialisms, and bureaucratic language in the narrative, the critic pointed out mixtures of foreign expressions such as "компания" and "дело деликатное," which creates an effect of absurdity. The critic proposed that there is another, third narrative voice in the epilogue marked by contrasting ideas and contrasting stylistic devices, as well as Puškinian simplicity. He concluded that this third voice, using both language varieties, addresses itself more to an educated audience. Another critique (1974: 11) focused on the craftsmanship and technical significance of *The Overcoat*, claiming that Gogol' intentionally uses "даже," "уже," and "уж" to achieve the comic effects of digression, absurdity, logical disruption, and grotesque. Through such word-play, Gogol' is seen to disclose the insignificance of the real life that he is presenting because what comes after the word "даже" seems to be trifling and trivial. The study also suggested that Gogol' draws attention to Akakij Akakievič's deliberately impoverished language, which matches that of the narrator. A structural approach was central to another critique (1974: 37), which proceeding from a description of the narrator's personality to a consideration of the general viewpoint resulting from narrator's unique role in *The Overcoat*, i.e., the narrator shows his own feeling of pathos and the various characters of the story react in like manner.

Another critic analyzed the narrative structure of *The Carriage* (1975: 26), focusing on the character of Čertokuckij, to which is ascribed an importance in the narrative's development: most of the elements of the narrative structure are seen to contain iconic significance. Thus everything that is furnished to create Čertokuckij's character is part of the icon. He described some devices which help build the iconic significance of *The Carriage*: grotesque, metaphoric and metonymic expressions, parallelism, repetition, and absurdity, which combine to contribute to the overall effect. Another critic (1976: 33) pointed out narrative devices in Gogol's *Two Ivans* -- exclamations, digressions, formulaic

expressions, apostrophes to the reader, trivial details, and parallelisms. The critic found the tension-generating disparity in the text between syntax and semantics to reflect a complex interrelationship between reality and appearance, an oscillation between equilibrium and disequilibrium. He also explored the function of shifts in "skaz" narrative voices in *Two Ivans*, asserting that three narrative voices exist in the text. Another critique (1976: 19) analyzed *The Inspector General's* simplicity, fluency, dynamics of language, and use of hyperbole, irony, the grotesque, and colloquial speech. The dual nature of the mayor's speech (politeness with Xlestakov and coarseness to his subordinates) is seen to result in mutual misunderstanding between the mayor and Xlestakov, showing Gogol's facility at creating his protagonists through their verbal mannerisms. Stylistic devices such as the use of "да" as a syntactic and pragmatic connective in the stylized manner of *The Overcoat* have also been scrutinized (1978: 16). Explaining that Russian "да" is chiefly restricted to initial position in a pragmatic role, which is an indication of more popular and vulgar speech, this critic pointed out that while Gogol' used "да" for depicting individuals, he more often used "да" in describing situations. Thus Gogol' used "да" for grotesque effect in the scene between Petrovič and Akakij Akakievič.

The narrative voice in *The Nose* was explored by one critic (1989: 33) who asserted that the struggle between man and the devil is perhaps the struggle between the principles of sense-making and sense-destroying nonsense, believing this to be the subject of *The Nose*. Another critic explored Gogol's hidden absurdity in *The Diary of a Madman* (1989: 37). The critic revealed how Gogol' makes use of an unreliable narrator to handle the reader's perceptions, and how the frequent contradictions, digressions, and absurdities in the account, as well as the author's lack of commentary, leave the reader guessing. The critic pointed out that the voice of the first-person narrator is the story, and there is no authorial intervention at all. Comic effect comes from the rhythm of the passage,

repetition, and absurd juxtapositions. The critic contended that the hidden absurd in *The Diary of a Madman* allows Gogol' to connect with the reader more closely, at the same time adding a comic effect. Another critic (1990: 5) explored intertextuality in the novelistic dialogue of *The Nose* from Baxtin's viewpoint of carnivalization and double-voicing. The critic asserted that *The Nose* has features of parody, such as a form of double-voicing, which plays an important role in the composition of language in the comic novel. He also pointed out that the nose is used as a comic device to reveal the absurdity of social and textual convention.

Some critics have explored the interrelationship of religion and literature in Gogol's writings, while others have applied their religious views to his individual works.

One critique (1968: 37) of *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends* highlighted another critical movement of the 1960s with its religious approach. He emphasized that to Gogol' the aesthetic and the religious were not separate categories. Supporting Gogol's claim that his works constitute a unity from beginning to end without any change of viewpoint, the critic asserted that Gogol's quest for beauty is not a quest of discovery or a quest for an ideal, but a quest for embodiment of art in life. He pointed out that Gogol' believes the writer to be not a creator of beauty writing for art's sake or for himself, but a prophet who reveals beauty and writes for his people and for God. Another religious study (1969: 4) was attempted by a critic who rejected the view that Gogol's life was marked by religious fanaticism, unconventional behavior, and mental illness. She suggested that Gogol's prayers, his pilgrimages to Jerusalem, his shadowy moods, and his destruction of part two of *Dead Souls* indicate not mental insanity, but a strong, purposeful idealism. She also contended that the theme of banality is strongly linked to a Gogol's religious quest, for it is a significant element that separates humanity from God. One critic (1972: 49) considered *The Overcoat* a caricature of hagiography, especially of

the story of the sixth-century St. Acacius of Sinai, whom Akakij Akakievič is seen to resemble. Pointing out the lack of a hagiographical description of sincerity and humility in the opening part of the story, he saw the introduction to *The Overcoat* as a satirical digression. He claimed that Gogol' followed the hagiographical tendency of not mentioning specific names, places, and dates and noted that the simple tasks of copying documents performed by Akakij Akakievič and St. Acacius are identical. Furthermore, the downtrodden, alienated Akakij holds many elements in common with St. Acacius's life. He also pointed out that the most structurally significant link between Akakij Akakievič and St. Acacius lies in the events after Akakij's death.

Another critique (1976: 24) showed that Gogol's anxiety seems to be religious, asserting that Gogol's religious belief is strongly connected to his aesthetics. He contends that the sinner's pursuit of salvation is embodied in Akakij Akakievič's new coat, drawing upon the idea that clothing is used to symbolize righteousness in the Bible to conclude that Akakij Akakievič's exchange of clothing from a filthy coat to a new coat signifies his transformation into a new man. Seeing the surrounding frost and cold weather as symbols of Satan, he further asserted that the new coat symbolizes Christ himself. Agreeing with Schillinger's view of spiritual meaning in *The Overcoat*, the critic, however, claimed that Akakij Akakievič is not a holy martyr, but a sinner. Gogol's views on art, Russia, religion and the idea of writer as prophet were also treated in this study. One critic (1976: 56) observed how various heated polemics surrounding *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends* created misunderstandings and misconceptions about Gogol', and argued that Gogol' considers the theater to be a vehicle for the education of Russian people and a pulpit for preaching Christianity. The artist is seen as a person endowed with extraordinary insight and divine gifts. The critic concluded that Gogol' strived to achieve artistic, moral, and religious perfection with his passionate and

desperate yearning for religious ecstasy, and that Gogol's oeuvre should be re-evaluated in terms of a correct understanding of his *Selected Passages*.

Another critic's study of Gogol's religious and aesthetic outlook (1978: 72) made the claim that Gogol's quest for beauty is not a quest of discovery or a quest for an ideal, but a quest for embodiment of art in life. Rejecting the theory of "religious crisis" in Gogol's career claimed by Zenkovskij and Gippius, the critic claimed that to Gogol' the artistic and religious were not separate categories, but were the same in reality -- the Kingdom of God is the Kingdom of Beauty. He contended that to Gogol' Russia is a Christian work of art and a thing of beauty. Religious interpretation was also applied to *The Inspector General* by a critic (1980: 11) who considered the play's fictional town to represent humanity's common spiritual city, with its officials symbolizing of earthly passions and trivial vulgarity, and Xlestakov as the trivial conscience of the world. Viewing *The Inspector General* as an apocalyptic satire, he observed that Gogol' uses comic triviality to reveal the emptiness of life and human fear, although the characters in the play are too ridiculous to consider their disaster seriously. Another religious interpretation of *The Inspector General* (1987: 7) treated the play as a medieval allegory with an eschatological theme. The town in the play was seen to designate man himself, and the real Inspector General is the awakening conscience -- not a person of this world, but Jesus Christ, who will destroy all sinners. Seeing the silence of the last scene in the play as the silence before the triumphant sounds of the Last Judgment, he asserted that Gogol's preoccupation with the Last Judgment is regarded both from a religious point of view and as an expression of Gogol's own personality.

Elsewhere another work of Gogol's was found to exemplify the integral quality of religion in Gogol's artistic world (1987: 10). *Taras Bulba* was seen to reflect Gogol's idea of the relation between God and man, with the Cossacks representing a divine nature,

through Eastern Orthodox imagery: Ostap's death echoes Christian martyrs, and Bulba's death scene recalls Christ's crucifixion. The critic deemed the nature of wholeness in the Cossacks' life, a role of multiplicity-in-unity, to be the reflection of the Trinity and the Russian image of God. Another critic (1990: 4) pointed out certain general themes and modes of Christian thought which originated with Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite such as the ideas of place, transfiguration, and silence. He saw the violation of the idea of place as the plot of Gogol's stories. He asserted that Gogol's ideas are also lodged in the Orthodox view of transfiguration -- transformation of man and society. Gogol's stories contain the theme of silence, which follows after the failure of transfiguration.

Gogol's highly idiosyncratic art has also been a mother lode of material for psychological, especially psychosexual, analysis and criticism. As might be expected, this area has been a particularly potent catalyst in the generation of trends and countertrends in Gogol' criticism.

A psychological interpretation of *The Nose* (1951: 2) dealt with anxieties and obsessions, concluding that the nightmare in the story is not prosaic, innocent fantasy, but the substance of real life. The critic also insisted that Kovalev's problem stems not from his nose, but what the nose represents in the topsy-turvy world of Gogol', contending that the root of man's psychological problems lies beneath the surface of his physical complaints. In 1958 a critic (1958: 7) stimulated a new shift in criticism of Gogol' with his own psychological approach. The critic applied Freudian theory to *Mirgorod*, focusing on the role of love: "the ultimate source of energy in human being is the love instinct, Eros." Claiming that Gogol's inclination to supernatural beings or things as love objects frees him from fear or threat, the critic pointed out that heterosexual romance occupies only a small portion in *Mirgorod*, and Gogol's treatment of heterosexuality takes the form of retreat,

regression, and finally boredom. He concluded that this shift from love to boredom means a complete withdrawal from libido.

Another psychological approach was postulated in a critique of *The Diary of a Madman* (1961: 13). Contending that Gogol depicts man's fear and loneliness in an antagonistic world as well as the triviality of his existence, the critic showed how the two worlds of poverty and wealth are juxtaposed to dramatize triviality and meaninglessness. The critic also underlined Gogol's effort to neutralize the world of terror by shifting it into the world of absurdity. Another psychological study saw *The Nose* as a journey through Gogol's own sexual anxieties under the pretext of both a grotesque farce and a satire on social climbers (1963: 29). Consenting to Ermakov's view on *The Nose*, he insisted that Kovalev's nose symbolizes his sexual organ, making the loss of his nose a dream about the loss of his sexual organ, or of his sexual power. He suggested that the scene of the nose's visit to the Kazan Cathedral symbolizes the act of the union between man (the nose) and woman (the church). He contended that the dream in *The Nose* is not only Kovalev's and barber Ivan's dream, but also Gogol's own dream, since it expresses Gogol's personal sexual failure. Another study (1965: 12) also examined psychological traits in *The Diary of a Madman*, rejecting the social and moral approach to the work. The critic claimed that Popriščin's search for power and love reflects his quest for an identity within the social system. This critic also found that the vagueness and nothingness of the story's ending makes Gogol's vision one of fear.

Two critiques taking new psychological approaches to Gogol followed. One (1976: 43) saw *The Overcoat* as a product of psychological realism, considering Akakij Akakievič a psychological nonentity who is not simply a grotesque image, but a product of the author's narrative devices. Akakievič's new overcoat is deemed to represent the spiritual sustenance which brings him inner happiness. He pointed out that Gogol resorts

to a purely external method of portraying the inner world, which is psychological realism in another sense. He insisted that the stylistic devices used in *The Overcoat* contributed to a non-rational approach to psychology. His analysis of *The Diary of a Madman* showed that the story contains psychological elements as well as an inner logic of madness. He asserted that Gogol uses internal as well as external presentations of psychology in order to precisely reveal human madness. The second critic (1976: 29) pursued homosexual and psychological themes in Gogol's biography and writings. The critic called Gogol a closet homosexual, noting that Gogol did not have an interest in writing about women and was never interested in describing heterosexual relationships in his works. He examined the sexual symbolism of Gogol's nature descriptions in *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka* according to which natural phenomena (river, sky, and earth) are thought to have been assigned specific genders. He pointed out that Gogol conveys his visualization of sexualized nature in *The Terrible Vengeance*, finding sexual symbolism in geese. The critic contended that the comfortable lifestyle of the elderly couple in *The Old-World Landowners* showed how to live affectionately with another person while retreating from the threat of disastrous heterosexual sex or forbidden homosexual sex. *The Two Ivans* contained for him a story of a sexless homosexual marriage with Ivan Ivanovič's offer of a pig and two bags of oats in exchange for a rifle as a veiled homosexual proposition. He showed how Gogol's feelings of homosexual guilt result in his religious crisis and strong ties with Christianity, since religion alone kept Gogol from acting out his homosexual impulses.

Criticism of Gogol's links to sexuality (1980: 9) reappeared with *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka*. The contrasts of countryside and city are paralleled in the pattern of sexual imagery and death imagery: the urban narrator depicts sexuality and death with explicit visual imagery, while the rural narrator avoids such visual imagery. Another critic (1981: 1) underlined the sexual behavior of both protagonists in *The Two Ivans* as a form

of subtext, taking a psychological and symbolic approach to the tension between unsatisfied heterosexuality and unfulfilled homosexuality. He contended that Ivan Nikiforovič represents a sexually unstable person as well as a heterosexual. Ivan Ivanovič is secretive and sexually active, while Ivan Nikiforovič is open and sexually inactive. Ivan Ivanovič's coat is seen to symbolize a defense mechanism to cover his fear, his sexual insecurity, and his secretiveness as a closet homosexual. He also contended that Ivan Nikiforovič's gun symbolizes his penis and the two sacks of oats represent Ivan Ivanovič's maleness. Considering the cause of their broken relationship to lie in its sexual underpinnings, he asserted that only impotence remains triumphant due to their withdrawal from both kinds of sexuality. Considering Gogol' as a psychoanalyst, a critic drew several observations about homosexuality, marriage, and death in *The Fair at Soročincy* (1982: 29). The critic suggested that the narrator is a homosexual for whom marriage is unthinkable and tantamount to death, and that death and homosexuality are closely intertwined in Gogol's art as well as his life. The critic pointed out that Gogol' coupled erotic imagery coupled with absurdity in *Vij, Nevskij Prospekt*, and *The Overcoat*. He also saw Petrovič in *The Overcoat* as a personification of both anal and genital sexuality. He pointed out the "anal triad" of the anal personality type in Akaky Akakievič's behavior: orderliness, parsimoniousness, and obstinacy.

As surveyed above, twentieth-century Gogol' criticism written in English was extensive and comprehensive, with each critic exploring Gogol' in a different way. Overall, Gogol' criticism from 1915 to 1991 was very comprehensive and substantial. No one can argue its variety, depth, and substance. There were constant shifts and changes in Gogol' criticism and a proliferation of approaches and methodologies throughout the entire period. Gogol' criticism in English has indeed assiduously examined Gogol' and revealed innumerable unexplored aspects of Gogol's art. Criticism has singled out *Dead Souls* and *The Overcoat* as Gogol's most prominent accomplishments. Many critics have

explored Gogol's works, focusing on his narrative device ("skaz") and stylistic devices (the grotesque, digressions, word-play, Homeric similes, hyperbole, absurdity). Some critics paid no heed to *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends*, while others treated it as a tremendously important work which supported their own religious views. *The Nose* and *The Diary of a Madman* were considered important for their psychological aspects. Certain critics drew sexual analysis (heterosexual and homosexual) from *The Nose* and *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka*. Gogol's views of art were drawn out from *The Portrait*, *Nevskij Prospekt*, *Author's Confession*, and *Selected Passages*. Controversy prevailed in criticism dealing with literary movements. Some criticism placed emphasis on Realism, Romanticism, or even Romantic Realism, while others on Gogol's Symbolism, or Formalism. Comparative studies also stressed Gogol's affinity with other writers, Russian and foreign, emphasizing his strong influence upon Russian and foreign literature. Gogol's interpretation, however, has never reached a consensus, although many analyses were written from 1915 through 1991. Many critics still do not hesitate to address Gogol as a mysterious and unsolved writer: "one of the most puzzling transition-figures between the romantic and the realistic periods" (1925: 1); "the strangest prose-poet Russia ever produced" (1944: 1); "the mysterious dwarf" (1957: 5); "we are still far from agreement as to the nature of his genius, the meaning of his bizarre art, and his still weirder life" (1969: 9); "a romantic will see the romantic in him, a realist will see the realist." (1972: 6); "riddle" (1976: 29); "elusiveness" (1979: 17); "the literature on Gogol' is vast....I am raising problems, not solving them." (1981: 12); "enigma" (1981: 26); "mystery" (1982: 42); and so on. It is obvious that Gogol continues to resist definitive interpretation.

CHAPTER TWO

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF MAJOR ENGLISH-LANGUAGE LITERARY CRITICISM

1910-1919

1. Birkhead, A. "Russian Pickwick." *Living Age*, 287 (1915), pp. 312-15.

Points out Gogol's and Dickens' similar backgrounds: both began writing when they were young. Dickens' experience in a lawyer's office helped him accurately depict the world of *Pickwick Papers*, while Gogol's work in a governmental office informed him concerning the corruption of the Russian bureaucracy. Sees *Dead Souls* as much closer to Dickens' *Pickwick Papers* than to Cervantes' *Don Quixote*: just as Čičikov enjoys a certain sympathy among Russians, the English have affection for Samuel Pickwick; neither novel has a major heroine, etc. Notes the significance of coaches in both novels: the troika is the symbol of the Russian with his enthusiastic love of excitement and careless desire for change, while for the Englishman the coach represents slow and gradual social progress.

2. Bowen, C. M. "*Dead Souls* and *Pickwick Papers*." *Living Age*, 280, (1916), pp. 369-73.

Explains that Gogol', though, strongly influenced by Dickens, is no simple imitator, seeing in *Dead Souls* as many differences as similarities to Dickens' *Pickwick Papers*. Insists that both works have common features in the looseness of their structures and the simplicity of their plots. In addition, their settings are quite

similar. Čičikov makes a journey in his "бричка," while Pickwick travels by stage coach. Both men encounter a variety of character types. Gogol' is closest to Dickens in his depictions of minor characters such as Pliuškin, Manilov, Nozdrev, and Sobakevič. Like Dickens, Gogol' presents his characters in bold outline. Asserts that Gogol's deliberate satires on Russian officialdom echo Dickens' political caricatures. Claims, however, that Čičikov is quite a different character than Pickwick. The two works are also seen to differ since the sadness behind the humor characteristic of *Dead Souls* is nowhere to be felt in *Pickwick Papers*. Argues that Dickens discusses the social evils of his time with hope and desire for reform, while Gogol' simply laughs in self-defense rather than weeping at tragic hopelessness.

1920-1929

1. Lavrin, Janko. Gogol. London: Routledge, 1925.

Examines both Gogol's life and works in chronological order. Sees Gogol' as one of the most puzzling transition-figures between the romantic and the realistic periods. Analyzes characteristics of his style and "skaz," taking a Freudian psychological approach. Asserts that in *The Overcoat*, Gogol' creates out of trivial details a character replete with comedy, misery and pathos. Summarizes Gogol's main features: 1) concentration on character at the expense of an involved plot, 2) trivial details, 3) agitated style, 4) element of "skaz," 5) fear of a dehumanized humanity, 6) a search for vexation of the spirit. Claims that Gogol' wished for a renewal of life by means of ethical and religious values.

1930-1939



1. Brasol, Boris. "Gogol." In his The Mighty Three: Poushkin-Gogol-Dostoievsky. New York: William Farquhar Payson, 1934, pp. 117-90.

Contains a brief biography of Gogol' and analyzes Gogol's works chronologically. Deems Gogol' the most tragic figure in world literature. Suggests that in Gogol's consciousness lie obsessive ideas about the Devil, which might be connected with his religious complex. Contrasts Gogol's Devil with Dante's Lucifer, Milton's Serpent, Goethe's Mephisto, Byron's Satan, and Lermontov's Demon, finding him closest to Dostoevskij's Devil: a clairvoyant of human souls, a good natured and gregarious sort of creature. Infers from Gogol's claim that Xlestakov is everywhere that Xlestakov has the three properties of Divinities; omnipresence, omniscience and omnipotence. Thus Xlestakov is the Devil created by Gogol' and ends up the only winner in the battle of life; all others, including Gogol', are losers. Contrasts features of Xlestakov and Čičikov. Describes how Gogol's faith in Holy Russia changed his artistic world from a farce to a sermon in his *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends: The Inspector General* and *Dead Souls* were "laughter through tears," *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends* "tears without laughter," lamenting the evils of a Christian world that had lost its Christ.

2. Kaun, Alexander. "Poe and Gogol: A Comparison." Slavonic and East European Review, 15, no. 44 (1937), pp. 389-99.

Observes similarities and differences in the works and lives of Poe and Gogol', asserting that both become writers due to frustrated ambition. Gogol's *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka* and Poe's *Tales of the Folio Club* are both seen as influenced by Hoffman's *Serapionsbrüder*. Sees Poe's fantasy as modified by his supernatural rationality, while Gogol's imagination is controlled by his humor. Shows how both writers' personal inferiority develops into an egotism of

superiority and a tendency to distortion and exaggeration. Compares the paranoiac tone of Gogol's *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends* and Poe's *Eureka*, suggesting that it results from their threatened mental balance. Sees in both writers attitudes of overvaluation toward women resulting from mother-worship and a search for a shelter from a masculine world. Contends that both writers died since they lost their will to live.

3. Simmons, Earnest J. "Gogol and English Literature." *Modern Language Review*, 26 (1931), pp. 445-50.

Notes several striking similarities between Gogol's *Nevskij Prospekt* and De Quincey's *Confessions of an English Opium-Eater*. Suggests that Gogol might have read a French version of *Confessions of an English Opium-Eater* since there was no Russian version of De Quincey's work when Gogol's *Nevskij Prospekt* was published. Points out that both writers portray the main streets of big cities: Nevskij Prospekt in St. Petersburg and Oxford Street in London. Both Piskarev and De Quincey escape from the reality of life, and drive themselves into ecstatic dreams. Both works also contain similar ball scenes. In the ball room, both heroes catch sight of a pretty woman surrounded by others. Concludes that Gogol's *Nevskij Prospekt* was directly influenced by De Quincey's *Confessions of an English Opium-Eater*.

1940-1949

1. Nabokov, Vladimir V. Nikolai Gogol. Norfolk, Connecticut: New Directions Books, 1944.

Contains a biography with a reversed chronological account of Gogol's life and travels abroad, beginning with Gogol's death and ending with his birth.

Attempts an analysis of Gogol's three most important works: *The Inspector General*, *The Overcoat*, and *Dead Souls*. Emphasizes the integrity of Gogol's art. Claims that Gogol' is the strangest prose-poet Russia ever produced -- neither a humorist, nor a father of the Natural school, nor a realistic painter of Russian life. Insists that Gogol' was never concerned with real life, and supports his claim by pointing to stylistic aspects of his writing, such as digression, irrationality, absurdity, and the grotesque, in which Gogol's art is seen to lie. Demonstrates Gogol's symbolic use of objects in his stories, novels and plays. Sees Gogol's work as poetry, in which the irrational is perceived as rational, a shift he saw as the basis of Gogol's art. Pointing out that ironic incongruity is an essential part of the texture of *Dead Souls*, shows how digressive paragraphs, injected into the narrative with lack of concern for relevance, produce fleeting yet vivid characterizations. Points out how underlying allusions are artistically combined with the superficial texture of the narration. Claims that "pošlost" personifies Čičikov, and sees Čičikov as "the ill-paid representative of the Devil." Contending that Gogol's world is invented and has nothing to do with reality, concludes that Gogol' is a visual writer who primarily excels as a stylist, and approached Gogol's work as a phenomenon of language, not of ideas.

1950-1959

1. Bowman, Herbert. "The Nose." *Slavonic and East European Review*, 31, no. 76 (1952), pp. 204-11.

Enumerates certain important features of the nose: first, the nose is the least important member of the human body, but it is located in the most evident place; second, it is seen not by its owner, but by other people; third, it tends to appear in expressions of ridicule or detraction. Characterizes Gogol's *The Nose* as

a satire on Russian bureaucracy, a grotesque image of St. Petersburg life. Sees *The Nose* as a reflection of Gogol's imagination transformed into a dream.

2. Friedman, Paul. "The Nose: Some Psychological Reflections." *The American Imago*, 8 (December 1951), pp. 337-50.

Suggests that Gogol has a gift for revealing fears, anxieties, and obsessions from the dark of night into the bright light of day. Refuses to interpret the story of Gogol's *The Nose* as a simple dream. Insists that for Gogol the nightmare in the story is not prosaic innocent fantasy, but the substance of real life which is composed of just such nightmares. In the madman's world a nose can have mysterious and important meanings. Argues that Kovalev's big problem does not stem from the pimple on his nose, or his nose itself. The problem is what the nose represents in the topsy-turvy world of Gogol. Believes the doctor in the story is very wise because he refuses to perform the operation on Kovalev when he asks for it. Contends that the root of man's psychological problems lies beneath the surface of his physical complaints.

3. Futrell, Michael A. "Gogol and Dickens." *Slavonic and East European Review*, 34, no. 83 (1956), pp. 443-459.

Rejects the view that Gogol's *Dead Souls* was influenced by Dickens' *Pickwick Papers*. Accepts the possibility that Gogol might have read foreign versions of *Pickwick Papers* in the two years before the completion of part one of *Dead Souls*, but points out that the subject of *Dead Souls* was provided to Gogol by Puškin in 1835 and Gogol started to write it in the same year, while *Pickwick Papers* was published in English in 1836. Suggests that the source of structural similarities between *Dead Souls* and *Pickwick Papers* comes from a common

tradition exemplified by Cervantes, Lesage and Fielding. Insists that there is no specific connection between thematic or stylistic features in both works, suggesting, for example, that the technique of expressive personal names in both works' characters had been employed by many forerunners of Dickens. Points out that there might exist some similarities in treating social and economic changes in Russia and England, since both works were written at the same time. Concludes that Gogol's artistic world is more extraordinary and individual than Dickens' world.

4. Kanzer, Mark. "Gogol: A Study on Wit and Paranoia." *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 3, no. 1 (January 1955), pp. 110-25.

Asserts that wit and paranoia are products of social tension. Suggests that Gogol's mockery and humor result from an interplay between personal paranoia and dissatisfied social tension. Believes that in the development of Gogol's personality, disharmony and depression in relationships with his associates created a mood of instability. Finds that in Gogol's world, an interplay of paranoia is in accordance with Freud's formulation of a situation in which three persons are involved: the first person, a narrator, provides instinctual aims to the second person, a mother, who is presented as a hostile character, and the third person, a father, is a superego. In *Vij*, Gogol depicts a mother's enchantment on her son, which is answered by his sadistic attack on her. *The Nose* depicts both a son's symbolic retreat from his mother, and his preoccupation with triumph over his father. In Gogol's world, humor is connected to paranoia with its distorted three person interplay and responses to social tension.

5. Magarshack, David. Gogol: A Life. New York: Grove Press, 1957.

Consists of an introduction and six parts: "The mysterious dwarf," "From defeat to triumph," "Historian and essayist," "The mature artist," *Dead Souls*, "The barren years." Links Gogol's biography and personality with analyses of his works. Includes many quotations from Gogol's writings, as well as from the memoirs and comments of his contemporaries. Agrees with Vikenty Veresaev that Gogol's works had a direct impact on the uneducated man. Points out some important characteristics of Gogol's style. Notes how in his early stories, Gogol invented a new narrative style in which a beekeeper tells the stories, allowing the author to be a contradictory and ironic observer.

6. Martin, Mildred. "The Last Shall Be First: A Study of Three Russian Short Stories." *Bucknell Review*, 6, no. 1 (1956), pp. 13-23.

Examines Gogol's *The Overcoat* from a Christian point of view. Points out that Akakij Akakievič's sorrowful cry -- "Leave me alone! Why do you insult me?" -- comes not from his pride, but from his Christian self-respect, which arises from the knowledge that he is a child of God. Suggests that *The Overcoat* might be interpreted as a reminder that human beings are simple, since Akakij's simplicity prevents him from thinking of himself or thinking unkindly of others. Concludes that through the cry of Akakij the reader feels a new kind of truth, the dawning of a feeling of brotherhood.

7. McLean, Hugh. "Gogol's Retreat from Love: Towards an Interpretation of *Mirgorod*." In his American Contributions to the Fourth International Congress of Slavists, Hague: Mouton, 1958, pp. 225-45.

Analyzes the role of love in Gogol's stories in *Mirgorod*. Observes that Gogol uses overtly erotic imagery in his early stories, yet depicts a straightforward

sexual embrace only when the romantic partner is a supernatural being in nature or a thing. Claims that Gogol's inclination to things as an object of love frees him from fear or threats. Notes that before the publication of *Mirgorod*, Gogol had taken up the theme of love in *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka*, but drops it entirely after *Mirgorod*. Sees the love theme in *Mirgorod* as a source of tragedy, disaster, death, or farce. Points out that heterosexual romance occupies only a small portion in *Mirgorod*. Gogol's treatment of heterosexuality takes the form of retreat, regression, and finally boredom. In this process, a mixture of fear, death, masochistic delight, and sadistic impulse plays an important role. This symbolic shift from love to boredom, to which is ascribed a more negative meaning than hate, means a complete withdrawal from libido.

8. Selig, Karl Ludwig. "Concerning Gogol's *Dead Souls* and *Lazarillo de Tormes*." *Symposium*, 8 (1954), pp. 138-40.

Refutes the view of L. B. Turkevič that Gogol's *Dead Souls* was influenced by Cervantes' *Don Quixote*. Asserts that there is a similarity between Gogol's *Dead Souls* and an anonymous Spanish picaresque novel, *Lazarillo de Tormes*, noting that the episode in part two of *Dead Souls* is similar to the episode of the third part of *Lazarillo de Tormes* and both protagonists of both works -- Tentetnikov and Lazarillo -- have a similar reason for leaving their positions. Adds that both novels contain a balance and a deadlock between society and scoundrel, master and servant, anti-hero and host.

9. Stilman, Leon. "Gogol's *Overcoat*: Thematic Pattern and Origins." *American Slavic and East European Review*, 11, no. 2 (1952), pp. 138-48.

Asserts that the thematic pattern of Gogol's *The Overcoat* is yearning, the temporary illusion of possession, then finally frustration. Points out that this thematic pattern is also present in his other works such as *Nevskij Prospekt*, *The Diary of a Madman*, *The Inspector General*, and *Dead Souls*. Piskarev's dream of changing a prostitute into his spouse is purely illusion and his attempt fails, and the gratification of Popriščin's passionate desire is short-lived when the illusion is dispelled. The desire of Xlestakov and Čičikov for self-aggrandizement attain only short-lived gratification while their illusions are shared by others. Akakij's yearning for a new coat is realized, but frustrated, the illusion vanished. Points out the triangular plot of *The Overcoat*: Akakij is attacked by robbers, then by the VIP, and the VIP is attacked by Akakij's ghost. Sees the last attack as Akakij's posthumous vengeance and triumph. Claims that Gogol's original purpose stemmed from his own compulsions, which developed as a result of demands from his contemporaries for greatness and immortality. Makes the point that Gogol tried to create a work the likes of which had never been made; however, his work did not satisfy his purpose, and only frustration remained. Concludes that despite this, Gogol's works are meaningful enough in their own terms, as genuine art always is.

10. Strakhovsky, Leonid I. "The Historicism of Gogol." *American Slavic and East European Review*, 12, no. 3 (1953), pp. 360-71.

Asserts that Gogol exhibits qualities of a historian, showing a precise conception of historical perspective. Suggests that Gogol developed as a historian through acquaintance with many historical sources such as chronicles, legends, folklore, songs, and oral tradition. Points out that Gogol wished to succeed to a teaching position in universal history ("всеобщая история"), and also had

projected a huge publication on the history of the Ukraine. Gogol', however, wrote only an introductory article. Draws the main characteristics of Gogol's universal historianism from his article "On the Teaching of Universal History": he embraces all of mankind in a full panorama and depicts the free human spirit struggling against the power of nature and against human ignorance. Outlines the significant role in Gogol's historianism played by geography. In Gogol's historical novel *Taras Bulba*, Gogol' depicts nature in the Ukraine and relates it to the historical background of the Cossacks' struggle for freedom and the preservation of their Orthodox religion. Contends that although Gogol' freely uses his romantic imagination and hyperbolic expression, he fully expresses his quality of a true historian in *Taras Bulba*.

11. Strong, Robert L. "The Soviet Interpretation of Gogol." *American Slavic and East European Review*, 14, no. 4 (1955), pp. 528-39.

Introduces Soviet literary critics' views of Gogol', and subjects them to harsh criticism. Among the views discussed are those of A. V. Lunačarskij, who asserted that Gogol' was persecuted by Nikolaj's autocracy, P. S. Kogan, who considered Gogol' to be a revolutionary and a reactionary, A. Starčakov, who saw Gogol' irreconcilable contradiction between his world view and the objective meaning of his art as the source of his tragedy, and M. B. Xrapčenko, who argued that Gogol' was a romantic and a realist. Points out that during the 1930's the Soviet view of Gogol' changed from a romantic to a realist, claiming Gogol' as a fighter against the vulgarity of gentry existence. Finds a contradiction in V. V. Ermilov's view that Gogol' depicts conflict between the upper and lower classes, yet also presents the problem of the morality for all classes. Concludes that Soviet

literary critics apply their interpretation with a utilitarian approach according to the socio-political situation of a given time.

12. Weathers, Winston. "Gogol's *Dead Souls*: The Degrees of Reality." College English, 17 (1956), pp. 159-64.

Sees Gogol's comic-tragic depiction of life in *Dead Souls* as taking place not within the confines of a nineteenth-century Russian town, but in the universal setting of human reality. The protagonist Čičikov is the tale's universal hero, and the town N represents any society which degenerates from a living identity into hellishness. Points out two classes of society depicted in *Dead Souls*, the nobility and the serfs, which Gogol uses as portraits of what he considers to be degrees of reality: the world of the serfs is one of tragedy and reality, while the world of the nobility is one of comedy and pseudo-reality. Finds in the Gogolian concept of reality a gradation from the very liveliness of the dead serfs to the very deadness of the living bureaucrats. Suggests that the governor's daughter fulfills the epic tradition of questing for an ideal, here a two-fold value of eternal, spiritual beauty and temporary, physical beauty. Contends that Gogol hopes all men, including Čičikov, will ride out of the comedy and illusion into a meaningful reality.

1960-1969

1. Alkire, Gilman H. "Gogol and Bulgarin's *Ivan Vyžigin*." Slavic Review, 28 (1969), pp. 289-96.

Explores similarities between Gogol's works and Bulgarin's satirical novel *Ivan Vyžigin*. Places *Ivan Vyžigin* in the tradition of the western picaresque novel with its moral and political didacticism and utopian interlude. Points out that both writers treat the external characteristics of two cities similarly: Moscow is

feminine, while St. Petersburg is masculine. Bulgarin, however, does not depict the internal psyche of St. Petersburg as does Gogol'. Suggests similarities in both writers' depiction of provincial officialdom and landowners: Gogol's Kostanzoglo is of the same type as Bulgarin's Vyžigin, and Nozdrev is a similar type to Glazdurin. Suggests that Bulgarin's *Petr Ivanovič Vyžigin* influenced Gogol' in its description of a petty functionary ("мелкий чиновник"). Bulgarin's Romund Vikentevič Šmigajlo has similar characteristics to Gogol's Akakij Akakievič: such as being slow-witted, self-satisfied, and possessing a self-effacing style. Concludes, however, that Bulgarin has only a generalized influence on Gogol'.

2. Baumgarten, Murray. "Gogol's *The Overcoat* as a Picaresque Epic." *Dalhousie Review*, 46 (1966), pp. 186-99.

Argues that Akakij Akakievič cannot be found in a realistic world of time and space but in a dreamlike bureaucratic world. Claims that in *Taras Bulba* there are two worlds, the lyric and the picaresque, comparable to Homer's *Iliad*. Insists that in *The Overcoat*, the lyrical world penetrates into the picaresque and modifies it. The lyrical world is in turn modified by the picaresque in which it is embedded. Suggests that in *The Overcoat* the most important character is the narrator, not Akakij Akakievič. The narrator is seen as part of the bureaucracy and is unable to distinguish reality from art. Emphasizes that the VIP in *The Overcoat* is the essence of the picaresque world, and that fate is not the choice of Akakij Akakievič or the narrator, but the necessity of circumstance. Adds that the nature of the picaresque world has been changed by the lyrical world, and that in this sense *The Overcoat* is a picaresque epic.

3. Besoushko, Volodymyr. "Nikolas Gogol and Ukrainian Literature." *Ukrainian Quarterly*, 16, no. 3 (1960), pp. 263-68.

Finds strong and significant mutual influences between Gogol' and Ukrainian literature. Points out that in Gogol's early stories, he picked up epigrams from other Ukrainian works; four epigrams from his father's plays, three from Ivan Kotlarevskij, one from Hulak-Artemovskij, others from Ukrainian poetry. Finds in Gogol' Ukrainian ingredients such as harsh humor, idealization of woman and the past, fantasy elements redolent of fairy tales, ballads and fables. Points out that from Ukrainian plays Gogol' drew such types as Cossacks, a Polish nobleman, a gypsy, a Jew, a peasant, a quarrelsome old woman, and a devil. Contends that Gogol' enriched the Russian language with the help of Ukrainian components. Lists many Ukrainian writers influenced in turn by Gogol', explaining how and which of Gogol's works were influential. Concludes that even though Gogol' writes his works in Russian, the Ukrainian spirit exists in them.

4. Bogojavlensky, Marianna. *Reflections on Nikolai Gogol*. Jordanville, New York: Holy Trinity Monastery, 1969.

Refutes the view that Gogol's life was marked by religious fanaticism, unconventional behavior, and mental illness. Follows the evolution of Gogol's artistic world as well as his spiritual quest. Believes that Gogol's prayers, his pilgrimages to Jerusalem, his shadowy moods and his destruction of Part Two of *Dead Souls* indicate not mental insanity, but a strong, purposeful idealism. Finds a main theme in his works: the continual threat of evil. Finds that while evil appears in some incarnated form in Gogol's early works, it later assumes symbolic form. Contends that the theme of banality is strongly connected with a Gogol's religious quest, for it is a significant element that separates humanity from God. Concludes that Gogol's religious personality contains the inner agony of Christian life, and in

his tragic belief he fails in an attempt to combine his literary and religious messages.

5. Bortnes, Jostein. "Gogol's *Revizor*: A Study in the Grotesque." Scando Slavica, 15 (1969), pp. 47-63.

Suggests that a characteristic of the grotesque is its tension between the comic and the tragic, the "laughter through tears" which Gogol' regarded as the essence of his own humor. Compares two contrasting interpretations of the nature of the grotesque, Wolfgang Kayser's and Mixail Baxtin's and applies them to *The Inspector General*. Supports Gogol's own interpretation of *The Inspector General*: to create on the stage a living symbol of evil in order to destroy it with laughter, bringing about a spiritual rebirth and preparing the audience for the coming of Jesus Christ. Sees the play's double plot as consisting of "beamten" comedy, which dominates in acts one and five, and "chevalier d'industrie" comedy, which dominates in acts two and four. This double plot confuses the action of the play and creates an ironic dimension. Asserts that in *The Inspector General* presents a world in which God is absent and the principle of evil is secularized and comes to life in Xlestakov. Concludes that the secularization of evil is a characteristic trait of the grotesque.

6. Debreczeny, Paul. Nikolai Gogol and His Contemporary Critics. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1966.

Consists of 4 chapters: 1) *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka, Mirgorod, Arabesques*. 2) *The Inspector Inspector*. 3) *Dead Souls*. 4) *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends*. Concludes with a selective list of contemporary articles on Gogol' and an index. Presents all the criticisms of Gogol'

by the critics of his time (up to 1848), as well as Gogol's reaction to them. Examines and summarizes the views of critics such as Senkovskij, Bulgarin, Belinskij, Puškin, Ševyrev, Polevoj, etc. In the fourth chapter, points out that after the publication of *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends*, it was hard to tell Gogol's supporters from his detractors, as the old dividing lines between the various literary circles became confused. Concludes that Gogol's career offers the sad spectacle of an artist whose great talent was misdirected and then crushed by critics in an age when aesthetic and social values were chaotically confused.

7. Driessen, Frederik C. Gogol as a Short Story Writer: A Study of His Technique of Composition. Translated by Ian F. Finlay. Hague: Mouton, 1965.

A critical and literary guide to Gogol's short stories, with a detailed examination of plot, composition, and major themes. Asserts that anxiety is a mainstay of Gogol's world, taking various forms not only in his works, but also in his life. Sees anxiety as a form of horror hidden behind grotesque and humor. Proposes that Gogol's illness fulfilled many functions, facilitating coexistence of anxiety, narcissism, self-dramatization, self-pity, and guilt. Rejects the view that there is realism in Gogol, arguing that realistic details are drawn by Gogol into fantasy, thus creating a fake realism -- essentially a joke, grotesque, or dead reality. Praises Gogol's use of two narrators -- Foma Grigorievič and Rudyj Pan'ko -- in *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka*. Elaborates on the structure of each chapter in *The Terrible Vengeance*, concluding that the chapters are interrelated with each other. Finds two kinds of sexual desire in *Vij*, animal and demonic. Interprets Gogol's feminine ideal of beauty as demonic. Rejects Ejxenbaum's and Čiževskij's

interpretations of *The Overcoat* and insists that *The Overcoat* is the story of an unhappy love through which Akakij Akakievič discovers himself and comes to life.

8. Eikhenbaum, Boris. "The Structure of Gogol's *The Overcoat*." Translated by Beth Paul and Muriel Nesbitt. *Russian Review*, 22, no. 4 (1963), pp. 377-99.

Applies a formalistic approach to his analysis of *The Overcoat*. Sees the first person narrative as the foundation of the story, filled with live speech and verbalized emotion. Asserts that puns, sounds, etymological toying, and hidden absurdity play a significant role in *The Overcoat*. Sees absurdity concealed in quite logical syntax, creating the impression that it is unintentional. Contends that the melodramatic episode serves as contrast to the comic narration which both precedes and follows it. Shows how the lack of correspondence between serious intonation and actual significance is used as a grotesque device. Finds that the pattern in which anecdotal narrative alternates with melodramatic episodes, makes the entire composition of *The Overcoat* a grotesque. Akakij Akakievič's death, related as grotesquely as his birth, is seen to exemplify this pattern of alternation.

9. Erlich, Victor. *Gogol*. New Haven, Massachusetts: Yale University Press, 1969.

Consists of a general study of Gogol's life and works focusing on the grotesque. Finds that Gogol is one of the best writers to condense the grotesque imagination fully and boldly. Introduces various artists' views of the grotesque, such as those of historian Wolfgang Kayser, Wieland, Wilhelm Busch, and Lee Byron Jenning. Examines the element of the grotesque in Gogol's works, pointing out some examples from *Ivan Fedorovič Šponka and His Aunt*, *The Old-World Landowners*, *The Inspector General*, and *Dead Souls*. Concludes that Gogol is a

great impersonator, rejecting recent psychological approaches to Gogol's personality.

10. Fanger, Donald Lee. Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism: A Study of Dostoevsky in Relation to Balzac, Dickens and Gogol. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Considers Gogol' a representative of Romantic Realism in which objective perception is combined with the subjectivity of the romantic. Treats Gogol' in the third chapter of the first part ("Gogol'; The Apotheosis of the Grotesque") as one of the three authors (Balzac, Dickens, and Gogol') seen as Dostoevskij's forerunners in Romantic Realism. Asserts that the fundamental element of the works of all three is the modern, urban theme. Asserts that Russian Realism was born in the decade after Gogol's *Dead Souls*, and its practitioners rejected more of Gogol' than they accepted. Sees the demonic elements in the Ukrainian and St. Petersburg stories as the main point of Gogol's tragic and comic ambiguities.

11. Gifford, Henry. "Gogol's *Dead Souls*." In his The Novel in Russia. London: Hutchinson University Library, 1964, pp. 42-52.

Places a high value on Gogol's talent, especially his use of language. Asserts that Gogol's main purpose in *Dead Souls* is the generalization or typification of milieu and characters, a striving for an inclusiveness which is strengthened by his unique similes. Discusses Gogol's passion for examining people and accumulating plentiful details. Points out the typification of main characters. Observes that throughout the entire story Gogol' makes no attempt to deliberately condemn the regime or the social structure. Asserts that the last scene of part one

of *Dead Souls* symbolizes Russian destiny. Concludes that Gogol' was as a great writer as Puškin in Russian literature.

12. Gustafson, Richard F. "The Suffering Usurper: Gogol's *Diary of a Madman*." *Slavic and East European Journal*, 9, no. 3 (1965), pp. 268-80.

Interprets *The Diary of a Madman* as an atypical Gogolian story, points out that it is the only first person narrative among Gogol's works. Rejects the social and moral approach to the work in favor of a psychological view. Suggests that the protagonist Popriščin's search for power and love reflects his quest for an identity within the social system as Gogol' guides him through a series of discoveries. Finds two Popriščins in *The Diary of a Madman*: the suffering clerk who is frustrated by man's inhumanity, and the impostor who usurps a fantasy throne to make his dream come true. Popriščin's attempt to find his identity was thus destined from the beginning to fail. Concludes that the vagueness and nothingness of the story's ending makes Gogol's vision one of fear.

13. Juran, Sylvia. "Zapiski Sumasshedshego: Some Insights into Gogol's World." *Slavic and East European Journal*, 5 (1961), pp. 331-33.

Contents that Gogol's *The Diary of a Madman* depicts man's fear and loneliness in an antagonistic world as well as the essential triviality of his existence. Shows how the two worlds of wealth and poverty are juxtaposed to dramatize triviality and meaninglessness. Believes that the two dogs play an important role in connecting these two worlds. Traces the causes of Popriščin's loneliness and fear in the real world and the path by which he seeks love and meaningfulness in the other world. Observes that Gogol' tries to neutralize the world of terror by shifting it into the world of absurdity. The man residing in the world of absurdity also

becomes absurd. Concludes that Gogol's vision of the world can be found in this insight into madness.

14. Kent, Leonard Joseph. The Subconscious in Gogol and Dostoevskij, and Its Antecedents. Hague: Mouton, 1969.

Divided into three chapters: 1) "Towards the literary 'discovery' of the subconscious," giving an exposition of the subconscious in folklore and literature since the dawn of time, 2) "Nikolaj Vasilievič Gogol'," 3) "Fedor Mixajlovič Dostoevskij." Rejects Ernest Simmons' claim that Gogol' was scarcely influenced by Western literature. Claims there is adequate evidence that Gogol' and Dostoevskij were at least exposed to the influence of German Romanticism, especially Hoffmann. Emphasizes that the subconscious has long been a traditional part of literature. Contends that in Gogol' the conscious use of the subconscious is prominent, although less developed and complex than in Dostoevskij.

15. Landry, Hilton. "Gogol's *The Overcoat*." Explicator, 19 (1961), item 54.

Partly rejects Vladimir Nabokov's view of *The Overcoat* as a depiction of Gogol's irrational futile world, seeing *The Overcoat* as a satirical description of a poor clerk's relation to a corrupt bureaucracy. Admits that while there is absurdity throughout the story, the main poles of the story are the satiric and sympathetic. Agrees with Belinskij in his view that the absurdity of Gogol's world derives from an absurd bureaucracy, and the poor clerk's destiny shows that he has lived and died in a country where there are no provisions for protecting human rights, honor, or property.

16. Oulianoff, Nicholas I. "Arabesque or Apocalypse? On the Fundamental Idea of Gogol's Story *The Nose*." *Canadian Slavic Studies*, 1, no. 2 (Summer 1967), pp. 158-71.

Rejects the view that Gogol's *The Nose* is neither Hoffmannian fantasy, nor social satire, nor sexual delusion, nor frivolous jest, nor arabesque. Points out that Kazan Cathedral, where Kovalev and the nose talk, has an important meaning in the work. States that for Gogol, stupidity and vulgarity are a sin against God as well as conditions for the appearance of the powers of evil in the world. Asserts that in *The Nose*, the world as God's creation is transformed into an illusion created by the devil; the appearance of the nose shows the illusory nature of the world. Asserts that *The Nose* contains much that recalls Hieronymus Bosch's paintings. According to Bosch's view, which stems from the medieval tradition, every incarnation of the Devil is realized in a grotesque way. Asserts that in Gogol, the world belongs to the Devil, and evil force saturates man's inner mind, destroying every image and achieving triumph.

17. Parry, Idris. "Kafka, Gogol and Nathanael West." In *Kafka*. Edited by Ronald Gray. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1962, pp. 85-90.

Likens Gogol' more to Kafka, Poe, and Nathanael West, than to Gončarov, Dostoevskij and Tolstoj. Points out similarities between the protagonists of Kafka's *The Metamorphosis*, and in *The Nose*, both of whom wake up one morning not from a nightmare, but into one. While Kovalev and his nose have an independent relationship, (one of hunter and hunted), Gregor Samsa's cockroach form, however, is the pure expression of his own personality, making him an amalgam of hunter and hunted. Both works are seen as characterized by a precise and detailed yet deceptive realism. Claims that Gogol' and Kafka are concerned with something more fundamental than everyday life. Likens the protagonist of Nathanael West's

The Day of the Locust, Homer Simpson, to both Kovalev and Gregor Samsa, for his hands are independent from his brain. Concludes that the three authors make impossibilities become possibilities, then probabilities, which then wind up as inevitabilities.

18. Proffer, Carl Ray. "Dead Souls in Translation." *Slavic and East European Journal*. 8, no. 4 (1964), pp. 420-33.

Lists translations of Gogol's *Dead Souls* in Britain, France and the United State, offering details on their early history. Finds all the early translations very poor. Compares and examines the five English translations: B. G. Guerney's, A. R. MacAndrew's, David Magarshack's, Helen Michailoff's, and Constance Garnett's. Suggests that Guerney's translation is stylistically the best although it is not without serious defects. Criticizes MacAndrew's translation as incorrect and incomplete. Finds Garnett's translation to be better than MacAndrew's but stylistically indistinguishable. Considers Michailoff's translation comparable to Garnett's, while Magarshack's is deemed much better than either. Contends that Magarshack's is the most carefully prepared and accurate among the all translations.

19. Proffer, Carl Ray. "Gogol's Definition of Romanticism." *Studies in Romanticism*. 6, no. 2 (1967), pp. 120-27.

Explores Gogol's relationship with "Romanticism." Notes that although Gogol' himself hardly uses the word "Romanticism" in his articles, he did offer his own definition of "Romanticism" in his essay "Petersburg Notes of 1836," published in *The Contemporary* in 1837. Here Gogol' extols "Classicism" while criticizing "Romanticism." Points out that by "Classicism" Gogol' means perfect

qualities, such as discretion, intellect, and natural harmony, while "Romanticism" implies something unpolished and disharmonious that is separated from reality. Finds Gogol' to be antagonistic attitude toward Janin, Hugo, Dumas, and Ducange by his own definition of "Romanticism," while praising Schiller and Scott as excellent examples of "Classicism," as he interprets it.

20. Proffer, Carl Ray. "Gogol's *Taras Bulba* and the *Iliad*." Comparative Literature, 17, no. 2 (1965), pp. 142-50.

Analyzes the relationship between Gogol's *Taras Bulba*, (in the second edition published in 1842) and Homer's *Iliad* with respect to parallel themes, similar motifs, and stylistic devices. Notes that Gogol' considered *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey* the only universal works of literature. Finds no Homeric similes in Gogol's first version of *Taras Bulba*, whereas there are ten similes in his second version: like a rock, like a hawk, like eagles, like a hound, like so many suns, like a star, like the young lamb. There are also similarities between Gogol' and Homer in imagery and tone. The device of a long catalogue of heroes is seen as common to both writers, but Gogol' pays far less attention to the lineage of heroes than Homer does. Lists several similarities between both works such as decapitations described without pity or regret, death implied by escape of soul, immolation of the heroes' bodies, and exchanges of mockery and sneering before battle. Concludes that both works are heroic epics containing humor.

21. Proffer, Carl Ray. The Simile and Gogol's Dead Souls. Hague: Mouton, 1967.

Analyzes aspects of Gogol's similes, imagery, and value judgments. Discusses types of similes described in *Dead Souls*, including the origin and meaning of Gogol's Homeric similes and the function of the many humorous

similes. Asserts that Gogol' uses images of smoothness, roundness, and cleanliness in depicting Čičikov in order to cover his internal impurity. Considers the wheel and Čičikov's habit of sideways movement to be another leitmotif. Insists that Gogol' had a tendency to decrease hyperbolic and grotesque similes in the final version compared with earlier variants. Presents also a comparative examination of simile and Homeric simile in *Taras Bulba* and *The Iliad*. Contends that the important role played by similes in *Dead Souls* is enhanced by their relation to other images in the work.

22. Proffer, Carl Ray. "Washington Irving in Russia: Pushkin, Gogol, Marlinsky." Comparative Literature, 20, no. 4 (1968), pp. 329-42.

Suggests that Washington Irving influenced Puškin and Gogol' in their themes, motifs, and manner of narration. Points out how Irving, along with Scott, developed a narrative method using a complicated system of narrators. Cites Čudakov's and Polevoj's remarks on the influence of Irving's device upon Gogol'. Points out several parallels and contrasts between Irving's *Dolph Heyliger* and *Mysterious Picture* and Gogol's *The Portrait*. Traces Gogol's well-known narrative device, "skaz," back to Irving's works. Making the point that Russian writers like Puškin, Gogol', and Marlinskij had an interest in American literature, calls for more research on Irving's influence on these three writers.

23. Rahv, Philip. "Gogol as a Modern Instance." In Russian Literature and Modern English Fiction. Edited by Donald Davie. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1965, pp. 239-44.

Contends that Gogol's world still contains characteristics of Realism, criticizing in part Nabokov's view on Gogol'. Underscores the uniqueness of

Gogol's style and language. Emphasizes the digressions, sudden changes of mood, contradictions, and the labyrinthine and twisted psychology of Gogol's world. Finds that Gogol', like Flaubert, utilizes language to protect himself from the conflict between his art and his life, and depicts the world's negative aspects despite his desire to create a positive art. Asserts that Gogol's exaggeration, caricature and farce express the reality of life at that time. Concludes that Gogol's world depicts the suffering of the Russian people and nation.

24. Reeve, Franklin D. "*Dead Souls*." In his The Russian Novel. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966, pp. 64-103.

Claims that Gogol's *Dead Souls* lives in its own rhythm, that is, Gogol's own perception of pattern. Discusses definitions of the terms "повесть" (tale, story), "роман" (novel), "рассказ" (short story) and "эпическая поэма" (epic poem). Assays criticisms of *Dead Souls* by Russian critics Ermakov, Timofejev, and Šklovskij. Asserts that the function of digression in *Dead Souls* is to delay and complicate the action. Digression becomes the means of continual movement in the story and the narrative action in *Dead Souls* proceeds by means of digression. Argues that *Dead Souls* is not a picaresque novel, because Čičikov does not climb the social ladder. Finds that Gogol' creates the absurd and the illogical through logical means, that is, the device of language expressing consciousness. Contends that the whole of *Dead Souls* is centered on Čičikov's travels. Views Čičikov as an extension of Gogol'.

25. Rosebacher, Peter. "The Function of Insanity in Chekhov's *The Black Monk* and Gogol's *Notes of a Madman*." Slavic and East European Journal, 13, no. 2 (1969), pp. 191-99.

Compares and analyzes the function of insanity in the protagonists in Čexov's *The Black Monk*, and Gogol's *The Diary of a Madman*. Finds that Gogol' is more disturbed by the mental nature of his protagonist than is Čexov, and that this disturbance plays an important role in understanding Gogol's world. Insists that at the base of Gogol's disturbance lies the failure to absorb the Christian message. Also sees tension between Gogol's view of the artistic world and his idea of the Christian message. Contrasts Gogol's literary type, saturated with the awareness of man's high destiny, with Čexov's, which is concerned with the achievement of happiness. Asserts that the insanity of both Čexov's *The Black Monk* and Gogol's *The Diary of a Madman* overcomes the limitations of the literary type.

26. Rozanov, Vassily. "How the Character Akaky Akakiyevich Originated." Translated by Spencer E. Roberts. *Ohio University Review*, 10 (1968), pp. 42-56.

Suggests a possible source for the hero Akakij Akakievič. According to Gogol's friend Annenkov, an anecdote about a poor clerk who has a passion for hunting gave Gogol' the idea for *The Overcoat*. The first manuscript, discovered by professor Tixonravov, contains only a kind of artistic sketch of a nameless person with characteristics similar to those of Akakij Akakievič: he is downtrodden, ugly and oppressed. Exploring the difference between the first manuscript and the other manuscripts, finds that in the last manuscript many necessary objects are eliminated, while only simplified and concentrated objects are left. Believes that Gogol' makes the reader believe that he is not depicting a lonely world but a bright life, which Gogol' has never felt. Gogol's lyricism always contains pity, sorrow, and "invisible tears through visible laughter." Concludes that Gogol' expresses delight in his own lyricism even while hating it at the same time.

27. Seeley, Frank F. "Gogol's *Dead Souls*." *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 4 (1968), pp. 33-44.

Refutes the view, held by both Gogol's contemporary social critics and later Soviet critics, that his work is full of realistic elements. Asserts that Gogol's novel contains romantic elements much more than those of Puškin or Lermontov do. Suggests the view, developed by Rozanov, the Symbolists, and the Formalists, that Romanticism is primarily the distortion of reality by fantasy. Insists that the world of Gogol's *Dead Souls* is a psychological world, which reflects the changing form and structure of society. Points out the psychological differences between Gogol's world and those of Puškin and Lermontov. Points out the similarity between R. H. Tawney's idea of individual rights, social functions and property rights in Western society and Gogol's new social type. Observes three types of women in *Dead Souls*: simple wives who are a mirror image of their husbands; women as individuals working outside the family, who are interested in gossip, fashion and men, but are powerless; powerful women as a group. Asserts that the protagonist Čičikov is neither virtuous nor villainous, but is a specimen of economic man. Emphasizes Gogol's idea that old moral categories become outmoded where economic rights and interests become a standard of measure.

28. Setchkarev, Vsevolod. *Gogol: His Life and Works*. Translated by Robert Kramer. New York: New York University Press, 1965.

Broken down into a biography of Gogol' and an analysis of Gogol's works. The first part chronicles Gogol's life from his birth through his jobs in St. Petersburg as a government clerk, professor, and poet. Includes also his life abroad, creative failure and spiritual crisis, and suicide. The plots of all Gogol's

works are thoroughly summarized. The second part presents a critical analysis of Gogol's works in chronological order. Describes Gogol's style in his early works as an intentional mixing of all elements of tone and expression. Discusses the influence of Hoffmann, Sterne, and Jules Janin. Rejecting psychoanalysts' view, considers *The Nose* and *The Carriage* to be purely linguistic and literary works: the former as a work playing with the technical narrative device and the latter as a work of terse composition. Explores Gogol's stylistic devices of absurdity and hyperbole, rejecting the claim that Gogol reflected Russian reality in *Dead Souls*. Argues that in *The Overcoat*, Gogol develops not social sympathy, but ironic misanthropy. Views *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends* as Gogol's idealized reconstruction of a divinely ruled social hierarchy where the poet is chosen by God to interpret his time.

29. Spycher, Peter C. "N. V. Gogol's *The Nose*: A Satirical Comic Fantasy Born of an Impotence Complex." Slavic and East European Journal, 7, no. 4 (1963), pp. 361-74.

Refutes the view of V. Setchkarev that Gogol's *The Nose* is merely a nonsensical jest. Asserts that *The Nose* is a dramatization of Gogol's own sexual anxieties under the pretext of both a grotesque farce and a satire on social climbers. Shows that Gogol originally planned to present *The Nose* in the form of a dream, pointing out that the story begins on March 25 and ends on April 7, and if the former date is counted by the Julian calendar, and the latter date by the Gregorian calendar, no time has elapsed. Searches for answers to the questions: Does Kovalev have a dream? What is the meaning of the nose, its loss, and its recovery? Hypothesizes that Kovalev's nose symbolizes his sexual organ, making the loss of his nose a dream about impotence. Concludes that in *The Nose* there is one more dream besides Kovalev's and the barber Ivan's -- Gogol's own.

30. Stromecky, Ostap. "Ukrainian Elements in Mykola Hohol's *Taras Bulba*." *Ukrainian Quarterly*, 25, no. 4 (1969), pp. 350-61.

Explores Ukrainian linguistic elements in Gogol's *Taras Bulba*, and asserts that Gogol' interjects these Ukrainian components of humor and language into Russian literature. Insists that in *Taras Bulba*, Gogol' interweaves Ukrainian words, melodies, and spirit into the texture of his language. Points out that in *Taras Bulba* there are 1,085 Ukrainian words, such as "смутно стояли," "смутно на сердцу," "смутенко ходила," "чудно-дивно," "чудно-ново-прекрасно," etc. Gogol' blends Russian thought into Ukrainian grammatical structure, or vice versa. Gogol's style is poetic and melodious like musical "bandura" chords. Insists that a stylistic device of repetition is densely employed in Ukrainian "dumas," historical and love songs. Points out that the three heroes have symbolic number and meaning. The names of Taras and Ostap are found in Ukrainian folklore in the meaning of faithfulness; on the other hand, there is no connection to Ukrainian in the name Andrei, who becomes a traitor. Asserts that *Taras Bulba* is not a mockery, but a story of the Cossack loyalty and brotherhood.

31. Timmer, Charles B. "Dead Souls Speaking." *Slavonic and East European Review*, 45 (1967), pp. 273-91.

Contents that Gogol' wants the reader to enter into the context of *Dead Souls*, and to compare and combine historical facts which are extended throughout the work. Insists also that Gogol' deliberately uses the title "poema," for he believes *Dead Souls* contains a true image of certain people in certain conditions at a certain historic point. Through the examination of the text, explores the place of the town of N, the season and the historical period, in which the events take place.

Asserts that the place is a town about 250 miles north east of Moscow in the provincial capital Vologda. Determines the season that the action took place to be late spring or early summer. Insists that the period in which the events happen is sometime between 1821 and 1825.

32. Vinogradov, Victor Vladimirovich. "The Language of Gogol." In The History of the Russian Literary Language from the Seventeenth Century to the Nineteenth. Translated by Lawrence L. Thomas. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969, pp. 209-36.

Explores Gogol's language and style. Cites linguistic research on the various components of Gogol's idiom and his innovative use of the the Russian literary language. Finds Gogol's linguistic system exceptionally comprehensive. Divided into eight chapters: 1) The position of Gogol's language in the literary conflicts of the thirties, forties, and fifties. 2) The dialectal and stylistic composition of Gogol's language up to the second half of the thirties. 3) Gogol's campaign against anti-national styles of the Russian literary language in the name of national Realism. 4) The unmasking and disclosure of official rhetoric and stylistics. 5) Gogol's conception of the principle of mixture of literary styles with various dialects of the spoken language as a base for a national Russian language system. 6) The breadth of inclusion of class, professional, and regional dialects in Gogol's language. 7) Gogol's conception of the structural bases and stylistic norms of an all-national Russian language. Idealization of Church Slavonic and the "folk" language in Gogol's publicistic works. 8) Gogol's influence on the further development of the Russian literary language.

33. Vlach, Robert. "Gogol and Hasek: Two Masters of Poshlost." Etudes Slaves et Est Europeennes, 7 (1962), pp. 239-42.

Gives an interesting comparative study of Gogol's *Dead Souls* and the Czech writer Hasek's *Good Soldier Schweik*. Asserts that Gogol' and Hasek present "pošlost" respectively in *Dead Souls* and *Good Soldier Schweik*. Points out both writers have in common their source of inspiration. Insists that both novels are comic epics, galleries of portraits, travel stories with little psychology, and both have no tragic conflicts, no positive heroes, and no arguments about Christianity and immorality. "Pošlost" spreads out through the stories, making laughter turn into tears of despair. Contends that "pošlost" possesses not only heroes in the novels, but also the authors. In real life both authors become victims of "pošlost" even though they are masters of "pošlost" in their writings. Asserts that both writers despise humanity because of its "pošlost".

34. Vogel, Lucy. "Gogol's Rome." *Slavic and East European Journal*, 11, no. 2 (1967), pp. 145-58.

Discusses the dispute between Belinskij and Gogol' concerning Gogol's unfinished novel *Rome*, finding that *Rome* plays an important role in Gogol's life and art. Suggests that for Gogol' Rome is not only a place, but a spiritual state. Contends that Gogol' arranges his stylistic devices so as to express the emotional ecstasy which he had experienced through the beauty of Rome. Thus, in *Rome* Gogol' paints an impressive, emotional picture of Rome with words like "красота," "гармония," "торжество," "согласие," and "спокойство." Asserts that Gogol' might intend to convey the symbolic meaning of Rome as a divine and eternal idea of beauty and spiritual motherland. Suggests that Gogol' communicates his personal message of Christ through the message of Rome.

35. Wittlin, Joseph. "Gogol's Inferno." *Polish Review*, 7, no. 4 (1962), pp. 5-20.

Draws several observations from a Christian viewpoint. Points out that Gogol's Hell is quite different from Dante's Inferno in *The Divine Comedy*. Dante's Hell is located below the earth's surface; on the other hand Gogol's Hell is within himself. Asserts that Gogol' feared death, life, women, sickness, Russia, the Tsar, the Tsar's officials, but most of all he feared himself which is his Hell. Believes that Gogol' had a tormented soul. Observes that in Gogol's world there are fear, boredom, and absurdity. Gogol' tries to remove them with laughter. Gogol', however, is frightened by his laughter because it is a laughter bred in Hell. Insists that Gogol' intensely needs the love of God. When Gogol' writes the second part of *Dead Souls*, a tragedy takes place: He fails in his depiction of Christianity. Contends that in Gogol's last years he continued to search for God in order to emerge from Hell.

36. Woodward, James B. "The Threadbare Fabric of Gogol's *Overcoat*." *Canadian Slavic Studies*, 1 (1967), pp. 95-104.

Examines the stylistic technique in Gogol's *The Overcoat*. Asserts that *The Overcoat* depicts the gradual reduction of Akakij Akakievič to pure spirit, whereas *The Diary of a Madman* describes the Popriščin's slip into insanity. Describes several devices of contrast in *The Overcoat*. These devices include not only juxtaposition of the comic and solemn, but also repeated confrontations between affirmation and negation. Classifies some adversative conjunctions and counts the number of uses in the text; "но"-64 times, "а"-53 times, "да"-12 times. Asserts that these are used for the purpose of concentration or emphasis. Other adversative conjunctions are also used to accentuate the adversative intonation: "однако"-8 times, "впрочем"-12 times, "все таки"-3 times, "зато"-2 times, "все же"-1 time. Several concessive clauses, which are introduced by "хотя," "хоть," "несмотря

на то, что," display tension or contrast, which is usually reinforced by the insertion of an adversative conjunction at the beginning of the main clause. Asserts that both the frequency of direct and indirect questions and the mass of indefinite words, such as, indefinite pronouns, pronominal adjectives and adverbs, play an important role in creating vagueness in *The Overcoat*. Furthermore, such created vagueness is intensified by the use of the adversative conjunctions. Claims that the combination of indefinite words and the adversative intonation is the main feature of *The Overcoat*. Concludes that such intonations and stylistic features are very apparent characteristics in *The Overcoat*, and they play a major role in displaying the unreality of Gogol's world.

37. Zeldin, Jesse. "A Reevaluation of Gogol's *Selected Passages*." *Russian Review*, 27, no. 4 (1968), pp. 421-31.

Points out that most critics did not accept the real message of Gogol's *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends*. Even a Christian critic, Mocul'skij, makes only passing mention of *Selected Passages*. Asserts that the essays on literature in *Selected Passages* are important and influential to Russian literature. Points out that Gogol' believes the writer to be not a creator of beauty, but a prophet who reveals beauty. Also a writer writes not for himself or for art's sake, but for his people and for God, who gave him the gift and the insight to tell the truth. Contends that Gogol' never attempted to turn himself from art to religion, but to return to traditional religion-based views of the writer. Emphasizes the Christianity of Gogol'.

1. Annenskii, Innokentij F. "The Aesthetics of Gogol's *Dead Souls* and Its Legacy." In Twentieth Century Russian Literary Criticism. Edited by Victor Erlich. Translated by Elizabeth Traham and John Fred Beebe. New Haven, Massachusetts: Yale University Press, 1975, pp. 51-60.

Explores Gogol's aesthetics in *Dead Souls*, and discusses its influences on Russian writers. Points out several examples of Gogol's imagery from *Dead Souls*. Observes that all characters in the novel have two persons inside themselves which are tied together by life -- a substantial being, i.e., voice, color, gesture, laughter, and a mysterious, secret being. The former creates a typicality, and the latter a personality. Believes that Gogol' disconnects these two persons, making the former a distinct typicality, while the latter fades away. Cites examples of this typicality in characters: Čičikov, Nozdrev, Manilov, and Petruška. Compares Gogol' and Puškin: Puškin is the delight and joyfulness of Old Russia, Gogol' the agony and torment of Future Russia. Argues that writers influenced by Gogol' moved away from him (Dostoevskij, Gončarov, Turgenev, L. Tolstoj, Saltykov-Ščedrin, Čexov, Sologub, and Nekrasov). Discusses characteristics of their works displaying features of Gogol's aesthetics.

2. Asch, Laurie. "The Censorship of Nikolai Gogol's *Diary of a Madman*." Russian Literature Triquarterly, 14 (1976), pp. 20-35.

Compares and analyzes the original version published in 1835 with four different versions of *The Diary of a Madman*: Tixonravov's (1894), Komarovič's (1938), Muratova's (1960), and Zalilova's (1966). In the original version, published under Tsarist censorship, elements of political and social satire are kept to a minimum and remain subordinate to the theme of propressive insanity. Concludes that all four versions have succeeded more in confirming the problems of textual authenticity than in determining the real version of Gogol's story. Contends that

versions appearing before and after the Revolution portray conflicting ideologies: the pre-revolutionary versions contain few unfavorable references to Nikolaj I, while post-revolutionary versions underline Gogol's ridicule of the monarchy by adding passages unflattering to the Tsar.

3. Bailey, James. "Some Remarks about the Structure of Gogol's *Overcoat*." In Mnemozina: Studia Litteraria Russica in Honorem Vsevolod Setchkarev. Edited by Joachim T. Baer and Norman W. Ingham. Munich: Fink, 1974, pp. 13-22.

Supports ideas of Ejxenbaum, Slonimskij, and Čiževskij concerning language effects in Gogol's "skaz" technique. Claims that the structure of *The Overcoat* is found in the text itself, dividing it into three sections: 1) descriptions of the department, Akakij Akakievič's birth, and his way of life, 2) Akakij's purchase of a new coat, 3) fantastic ending. Explains the shift from "мирок" to "мир" and from "мир" to "мирок." Claims that Gogol uses Petrovic to shift Akakij from his "мирок" to "мир" and uses the Very Important Person to shock Akakij out of the "мир" which he has just entered. Points out that Petrovič, like other Gogolian demonic characters, is given an eastern coloring (he is shown with his legs crossed under him "like a Turkish pasha"). Discusses the importance of time, opposition, and the shocking extremes in the structure and overall effect of the story.

4. Bakhtin, M. M. "The Art of the Word and the Culture of Folk Humor: Rabelais and Gogol." In Semiotics and Structuralism: Readings from the Soviet Union. Edited by H. Baran. New York: White Plains, 1976, pp. 284-96.

Asserts that Gogol's laughter is not influenced by Rabelais, but has a direct connection to the Ukrainian folk-festival forms. Points out that in *Vij* and *Taras Bulba*, the laughter of grotesque seminarian realism is organically blended with

Ukrainian folk-festival laughter, since both are strongly related to each other. Contends that the style of Gogol's St. Petersburg stories has ingredients of folk-festival humor, and that his alogisms and absurdities are also connected with folk humor and grotesque realism. In Gogol's world, a carnival perception is pre-eminent. Finds that Gogol's grotesque violates and rejects the absolute and eternal norms, for the sake of a new creation of unanticipated quality. Gogolian laughter remains the sole positive hero in his artistic world. Concludes that his uniquely bright, positive, lofty laughter purifies banality and triumphs over all.

5. Barksdale, E. C. "Gogol: The Myth and the Grotesque." In his The Dacha and the Duchess. New York: Philosophical Library, 1974, pp. 105-12.

Explores Gogolian myth and the role of grotesque in his myth. Finds in Gogol's world a pastoral myth which is dispelled by the non-pastoral actions of his characters, as well as by Gogolian grotesque and the theme of unexplained death. The digressions and irregularities in Gogol's world also have the effect of deviating from the Levi-Strauss' view of myth. Asserts that in *Dead Souls* a pastoral world becomes a unreal evil world, and becomes a grotesque schematization of pastoral myth. Points out that folk tales in Gogol's world mirror everyday life, but metamorphose into myth by mixing reality and the grotesque. Contends that the Gogolian myth reflects his distorted mind, and his death is a pastoral myth of the grotesque.

6. Belyi, Andrei. "Gogol." Translated by Elizabeth Trahan. Russian Literature Triquarterly, 4 (1972), pp. 131-44.

Explores who Gogol' is through a careful examination of his textual stylistics. Sees Gogol's art as full of bountiful images such as glittering sounds,

dazzling colors, and fragrant smells. Points out that when Gogol' combines these images, a new, unreal image suddenly emerges: for example, a Cossack is dancing, and suddenly a fang juts out from his mouth. Suggests that Gogol' can be seen as a Realist, a Symbolist, a Romantic, or a Classicist. Gogol's forests, like a Symbolist's, are not forests, and his mountains are not mountains. As a Romantic, like Hoffmann or Poe, he presents the fantastic as reality; his epic is compared to a Classicist such as Homer; and Gogol's world, like that of the Symbolists, contains mysteries of rapture and horror; his ecstasy is rapturous yet has ominous delight. Contends that to Gogol', Mother Russia is a mysterious figure, comparing Gogol's relation to Russia with the sorcerer's relation to his daughter Katerina. Declares Gogol' to be the best stylist of his time, and admires the dazzling expressiveness he achieves when he combines crude and meaningless language with the most intricate similes and metaphors. Points out Gogol's alliteration, masterful use of word order, compound epithets, similes, repetitions, parallelisms, semi-parallelisms, etc.

7. Bernheimer, Charles C. "Cloaking the Self: The Literary Space of Gogol's *Overcoat*." *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 90, no. 1 (January 1975), pp. 53-61.

Asserts that the self which is embodied in Gogol's literary works is a false, masked self. Suggests that the story of *The Overcoat* reveals Gogol's conflicting feelings concerning the role of writing in relation to the external world and to the author's own world. Argues that if Akakij Akakievič can't get an overcoat, he will be destroyed by the frost; on the other hand, if he gets an overcoat, he will be demolished by the force of external reality. Contends that, in turn, the reflexive structure of *The Overcoat* serves as a defense mechanism for Gogol's own fear of being demolished. Claims that Gogol' does not resolve his story, leaving the reader

ambivalent. In the end, Akakij Akakievič is left with an empty feeling, and Gogol' returns to the realm of fantasy.

8. Boyd, Alexander. "In the Town of N: Nikolai Gogol and *Dead Souls*." In his Aspects of the Russian Novel. London: Chatto and Windus, 1972, pp. 46-67.

Chronologically presents Gogol's biography, including explanations of his works. Praises Gogol's *Dead Souls* as his greatest masterpiece. Asserts that the title *Dead Souls* refers to the sub-human personalities of its characters, who are motivated by greed, envy, and selfishness. Suggests the characters in *Dead Souls* are dead in the sense that they belong to the fictitious and unreal world. Enumerates the main characteristics of the characters, citing the text. Treats K. Aksakov's comparison of Gogol's *Dead Souls* to Homer's *Iliad*, and Belinskij's rejection of Aksakov's claim and his criticism of *Dead Souls*. Introduces the second part of *Dead Souls*, analyzing its new characters, in particular Tentetnikov, who is seen as a forerunner of Turgenev's characters. Sees Konstanžoglo, an energetic and super-efficient landowner, as the first positive character in *Dead Souls*. Describes Gogol's didactic preface in the second edition of *Dead Souls* in 1848, and the harsh criticism by Aksakov and Belinskij of *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends*. Believes that although Gogol' had taken on the role of teacher and remained a firm believer in Orthodoxy, his humor and satire are still alive with greatness.

9. Bryusov, Valery. "Burnt to Ashes." In Gogol from the Twentieth Century. Edited and translated by Robert A. Maguire. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974, pp. 103-32.

Interprets Gogol' not as a realist, but as a dreamer and a fantasist. Believes that in his works Gogol' depicts his own ideal world through hyperbole and exaggeration. Cites several conversations in Gogol's works as evidence that in Gogol's world of parody and satire the ridiculous side of human relationships is outrageously exaggerated. Declares that Gogol's description of the "pošlost" and the absurdity of life is beyond the normal person's imagination. Analyzes the extraordinary depictions of nature in the Ukrainian stories as exemplary of his skill of exaggeration. Supports V. Rozanov's claim that Gogol' presents and depicts all objects not realistically, but in extreme condition. Contends that such extremes and exaggeration were also present in Gogol's own life.

10. Byrns, Richard. "Gogol and the Feminine Myth." *Etudes Slaves et Est Europeennes*, nos. 20-21 (1975-1976), pp. 44-60.

Sees two types of woman --demonic and vulgar or beautiful and idealized-- as hindering and helping, respectively, in Gogol's religious quest. Emphasizes two contradictory aspects in Gogol's world: an earthly forbidden desire and a yearning for spirituality. Points out that Gogol' tries to define the ideal woman in his *Hans Kjuxelgarten* and *Woman*. Maintains that for Gogol' love is not only a state of innocence unspoiled by sin or desire, but the homeland of a godlike soul, and as a result Gogol' conceptualizes his ideal woman spiritually. Gogol's other stories are dominated by negative feminine images because this world has no place for a spiritual ideal and beauty is inevitably prostituted. Tells how Gogol', late in life, mixes his conception of the ideal woman with his conception of Christianity, presenting a new earthly ideal woman in *Dead Souls* part two and *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends* -- not a spiritual ideal, but an active



and compassionate Madonna figure, arguably a completely developed feminine vision of Gogol'.

11. Chizhevskii, Dmitrii. "About Gogol's *Overcoat*." In Gogol from the Twentieth Century. Edited and translated by Robert A. Maguire. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974, pp. 295-322.

Emphasizes the craftsmanship and technical significance of *The Overcoat*. Sees Gogol's repetition of the meaningless word "даже" as part of a deliberate comic word-play of contrasts between the meaningful and the meaningless in which "даже" frequently represents the meaningless or introduces ideas which lack the anticipated logical conjunction. Through word-play, Gogol' discloses the insignificance of the real life that he is presenting since what comes after the word "даже" is really trifling and trivial. Thus the insignificant is represented as the significant in life. Points out that the story of *The Overcoat* is told not by the author himself, but by a narrator whom Gogol' deliberately keeps at a certain distance from himself. Suggests that Gogol' draws attention to Akakij Akakievich's deliberately impoverished language, which matches that of the narrator. Asserts that the theme of *The Overcoat* is the rebirth of the human soul under the influence of love, especially love for an insignificant object -- the overcoat.

12. Clyman, Toby W. "The Hidden Demons in Gogol's *Overcoat*." Russian Literature, 7, no. 6 (1979), pp. 601-10.

Explores the hidden demons in Gogol's *The Overcoat* through a close examination of the text. Claims that the sly tailor, Petrovič, is a hidden demon. Mentions the remarks of Dmitrij Čiževskij and James Bailey regarding the devil and Petrovič. Provides detailed research on Petrovič. Points out that Petrovič's formal name, Grigorij, means "watcher" in Greek. Insists that in the apocryphal

story of Enoch, the angels who revolt against God are named watchers. Asserts that Gogol' switched the tailor's name to Petrovič in order to mask his demonic identity. Adds that Petrovič's environment, physical appearance, and behavior are strongly connected with a conception of the demonic. The descriptions of Petrovič's apartment, such as dark, smoke-filled, and containing a spirituous odor, have the same features as the place where evil spirits reside in common folk belief. Petrovič's pock-marked face, one eye, and foot with a large toe nail are tied to folk belief about the devil. Descriptions of his behavior and appearance, such as "crooked," "bent," and "deformed," have a connection with demonic features. Adds that words which have the same root as four ("четыре") appear more than eleven times. Suggests that the word "четыре" contains all the letters of the alphabet which spell devil ("чёрт"). Concludes that the frequent appearance of the oblique form of the word "четыре" and the word "чёрт" is important in the fact that demons are everywhere in Gogol's works.

13. Debreczeny, Paul. "Gogol's Mockery of Romantic Taste: Varieties of Language in *the Tale of the Two Ivans*." *Canadian American Slavic Studies*, 7 (1973), pp. 327-41.

Analyzes the relationship between author and reader, and the varieties of narrative style in *The Tale of How Ivan Ivanovič Quarreled with Ivan Nikiforovič*. Finds in the narrative two voices, i.e., that of the beekeeper Rudyj Pan'ko from Dikanka, and that of a writer of popular romantic literature. The former addresses a local audience; the latter, mass one. Notes the Ukrainian expressions and grammar, church related colloquialisms, and bureaucratic language in the narrative. Points out mixtures of foreign expressions such as "компания" and "дело деликатное," which creates an effect of absurdity. Proposes that there is another third narrative voice in the epilogue marked by contrasting ideas and contrasting

stylistic devices, as well as Puškinian simplicity. Concludes that this third voice, using both language varieties, addresses itself more to an educated audience.

14. Eikhenbaum, Boris. "How Gogol's *Overcoat* is Made." In Dostoevsky and Gogol: Text and Criticism. Edited by Priscilla Meyer and Stephen Rudy. Translated by Peter B. Stetson. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1979, pp. 119-35.

This structural analysis of Gogol's *The Overcoat* asserts that the texture of the story depends on the role of the author's personal tone. Maintains that the personal tone of the narrator in *The Overcoat* does not reflect Gogol's inner mind, serving instead as a simple technical device which creates "skaz" and thus plays a more important role than the plot. Since "skaz" eschews a simple narration to repeat words with stress on mimetic and articulated sounds, the words in *The Overcoat* play a significant role in carrying out comic effects. Discusses a variety of puns composed of acoustic similarities, plays on etymologies, and hidden absurdities, which are important in *The Overcoat*. Contends that Akakij Akakievič's language is a part of Gogol's own language, well designed and prepared in advance. Sees plot as merely a prop around which are interwoven stylistic devices. Refutes the view that the ending of *The Overcoat* makes it a touching story with melodramatic episodes, seeing it instead as filled with "skaz" comic devices and the grotesque.

15. Emerson-Topornin, Alexis E. "*Shinel*: The Devil's Ovals: Motif of the Doubles." Forum at Iowa on Russian Literature, 1, no. 1 (1976), pp. 34-56.

Asserts that a double motif can be found at the core of *The Overcoat*. Furthermore, at the very center of the story lies the motif of seduction by the demon. Sees Akakij Akakievič as an embodiment of nothingness and as an anti-

Faust, while the tailor, Petrovič, is a kind of devil. For Akakij Akakievič the overcoat symbolizes security, warmth, and a sense of power, but possessing the overcoat ruins him. For Gogol', the overcoat is also ascribed a prophetic function: to live as an artist means a life of loneliness, self-deprivation and emotional starvation in a world which is the devil's own creation. Asserts that the Very Important Person symbolizes a nothingness and a faceless lack of individuality. Views the VIP as a wearer of a symbolic "шинель." Points out the motif of the double: Akakij Akakievič is close to the narrator, while the VIP is far removed; the former is more positive, while the latter is more negative; the character of Akakievič is the Ego, whereas the VIP is the alter Ego. Concludes that the overcoat is a symbol not of love, but of anti-love, like the devil's own tortoise shell, Petrovič's carapace-like toe nail.

16. Even-Zohar, Itamar. "The Tailor Petrovich Pronounces the Verdict on Akakij: A Note on a Stylised Scene and a Pragmatic Connective." *Slavica Hierosolymitana*, 3 (1978), pp. 1-7.

Analyzes the role of "да" as a syntactic and pragmatic connective in the stylized manner of Gogol's *The Overcoat*. Explains that Russian "да" is chiefly restricted to initial position in a pragmatic role, which is an indication of more popular and vulgar speech. Points out, however, that while Gogol' used "да" for depicting individuals, he more often used "да" in describing situations. Notes that "да" appears in scenes of great excitement in *Dead Souls*. Points out the use of "да" for grotesque effect in the scene between Petrovič and Akakij Akakievič in *The Overcoat*. Concludes that any conventional use of "да" becomes an apotheosis of the grotesque, and the entire syntactic and pragmatic connective is semanticised, then ironised and even reversed to a certain degree.

17. Fanger, Donald Lee. The Creation of Nikolai Gogol. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Divided into four chapters: "Approaches," "Improvising a Vocation," "Embracing a Calling," and "The Surviving Presence." The first part emphasizes the uniqueness of Gogol's world and describes the Russian cultural context; the second and third parts analyze Gogol's works. Claims that figurative metamorphosis exists everywhere in Gogol's works. Observing comic elements which consist of a distinctive play of antitheses between something meaningful and something meaningless, contends that these antitheses alternate, with non-sense proving to be sense, or vice versa. The nature of identity is also central to Gogol's writings: changes of identity occur in *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka*, and mistaken identity figures prominently in *Nevskij Prospekt*, *The Diary of a Mad Man*, *The Nose*, *The Inspector General*, and *Dead Souls*. The motif of vision plays an important role in Gogol's creations, especially in his early works. Gogol's shortsighted characters are vitalized through the creator's vision with power. Pointing out that the road offers views of landscapes, characters, and events, contends that Čičikov in *Dead Souls*, like a mirror moving down the road, is all surface. Also investigates (in Part Four) the peculiarity of Gogol's poetic message and discerns several features of the Gogolian universe -- metamorphosis (sudden change), evasion (the road), identity, and recognition (motifs of vision). Argues that Gogol's achievement is to demonstrate as nearly as possible the power of a medium without a message, and concludes that his great works are self-reflexive and ultimately "about" the nature of their own literary beings. Agrees with Andrej Sinjavskij's view that Gogol created his (and Russian) prose out of the colloquial language.

18. Fanger, Donald Lee. "Dead Souls: Mirror and Road." *Nineteenth Century Fiction*, 33, no. 1 (1978), pp. 24-47.

Claims that Gogol's *Dead Souls* is not an ordinary novel, but a provocative and enigmatic masterpiece. Asserts that *Dead Souls* cannot be called a picaresque novel, although it is dominated by the road. Argues that the road serves not as pretext for Čičikov's adventure, but rather offers views of landscapes, characters, and events. Sees Čičikov, the featureless hero, as a mirror moving down the road. Like a mirror, Čičikov is all surface, and his mirroring of the other characters is shown to be mutual; for example, Manilov appears as a hyperbolic parody of Čičikov's own main feature. The role of the author is seen as distinct from that of the narrator, with the former remaining above the process of presentation as carried out by the narrator, with persistent implication that the author has some larger enterprise of his own, as enigmatic as Čičikov's. Thus the author is himself a creature of the road.

19. Fedorenko, Eugene. "Gogol's *Revizor*: A Reexamination of Language Characteristics." *Russian Language Journal*, 106 (1976), pp. 39-50.

Closely examines variances among the three versions of Gogol's *The Inspector General*: the original version, the version published in 1836, and the final version of 1842. Points out that although Gogol alters almost all of the acts in various ways, the development of the plot and the fundamental characters remain unchanged. Makes several observations on Gogol's simplicity, fluency, dynamics of language, and successful use of hyperbole, irony, the grotesque, and colloquial speech. Explains the dual nature of the mayor's speech (he is polite with Xlestakov, coarse to his subordinates) which results in mutual misunderstanding between him and Xlestakov. Discusses Gogol's depiction of provincial ladies' speech and

actions. Concludes that Gogol' was an expert at creating his protagonists through their verbal mannerisms.

20. Freeborn, Richard. "*Dead Souls*." In his *The Rise of the Russian Novel*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1973, pp. 74-114.

Asserts that for Gogol' nothing is more profoundly real than the relationship between his creative spirit and the literary creation to which it gives life. Sees the seriousness of the endeavor as an integral part of the laughter-dominated atmosphere of Gogol's art. Asserts that in *Dead Souls* the true message is that Gogol's characters are literal projections of his own spirit as well as the embodiment of the "pošlost'" in his own character, capable of exorcism and sublimation only through the power of laughter, which is not only self-purifying, but also exorcises the devil of Russia. Points out that Gogol's *Dead Souls* is very subjective, and bears some resemblance to a poem in the subjectivity of its lyricism and the looseness of its structure. Nonetheless, it can be recognized as a novel under Gogol's own definition of that genre. Adds that narrative digressions take the form of the extended or Homeric simile. Claims that in *Dead Souls* Gogol' is present as a first person commentator rather than as a narrator, making more lyrical digressions possible.

21. Gippius, Vasilii V. "*The Inspector General: Structure and Problems*." In Gogol from the Twentieth Century. Edited and translated by Robert A. Maguire. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974, pp. 216-65.

Examines Russian drama prior to Gogol's *The Inspector General*, in terms of its failure to reflect social problems and to develop from the level of vaudeville comedy. Argues that *The Inspector General* contains social denunciation whether

or not Gogol' wanted it to. Sees the Russian official as an important theme in Gogol's view of Russian social life in the mid 1830's, asserting that Xlestakovism serves as a social commentary on the confusion of life as well as a typical and generalized phenomenon. Finds the social theme in Gogol' to be strongly tied to the aesthetic theme. Names five characteristic features of *The Inspector General*: 1) the elaboration of the traditional "official abuses" plot but with the elimination of malevolent individuals, 2) the absence of positive character types, 3) the assignment of an oppositional role to lower class characters, 4) an ingenious structure which removes the possibility of sympathetic or praiseworthy approaches to government and leaves no room for softening the satirical and realistic tone, 5) the weaving throughout the play's structure of the motif of power and the abstract idea of punishment.

22. Glass, Elliot S. "Dead Souls and the Hispanic Picaresque Novel." *Revista de Estudios Hispánicos*, 11 (1977), pp. 77-90.

Explores how Gogol' was influenced by the Hispanic picaresque novel, especially Cervantes' *Novelas ejemplares*, *Entremeses*, and *Don Quijote*. Supports Ludmilla B. Turkevič's assertion that Gogol' had *Don Quijote* in mind when he wrote *Dead Souls*. Compares Gogol's *Dead Souls* to the Hispanic picaresque novel, whose protagonist is "un hidalgo de apariencia," a great manipulator who travels from inn to inn plotting, scheming, and living by his wits. Asserts that Čičikov, like the 16th and 17th century "hidalgos de apariencia," embodies the collective personality of his land and culture, a personality characterized by spiritual and physical hunger, self-deception, arrogance, self-indulgence, and opportunism. Suggests that both *Dead Souls* and the Hispanic picaresque novel contain a series of unrelated adventures which are woven together by a

protagonist, with the road and the inn as integral elements common to both. Classifies three types of women in *Dead Souls*: the young innocent maiden (Governor's daughter), the aggressive manipulator (Korobočka), and the foolish pretentious gossipmonger (a host of provincial ladies), finding women of these types to be abundant in the Hispanic picaresque novel. Concludes that Gogol' might have been influenced by the Hispanic picaresque novel, since he was in Italy when he was finishing *Dead Souls*.

23. Hallet, R. W. "The Laughter of Gogol." *Russian Review*, 30, no. 4 (1971), pp. 373-84.

Analyzes the essence of Gogol's laughter and its relation to his personality. Finds several comic devices, such as digression, incongruity, irrelevance, and anti-climax, which play a significant role in creating humor. Points out that Gogol's comic manner is an escape from his personal life and idealistic self, as well as a consequence of his deep depression. Explores the duality of laughter and tears in Gogol's complex humor. Suggests that by laughter Gogol' revenges himself on Russian society for humiliations he had experienced. This revenge in part takes the form of anti-heroes whom Gogol' endows with his personal neuroses. Concludes that these elements of Gogol's personal psyche cause readers to feel nervousness in the presence of his humor.

24. Hippisley, Anthony. "Gogol's *The Overcoat*: A Further Interpretation." *Slavic and East European Journal*, 20, no. 2 (Summer 1976), pp. 121-9.

Examines the spiritual significance of *The Overcoat* and its relationship to Gogol's life. Emphasizes a spiritual and religious approach to the story, which he feels represents the sinner's pursuit of salvation as embodied in Akakij Akakievič's new coat. Discusses several interpretations, including those of Čiževskij, Driessen,

Rozanov, Ejxenbaum, Merežkovskij, Nabokov, Močul'skij, and Zenkovskij, finding the religious interpretation most persuasive. Draws upon the idea that clothing is used to symbolize righteousness in the Bible (Revelation 7:14, Isaiah 64:6, Isaiah 61:10, Psalms 132:9, and Mark 2:21). Argues that John Schillinger's criticism of *The Overcoat* concentrates predominantly on externals. Agrees with Schillinger's view of spiritual meaning in *The Overcoat*, but rejects his claim that Akakij Akakievič is a holy martyr.

25. Holquist, James M. "The Burden of Prophecy: Gogol's Conception of Russia." Review of National Literatures, 3, no. 1 (1972), pp. 39-55.

Explores the source of Gogol's concept of Russia, emphasizing the tormenting contradiction between the real Russia and Gogol's ideal Russia. Points out that Gogol's personal history consists of attempts and failures to achieve a religious view of world. Links Gogol's ideal Russia to his conception of the ideal writer, who has a messianic calling to bridge the gap between ideal Russia and real Russia. Points out that Gogol saw both the Tsar and the Russian church as important instruments to stimulate and revive Russia. Concludes that Gogol's attitude to Russia stems from his platonic nationalism, and his prophetic idea of the writer stems from his religious concepts.

26. Hulanicki, Leo. "The Carriage by N. V. Gogol." Russian Literature, 12 (1975), pp. 61-77.

Analyzes the narrative structure of Gogol's *The Carriage*, beginning with its two-part exposition. Emphasizes the character of Čertokuckij, to which is ascribed an importance in the narrative's development. Most of the elements of the narrative structure are seen to contain iconic significance. Thus everything that is

furnished to create Čertokuckij's character is part of the icon. Observes that the background details depicting the town and the society greatly enhance the iconic structure of *The Carriage*. Finds that among the two essential elements of "skaz," namely "orality" and "individualization," the former is present in *The Carriage*, but the latter is absent. Describes some devices which help build the iconic significance of *The Carriage*: grotesque, metaphoric and metonymic expressions, parallelism, repetition, and absurdity, which combine to contribute to the overall effect.

27. Ivanov, Viacheslav. "Gogol's *Inspector General* and the Comedy of Aristophanes." In Gogol from the Twentieth Century. Edited and translated by Robert A. Maguire. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974, pp. 200-14.

Asserts that Gogol' in his *The Inspector General* portrays a world in the tradition of ancient Greek comedy, as well as a metaphysical and spiritual one. Comparing Gogol's "The Denouement" of *The Inspector General* with ancient Aristophanic comedy, explains how the aesthetic and social functions of *The Inspector General* merge in the chorus. Insists that the action in *The Inspector General* is reflected not in the personal relationships, but in the social and collective confederation. Finds in *The Inspector General* a universal laughter which is not simple and unmindful, but healthful and pure. Asserts that Gogol's universal laughter is the real collective character of the people who are associated through their minds and spirits. Adds that Gogol's comedy is musical, as is the ancient comedy of Aristophanes, since it combines the important feature of direct declamation with humorous singing. This choral element is seen as a source of inner vitality.

28. Jennings, Lee B. "Gogol's *Dead Souls* Grotesqueries." In Vistas and Vectors: Essays Honoring the Memory of Helmut Rehder. Edited by Lee B. Jennings and George

Schulz-Behrend. Austin, Texas: Department of Germanic Languages, University of Texas at Austin, 1979, pp. 136-41.

Raises the question of the clarity of the term "grotesque" in literature, and attempts to apply the term to Gogol's works clearly. Emphasizes the role of visual imagery in the grotesque. Argues that a satirical and absurd view of life may support manifestations of the grotesque, but cannot be considered an essential element since the grotesque can be well presented without it. Supports the idea that most of Gogol's works are dominated by the religious theme of man's possession by the devil. Concludes that the grotesque in Gogol's *Dead Souls*, while adhering to the "Victorian" pattern of European middle class realism, at the same time strangely deviates from it, drawing closer to the earlier styles of Byron's *Weltschmerz*, yet approaching a more modern conception of absurdity than that provided by mid-century realism.

29. Karlinsky, Simon. The Sexual Labyrinth of Nikolai Gogol. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1976.

Explores homosexual and psychological themes in Gogol's biography and writings. Noting that Gogol' did not have an interest in writing about women and was never interested in describing heterosexual relationships in his works, considers Gogol' a closet homosexual. Examines the sexual symbolism of Gogol's nature descriptions in *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka*. In a description of a hot summer day in *The Fair at Soročincy*, natural phenomena -- river, sky, earth -- are assigned specific genders and allowed to engage in explicit acts of sexual intimacy. In *A May Night*, a nocturnal pond tries to make love to distant stars. Also points out that Gogol' conveys his visualization of sexualized nature in *The Terrible Vengeance*: female images of summer earth and a beautiful river, and male images of the Dnieper are personified in a old sleeping man with impotence and petulance.

Geese were seen as sexual symbols: Afanasij' chasing the geese in *The Old-World Landowners*, the goose-faced wives in Ivan Šponka's dream, the sexual role of ganders in *The Tale of How Ivan Ivanovič Quarreled with Ivan Nikiforovič*. Contends that the comfortable lifestyle of the elderly couple in *The Old-World Landowners* shows an example of how to live affectionately with another person while retreating from the threat of disastrous heterosexual sex or forbidden homosexual sex, and that *The Two Ivans* also contains a story of a sexless homosexual marriage. Considering the gander, the rifle, a pig as a phallic symbol, sees Ivan Ivanovič's offer as a veiled homosexual proposition. Contends that *The Old-World Landowners* and *Taras Bulba* contemplate heterosexuality, *The Two Ivans* turns to homosexuality, and *Vij* takes in both and adds a touch of sado-masochism. Shows how Gogol's feelings of homosexual guilt result in his religious crisis and strong ties with Christianity since only religion kept Gogol' from acting out his homosexual impulses.

30. Lindstrom, Thais S. Nikolay Gogol. New York: Twayne, 1974.

Divided into eight chapters which follow Gogol's literary career in chronological order: 1) Establishment of Identity, 2) First Creative Realizations, 3) *Mirgorod* Stories, 4) The St. Petersburg Cycle, 5) A Theater of the Absurd, 6) Years Abroad, 7) *Dead Souls*, 8) Disintegration of Creativity. Combines analyses of Gogol's works with a description of his life. Attempts to elucidate various puzzling aspects of Gogol's world, taking mainly a Formalist approach. Sees *The Overcoat* as an unprepared, uninhibited verbal narrative, replete with colloquialisms, repetition and lapses of memory, which creates the impression of natural, unhurried speech. Finds *Dead Souls* to represent the pinnacle of Gogol's art. Asserts that *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends* shows that

Gogol' never shifted from his deeply conservative ideological view, that is, the acceptance of serfdom and the Tsar's power.

31. Little, Edmund. "Gogol's Town of N N and Peake's *Gormenghast*: The Realism of Fantasy." *Journal of Russian Studies*, 34 (1977), pp. 13-8.

Discusses similarities between Gogol's *Dead Souls* and Mervyn Peake's *Titus Groan* and *Gormenghast*; both writers are seen to devote more energy to creating the characters than to designing the plot. Both writers have a common interest in painting and create dazzling visual effects. Neither Gogol' nor Peake are seen to concern themselves with the depiction of the human being, and this results in a methodical dehumanization by means of nomenclature. Both authors' characters have names with absurd meanings that reflect their background or physical appearance. The characters in the novels are given distinctive and exaggerated characteristics for humorous effect. Describes how animals in both authors' novels are frequently given human identity, and inanimate objects often take on aspects of human life. Adds that their novels do not depict the beauty of landscape or love in human relationships.

32. Little, T. E. "*Dead Souls*." In *Knaves and Swindlers: Essays on the Picaresque Novel in Europe*. Edited by Christine J. Whitbourn. London: Oxford University Press, 1974, pp. 112-38.

Asserts that Gogol's *Dead Souls* is a picaresque novel, although certain critics, like F. D. Reeve and D. E. Tamarčenko, claim it is not. Finds traditional picaresque elements in *Dead Souls* to be plentiful: for example, the protagonist Čičikov is a knave and swindler, the novel is episodic rather than plot-oriented, and humor is a dominant element. Sees *Dead Souls* not as autobiography, but as a

first person narrative faithfully recording its milieu, but lacking depictions of love affairs. Believes the accurate description of society is an important element for the picaresque novel. Explores Gogol's artistic instincts and religious views. Concludes that Čičikov is a hero of a picaresque *Odyssey*, traveling through a moral, rather than social hell.

33. Maguire, Robert A. "Some Stylistic Approaches to Gogol's *Two Ivans*." Teaching Language Through Literature, 15, no. 2 (1976), pp. 25-39.

Proposes Gogol's *The Tale of How Ivan Ivanovič Quarreled with Ivan Nikiforovič* as an example of teaching Russian literature with a stylistic approach to college students. Emphasizes that a simple dictionary meaning of Russian vocabularies is not enough to understand the text. Points out and annotates narrative devices such as exclamations, digressions, formulaic expressions, apostrophes to the reader, trivial details, and parallelism. Finds the tension-generating disparity in the text between syntax and semantics reflecting a complex interrelationship between reality and appearance, an oscillation between equilibrium and disequilibrium. Notes the contrast between the two Ivans' language: Ivanovič's delightful language is used to cover reality and evade action, while Nikiforovič's is dull, direct and rough, and contains earthy Russian expressions. Explores the function of shifts in "skaz" narrative voices. Asserts that three narrative voices exist in the text. Each is quite different in its educational background and its approach to the readers. Concludes that the story, through its different voices, maintains the theme of "unchanging change."

34. Matthews, Irene. "Gogol's Early Satire." Satire Newsletter, 9, no. 1 (1971), pp. 6-17.

Asserts that Gogol's *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka* and *Mirgorod*, as early satires, are based on Ukrainian folklore, legend, fairy tale, and Gogol's own romantic imagination. Points out that *Ivan Fedorovič Šponka and His Aunt* is autobiographical in its theme of fear of woman. Details how Šponka's life and journey are presented with comic exaggeration. Points out that his way of life is summarized in one word "pošlost'," characterized by triviality, ugliness, pretentiousness, and petty conceits. Insists that *Evenings*, except *Šponka and His Aunt*, are purely comic feature. Contends that in *The Tale of How Ivan Ivanovič Quarreled with Ivan Nikiforovič*, Gogol' expresses a moral and social aim as a writer, i.e., elimination of universal failure and revival of human nature.

35. McFarlin, Harold A. "The Overcoat As a Civil Service Episode." *Canadian American Slavic Studies*, 13 (1979), pp. 235-53.

Emphasizes the importance of administrative jargon in *The Overcoat*. Argues that V. V. Vinogradov has identified Gogol's bureaucratic style, but has not made a deep investigation into its definitions and artistic functions. Shows how Gogol' accumulates bureaucratic reference and creates an overpowering bureaucratic ethos. Suggests that Gogol' intentionally reflects Akakij Akakievič's rank and occupation in all his private activities and thoughts. Contends that Akakij Akakievič is not at the very bottom, but in the middle of the ranks, and represents both lower and middle civil servants who have ambitions for promotion, but can not be promoted according to the reform of 1809 due to lack of education. Concludes that Akakij Akakievič is not a simple "little man," but an ordinary example of Gogol's governmental figures, who fawn over high ranking officials and show rudeness toward lower ranking ones.

36. Merezhkovskii, Dmitrii. "Gogol and the Devil." In Gogol from the Twentieth Century. Edited and translated by Robert A. Maguire. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974, pp. 57-102.

Declares that the Devil depicted in Gogol's works is not an object of substance but a personification of Gogol's own dynamic impulses masked by humorous devices. Declares that in Gogol's works there is a dualism, a struggle between God and Satan. All of Gogol's characters serve as symbols of good or evil. Low language is seen to reflect the power of evil, while lofty language reflects goodness. Contends that Xlestakov and the bourgeois, Anti-Christlike Čičikov are medians of a universal demonism, two real substantiations of the Devil, man's immortal "pošlost'." Sees Čičikov as an unmoving realist, the embodiment of the prose of real life, while Xlestakov is progressive, an idealist, embodying the poetry of real life. Praises Gogol's struggle to turn his literature from pure art to Christianity, concluding that as the poet disappeared, the prophet emerges.

37. Mills, Judith Oloskey. "Gogol's *Overcoat*: the Pathetic Passages Reconsidered." Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, 89 (1974), pp. 1106-12.

Deals with two controversial points in Gogol's *The Overcoat*: the pathetic passages and humor. Asserts that the divergence in critical interpretation results from a sharp contrast between sentimentality and humor in the work. Underlines the structural focus, proceeding from a description of the narrator's personality to a consideration of the general viewpoint resulting from the narrator's unique role. Exploring the implications of the narrator's point of view for the structure and the pathetic passages, asserts that the pathetic passages in *The Overcoat* create the logical structural elements in the story. Contends that the narrator expresses his

own feelings of pathos in the structure and the various characters of the story react in like manner.

38. Moyle, Natalie K. "Folktale Patterns in Gogol's *Vij*." *Russian Literature*, 7, no. 6 (1979), pp. 665-88.

Examines Gogol's intentional connection between *Vij* and folklore, rejecting the view that the story has no pattern of folklore. Supports Gogol's idea as expressed in his footnote: "...This whole tale is folklore. I did not want to alter it in any way..." Points out several motifs of typical folklore: the three brothers, departure from a secure home, losing one's way and entering a realm of enchantment, and an enchanted beautiful girl with an ugly appearance. One departure from folklore patterns is the order in which the brothers experience their adventures, which proceeds not from the oldest to youngest, as in the folklore pattern, but from the oldest immediately to the youngest and then to the middle brother, the hero Xoma. Notes another departure from folklore, the curious death of Xoma. Asserts that this intentional digression creates irrationality in logical prediction, thus reflecting Gogol's idea that life does not operate according to any principle of rational thought. Asserts that in this sense Gogol uses folklore as a vehicle to project his idea. Concludes that folklore patterns are used as the basic in *Vij*.

39. Nagle, John J. "Idealism: The Internal Structure in Gogol's *Nevsky Prospekt* and Chekhov's *An Attack of Nerves*." *West Virginia University Philological Papers*, 19 (1972), pp. 20-8.

Explores similarities in the internal structures of Gogol's *Nevskij Prospekt* and Čexov's *An Attack of Nerves*, finding Čexov to be under the influence of

Gogol's syllogistic technique. Asserts that both works contain their authors' visions of art. Explains that in *Nevskij Prospekt* there are two aspects of Nevskij prospekt: the life of day and the life of night in which the street's true nature is revealed. Contends that a pretty prostitute's dark beauty at night embodies Gogol's artistic sense of idealism and his view of the function of art in life. Believes that the first episode plays a more important role than the second episode, which merely underscores the grotesque and furthers the tragedy. Discusses the philosophical and psychological meanings of *Nevskij Prospekt*. Observes that Čexov's *An Attack of Nerves* also depicts the dark reality of life. Compares and contrasts the two stories' characters. Concludes that in spite of some differences, both stories basically follow the same internal structural principles.

40. Nilsson, Nils Ake. "Gogol's *The Overcoat* and the Topography of Petersburg." *Scando Slavica*, 21 (1975), pp. 5-18.

Notes that although the first part of *The Overcoat* lacks topographical details while maintaining a general realism, Gogol' puts topographical details in the epilogue which is a fantastic episode. Links this technique with a new literary device introduced in the 1830's by Victor-Joseph Jouy to which Gogol' gave a twist by adding a simple tone of casualness to the device. Does not see *The Overcoat* as related closely to the genre of ghost stories.

41. Obolensky, Alexander P. Food-Notes on Gogol. Winnipeg, Canada: Trident Press Ltd., 1972.

Offers a chronological analysis of instances of food and drink in Gogol' supported by excerpts from Gogol's correspondence, memoirs and conversations with many friends. Consists of 12 chapters: 1) *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka*,

2) The Crucial Years: 1829-1836, 3) 1835-*Mirgorod*, 4) History, Legend, Witchcraft, 5) *Arabesques*, 6) Two Anecdotes and one Short Masterpiece, 7) The Theater, According to Gogol', 8) Wandering, 9) The Author and his Hero, 10) Journeying with Čičikov, 11) Gogol' turns to Preacher, 12) Saved from the Burning. Insists that food for Gogol' is not a trivial matter, but an obsession. Finds, in Gogol's works, that food functions as skeletal plot, character delineations, thematic threads, linguistic and stylistic devices, and socioeconomic differentiations of characters. Notes that many Gogolian characters are named after food or drink. Claims that Gogol's metaphors are also linked to food items.

42. Oinas, Felix J. "Akakij Akakievic's Ghost and the Hero Orestes." *Slavic and East European Journal*, 20 (1976), pp. 27-33.

Suggests several literary connections to the ghost scenes in *The Overcoat*. Posits a relationship between the jumping furniture in Puškin's diary and the ghost scenes in the epilogue. Also suggests possible influence from E. T. A. Hoffmann. Finds similarity between *Das Majorat* and *The Overcoat* in both descriptions of the night when the ghosts hang around the city. Points out that the role and behavior of Orestes' ghost in Aristophanes' comedies -- *The Birds*, *The Acharnians* -- closely resembles those of Akakievič's ghost in *The Overcoat*: both ghosts appear at night in large city, Athens and St. Petersburg respectively, and strip people. Noting Gogol's interest in Greek folklore and Aristophanes, asserts that the ghost episode in *The Overcoat* has a strong connection with the vindictive Orestes in Greek folklore.

43. Peace, Richard A. "Gogol and Psychological Realism: *Shinel*" In *Russian and Slavic Literature*. Edited by Richard Freeborn, R. R. Milner-Gulland, and Charles Ward. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Slavica Publishers, 1976, pp. 63-91.

Sees *The Overcoat* as a product of psychological realism. Makes the point that the cliché "We have all come out of Gogol's *The Overcoat*" has a kernel of truth. Explains the protagonist, Akakij Akakievič, as a psychological nonentity composed not only of grotesque reality, but also of the author's narrative devices. Points out that the poverty of Akakij Akakievič is not credible in real terms, and is thus grotesque. Observes that Akakij Akakievič is not materially, but spiritually poor. Asserts that Akakij Akakievič's main problem is an inability to communicate due to lack of words. Later he finds a friend with whom he easily communicates -- a new overcoat, which represents the spiritual sustenance which brings him inner happiness. Refutes the Formalists' view that puns in *The Overcoat* contribute to humor only at face value, finding in them a hidden content. Believes that Gogol' resorts to a purely external method of portraying the inner world, which is psychological realism in another sense. Concludes that the stylistic devices used in *The Overcoat* contributed to a non-rational approach to psychology.

44. Peace, Richard A. "The Logic of Madness: Gogol's *Zapiski Sumasshedshego*." Oxford Slavonic Papers, 9 (1976), pp. 28-45.

Fully supports Belinskij's view of Gogol's *The Diary of a Madman*: "a psychological case history in poetic form, which is remarkable for its truth and its profundity..." Believes that *The Diary of a Madman* contains not only psychological elements, but also an inner logic of madness. Sees the story as a realistic record of a developing progression into madness. Asserts that Gogol' uses internal as well as external presentations of psychology in order to precisely reveal human madness. Contends that in so far as the story depicts man's agonizing struggle to preserve human value in a society where worth is measured by outward

forms such as social rank, the story can be included in a category of Realism.

45. Pereverzev, Valerian Fedorovich. "The Evolution of Gogol's Art." In Gogol from the Twentieth Century. Edited and translated by Robert A. Maguire. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974, pp. 134-54.

Explores the stages of evolution of Gogol's art from an aesthetic viewpoint. Analyzes the elements of Gogol's *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka*, pointing out its two different types of life: one bright and festive yet filled with triviality, passionlessness, and impotence; the other fearful and dangerous yet joyful, dynamic, and meaningful. Draws several contrasts between the stories in *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka* such as petty versus profound passions and triviality versus heroic deeds. Sees this principle embodied in the language as well, through the contrast between plain, natural, crude language, and ceremonious, lofty language. Points out that Gogol was not actually familiar with these two kinds of life. Refers to several of Gogol's unfinished works, such as *The Hetman* and *The Dread Wild Boar* to show how Gogol's artistic milieu moves from the fantastic to the real, with the trivial and comic characters and language growing more prominent. Concludes that Gogol discards elements which reflected the life of the Cossack concentrating instead on the milieus of the small landowner and civil servant with which he was familiar.

46. Proffitt, Edward. "Gogol's Perfectly True Tale: *The Overcoat* and Its Mode of Closure." Studies in Short Fiction, 14, no. 1 (Winter 1977), pp. 35-40.

Sees *The Overcoat* as realistic from the beginning to the end with no shift to the fantastic in the epilogue, which he sees as a parody of literary convention, that is, a parody of poetic justice. Asserts that every aspect of the epilogue points

to the conclusion that the "ghost" is only the product of the minds of the inhabitants of St. Petersburg, so trapped by superstition that they cannot see what is before their eyes.

47. Rowe, William Woodin. "Observations on Black Humor in Gogol and Nabokov." Slavic and East European Journal, 18, no. 4 (1974), pp. 392-9.

Explores similarities and differences in the use of black humor between Gogol's and Nabokov's works. Asserts that both writers frequently use topics which are considered unsuitable, indelicate, and impermissible such as sex, excrement, insanity, and death, often generating an effect of black comedy. Insists that their humors, woven by ironic reversal words, create the weakness of the reader's world, then stimulate the reader's full participation. Points out several differences in both writers: Nabokov pays more attention to suicide than simple death; Gogol treats insanity as an internal disorder, while Nabokov treats it as a sinister conspiracy without an internal disorder. Concludes that Gogol's dark humor is less consciously created than Nabokov's.

48. Rowe, William Woodin. Through Gogol's Looking Glass: Reverse Vision, False Focus, and Precarious Logic. New York: New York University Press, 1976.

Analyzes Gogol's creative process, emphasizing the world of vision and perception in Gogol's works. Asserts that Gogol's writing contains two significant features: an imagination which discloses reality, and a Romantic art which becomes life. Gogolian Romanticism is characterized by fears, escapes, distorted reflections, multiple realities, hyperbole, grotesques, antithesis, and reversals. Names three techniques --reverse vision, false focus, and precarious logic-- on which Gogolian Romanticism is established. Through reverse vision, the good turns into the bad, the dead into the alive, imagination into reality, absence into presence, day into

night. The false focus is presented with a mixture of deceptions, altered appearances, and dual identities. Insists that the false focus causes the readers to pay attention to a deceptive reality. The effects of precarious logic range from absurd humor to insight into reality.

49. Schillinger, John. "Gogol's *The Overcoat* as a Travesty of Hagiography." *Slavic and East European Journal*, 16, no. 1 (1972), pp. 36-41.

Argues that *The Overcoat* may be considered a caricature of hagiography, especially a caricature of the story of the sixth-century Saint Acacius of Sinai, whom Akakij Akakievič is seen to resemble. Pointing out the lack of a hagiographical description of sincerity and humility in the opening part of the story, sees the introduction to *The Overcoat* as a satirical digression. Asserts that Gogol follows the hagiographic tradition of generality, i.e., the tendency to not mention specific names, places and dates: people are not mentioned by name (the terms "civil servant," "official," "landlady," "director," and "VIP," among others, are used instead) and geographical references are vague and obscure. The simple tasks of copying of documents by Akakij Akakievič and St. Acacius are identical. Akakij's diligence, his acceptance of torments and sufferings at the hands of his fellow workers, his filthy clothes, and his alienation from everyday life in the street are elements held in common with St. Acacius's life. Just as Akakij Akakievič undergoes suffering at the hands of his fellow workers, St. Acacius was tormented by his brethren. Like a saint who refuses worldly activities and devotes himself to spiritual pursuits, Akakij Akakievič is oblivious to everyday life in the street. Points out that the most structurally significant link between Akakij Akakievič and St. Acacius lies in the events after Akakij's death, seeing the VIP's considerate attitude to his subordinates as repentance for his cruelty.

50. Shepard, Elizabeth C. "Pavlov's *Demon* and Gogol's *Overcoat*." *Slavic Review*, 33, no. 2 (1974), pp. 288-301.

Finds *The Overcoat* to be curiously reminiscent of Nikolaj Pavlov's *The Demon*. Points out some interactions between the two texts and offers evidence for considering *The Demon* as a source for *The Overcoat*. Both the protagonists of *The Demon* and *The Overcoat* are poor clerks of unspecified rank, who copy documents in a certain department of the bureaucracy in St. Petersburg, and live in isolation from real society. Like *The Overcoat*, *The Demon* has a theme of confrontation between the "little man" and the social system. Claims the different endings of the stories indicate their opposite resolution of the confrontation: Pavlov depicts human nature as materialistic and human life as a ceaseless deception, while Gogol' presents human nature and life as the perfectable even though they are tainted with corruption.

51. Sherry, Charles. "The Fit of Gogol's *Overcoat*: An Ontological View of Narrative Form." *Genre*, 7 (1974), pp. 1-29.

Claims that formal and stylistic elements in artistic works are linked to an ontology, for the presence of things is disclosed in language. Discusses opposing interpretations of two incidents in *The Overcoat*, one involving the sudden reaction of a fellow worker who tries to have some fun teasing Akakij Akakievič, and the Very Important Person's sudden change of attitude toward his subordinates after having his coat snatched off by Akakij Akakievič's ghost. The Formalists' claim that these incidents are models of the stylistic grotesque and the social interpretation that these incidents disclose man's inhumanity to man are said to cancel one another out. Sees Gogol' as using Akakij Akakievič to disclose the

cruelty of life. Claims that in Gogol's world tragedy can not arise, although the grotesque can, for there is no device to confront reality except illusion or retreat to madness. Sees the grotesque in Gogol's work as having an ontological origin: Objects which are emptied of their meaning become grotesque, so that there is no more hidden meaning to be disclosed. Concludes that the Formalists' interpretation of the stylistic grotesque is fulfilled with an ontological view, while the social interpretation is not, for it is hard to find how a polemic against the existing social conditions can be made from a view of existence which treats it as unreal and whimsical.

52. Sirskyj, Wasyl. "Ideological Overtones in Gogol's *Taras Bulba*." *Ukrainian Quarterly*, 35, no. 3 (1979), pp. 279-87.

Examines the values of Cossacks in Gogol's two versions of *Taras Bulba*: loyalty to the Cossack brotherhood, loyalty to the Ukrainian Orthodox faith, and loyalty to the Cossack fatherland. Points out that in the first version these three loyalties are well described, while in the second version Gogol replaces them with the Russian spirit, Russian Orthodoxy and Russian imperial grandeur. Asserts that such changes delighted the Russian people and Tsar Nikolaj I. Contends that Gogol's ideological alteration of *Taras Bulba* was unrelated to his religious crisis and resulted from pressure exerted by Russian friends who financially and politically supported him. Concludes that Gogol never changed his conception of Ukrainian spirit.

53. Slonimskii, Aleksandr. "The Technique of the Comic in Gogol." In Gogol from the Twentieth Century. Edited and translated by Robert A. Maguire. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974, pp. 324-73.

Broken down into two sections: 1) Humor and grotesque, and 2) Comic alogism. Explores comic devices in Gogol's works, emphasizing semantic and structural gravity. Introducing several theoretical definitions of humor, insists Gogol's humor is intimately associated with Jean-Paul Richter's claim that totality - the whole of life -- is the fundamental characteristic of humor. Believes that humor requires above all that the comic and serious elements be mixed. The transition from the comic to the serious is seen to create a change in the author's tone, view and attitude, and the transition intensifies when a comic element combines with grotesque or lyrical digressions. Asserts that the main element of the grotesque in Gogol' is absurdity, which is created by a basic comic device, that is, comic alogism, used in the language of the narrator and characters. Concludes that the device of absurdity is spread throughout Gogol's world and saturates his language. It is the main factor which creates the effect of humor and destroys logical and causal connections.

54. Smith, Thomas A. "Gogol's Hollow Men: Teaching *Dead Souls*." *English Journal*, 61 (1972), pp. 32-5.

Deems Gogol's shifting point of view in *Dead Souls* as the most striking aspect of his style. Claims that the author interrupts the narrator's speeches from time to time to present his own ideas about characters or people in general, suggesting that the main reason for such continuous interruption by the author is to prove that *Dead Souls* is a satire. Observes that most of the characters in *Dead Souls* are hollow men or "dead souls" of a sort. Believes that Gogol' utilizes humor to mask his grief over the characters' vices. Asserts that in *Dead Souls* Gogol' reflects hope for the Russian people. Comments that the protagonist Čičikov is victimized by his milieu in Russian society.

55. Snyder, Harry Charles Jr. "Airborne Imagery in Gogol's *Dead Souls*." *Slavic and East European Journal*, 23 (1979), pp. 173-89.

Asserts that a sense of exhilaration exists in Gogol's *Dead Souls* from the beginning to the end of the story which can be explained not by earthly description, but in terms of airborne imagery. Citing Gaston Bachelard's view of the airborne movement of the imagination, claims the structure of *Dead Souls* is connected to the psychic state in which Gogol' wrote. Claims that in *Dead Souls* the dynamic airborne psyche tends to focus upon the moral aspect of upward movement, an elevated vision motivated by inner movement and aspirations toward communal feeling of well-being beyond individual need. Concludes that through his dynamic airborne imagination, Gogol' comes close to Heaven.

56. Sobel, Ruth. "Gogol's Views on Art and Literature in *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends*." *Journal of Russian Studies*, 31 (1976), pp. 29-37.

Asserts that Gogol' was concerned about his views of art and literature throughout his life, and shows this concern especially in his *Selected Passages from a Correspondence with Friends* and his *Author's Confession*. Points out that the fundamental motif of the *Selected Passages from a Correspondence with Friends* is the juxtaposition of two views of life: the ideal and heroic life ("podvig") and the real and everyday life ("pošlost"). Divides Gogol's letters into four groups: 1) the letter about *Dead Souls*, 2) letters about poems, 3) letters concerning theater and drama, 4) letters discussing his view about the ideal writer. Believes that the first group, Gogol's letters on *Dead Souls*, shows his own view about a writer who depicts "pošlost," then helps people come closer to the ideal. Suggests that the second group, his letters about Russian poetry, is closely linked

with Russian history and the development of Russian society, with Gogol' believing that the task of poetry is subordinated to the vision of an ideal society. Argues that Gogol' considers the theater to be a vehicle for the education of Russians and a pulpit for preaching Christianity. Points out that to be an ideal writer, Gogol' strives to achieve artistic, moral, and religious perfection. Concludes that Gogol's view on art and literature shows a keenly-felt, constant conflict between the real world and the ideal world.

57. Sobel Ruth. "Gogol's *Vij*." *Russian Literature*, 7, no. 6 (1979), pp. 565-84.

Points out various criticisms of Gogol's *Vij* such as the inadequacy of its fantastic and folkloric elements, while also noting the generous praise given the story for its realistic depiction of seminary life and well-drawn main protagonist. Rejects the appeal to folklore introduced *Vij*'s epilogue by Gogol', arguing that the creature *vij* sprang from Gogol's own imagination. Finds that although gnomes are not known in Ukrainian mythology, they might have been borrowed from German demonology by Gogol'. Finds the hero, Xoma, is unsuitable as a folk-tale hero since there is no description of his exploits and attributes. Xoma is seen as destined for victimhood rather than triumph. Asserts that Xoma is not a hero of folk-tale, but a parody of one, citing several parodic features: the selection of the second brother as a hero, lack of innocence in Xoma, occurrence of sexual relations in the middle rather than the end of the story. Believes that Gogol' skillfully conceals this parody, evoking a fairy tale world in his epigraph, parodying it in the story, then transforming it to the real world in the epilogue. Concludes that *Vij* is an experimental parody in which various elements are blended.

58. Stilman, Leon. "The All Seeing Eye in Gogol." In Gogol from the Twentieth Century. Edited and translated by Robert A. Maguire. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974, pp. 376-89.

Emphasizes his view that repeated motifs spring from the author's unconscious prompting which is frequently concealed. Asserts that the vision is a fundamental and important image in all of Gogol's works. Explains and analyzes two motifs which are linked to vision. The first motif is that of fear and horror, examples of which are provided from *Vij*, *The Portrait*, and *The Terrible Vengeance*. The other motif is that of an expanded vision which resembles the vision of an all-seeing divinity. This motif usually has no organic relation to the structure of the work itself. Points out that the image of the tower or tall building is a means of parody for Gogol's ideas, with several examples from *Dead Souls*, *The Terrible Vengeance*, *Arabesques*, and *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends*. Concludes that these motifs were present in Gogol's conscious mind and life.

59. Stilman, Leon. "Men, Women and Matchmakers." In Gogol from the Twentieth Century. Edited and translated by Robert A. Maguire. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974, pp. 390-403.

Carefully examining the text of Gogol's work, explores the various recurring motifs which are concealed in the forms of genre, mode and style. Points out that the pattern of "a man, a woman, and a third man -- a matchmaker" is one of Gogol's motifs in the stories of *Ivan Fedorovič Šponka and His Aunt*, *The Marriage*, and *The Nose*. Suggests that in these three stories there is a connection between the themes of matchmaking, marriage, and the danger that threatens the suitor. Adds that in *Vij* and *Nevskij Prospekt*, the image of the matchmaker and the image of the bride-to-be are integrated in a single character. Concludes that there

is another recurrent motif -- a troika -- in the ending of Gogol's stories: Part One of *Dead Souls*, *The Diary of a Madman*, *The Tale of How Ivan Ivanovič quarreled with Ivan Nikiforovič*, Scene 21 of *The Marriage*, and Act IV of *The Inspector General*.

60. Stromecky, Ostop. The How of Gogol: Iak Tvoriv Hohol. Huntsville, Alabama: University of Alabama Huntsville Press, 1975.

Consists of nine chapters arranged chronologically and thematically into three distinct periods: thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. Asserts that each period is organically related to the others. Contains a study of Ukrainian influences upon Gogol' with several excerpts from Ukrainian folklore. Compares Gogol's early works with Ukrainian folklore, folk legend and song. Asserts that in both *Vij* and *The Terrible Vengeance*, Gogol's presentation of Ukrainian folklore is so dazzling that the embodiment of supernatural situations is natural to the point that the reader cannot separate reality from fantasy. Concludes that Gogol' creates a very complex camouflage in his works, in which the conflict of two opposite forces, natural force and "pošlost" force, comes together.

61. Struc, Roman. "Categories of the Grotesque: Gogol and Kafka." In Proceedings of the Comparative Literature Symposium. Edited by Wolodymyr T. Zyla. Lubbock, Texas: Texas Tech University press, 1971, pp. 135-54.

Explores characteristics of the grotesque in Gogol' and Kafka. Finds both writers under Hoffmann's Romantic influence. Points out that details in Gogol's world create an effect of diversion and distortion in the mode of Rabelaisian grotesque. Gogol' displays his grotesque imagination through an alternation of humor and horror, and comments on the absurdity of the human condition, the

demonic forces present in common situations, and the failure of predictability and normalcy. Gogol's humor is thus seen as an integral part of the grotesque, creating a positive effect. In Kafka's world, reality is distorted and probability is abandoned. Kafka presents absurdity not in the form of romantic grotesque, but as a straightforward intrusion, just as with Gogol'. The style of narrative in Kafka is fighting against its content, and the protagonist's reaction produces a great grotesque effect in the story. Contends that the main function of Kafka's grotesque is to expose absurdity.

62. Tabakov, Oleg. "A Soviet Actor and Director Looks at Gogol and *the Government Inspector*." *Journal of Russian Studies*, 35 (1978), pp. 24-8.

Draws on experience as a director and an actor in Gogol's *The Inspector General*, to characterize Gogol' as a complex and controversial writer. Asserts that Gogol' precisely depicts human failure, defects and shortcomings through laughter and mockery. Finds Gogol's lyrical style strange and awkward, yet so perfect it is reminiscent of poetry. Thinks Gogol' implies that his despicable and worthless characters will change in the future, feeling that this is the most prominent feature in Gogol'. Finds that the quality of creating oneself through heavy torment is the most significant characteristic of Xlestakov.

63. Troyat, Henri. *Divided Soul: The Life of Gogol*. Translated by Nancy Amphous. Garden City, New York: Double Day and Company, 1973.

Divided into three parts: Part one contains Gogol's childhood, civil servant period, and *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka*, *Arabesques*, *Mirgorod*, *The Inspector General*, etc. Part two deals with Gogol's journey abroad and *Dead Souls*. Part three treats *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends*,

Gogol's last travel, and the end of *Dead Souls*. Contains a dramatized written biography of Gogol, consisting of a chronicle of events and excerpts from his letters and memoirs. Places special emphasis on Gogol's life outside Russia. Includes psychological speculation, sociological research, and literary analysis.

64. Tynianov, Iurii Nikolaevich. "Dostoevsky and Gogol: Towards a Theory of Parody." In Dostoevsky and Gogol: Text and Criticism. Edited by Priscilla Meyer and Stephen Rudy. Translated by Peter B. Stetson. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1979, pp. 101-17.

Asserts that Dostoevskij's *The Manor of Stepančikovo* is a parody about Gogol's personality. Insists that Dostoevskij had a negative view of Gogol's *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends*. Believes that Gogol, as the author of *Selected Passages*, serves as a prototype for Dostoevskij's main protagonist, Foma Opiskin. Foma is a writer, a preacher, and a moralist just like Gogol in the late period of his life. Foma is a knave, a two-faced person, a practical person, and a sort of poet. Contends that certain materials which are used in depicting Foma can be discovered in Gogol's biography. Believes that Foma's physical appearance is also an imitation of Gogol's. Citing the last sermon of Foma Opiskin, insists that it contains the same idea as Gogol: "...You are a landowner of Russia...You ought to shine like a diamond in your estate...Zealous work, zealous toward God, zealous toward sovereign, and zealous toward your country!..Hard work is the duty of the landowner..." Asserts that there is a similar feature in both Foma's style and Gogol's style: a combination of lofty style with vulgar expressions. Pointing out several similar elements in both works, explains a possible reason why these similarities escaped the critics' attention. *The Manor of Stepančikovo* is seen essentially as a comic work with elements of parody.

However, the parodistic trend tends to fade out as the comic element strongly emerges.

65. van Schooneveld, C. H. "Gogol and the Romantics." In Slavic Poetics: Essays in Honor of Kiril Taranovsky. Edited by R. Jakobson, C. H. van Schooneveld, and D. S. Worth. Hague: Mouton, 1973, pp. 481-4.

Enumerates the characteristics of the Russian Romantic movement: The relationship between hero and configurants, and the relationship between hero and author. Believes that in Romanticism, the hero eliminates the configurants, then finally the author removes the hero from the stage of the story. Cites examples from the stories of Puškin and Lermontov. Contends that in Romanticism the hero has an initial triumph and a ultimate downfall. Asserts, however, that Gogol' rejects this Romantic formula in his works, especially in *The Overcoat*. Suggests that in *The Overcoat*, configurants destroy the hero Akakij Akakievič. The author then retains the hero instead of eliminating him. Calls this pattern Gogol's inversion technique, concluding that Gogol's relationship to Romanticism is one of inversion.

66. Vroon, Ronald. "Gogol in Oblomovka." Russian Literature Triquarterly, 3 (1972), pp. 282-96.

Presents a comparative study of Gogol's *Dead Souls* and Gončarov's *Oblomov*. Points out similarities of structural techniques in them, including the techniques of character introduction and the delayed biography. Observes that both authors use rhetorical questions, interrupt narrative in order to describe characters, and make use of animal imagery, which amplifies the effect of the grotesque. For example, Gogol' depicts Sobakevič with the image of a bear and Gončarov characterizes Zaxar with the image of a dog. Insists that both authors use

metonymic elements as leitmotifs. Suggests that in *Oblomov* the hero's anxiety is expressed by an epic simile just as in *Dead Souls*. Sees Oblomov's character as the embodiment of several characters in *Dead Souls*. Points out similarities between the mental conditions of Oblomov and Tentetnikov.

67. Waszink, Paul M. "Mythical Traits in Gogol's *The Overcoat*." *Slavic and East European Journal*, 22, no. 3 (Fall 1978), pp. 287-300.

Examines mythical elements in Gogol's *The Overcoat*, finding two important motifs: that of oblivion, which Levi-Strauss considered a lack of communication with the self; and the mythical phenomenon of Konkreszenz, which was developed by Ernst Cassirer. In *The Overcoat*, Konkreszenz is displayed by the use of metonymy. The author's speech has the functional value of simply expressing a symbolic language system. The mythical motif of oblivion opposes the non-mythical motifs of understanding and knowing. When the confrontation of these oppositional elements occurs, the protagonist becomes confused and forgets himself. Thus as long as Akakij Akakievič occupies himself with meaningless language, which he himself does not understand, everything goes well. However, he has to experience death when he breaks the established rules.

68. Wolterstorff, Nikolas. "Characters and Their Names." *Poetics*, Vol.8, No.1-2, (1979), pp.101-127.

Asserts the theory that fictional characters are not persons, but kinds of persons, that is, person-kinds. Explores how the proper names of characters in Gogol's *Dead Souls* function both inside the fiction and outside the fiction in predications. Points out that John Woods' naive theory of fiction hardly applies to *Dead Souls*, for Gogol indicates the state of affairs by referring to the non-existent

person, Čičikov, and by predicating his property. Refuting the naive theory of fiction, proposes basic ontological principles: the Principle of Exemplification and the Principle of Completeness. Asserts that with the name "Čičikov" Gogol' portrays a certain kind of person; that is, not a person of a certain kind, but a certain person-kind, i.e., the Čičikov-in-*Dead Souls* kind. Suggests that a character in a fictional world is a person-kind, which is a component; The Čičikov character is a component within the world of *Dead Souls*. Concludes that the Čičikov character in *Dead Souls* does have the property of existence, and that property is fundamental and analytic within the character.

69. Woodward, James B. "Allegory and Symbol in Gogol's Second Idyll." *Modern Language Review*, 73 (1978), pp. 351-67.

Underscores the significance of Gogol's *The Old-World Landowners* in the development of his allegorical art. Treats Gogol's use of digressive narrative in creating Gogolian symbolism. Explains the ambiguity of femininity among his characters, finding femininity and masculinity to have no relationship with sexual distinction: women are usually depicted with a masculinized personality, while men display effeminate characteristics. Contends that the combination of men's feminization and women's masculinization is a vehicle of allegorizing the main theme in Gogol's world. Asserts that sexual distinction constitutes the basis of Gogolian symbolism.

70. Woodward, James B. Gogol's *Dead Souls*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1978.

Analyzes images in detail to show that Gogol's digressions are not digressions at all, but are vital to the central theme of *Dead Souls*. Declares

Gogol's *Dead Souls* with its central theme developed and supported by interrelated symbolic themes, the most complex moral allegory in the Russian language. Finds in chapter five its main symbolic theme, the relationship between feminine spirituality and masculine bestiality, a duality around which the whole work is organized. Sees the work as an allegory of spiritual perversion and a prediction of eventual rebirth. Details how Gogol' introduces the five main types of perversion individually in chapters two through six, then presents their symbolic indicators in chapters seven through ten in his portrayal of the town and its inhabitants. The portrait of Čičikov is also interwoven with these indicators, chiefly Manilov, Korobočka, Nozdrev, Sobakevič and Pljuškin. Suggests that the figurative is simply a mask which Gogol' uses to hide the allusive force of literal meaning.

71. Yermakov, Ivan. "*The Nose*." In Gogol from the Twentieth Century. Edited and translated by Robert A. Maguire. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974, pp. 156-98.

Explores Gogol's psyche as manifest in *The Nose*, using Freud's concept of the creative process. Finds two important characteristics in the story: the fear of emasculation, which goes along with the restrained wish to possess a large sex organ; and the desire for unlimited sexual pleasure. Finds the story to be a dream which is not quite a dream, full of meaningless and nonsensical conversation. Contends that Gogol' uses dreams not only to reveal his characters but also to push his readers to examine themselves.

72. Zeldin, Jesse. Nikolai Gogol's Quest for Beauty: An Exploration into His Works. Lawrence, Kansas: Regents Press of Kansas, 1978.

Agrees with Gogol's claim that his works constitute a unity from beginning to end without any change of view-point. Claims that Gogol' is primarily interested in the nature of reality, which he identifies with beauty. Asserts that Gogol's quest for beauty is not a quest of discovery or a quest for an ideal, but a quest for embodiment in art and life. Concludes that in the long run Gogol' does not succeed in this quest. In the chapter entitled "The Artist," claims that Gogol's "pošlost" gives rise to both horror and laughter, which do not conflict or even interweave but become aspects of each other. In the chapter entitled "The Christian," rejects the theory of "religious crisis" in Gogol's career claimed by Zenkovskij and Gippius, asserting that to Gogol' the religious and the aesthetic were not separate categories, but were the same in reality. In the chapter entitled "The Russian," contends that to Gogol' Russia embodies artistic unity and reconciles all things. Thus Russia is a Christian work of art and a thing of beauty. Concludes that Gogol' fails in his quest for beauty because the modern world can not allow the Gogolian vision that unity and beauty are ultimately in reconciliation and harmony.

73. Zoshchenko, Mikhail. "Woe to Wit." In his Before Sunrise, pp.270-282. Translated by Gary Kern. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1974.

Explores the cause of Gogol's tragedy. Believes that Gogol' depicts the life of landowners, the regime of Nikolaj I, and the vulgar morality of society. Maintains that Gogol' has a huge conflict between real life and his desires. Insists that this conflict makes Gogol' create a terrible tragedy in the long run. Points out, furthermore, that Gogol's psychological disorder creates more serious tragedy. Suggests that Gogol's fear, in his personal life, has a connection with his attitude toward women. His fear is related to women, especially his mother. Asserts that Gogol's reluctance to meet his mother creates more objects of fear: mother, home



and women. A mother in the infant's mind is not simply a mother, but a source of nourishment and food. Observes that Gogol's attitude toward food was odd, just like his attitude toward his mother. Gogol's psychological disorder results from women, mother, food, home, night, and bed. Points out Gogol's odd attitude toward beds: He never lay down on a bed or a sofa, instead he used to nap in an armchair. Contends that these oddities come from his sufferings, which finally created a tragedy of death.

1980-1989

1. Alexander, Alex E. "The Two Ivans' Sexual Underpinnings." *Slavic and East European Journal*, 25 (1981), pp. 24-37.

Analyzes the sexual behavior of Ivan Ivanovič and Ivan Nikiforovič as a form of subtext, taking a psychological and symbolic approach to the tension between unsatisfied heterosexuality and unfulfilled homosexuality. Points out that Ivan Nikiforovič represents a person of sexual instability as well as a heterosexual person. Ivan Ivanovič is secretive and sexually active, while Ivan Nikiforovič is open and sexually inactive. Ivan Ivanovič's coat is seen to symbolize a defense mechanism to cover his fear, his sexual insecurity, and his secretiveness as a closet homosexual. Contends that Ivan Nikiforovič's gun symbolizes his penis and the two sacks of oats are presented as a Ivan Ivanovič's maleness. Their tension comes to an end when Ivan Ivanovič's offering is rejected by Ivan Nikiforovič, and the latter calls the former a gander. Their relations are crushed by action of their sexual underpinnings. Concludes that only impotence remains triumphant due to their withdrawal from both kinds of sexuality.

2. Altshuller, Mark. "The Walter Scott Motifs in Nikolay Gogol's Story *The Lost Letter*." *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, 22 (1989), pp. 81-8.

Asserts that there is a consistent thematic parallel between Walter Scott's novel *Redgauntlet* and Gogol's *The Lost Letter*. Speculates that Gogol must have read a Russian version of *Redgauntlet* in 1828. Points out a similarity of motif -- both protagonists travel into hell for a missing document, and in both stories strangers direct the path to hell. The depictions of hell in both stories are similar as well: a banquet with music and dance. Finds the description of the return to earth from hell in both works almost identical word for word. Notes that Scott draws this theme from a Scottish legend; moreover, there is no such theme in Russian or Ukrainian legends.

3. Bahrij-Pikulyk, Romana. "Superheros, Gentlemen or Pariahs?: The Cossacks in Nikolai Gogol's *Taras Bulba* and Panteleimon Kulish's *Black Council*." *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, 5, no. 2 (Fall 1980), pp. 30-47.

Compares Gogol's *Taras Bulba* and Kuliš's *Black Council*, which both treat Cossacks. Defines two types of historical fiction: historical romance and historical novel. The former is characterized by the contradiction that although historical characters and events are presented, they are idealized and fantasized, while historical personages and events in the latter are depicted in a detailed and individualized way. Claims that *Taras Bulba* is a historical romance while *Black Council* is a historical novel. Discusses several characteristics of historical romance in *Taras Bulba*: the personal and complex myth of the Ukraine, the domination of heroic personalities over historical process, and an inaccurate depiction of the religious conflict between Cossacks and Poles. Points out that Gogol's main source for *Taras Bulba* is his own mythical conceptions drawn from folklore and oral literature. *Black Council*, by contrast, depicts real historical events, personages,



and social struggles. Cossacks in *Black Council* are depicted not mythically or ideally, but analytically or critically.

4. Bakhtin, M. M. "Verbal Art and the Folk: Culture of Laughter." In *Dead Souls: The Reavey Translation, Backgrounds and Sources, Essays in Criticism*. Edited by George Gibian. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1985, pp. 569-77.

Discusses elements of the folk culture of laughter in Gogol'. Asserts that the basic theme of Gogol's *Dead Souls* is a carnival journey through the world beyond the grave, and that in Gogol's works there are many traditional elements of the carnival underworld. Introduces Gogol's own idea of laughter ("Laughter is significant and more profound than people think"), and claims that Gogol's laughter has arisen from the folk culture of laughter as disclosed in the structure of Gogol's language with its exotic, enigmatic, and ambivalent words. Claims that the folk culture of laughter restores forgotten meanings. Notes that in Gogol' there are two worlds: one completely legitimate and official world, the other a world of absurdity, nonsense, and humor. Gogol' rejects the former world for the sake of the unexpectedness and the unpredictability of truth. Concludes that Gogol' creates a certain purification of vulgarity through laughter stemming from the folk culture of laughter.

5. Belinsky, V. G. "*Chichikov's Adventures, or Dead Souls: Gogol's Epic Poem*." In *Dead Souls: The Reavey Translation, Backgrounds and Sources, Essays in Criticism*. Edited by George Gibian. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1985, pp. 453-7.

Claims that the Russian spirit in Gogol's *Dead Souls* lies in its humor, irony, the sweeping power of emotions, the lyricism of the digressions, and the pathos of the whole poem. Strongly asserts, however, that Gogol's humor is not

merely funny or jocular: in Gogol's world everything is serious, profound, calm, and genuine, and as a result Gogol's *Dead Souls* is a lofty and inspired poem, not a comic one. Protests Konstantin Aksakov's claim that *Dead Souls* is a Russian *Iliad*. Shows that Gogol' explains the mystery of how Čičikov turns into an "acquirer" through trivialities, digressions, and absurdities.

6. Bely, Andrei. "The Figure of Fiction in *Dead Souls*." In *Dead Souls: The Reavey Translation, Backgrounds and Sources, Essays in Criticism*. Edited by George Gibian. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1985, pp. 517-31.

Claims that the accurate development of the figure of fiction is the main technical device in the writing of *Dead Souls*. The figure in *Dead Souls* is described as full of mysterious individuality. Asserts that Gogol' depicts not a portrait, but a sort of expressive sketch, like a screen or a mask which nevertheless results in a three dimensional portrait, for the function of the fictitious figure is precisely to suggest the hidden realities which are ambiguously disguised in superficial images. Asserts that Čičikov has no distinguishing characteristics, making him a neat, present, and generalized space without progeny. Sees the motif of roundness (Čičikov has a round chin, a roundness of body, a round cheek, and a round belly) as correlated with pleasantness and neatness. Contends that in *Dead Souls* the stream of events flows smoothly by; even though Gogol' eschews pinpointing exact time and distance, it is enough to say "at a certain time" or "at a certain distance."

7. Bodin, Per-Arne. "The Silent Scene in Nikolaj Gogol's *The Inspector General*." *Scando Slavica*, 33 (1987), pp. 5-16.



Refutes the many interpretations of the final silent scene in *The Inspector General* over the past 150 years, including that of conservative 19th century critics who saw the scene as a sign of the effectiveness of the central government and the characters' imminent punishment. Presents Andrej Belyj's view that the scene depicts characters who are no longer living, and the views of other critics who interpreted the scene as a psychologically motivated reaction to a real new inspector who is dangerous but can also be cheated. Points out that most interpretations have not dealt with the fact that the silent scene is completely different in character from the rest of the play. Points out the fact that Gogol' himself regarded *The Inspector General* as a medieval allegory in which the little town is humanity and the real Inspector General is the awaking conscience. Insists, while supporting Gogol's own view, that *The Inspector General* be simultaneously interpreted on several levels, including those of social satire, eschatological vision, and allegory. Concludes that the Inspector General is not a person of this world, but Jesus Christ, and the inspection signifies the future Last Judgment.

8. Cooke, Olga Muller. "Gogol's *Strashnaja mest'* and Belyj's Prose Fiction: The Role of Karma." *Russian Language Journal*. 43, nos. 145-146 (1989), pp. 71-84.

Compares the role of the sorcerers in *The Terrible Vengeance* and in Belyj's *Moscow*, noting the basic difference that Gogol' prefers a Christian cosmology while Belyj favors Eastern religion and its principle of karma. Discusses Belyj's analysis of *The Terrible Vengeance*, including his interpretation of Gogol's love for Russia as the sorcerer's love for Katerina, and his view that the negated particles ("не" and "ни") are analogues of the nihilistic plot. Finds similarities and differences between Belyj's sorcerers in *Kust*, *Gornaja vladichica*, *Kubok metelej*, *Silver Dove*, and Gogol's sorcerer in *The Terrible Vengeance*. Concludes that



Belyj does not imitate Gogol', but creates a newly resurrected Gogol' in his own world.

9. Cox, Gary Duane. "Geographic, Sociological, and Sexual Tensions in Gogol's Dikanka Stories." *Slavic and East European Journal*, 24, no. 3 (Fall 1980), pp. 219-32.

Through the analysis of sociological, sexual, and stylistic contrasts, asserts that a conflict between static rural and active urban values is reflected in Gogol's *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka*. Suggests that the contrasts of countryside and city also are paralleled in the pattern of sexual imagery and death imagery: the urban narrator depicts sexuality and death with explicit visual imagery, while the rural narrator avoids such visual imagery. Finds that the narrative structure of *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka* underlines this contrast.

10. Deutsch, Judith E. "The Zaporozhian Cossacks of Nikolaj Gogol: An Approach to God and Man." *Russian Literature*, 22, no. 3 (1987), pp. 359-77.

Asserts that Gogol's *Taras Bulba* reflects his idea of the relation between God and man. Finds that Gogol' considers Cossacks to represent neither their own culture nor the Ukrainian nation. Gogol' depicts them rather as representing a divine nature, making use of Eastern Orthodox imagery: Ostap's death echoes Christian martyrs, and Bulba's death scene recalls Christ's crucifixion. Sees the description of Cossacks as bigger, better, and purer than any other heroes as a product of Gogol's idea of Christian soldiers. Gogol' emphasizes the nature of wholeness in the Cossacks' life, a role of multiplicity-in-unity, which recalls the Trinity and reflects the Russian image of God. The Polish army, by contrast, is presented as a non-organic unit, and the Polish milieu is fragmented and lifeless. Concludes that Gogol's religious approach is an integral part of his artistic world.

11. Ehre, Milton. "Laughing Through the Apocalypse: The Comic Structure of Gogol's *Government Inspector*." *Russian Review*, 39 (1980), pp. 137-49.

Applies a religious interpretation to *The Inspector General*, strongly supporting Gogol's own views of this play. After Gogol's "Denouement" in 1846, he turned his focus toward the end of the world. Thus the town in *The Inspector General* becomes humanity's common spiritual city, its officials symbolize passions and trivial vulgarity, and Xlestakov represents the trivial conscience of the world. Suggests two possible interpretations of *The Inspector General*, as a social comedy or as an apocalyptic satire, choosing the latter view. Observes that Gogol uses comic triviality to reveal the emptiness of life and human fear, although the characters in the play are too ridiculous to consider their disaster seriously. Points out that Gogol's apocalypse takes on the aspect of reproof, while concluding that in spite of the play's apocalyptic character, its laughter creates reconciliation, tolerance and forgiveness in human society.

12. Gippius, Vasilii V. Gogol. Edited and translated by Robert A. Maguire. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1981.

Divided into 14 chapters: 1) The first influences and the first idyll, 2) The demonic and the farcical, 3) Aesthetics, 4) History, 5) The contemporary world and the second idyll, 6) The mission of a comic writer, 7) New esthetic manifestoes, 8) Moralism, 9) The poem, 10) An assemblage of freaks, 11) The Third idyll, 12) Defeat 13) The final course, 14) Death. Explores the essential elements of Gogol's life and work. Rejects the attempt to put Gogol into a single category, reinterpreting him instead on the basis of several polarities; realist versus romanticist, reactionary versus exposé, humorist versus preacher, etc. Discusses

Gogol's relation to the Ukrainian tradition, asserting that Gogol' did not reflect reality in *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka*. Explains that Gogol' had a relatively poor knowledge of the Ukrainian world and had been raised on the Romantic tales of Žukovskij, Washington Irving, and Hoffmann. Examines Gogol's awareness of aesthetics during the 1830s. Finds that throughout Gogol's life three main ideas -- realism, religion, and individualism -- occupied his mind in various degrees at various times. Sees aesthetic faith as the foundation of Gogol's sense of life. Raises the question of Gogol's true intentions as to the continuation of *Dead Souls* along the lines of Dante's *Divine Comedy*, arguing it is almost impossible to imagine a description of "inferno" or "paradise" in terms of the realistic psychological novel.

13. Gippius, Vasilii V. "An Introduction to *Dead Souls*." In *Dead Souls: The Reavey Translation, Backgrounds and Sources, Essays in Criticism*. Edited by George Gibian. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1985, pp. 489-517.

Considers Gogol's *Dead Souls* to be a work of the highest order, citing Puškin's support and his call for a Russian epic equivalent to Cervantes' *Don Quixote*. Asserts that the basic theme of *Dead Souls* is the portrayal of "pošlost'," or the portrayal of "pošlost' pošlogo čeloveka," also found to be the fundamental theme of other Gogolian works. Contends that the design of *Dead Souls* has no relation to Dante's *Divine Comedy*, for in the second part of *Dead Souls* there is no equivalent to Dante's "purgatory" for Gogol's characters. Asserts that *Dead Souls* is a poem about all of Russia, for its separate elements all have a relation to Russia. Claims that Gogol' has two plans in creating his poem, the psychological and historical, with the conscious goal of creating typical characters. Analyzes the characterizations of six landowners, including Čičikov. These six portraits represent the bulk of Gogol's "accusatory material" and the basic social-psychological problems raised in the novel. "Čičikovism" is defined as a passion for



life in all its fullness and a readiness to use any means to achieve this goal, from common adaptability to eccentric speculation. Suggests that Gogol' observes the positive potential of the Russian people not in these main six characters but in other folk characters. Asserts that the author is not a simple conventional figure who draws together separate elements, but a unified personality. The author has to uncover the "pošlost'" of men, and Gogol' unmask it through laughter. Finds Gogol's principles to be the analysis of "pošlost'," the synthetic creation of generalized images, the unmasking of these images through laughter, and the author's subjectivity.

14. Graffy, Julian. "Passion versus Habit in *Old World Landowners*." In Nikolay Gogol: Text and Context. Edited by Jane Grayson and Faith Wigzell. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989, pp. 34-49.

Explores the comfortable yet isolated inside world of "habit and order" in *The Old-World Landowners*. Points out that the moral and emotional shapes of this world are created by means of certain recurrent adjectives, adverbs and abstract nouns. This inside world is characterized as rustic, peaceful, pleasant, and remote, and the relationships among its inhabitants are innocent and untroubled. Contrasts this inside world with two external spaces: the outside world of the house and its garden. The space of the narrator and this outside space interrelate, representing contrasting realms of habit and passion. Sees the outside world of passionate intensity and time as a threat to the peaceful inside world.

15. Gregg, Richard. "The Curse of Sameness and the Gogolian Esthetic: *The Tale of the Two Ivans* as Parable." Slavic and East European Journal, 31 (1987), pp. 1-9.



Examines the theme of boredom and spiritual impoverishment in Gogol's *The Tale of How Ivan Ivanovič Quarreled with Ivan Nikiforovič* in relation to Gogol's artistic view. Points out that the story makes the antithesis of the two Ivans' appearance and characteristics a basic structural principle. This structure is opposed to texture. Finds a dramatized declension from diversity to simplicity, presented gradually as the two protagonists' opposing characteristics converge, to be a basic theme of story. They share the same approach and progress toward simplicity, disability, and impotence. Sees the disappearance of the two Ivans' diversity as a result of boredom.

16. Heldt, Barbara. "Dead Souls: Without Naming Names." In *Nikolay Gogol: Text and Context*. Edited by Jane Grayson and Faith Wigzell. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989, pp. 83-91.

Illustrates the tension existing in *Dead Souls* between spurious ideas of harmony and disharmony. Sees the opposite of harmony not as a harmonious negativity, but menacing atmosphere and amorphousness. Notes how *Dead Souls* plays tricks with secrecy and disclosure. Suggests that part of the strategy of secrecy in *Dead Souls* involves "not naming names," that is, Gogol's use of generic common nouns ("человек," "дама," "герой," "читатель," "старушка," etc.) as quasi-pronominal substitutes for more specific designators.

17. Herzen, Alexander I. "Diary Entries on *Dead Souls*." In *Dead Souls: The Reavey Translation, Backgrounds and Sources, Essays in Criticism*. Edited by George Gibian. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1985, pp. 458-9.

Asserts that *Dead Souls* has a realistic, not a romantic basis, praising Gogol's portrait of Russia. Finds *Dead Souls* to be a harsh condemnation of Russia, but with hope for the future of Russia. Claims that the title refers not only

to the dead serf-souls, but also landowners like Nozdrev and Manilov. Explores the question of why and how Čičikov is chosen as a protagonist in *Dead Souls*. Concludes with the speculation that in ten years Čičikov will have finished his education and become intelligent, but will still be a Manilov.

18. Jackson, Robert Louis. "Two Views of Gogol and the Critical Synthesis Belinskij, Rozanov, and Dostoevskij: An Essay in Literary Historical Criticism." *Russian Literature*, 15, no. 2 (1984), pp. 223-42.

Discusses two views of Gogol' by Belinskij and Rozanov, emphasizing Rozanov's interpretation. Contrasts Belinskij's view that Gogol's irony is revelatory of negative aspects of Russian life, and that Gogolian grotesque is thus a perfect aesthetic embodiment of social life, with Rozanov's claim that Gogol' does not reflect reality, but simply draws a series of caricatures. Contends that Dostoevskij's view on Gogol' is seen as a complicated artistic synthesis of these two opposing views. Points out that Gogol's art presents an antithesis of Puškin's pure and natural description, and creates a separation from reality with Gogolian irony and aimless lyricism blending with humor.

19. Keys, Roger. "The Unwelcome Tradition: Bely, Gogol and Metafictional Narration." In *Nikolay Gogol: Text and Context*. Edited by Jane Grayson and Faith Wigzell. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989, pp. 92-108.

Presents a history of Gogol's reaction to V. Belinskij's critique of the unrealistic aspects of Gogol's works. Offers an analysis of the connections and affinities between Belyj and Gogol'. Views Belyj and Gogol' as creators of a fictional world which challenged the prevailing idea in nineteenth century Russian criticism that fiction was intended to pronounce truths about the real world. Contends that Belyj used Gogolian narrative ambiguities in his *Silver Dove*.

Suggests that *Silver Dove* has some structural and stylistic features which are found in Gogol's narrative fiction and also has some intertextual affinities with the *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka* and *Mirgorod* cycles. Discusses Belyj's spiritual and psychological affinities with Gogol'.

20. Lotman, Iurii M. "Gogol's Chlestakov: The Pragmatics of a Literary Character." In The Semiotics of Russian Culture. Edited by Ann Shukman. Translated by Ruth Sobel. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Michigan Slavic Contributions, 1984, pp. 177-212.

Explores the fundamental essence of Xlestakov's character, noting that Gogol' originally intended him to be the main character in his *The Inspector General*. Compares Xlestakov to two historical figures known for lying and deceit, Ippolit Zavalishin and Roman Medoks. Asserts that Xlestakovism is related to a definite historical psychological type. Suggests that historically Xlestakovism consumed rather than generated Romanticism. In Romanticism a situation of "an image within an image" is less dynamic than in Realism. Concludes that the pragmatics of the Realist text is the most complicated problem.

21. Lotman, Yuri M. "The Problem of Artistic Space in Gogol's Prose." In Dead Souls: The Reavey Translation, Backgrounds and Sources, Essays in Criticism. Edited by George Gibian. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1985, pp. 577-83.

Finds an inconsistency in Gogol's artistic space consisting of a non-directionality of space. Suggests that space in *Dead Souls* must not only be unlimited, but also directional in order to resolve the problem of its spaciousness. Believes that the road in *Dead Souls* reflects the artistic space becoming the general form for its organization, and the journey is the movement of a literary character inside that space. Points out that in *Dead Souls* the author, the characters and the reader have different views of the artistic space: the characters stand on

earth, the reader has a broader view than the characters, and the author tends to direct the reader from above. Concludes that Gogol' might be the first writer to expose Russian literature to the artistic power of spatial models.

22. Mann, Yuri. "On the Two Opposing Structural Principles of *Dead Souls*." In *Dead Souls: The Reavey Translation, Backgrounds and Sources. Essays in Criticism*. Edited by George Gibian. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1985, pp. 482-9.

Sees two opposing structural principles in Gogol's *Dead Souls*: rationality and absurdity. Asserts that Gogol' developed and applied the idea of generalization since his early works. In *Dead Souls* the scale of generalization broadens considerably to encompass the claim that all events in the world are interlinking parts of one universal idea. This is seen to reflect Gogol's artistic view of rationality, which is one of his structural principles. The other structural principle found in *Dead Souls* consists of unexpected digression, illogicality and absurdity. Contends that Gogol' uses these contrasting principles to depict the deviation of humanity from rationality and eternal truth. Adds that in *Dead Souls* there are other examples of duality: epic and lyric, satire and tragedy.

23. Mersereau, John Jr. "Gogol's *Dead Souls*." In his *Russian Romantic Fiction*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1983, pp. 319-23.

Views Gogol's *Dead Souls* as a romantic work, rejecting the realistic approach. Sees *Dead Souls* as a variant of the picaresque novel, supporting Gogol's view that *Dead Souls* is a divine comedy consisting of three parts: Hell, Purgatory, and Paradise. Believes the title of *Dead Souls* refers to Čižikov and the landowners, the incarnations of the "pošlost" of life, created by the Devil. Observes that Gogol' uses humorous devices to expose the Devil. Points out that



Gogol' uses stylization and conventionalization in depicting his characters, using comparisons to intensify the metaphorical essence. Contends that the "skaz" narrative exhibits non-realistic features and departs from neutral reportage. Concludes that the characters in *Dead Souls* are descendants of other literary types: Pljuškin is Charles Maturin's Sir John Melmoth or Narezny's miser Tarax, Nozdrev is Narezny's hunter Sylvester, Čičikov is Perovskij's "pošljak" Klim Djundik.

24. Milne, Lesley. "Gogol and Mikhail Bulgakov." In Nikolay Gogol: Text and Context. Edited by Jane Grayson and Faith Wigzell. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989, pp. 109-26.

Explores Bulgakov's biographical, thematic, and stylistic connections to Gogol', finding that Bulgakov used Gogolian works to explore his own creativity. Recounts Bulgakov's struggle to stage *Dead Souls* in the early 1930's. Defines the Bulgakovian vision as a modernization and bureaucratization of Gogol's folkloric Ukraine; the vaudeville element is fully articulated and clearly a forerunner of the demonic scenes in *The Master and Margarita*. Discusses Bulgakov's intense awareness of the resemblance between his age and Gogol's, their mutual longing for Italy, and Bulgakov's adoption of Gogol's gastrocentric universe. Concludes that while Bulgakov does not stand entirely under the sign of Gogol', he is the true heir to the Gogolian tradition.

25. Nebolsine, Arcadi. "Gogol and Poshlost: Some Question," In Studies in Slavic Literatures and Culture in Honor of Zoya Yurieff. Edited by Munir Sendich. East Lansing, Michigan: Russian Language Journal, 1988, pp. 225-30.

Presents two opposite interpretations of Gogol's "pošlost": that of Vladimir Nabokov and Soviet scholar I. Katarskij, who criticized the vice of



"pošlost'," and that of Konstantin Močul'skij and Ilija Glazunov, who praised it. Considers Gogol's language and art as an exuberant medieval style of Baroque, and insists that Gogol' as a religious thinker and creative Baroque artist discovered "pošlost'." Points out that Gogol' never created "pošlost'" in his characters, whereas Dostoevskij, Tolstoj, and Čexov did -- in Lužin, Anatolij Kuragin, and Nataša (in *Three Sisters*). Discusses Gogol's difficulties in overcoming "pošlost'" in view of his tendency toward absolute unity and monolithism, and his Platonic aesthetics of harmony and "благообразие." Concludes that Gogol' with his conflict-ridden nature could not challenge "pošlost'."

26. Peace, Richard Arthur. The Enigma of Gogol: An Examination of the Writings of N. V. Gogol and Their Place in the Russian Literary Tradition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Divided into seven sections: 1) Introduction, 2) *Mirgorod*, 3) The St. Petersburg Stories, 4) Theater, 5) *The Carriage and Rome*, 6) *Dead Souls*, 7) Conclusion. Refutes three Western interpretations of Gogol's work by Simon Karlinsky, Donald Fanger and James Woodward. Offers a careful analysis of Gogol's artistic world, examining both text and context. Finds that the motif of old woman, sexual anxiety, and death is encountered in *Vij*, *The Terrible Vengeance*, *The Fair at Soročincy*, and *The Old-World Landowners*. Natural description in Gogol's early stories is not naturalistic, but contains sexual symbolism which later yields to fear. Self-mockery and anxiety about status underlie in *The Overcoat*, *The Diary of a Madman*, *The Inspector General*, and *The Nose* while anxiety about art and writing is paramount in *The Portrait*, *Dead Souls*, and *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends*. Asserts that Gogol's artistic concern is with disparity and disharmony, seeing his artistic personality as driven by three elements: 1) sexual fears in the early period, 2) concern about identity and status in

the middle period, 3) anxiety concerning art and literature in the later period. Concludes that Gogol's artistic view was a negative reconciliation with life in his early years while later it became a positive reconciliation with life, a result of his pursuit of the meaningfulness of art and his growth in Christianity.

27. Peace, Richard Arthur. "The Mirror-World of Gogol's Early Stories." In Nikolay Gogol: Text and Context. Edited by Jane Grayson and Faith Wigzell. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989, pp. 19-33.

Explores the mirror-like, invented world of Gogol's early stories, *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka* and *Mirgorod*. Interprets the love story in *The Fair at Soročincy* as a complex and ambiguous sexual affair which is parodied by the illicit and absurd romance between Paraska's evil stepmother, the demonic Xivnja, and her ecclesiastical lover. Suggests that incest and self-deception are hidden in Gogol's early stories, arguing that even a surface "beauty" masks hidden demonic forces. Insists that these early stories not only contain humor and absurdity, but also have landscapes and figures which are threatened by hidden satanic forces.

28. Peppard, Victor. "Gogolian Substrata in *Žizn' i Neobyčajnye Priključenija Soldata Ivana Chonkina*." Russian Language Journal, 131 (1984), pp. 131-8.

Places Vladimir Vojnovič's *Žizn' i neobyčajnye priključenija soldata Ivana Čonkina* in Gogol's satirical tradition. Asserts that Vojnovič's work owes much to Gogolian parody, stylization, and allusion. Notes, for example, how Vojnovič uses the device of digression to introduce his characters just like Gogol' does. Points out that especially Gogol's *The Inspector General* has much in common with Vojnovič's novel, such as the motif of mistaken identity. Also points out several differences between Vojnovič's novel and *Dead Souls* in narrative structure,



character scheme and use of fantastic elements. Contends, however, that both novels are similar on the thematic level with their complicated deception and falsification. Concludes that Vojnovič's world is saturated with Gogol's style, themes, and motifs.

29. Rancour-Laferriere, Daniel. "All the World's a Vertep: The Personification /Depersonification Complex in Gogol's *Sorochinskaja Jarmarka*." Harvard Ukrainian Studies, 6, no. 3 (1982), pp. 339-71.

Deals with homosexuality in Gogol's world. Points out that Gogol' tends to treat erotic imagery coupled with absurdity, citing the protagonists of *Vij, Nevskij Prospekt*, and *The Overcoat*, in which Akakij Akakievič dies because of sick sexual relations with a feminized overcoat. Finds that in Gogol's world persons are depersonified, while objects are personified, citing Cicikov and the overcoat, respectively. Presents several examples of personification and depersonification from *The Fair at Soročincy*. Draws several observations about homosexuality, marriage, and death in the closing passage of *The Fair at Soročincy*, suggesting that the narrator is a homosexual for whom marriage is unthinkable and tantamount to a death. Concludes that death and homosexuality are closely intertwined in Gogol's life as well as his art.

30. Rancour-Laferriere, Daniel. Out from Under Gogol's *Overcoat*: A Psychoanalytic Study. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1982.

Offers a psychoanalytic study of Gogol's *The Overcoat* not from the standpoint of Gogol' as a psychoanalyst, but under the premise that all literature appeals to the reader's inner world and offers a complex kind of satisfaction within that world. Discusses the contradicting claims of Močul'skij, who said Gogol' was not a psychologist at all, and Driessen, who declared Gogol' a masterful

psychologist. Sees "skaz" as a special type of psychological mask intended to deceive readers with what Ejxenbaum called "the illusion of skaz," or what Baxtin called "a double voiced utterance." Finds it crucial to determine the purpose of the illusion of "skaz." Comments that from a psychoanalytic point of view, what is masked by fantastic material might create anxiety if expressed directly or bluntly. Compares Baxtin's study of Gogol's humor and Freud's approach to humor. Emphasizes both anal and genital sexuality in psychoanalyzing the text of *The Overcoat*.

31. Shapiro, Gavriel. "The Hussar: A Few Observations on Gogol's Characters and Their Vertep Prototype." Harvard Ukrainian Studies, 9 (1985), pp. 133-8.

Notes that Rozanov's study of the relationship between the "vertep" (Ukrainian puppet theater) and Gogol's works, left out a type of "vertep," which appears in Gogol's works: the mustached, boasting, cursing Hussar. Cites the chief of the Polish uhlans in *The Hetman*, the leader of the Polish detachment in the fragment *A Bloody Bandura-Player*, the head prison guard in *Taras Bulba* as examples. Proposes that there is also a relatively weak attachment between this type and Gogol's characters in *The Gamblers* and *Dead Souls*: Utešitel'nyj and Švoxnjev in the former, and Nozdrev in the latter. Concludes that Gogol depicts the above mentioned characters with some characteristics of the "vertep" Hussar, although he inclines toward psychological depiction of his characters in later years.

32. Shklovsky, Victor. "The Literary Genre of *Dead Souls*." In Dead Souls: The Reavey Translation, Backgrounds and Sources, Essays in Criticism. Edited by George Gibian. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1985, pp. 564-9.

Analyzes the genre of Gogol's *Dead Souls*, rejecting various aspects of the traditional novelistic convention. Likens the "Tale of Captain Kopejkin" to Gogol's *Nevskij Prospekt*, since both tales provide plentiful details of everyday life in St. Petersburg through the eye of a poor man. Points out the difference from the traditional novel in the ordering of the plot in *Dead Souls*. Believes that as a genre, the novel has a conventional and artificial plot of limited range, while the epic is a work of unlimited range with accurate descriptions of reality. Contends that Gogol's *Dead Souls* stands between these two genres and calls it a "lesser form of the epic" which escapes the restrictions of the conventional novelistic framework.

33. Shukman, Ann. "Gogol's *The Nose* or the Devil in the Works." In Nikolay Gogol: Text and Context. Edited by Jane Grayson and Faith Wigzell. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989, pp. 64-82.

Introduces and examines a whole series of possible explanations of *The Nose*: Roman Jakobson's, Bakhtin's, Donald Fanger's, Ermakov's, Stilman's, Karlinsky's, Woodward's and Peace's. Insists that the narratorial voice is in a position to play tricks on the reader even while managing the narration itself. Asserts that the struggle between man and the devil is perhaps the struggle between the principles of sense-making and sense-destroying nonsense, believing this to be the subject of *The Nose*. Concludes that any attempt to demand logic and causality of *The Nose* is misguided, because the only consistency of the story lies in the principle of non-consistency.

34. Sobel, Ruth. Gogol's Forgotten Book: Selected Passages and Its Contemporary Readers. Washington D. C.: University Press of America, 1981.

Asserts that Gogol's *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends* was misunderstood by contemporary critics. Examines Gogol's view on art and Russia, his relationship to Russian authority, the role of a writer as prophet. Points out that various interpretations of Gogol' result from his unique way of writing, and the polemics concerning Gogol' mirror the literary life of the time. States that Gogol' viewed Russia as a spiritually united nation of brotherhood where quarrels, hatreds and enmities never exist, and that he saw an ideal ruler as a person inspired by divine nature. Discusses Gogol's view of an artist as a person endowed with extraordinary insight with divine gifts. Explores Gogol's passionate and desperate yearning for religious ecstasy. Observes how various heated polemics surrounding *Selected Passages* created misunderstandings and misconceptions about Gogol'.

35. Stromecky, Ostop. "Gogol's Reverse Symbolism." *Ukrainian Quarterly*, 38, no. 2 (1982), pp. 151-63.

Asserts that Gogol's *The Terrible Vengeance* and *Vij* contain reverse symbolism. Suggests that Gogol' uses a natural mirror, the Dnieper, in creating reverse images. Through its water's reflections Gogol's characters perceive various dimensions such as physical appearance, mind, soul, and emotions. In *The Terrible Vengeance* the Dnieper is a source of life and death, while in *Vij* its reflection gives an old woman beauty and youth. Insists, thus, that the water of the Dnieper is a vehicle of Gogol's reverse symbolism, and like him, it is a creator of life and death. Following the principle of reverse symbolism, declares that Gogol's depiction of the supernatural is not a fantasy, but reality in the form of fantasy.

36. Todd, William Mills III. "*Dead Souls*: Charmed by a Phrase." In his Fiction and Society in the Age of Pushkin: Ideology, Institutions, and Narrative. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1986, pp. 164-206.

Asserts that Gogol's *Dead Souls* manages to divide the reading public, and the comic details in it destroy a devitalized way of life. Presents both the criticisms by S. Aksakov and V. Belinskij, and the interpretations by the Modernists. Pointing out the characteristics of ambiguity and uncertainty in *Dead Souls*, presents a new question concerning the ideology of polite society. Suggests that the social events which bring the characters together, such as visits, dinners and balls, are important elements of polite society. Insists that the ideology of polite society forms and molds the space, the scene, the characters, and their languages through Čičikov's journey in *Dead Souls*. Points out that the world of N, depicted by polite society, gradually collapses as the narrator's language increasingly shifts into everyday language from the refined language of polite society. Concludes that *Dead Souls* plays a double game with the ideology of polite society, which predominated in Russian elite groups. It makes a spectacular pseudo-event of its death, and it also suggests that the self-satisfied world has been dead all along.

37. Trott, Liz. "*Diary of a Madman*: the Hidden Absurd." In Nikolay Gogol: Text and Context. Edited by Jane Grayson and Faith Wigzell. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989, pp. 50-63.

Explores the hidden absurd in Gogol's *The Diary of a Madman*. Asserts that the voice of the narrator is the story and there is no authorial intervention at all, since the madman is the only first person narrator in Gogol's fiction. Shows how Gogol makes use of an unreliable narrator to handle the reader's perceptions. Shows how the frequent contradictions, digressions, and absurdities in the account, as well as the author's lack of comment, leave the reader guessing.

Contrasts several aspects of the narrator's role in *The Nose* and *The Diary of a Madman*. Concludes that the hidden absurd in *The Diary of a Madman* allows Gogol' to connect with the reader more closely, and comic effect comes from the rhythm of the passage, repetition, and absurd juxtapositions.

38. Vinogradov, Victor Vladimirovich. Gogol and the Natural School. Translated by Debra K. Erickson and Ray Parrott. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1987.

Divided into two parts: the first part deals with the relationship between Vinogradov and the Formalists, and the second part examines Vinogradov's *Gogol' and the Natural School*. Criticizes Mandel'shtam for not fully exploring Gogol's stylistic devices and for misunderstanding Gogol's place in the Russian literary tradition. Also considers the views of the Symbolists and Formalists, asserting that all these studies miss the essence of Gogolian style as well as its source in literary tradition. Praises Gippius's interpretation for its mixture of Gogol's personal and artistic histories and for its combined treatment of Gogol's spiritual and artistic world. Discusses the views of the German critic, Stender-Peterson on plot structure in Gogol's works. Points out that the poetics of Classicism, Sentimentalism, and Romanticism are basic elements in Gogol's art, and that they coexist in varying forms and styles. Asserts that Gogol' combines Naturalism with Sentimentalist elements.

39. Wigzell, Faith. "Gogol and Vaudeville." In Nikolay Gogol: Text and Context. Edited by Jane Grayson and Faith Wigzell. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989, pp. 1-18.

Asserts that Gogol' is an ethical and moral artist. Considers the context of Gogol's own time in her examination of the relationship between the comedies *The Inspector General* and *The Marriage* and the contemporary genre of vaudeville.

Insists that vaudeville, imported from France, had a strong influence upon both acting styles and upon audience expectations in the Russia of Gogol's time. Explains that vaudeville is viewed as an ephemeral creation in the 1830s and 1840s. Demonstrates characteristics of the vaudeville genre, introducing some vaudevilles. Argues that Gogol' strongly refuses vaudeville in his own plays, for he believes that Russian character and social circumstances are unsuited to the vaudeville. However, insists that in the speed of action in *The Inspector General* and *The Marriage*, Gogol' indebted to the vaudeville tradition. Concludes that while imitating the speed of action, Gogol' rejects, transforms and tones down the complications of plot, static dialogue, and comic devices.

40. Wilson, Edmund. "Gogol: The Demon in the Overgrown Garden." In *Dead Souls: The Reavey Translation, Backgrounds and Sources, Essays in Criticism*. Edited by George Gibian. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1985, pp. 542-6.

Explores Gogol's style, especially his queer, enormous, and comprehensive vocabulary. Asserts that Gogol's style is a variety of the viscous prose which was popular in his time, for example a narrative style of Hawthorne or Herman Melville. Finds Gogol' to be the master of complicated prose, likening his style to an overgrown garden. Rejects the views of Nabokov and Mirsky that Gogol's early stories such as *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka* and *Mirgorod* are merely fairy tales or farces. Points out that in Gogol's works there is a sudden and unexpected falling out of the bottom: The dissolution of the old fashioned landowners, the loss of Taras Bulba's sons, the outburst between Ivan Ivanovič and Ivan Nikiforovič, the disclosure of the deception in *The Inspector General*, and the collapse of Čičikov's deceit. Asserts that Gogol's life is likewise characterized by unexpected sudden collapse. Contends that Gogol's defeat comes from the failure of his sexual

life. Points out that Gogol' never succeed in depicting the ideal woman. Both Gogol' and his heroes try to find her, but never succeed.

41. Wilson, Reuel K. "A *Marvelous Hangout* or *Dead Souls* Revisited." *World Literature Today*, 54 (1980), pp. 376-81.

Compares Polish writer Kazimierz Orlos' *Cudowna melina* (*A Marvelous Hangout*) with Gogol's *Dead Souls* and *The Inspector General*. Finds the plot and atmosphere of grotesque farce in *Cudowna melina* similar to Gogol's works. Finds that while Gogol's grotesque characters are unique reflections of his imagination, those of Orlos are the result of distortion by vice. Emphasizes that both Gogol' and Orlos depict human vices from a highly moralistic and puritan viewpoint. Asserts that Gogol' attributes what is bad in life to spiritual poverty among the people, while Orlos appeals to basic Christian value, charity, honesty and respect for life.

42. Woodward, James B. *The Symbolic Art of Gogol: Essays on His Short Fiction*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, 1982.

Finds in Gogol's work a pattern in which the illogical becomes the logical through symbolism. Discerns the harmonious symbolic elements in five works: *Ivan Fedorovič Šponka and His Aunt*, *The Old-World Landowners*, *The Nose*, *The Overcoat*, and *The Carriage*. Finds at the core of these works a vision of evil and human imperfection allegorically presented in the form of sexual conflicts. Maintains that the Formalists' approach to the conventional associations between words cannot arrive at a harmonious artistic exegesis. Contends that behind a mask of digression, absurdity, pun, grotesque, etc., lie the symbolic basis of Gogol's works. Concludes that these meanings create a harmony through the logic of its repeated patterns.

43. Woodward, S. "Pro-Creative Disorder in Gogolian Fiction." *Russian Literature*, 26 (1989), pp. 297-303.

Contends that in Gogol's work disorder is an essential element for production or pro-creativity. Points out that in *Ivan Fedorovič Šponka and His Aunt*, Šponka resists marriage, feeling it will demolish his identity. Thus Šponka's orderly behavior in the face of the feminine threat does not create productivity. In *Nevskij Prospekt*, the painter Piskarev's disorderly studio shows chaos, but reflects an artist's creativity. In *The Overcoat* Akakij Akakievič's copying of documents is the opposite of creative writing. Sees the grotesque to be most characteristic for the excess of expression in Gogol's world. Contends that the style of disorder and the grotesque in Gogol's world are associated with pro-creativity.

44. Worrall, Nick. *Nikolai Gogol and Ivan Turgenev*. London: Macmillan Press, 1982.

Divided into eight chapters: 1) two lives, 2) two worlds, 3) theatrical theories and influences, 4) Gogol's plays 1832-1842, 5) *The Inspector General*, 6) Turgenev's plays 1834-1848, 7) Turgenev's plays 1848-1850, 8) *A Month in the Country*. Compares Gogol' and Turgenev as playwrights. Points out several similarities in life experience such as a strong maternal influence, unmarried status, and extensive stay in foreign countries. Discusses the influence on both writers of eighteenth and nineteenth-century German philosophy and the central role of nature in both writers' work. Points out that both writers are influenced by vaudeville and puppet theater. Both writers have in common the desire to reform Russian stage, and to create a new way of drama. Another common feature discussed is their effort to reveal the negative, corrupt side of society, although with the difference that Turgenev offers hope for a positive future. Both writers

also are seen to differ in religiosity: Gogol' views art as a semi-divine mission, while Turgenev does not.

45. Yelistratova, Anna. Nikolai Gogol and the West European Novel. Moscow: Raduga Publishers, 1984.

Compares Gogol's *Dead Souls* with novels by Western writers such as Fielding, Smollett, Rousseau, Goethe, Scott, Thackeray, Dickens and Balzac. Also criticizes the views of Western critics such as Vladimir Nabokov, Victor Erlich, and Janko Lavrin toward Gogol's *Dead Souls*. Rejects Nabokov's view that Gogol' is not a realist, but a master of the irrational world view. Asserts that Gogol's humor is an integral part of his realism. Supports that French poet Paul Eluard's remark that "the true historical significance of Gogol's lyrical digressions in *Dead Souls* only became manifest after the Great October Socialist Revolution."

1990-1991

1. Aksakov, Konstantin. "A Few words on Gogol's Poem *Cicikov's Adventures* or *Dead Souls*." Translated by Ruth Sobel. *Russian Literature Triquarterly*, 23 (1990), pp. 253-62.

Claims that Gogol's *Dead Souls* is an epic of antiquity. Argues that in *Dead Souls* Gogol' depicts images of nature and man profoundly and truly, conveys them in an artistic manner. Points out that *Dead Souls* presents a whole sphere of life, as Homer's epic does. Asserts that every single object in *Dead Souls* has its own life no matter how shallow that life is. Also points out that no matter who Čičikov is, he is still a Russian, riding in his troika. Believes that Gogol' presents the essential Russian feeling. Contends that the similes in *Dead Souls* recall those of Homer's

Iliad. Considers Ukraine as a part of the Great Russian spirit, concludes that the element of the Ukrainian language has been introduced by Gogol' into Russian language.

2. Galperina, Inna. "Critical Relativism: Gogol's *Marriage*, a Multifaceted Play or Playing in a Play." *Russian Literature*, 28, no. 2 (1990), pp. 155-74.

Sees Gogol's *The Marriage* not as a simple play, but a play within a play, with the main protagonist Kočkarev not only directing but also playing a part within his own play. Points out parallels between devices of characterization in Kočkarev's play and in traditional puppet theater: reduction (simplified appearance), exaggeration (exaggerated appearance), and repetition (recurrent behaviors), all of which are manifest not only in each individual character, but in the ensemble as a whole. Finds further parallels the way the space of the theater is created by speech and intonation, change of object functions, movements and gestures, pantomime, etc. Criticizes *The Marriage* for its lack of value judgment, and lack of social dimension. Asserts that *The Marriage* is only a literary artifice which reveals a world of absurdity. Concludes that art can still function in the absence of any social message.

3. Karpuk, Paul A. "Reconciling Chronological Inconsistencies in Gogol's *Taras Bulba*." *Russian Language Journal*, 45, nos.151-152 (1991), pp. 93-110.

Disputes the view that Gogol's *Taras Bulba* is marred by anachronism. Bases his views on five sources of the Ukrainian history -- Bantyš-Kamenskij's *Istorija Maloj Rossii*, Beauplan's *Opisanie Ukrajny*, Koniskij's *Istorija Rusov ili Maloj Rossii*, Rigel'man's *Letopisnoe povestvovanie o Maloj Rossii*, and Šafonskij's *Černigovskogo namestničestva topografičeskoe opisanie*. Sets up a

historical framework centering on several events: the foundation of the Kiev Academy in 1588, the establishment of the Uniate Church during 1589-1596, the Košynskyj's uprising in 1593, the Nalyvajko's uprising in 1596-97, the Taras' uprising in 1620s, the Ostrjanycja's rebellion in 1638, and the Poltora-Kožuxa's rebellion in 1639. Proposes that *Taras Bulba* begins in 1596 and ends in 1639. Sees the siege at Dubno as an artistic invention of Gogol'. Speculates that events in Chapters IX and XI are a synthesis of three historical events -- Taras' uprising in 1620s, the Cossacks' attack on Poland in 1635, and Pavljuk's uprising in 1637. Observes that Gogol' analogized the conclusion of the tale. Considers the second edition of the tale as Gogol's attempt to restore a chronological precision. Concludes that Gogol' intended to synthesize the events of a half-century to create a historical fiction.

4. Maguire, Robert A. "Gogol and the Legacy of Pseudo-Dionysius." In Russianness: Studies on a Nation's Identity. Edited by Robert L. Belknap. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1990, pp. 44-55.

Asserts that Gogol' shares traditional Christian thought with Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, a Greek mystical author of the sixth century. Points out certain general themes and modes of thought originated from Pseudo-Dionysius such as the ideas of place, transfiguration, and silence. The idea that a person has a suitable place in the world allotted to him by God is applied to Gogol's lost characters, who are seen as seeking their rightful place. Applies to Gogol' the concept of "person" and "individual" as defined in the language of Orthodoxy, i.e., a "person" is one who has the image of God, while an "individual" is one who is separated from God because of sin. Sees Gogol's characters in this scheme as "individuals." Points out that while in *The Portrait, Dead Souls* part two, and *Taras Bulba*, Gogol' offers the possibility of transfiguration, most of his characters

unchanged because of sin and persistence in staying out of their place. Finds that in Gogol' the theme of silence follows after the failure of transfiguration.

5. Sicher, Efraim. "Dialogization and Laughter in the Dark, or How Gogol's *Nose* Was Made: Parody and Literary Evolution in Bachtins Theory of the Novel." Russian Literature, 28, no. 2 (1990), pp. 211-33.

Explores the intertextuality in novelistic dialogue of Gogol's *The Nose* from Baxtin's viewpoint of carnivalization and double-voicing. Presents Baxtin's definition of parody and the role in novelistic discourse. Suggests the reader reconstruct the functional structure of *The Nose* in order to examine the absurdity in the story. Asserts that *The Nose* contains a feature of a parody, as a form of double-voicing, which plays an important role in the composition of language in the comic novel. Points out that the nose is used as a comic device to reveal the absurdity of social and textual convention. Concludes that *The Nose* contains literarily subversive text even though it delivers a social and moral message through that text.

6. Sobel, Ruth. "K. Aksakov's Essay on Gogol's *Dead Souls*: A Short Evaluation." Russian Literature Triquarterly, 23 (1990), pp. 263-8.

Analyzes Konstantin Aksakov's essay on Gogol's *Dead Souls*, published in the summer of 1842. Asserts that Aksakov considers Gogol's *Dead Souls* not only to be a work of literature, but also a work of the national spirit. Lists the four literary elements discussed by Aksakov: the universe, the work, the author, and the readers. Aksakov contends that the essence of Gogol's artistic method is plenitude, that is, a desire to cover a totality and to recreate it in his work, and argues that Gogol' is equal to Homer and Shakespeare in terms of the act of creation, but falls

behind them in terms of the content of creation. Evaluates Aksakov's style as vague, ambiguous, repetitive, replete with exaggeration and hard to understand. Concludes that even though Aksakov's study did not enjoy success, it is important to Russian intellectual history.

7. Toumanoff, Susan. "Afterword to Yuri Lotman's Artistic Space in Gogol's Prose." Russian Literature Triquarterly, 23 (1990), pp. 243-51.

Elaborates Yuri Lotman's view of artistic spatial system, and explains it with several examples. Asserts that semiotics and structuralism cannot be separated. Traces Lotman's linguistic background: The Kazan School in the 1870s, OPOYAZ (Society for the Study of Poetic Language) in the 1910s, and The Prague School in the 1930s. Makes several observations on the difference between the Structuralists and the Formalists: the Structuralists consider language to be a system, while the Formalists treat literature as a system. The latter analyze only artistic devices, while the former further explore these devices in social and cultural relationships. Cites Gogol's *The Old-World Landowners* as an example of Lotman's claim that language is a primary modeling system, on which literature -- a secondary modeling system -- is based; that is, language creates the structure of the world, while literature combines these structures with the author's views on art, love, death, etc. by means of imagery, plot, characterization and digression.

CONCLUSION

When Robert Maguire surveyed English Gogol' criticism in 1974 (in his *Gogol' from the Twentieth Century*), he lamented its lack of substantial scholarship. My own study of English Gogol' criticism reveals different findings. Indeed, many English studies contributed both essential and new scholarship to Gogol'. As a whole, criticism of Gogol' in English was marked by constant shifts and changes, and displayed a proliferation of approaches and methodologies. In this conclusion, I will comment on these shifts and changes, focusing on criticism's major aspects, such as comparisons of Gogol' to other writers, religious and psychological interpretations of Gogol', and, above all, on criticism of Gogol's poetics.

Criticism of comparative studies of Gogol' can be divided into five categories: the explorations of picaresque elements, of Ukrainian motifs and elements, of Gogol's influence on others, of others' influence on him, and of poetic features (plots, themes, structures, narrative devices, tropes, among others). Among them, Carl Proffer's exploration of Homeric similes, Roger Key's stylistic devices, Victor Peppard's digression and the motif of mistaken identity, and Peter Rosebach's the function of insanity represented shifts and changes in Gogol' criticism.

A. Birkhead's comparison of *Dead Souls* to Dickens' *Pickwick Papers* was the first English criticism of Gogol'. The critic saw the similarities in treatment of bureaucratic corruption and his study investigated external features in both works. His study ignores artistic elements in analyzing *Dead Souls*, and is essentially another social interpretation.

Since Birkhead's remarks on general links between Gogol' and Dickens, criticism has repeatedly addressed their affinities and differences. Another comparative study between *Dead Souls* and *Pickwick Papers* was made by Bowen, who focused more on artistic features than Birkhead. He found convincing similarities in three categories: the looseness of their structures, the simplicity of their plots, and the common theme of travel by coach. His consideration of *Dead Souls* as a satire on Russian officialdom, and of Gogol' as a spectator laughing at tragic hopelessness seems to stem from the influence of social approaches. Bowen's study, however, was not enough to precipitate a shift in Gogol' criticism. In 1956, Michael Futrell presented criticism of criticism, attacking the two former critics' comparisons, claiming that there are no influences or mutual relationships between *Dead Souls* and *Pickwick Papers*. He centered on Gogol's extreme individuality and uniqueness, contributing to the rise of psychological approaches in Gogol' criticism.

Ernest Simmons' comparison of *Nevskij Prospekt* to De Quincey's *Confessions of an English Opium-Eater* pointed out similar structures and explored the theme of escape from reality into ecstatic dreams. His focus on external elements such as themes, structures, and the prototype of woman contributed to another shift in criticism. Emphasizing the role of dream in Gogol's world pointed in another new direction. Boris Brasol's study more specifically found Gogol's obsessive idea of the Devil, contrasting it with other writers' Devils. Brasol's views were strongly connected with Gogol's religious complex, which might have changed the directions of his artistic world. He elaborately explored Gogol's spiritual mood and religious emotions in comparative studies. An examination of the Gogol'-Poe relationship by Alexander Kaun focused on both similarities and differences, emphasizing the influence of Hoffman. The critic aptly pointed out the differences in the nature of both writers' fantasy: Poe's fantasy as modified by his supernatural rationality, while Gogol's imagination as controlled by his humor. He also showed how both writers' personal inferiority develops into an egotism of superiority

and a tendency toward distortion and exaggeration. Thus the critic touched upon the impact of the writers' threatened mental balance upon their artistic worlds. This criticism can be seen as a more comprehensive comparative study than any other, signaling a new shift toward psychological approaches, especially with respect to *Evenings*. Comparative criticism, thus, began to take on a more comprehensive and extensive scope.

Some critics proposed a new change in criticism in the course of treating picaresque elements in *Dead Souls*. Karl Selig's comparison of *Dead Souls* to the anonymous Hispanic novel *Lazarillo de Tormes* explored the features of the picaresque novel in Gogol's works, rejecting the influence of Cervantes. Whether Gogol was under the influence of Cervantes or any Hispanic picaresque novel, it is obvious that some of Gogol's works contain some features of the picaresque novel. This study pioneered the exploration of picaresque features in Gogol. Since then many critics such as Murray Baumgarten, Elliot Glass, T. E. Little, and John Mersereau put Gogol's works, especially *Dead Souls*, in the category of the picaresque novel. Murray Baumgarten's claim that *The Overcoat* is a picaresque epic is not convincing, because it is hard to find any picaresque features in *The Overcoat*. On the other hand, Elliot Glass's study clearly pointed out some typical features of the Hispanic picaresque novel in *Dead Souls*, supporting the influence of Cervantes on Gogol: a protagonist who travels from inn to inn plotting, scheming, and living by his wits, a series of unrelated adventures which are interwoven by a protagonist, and three types of women -- a young innocent maiden, an aggressive manipulator, and a foolish gossipmonger. The critic's assertion that Čičikov is a type of "hidalgos de apariencia" (a personality characterized by spiritual and physical hunger, self-deception, arrogance, self-indulgence, and opportunism) is exceptionally well-defended. Glass's study is supported by T. E. Little and John Mersereau. Thus, treatments of picaresque elements in *Dead Souls* amounted to a significant accomplishment in Gogol criticism.

Another new shift of comparative studies evolved from analyses of Ukrainian ingredients in Gogol's works, especially in *Evenings* and *Taras Bulba*. Volodymyr Besoushko's critique explored Ukrainian ingredients in *Evenings* (harsh humor, idealization of women and the past, fantasy elements redolent of fairy tales, ballads and fables) while Ostap Stromecky explored Ukrainian linguistic elements in *Taras Bulba*, asserting that Gogol' interweaves Ukrainian words, melodies, and spirit into the texture of his language. Both critics expanded criticism by blending Ukrainian linguistic elements with Russian. However, it seems to me that their views are somewhat contaminated by Ukrainian nationalism, and they missed the most important feature -- Gogol's own imagination which was saturated in Ukrainian elements and the recreation of his artistic world through his fantastic imagination. Such ideal and fantastic features were mentioned later by another critic: Bahrij-Pikulyk. He compared *Taras Bulba* to Kuliš's *Black Council*, defining *Taras Bulba* as historical romance, in which historical characters and events are idealized and fantasized. His treatment of the personal and complex myth of the Ukraine, the domination of heroic personalities over historical process, and an inaccurate depiction of the religious conflict played a significant role in determining that Gogol's main source was his own mythical conception of folklore and oral literature.

Two critics (Gilman Alkire and Elizabeth Shepard) put forth a reflection of Belinskij's views on art under the name of comparative studies. Bulgarin's influence was seen in Gogol's description of a petty functionary ("мелкий чиновник"), landowners, and provincial officialdom by Alkire in a study of the generalized influence of Bulgarin's satirical novel *Ivan Vyžigin*. It is hard to agree with Alkire's claim that Gogol', like Bulgarin, does not depict the internal psyche of St. Petersburg. Another critic saw Nikolaj Pavlov's *The Demon* as a source of *The Overcoat*, pointing out similarities such as theme of confrontation between the "мелкий чиновник" and the social system. The claim that Gogol' presents human nature and life as perfectible even though they are tainted with

corruption is awkwardly made, and these two criticisms failed to take into account new shifts and changes in criticism, reverting instead to nineteenth-century Realism. On the other hand, a more artistically elaborated criticism also emerged in comparing Gogol' to Kafka and Irving. Idris Parry pointed out a similar absurdity and the repetition of some precise details in *The Nose* and Kafka's *The Metamorphosis* along with psychological approaches. Carl Proffer's study, "Washington Irving in Russia: Puškin, Gogol', Marlinskij," reflected the influence of Irving in themes, motifs, and manner of narration. His comparison of *The Portrait* and Irving's *Dolph Heyliger* and *Mysterious Picture* expanded in comparative studies on Gogol', emphasizing the narrative device of "skaz." Both critics helped to create a tendency to treat poetic features in comparative studies. Proffer's comparison of *Taras Bulba* to Homer's *Iliad* with respect to parallel themes, similar motifs, Homeric similes and stylistic devices contributed to the further development of Gogol' criticism. His criticism revealed many features hitherto unexplored in comparative studies.

Some critics studied Gogol's influence upon other Russian writers such as Čexov, Gončarov, Turgenev, Bulgakov, Belyj, Vojnovič, and Nabokov, scrutinizing Gogol's poetics, artistic technique, and psychological features. Their critiques expanded upon various changes in Gogol' criticism. Peter Rosebach analyzed the function of insanity in Čexov's *The Black Monk*, and *The Diary of a Madman*. His study of the mental nature of Gogol's protagonist reveals Gogol's own mental tension between his artistic views and religious ideas. He properly pointed out Gogol's struggle in search for his view of art in this research. John Nagel's critique of the internal structures of *Nevskij Prospekt* and Čexov's *An Attack of Nerves* demonstrated the similarities of Gogol's syllogistic technique upon Čexov. He clearly revealed Gogol's artistic views through comparison with Čexov, treating both authors' visions of art through the depiction of two aspects -- the life of day and the life of night -- and a prostitute's dark beauty at night as embodiment of Gogol's

artistic sense of idealism and his view of the function of art. Ronald Vroon's findings in comparing *Dead Souls* to Gončarov's *Oblomov* led directly toward text analysis in comparative studies, with its exploration of structural techniques of character introduction and delayed biography, the use of metonymic elements as leitmotifs, the use of rhetorical questions and interruption of the narrative in describing characters, and the effect of the grotesque -- all of which contributed a great deal to our understanding of Gogol'. Nick Worrall's comparative study traced both Gogol' and Turgenev to their sources in the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century German philosophy, vaudeville and puppet theaters. He accurately juxtaposed both writers' parallel two themes (nature and woman). Victor Peppard placed Vojnovič's *Žizn' i neobyčajnye priklučenija soldata Ivana Čonkina* in Gogol's satirical tradition with its use of parody, stylization, allusion, digression, and the motif of mistaken identity. The motif of mistaken identity is correctly seen as both a mainspring of the novel's plot, and a consistent element in the structure.

In the 1980s, two critics compared Gogol' and Belyj, focusing on stylistic devices and religious preferences. Roger Key found Belyj's tendency of Gogolian narrative ambiguities in his *Silver Dove*: certain structural and stylistic features in narrative mannerism and some inter-textual affinities with *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka* and *Mirgorod*. On the other hand, Olga Cooke treated different features of the role of the sorcerers in *The Terrible Vengeance* and in Belyj's *Moscow* along with the different orientations of religion: the hateful crimes of Belyj's sorcerer -- murder, incest, rape, bondage, madness -- far surpass those of Gogol's sorcerer, and the former offers a vision of redemption while the latter leaves no hope. It is remarkable in its application of the role of their different religious preferences to the depictions of their sorcerers. As discussed above, the criticism of the early period in comparative studies only dealt with external features or social approaches. Since the late 1960s and the early 1970s, however, Gogol'

criticism has become more comprehensive, increasingly emphasizing Gogol's artistic features and poetics.

Psychological approaches by Paul Friedman, Hugh McLean, Peter Spycher, Simon Karlinsky, and Daniel Rancour-Laferriere, exerted a huge influence in Gogol' criticism. All of them turned their attention not only to Gogol's text but also his personal character, concentrating on moods, fears, emotions, moral, as well as sexual, and spiritual problems. Some used the text of *The Nose* and *The Diary of a Madman* in their psychological treatments, while others *Evenings* and *Mirgorod*. They exceptionally developed psychological criticism in Gogol' from the early studies of Ermakov and established a new trend of psychological approaches in Gogol' criticism.

In the early 1950s, Paul Friedman's psychological reflections on *The Nose* made the first significant advance in criticism, showing Gogol's gift for revealing fears, anxieties, and obsessions. His Freudian interpretation of dreams is the major factor in his criticism of *The Nose*: the nightmare in the story is seen as the substance of real life, which is composed of nightmares. Arguing that Kovalev's problem does not stem from his nose itself, he insisted that the problem is what the nose represents in the topsy-turvy world of Gogol'. From Friedman's assertion, we can draw an assumption that the root of man's psychological problems lies beneath the surface of his physical complaints. Friedman's research overemphasized context at the expense of Gogol's text. It is, however, a unique approach which definitely brought about a new change in criticism. Another critic, Hugh McLean, analyzed the role of love in Gogol's *Mirgorod*, applying Freudian theory to Gogol's works -- "the ultimate source of energy in human being is the love instinct, Eros." His observation that Gogol' uses overtly erotic imagery in *Evenings*, yet depicts a straightforward sexual embrace only when the romantic partner is a supernatural being in nature or a thing, was remarkable in developing sexual themes in Gogol'. Noticing the

huge change in erotic themes from *Evenings* to *Mirgorod*, he saw the love theme in *Mirgorod* as a source of tragedy, disaster, or death taking the form of retreat, regression, and finally boredom. In this process, a mixture of fear, death, masochistic delight, and sadistic impulse plays an important role. The argument is quite convincing in showing that *Evenings* is full of open erotic imagery, whereas it is entirely dropped in *Mirgorod*.

In the 1960s, two critics applied psychological approaches to *The Diary of a Madman*, emphasizing context rather than text. Juran Sylvia treated the relationships between man's fear and loneliness and the role of absurdity in the artistic world. The critic's observation that Gogol tries to neutralize the fearful world by shifting it into the world of absurdity is another advance in psychological interpretation. Richard Gustafson's criticism reflected the protagonist's quest for human identity with psychological approaches. He proposed two Popriščins: the suffering clerk frustrated by man's inhumanity and the impostor who confiscates a fantasy throne to make his dream come true. Gustafson's conclusion that the vagueness of the story's ending makes Gogol's vision one of fearfulness bears similarity to Sylvia's treatment. It is obvious, thus, that both critics saw Gogol's vision of fear as a significant factor in *The Diary of a Madman*. Peter Spycher saw *The Nose* as a dramatization of Gogol's own sexual anxieties under the pretext of both a grotesque farce and a satire on social climbers. His claim that Kovalev's nose symbolizes his sexual organ leans on Ermakov's views. His sexual interpretation of *The Nose* goes too far: he assumed the beggar-women, standing in front of the Kazan Cathedral are syphilitics, and he saw the nose's visit to the Kazan Cathedral as a symbol of the act of the union between man (the nose) and woman (the church) -- two speculations which are groundless. His idea that the dream in *The Nose* might be Gogol's own dream and might depict his personal sexual downfall is convincing, although the idea is not original.

Since the late 1970s, three Western critics have dealt with heterosexual and homosexual themes in the framework of psychological approaches. Simon Karlinsky's exploration of homosexual orientation in Gogol's early works definitely created a new shift in criticism. His findings of the sexual symbolism in the description of nature in *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka* were new and convincingly portrayed. The natural phenomena of a hot summer day in *The Fair at Soročincy* which are assigned specific genders and allowed to engage in explicit acts of sexual intimacy, a nocturnal pond that tries to make love to distant stars in *A May Night*, and female images of summer earth and beautiful river, and male images of the Dnieper personified as a old sleeping man, who is sexually impotent and petulant, in *The Terrible Vengeance* -- are all well-supported and convincing. One of the most interesting interpretations of *The Tale of How Ivan Ivanovič Quarreled with Ivan Nikiforovič* treats the hidden homosexual theme, seeing the story as one of a sexless homosexual marriage. Such an interpretation of Ivan Ivanovič's offer (a pig and two bags of oats in exchange for the rifle) as a veiled homosexual proposition was supported by another critic. Alex Alexander also pointed out the tension between unsatisfied heterosexuality and unfulfilled homosexuality in *Two Ivans*: Ivan Nikiforovič represents a heterosexual while Ivan Ivanovič is a closet homosexual. Both critics' interpretations are almost identical, especially where *Two Ivans* is concerned. Karlinsky's suggestion of interrelationship between Gogol's homosexual guilt and his religious crisis pointed in a new direction for religious-psychological approaches. Rancour-Laferriere revealed new elements in "skaz" as a special type of psychological mask intended to deceive readers. His study focuses on text rather than context. His observations about homosexuality, marriage, and death in *The Fair at Soročincy* were utterly convincing: the narrator is a homosexual for whom marriage is unthinkable and tantamount to death, which is closely linked to homosexuality not only in Gogol's art but also in his life. Rancour-Laferriere's further claims that anal and genital sexuality is supposedly depicted in

The Overcoat, and that Petrovič is a personification of anal and genital sexuality seem, however, to be extreme.

To conclude, most psychological criticism was original, and provided another method in treating Gogol's enigmatic works, creating sensational shifts and changes in criticism. In this area, two critics were preeminent: Hugh McLean, scrutinizing Gogol's early works from the psychological viewpoint, and Karlinsky, discovering explicit homosexual themes -- all of which provided further psychoanalytic insight and opened the door wide to psychosexual approaches to Gogol'.

Religious approaches precipitated another shift in criticism, treating Gogol's main works such as *The Overcoat*, *The Inspector General*, part two of *Dead Souls*, and *Selected Passages*. Several critics applied their religious views to *The Overcoat* and *The Inspector General*: some critiques seem to be groundless speculation, while others seem to be well-supported. In *The Overcoat*, Akakij's attitude, his environment, and the symbolic meaning of his new coat were treated, whereas in *The Inspector General* Biblical symbolic meanings were applied to the last scene of the play. Jesse Zeldin and Ruth Sobel exhibited solid scholarship in their careful reexamination of *Selected Passages*, which had been disregarded by most Russian critics (including Realists, Symbolists, and Formalists). All religious studies had focused not on texts but on context, elaborating Gogol's spiritual longing from his work. These studies signified another new change in criticism, reconstructing Gogol's artistic views with his religious searching. The religious approaches to Gogol', thus, revealed many unexpected and unexplored features of Gogol's works.

In 1956, Mildred Martin's study introduced the first religious interpretation, examining *The Overcoat* from a Christian point of view. His approach focused mainly on

Christian brotherhood, finding Christian self-respect in Akakij's memorable cry -- "Leave me alone! Why do you insult me?" His study failed to provide a new direction in criticism, echoing Belinskij's social approaches. The criticism of John Schillinger and Anthony Hippisley developed excellent religious interpretations to *The Overcoat*, pointing out more detailed interrelationships between religion and art. Schillinger saw *The Overcoat* as a caricature of hagiography, considering the opening part of the story as a satirical digression. Comparing *The Overcoat* to the story of the sixth-century St. Acacius of Sinai, Schillinger clearly demonstrated the affinity of the works' structures and the similarities between Akakij and St. Acacius such as their simple tasks, similar environments, filthy clothes, sufferings, and death. His discovery of the hagiographical tendency in the story was most significant. This criticism provided another new approach to *The Overcoat* from a religious standpoint. Another religious interpretation was applied to *The Overcoat* by Hippisley, who asserted that Gogol's religious belief is strongly connected to his aesthetic concept. He appropriately adapted several Biblical quotations to support his claims: new clothing symbolized righteousness and Christ himself, and severe cold weather symbolized Satan. Akakij's searching for a new coat was seen as a sinner's pursuit of salvation. It is a remarkable application of unexpected yet apt symbolic meanings to Akakij and his new coat. His criticism contains an interesting spiritual approach, but requires further explanation, especially on the epilogue of the story, for the revenge of Akakij's ghost in the epilogue is quite unsuitable in terms of Christianity.

Some critics picked up symbolic meanings in Gogol's work, choosing to analyze it as a religious and moral statement, while others properly applied Christianity to Gogol's life and artistic world. In 1967, Lucy Vogel saw the unfinished tale *Rome* as playing an important role in Gogol's spiritual life and art, asserting that Gogol might intend to convey the symbolic meaning of Rome as a divine and eternal idea of beauty and spiritual motherland. Vogel's study traced Gogol's subjective religious ideas as they shifted from

1837 to 1839. This signified a new shift in the religious approach, emphasizing not style or lyricism but Gogol's spiritual desire and his treatment of themes in *Rome*. In the interpretation of the unfinished second part of *Dead Souls*, Joseph Wittlin applied a Christian viewpoint to Gogol's fear of death, women, and weakness, as well as other personal features. Wittlin's claims that Gogol's Hell was within him have a relation to Gogol's psychological anxiety and fear. His assertion that Gogol had struggled to have contact with God and to emerge from Hell, which is in his own mind, seems to reflect the lack of real Christianity in Gogol. Wittlin's critique pointed in another direction: the interrelationship between Gogol's personal features and his desire for Christianity might play a significant role in the interpretation of Gogol's inner world. Marianna Bogojavlensky's 1969 study refocused the mutual relationships between Gogol's religious searches and his art, rejecting views of religious fanaticism, unconventional behavior, and mental illness. Bogojavlensky's findings that Gogol's prayers, his pilgrimages to Jerusalem, his shadowy moods, and his destruction of part two of *Dead Souls* indicate not mental insanity, but a strong, purposeful idealism, provided new insight on how Gogol's religious drive affected his final work. Her views are convincing because most Christians are struggling to discover the real meanings of life as Gogol did. Her treatment of banality in Gogol as a significant element that separates humanity from God, was an excellent insight within the Christian approach. Per-Arne Bodin's identification of an eschatological theme in the last scene of *The Inspector General* was another new interpretation from the Christian point of view. The town in Gogol's play was seen as the human being, the real Inspector General as Jesus Christ who will destroy all sinners, and the silence of the last scene in the play is the silence before the triumphant sounds of the Last Judgment. His criticism is quite unique in so far as it uses only the last part of the whole work. It seems to me quite possible that the final silent scene can be interpreted as a strong Christian message. Bodin's exploration provided another view of the religious approach in criticism, and his claims could be supported from Gogol's spiritual conviction.

Another critic, Judith Deutsch, dealt with the theme of Christianity in *Taras Bulba*, finding the Cossacks representative not of their own culture but of a divine nature. The critic's claims are supported by new interpretations of several scenes: Ostap's death was seen as a Christian martyrdom, Bulba's death as Christ's crucifixion, and the nature of wholeness in the Cossacks as the Trinity and the image of God. This critique opened another avenue of religious approach, suggesting also that Gogol's own religious approach is an integral part of his artistic world.

The most memorable religious criticism was performed by two critics who combined Gogol's artistic views and his religious views from *Selected Passages*. In 1968, Jesse Zeldin reevaluated *Selected Passages*, emphasizing Gogol's views of literature and the artist, including his Christianity. He presented his discovery of Gogol's fundamental purpose in art: the unity of the aesthetic and the religious; the writer as a prophet for his people and God, revealing beauty, with the Kingdom of Beauty and the Kingdom of God one and the same. His criticism provided a new direction not only in a religious framework but also for general artistic approaches to Gogol'. Zeldin's views were strongly supported by another critic, Ruth Sobel, in 1976. Sobel also pointed out that for Gogol', theater was deemed a vehicle for the education of Russian people and a pulpit for preaching Christianity, while the artist was a person endowed with divine gifts. The unity of the aesthetic and the religious became one of their achievements, and provided a new direction for religious approaches which contradicted the interpretations of Konstantin Močul'skij's and V. Zenkovskij'. Religious approaches, to sum up, did not give rise to as many shifts and changes in Gogol' criticism as did other approaches. Early religious approaches tended to draw symbolic meanings which might relate to Biblical messages. In some cases, critiques seem far-fetched. Later approaches, however, such as those of Zeldin and Sobel, contain solid scholarship, which fruitfully explores the interrelationships of religion and literature in Gogol's writings.

Many new shifts and changes occurred in English-language criticism's tendency to center on poetics and stylistic devices. Many critics, thus, discovered features of poetics in Gogol' such as similes, metaphors, imagery, puns, among others, and also pointed out stylistic devices such as digression, absurdity, hyperbole, the grotesque, narrative mannerism especially "skaz," and triviality. A new direction was paved by Nabokov in 1944. His study of the integrity of art, focusing on the stylistic devices such as digression, absurdity, irrationality, and the grotesque, made a lasting impact on Gogol' criticism. He strived to restore the aesthetic elements to Gogol' criticism and maintain the balance that was lost in social criticism. Considering Gogol's work to be poetry, he also gave rise to the tendency of textual analysis in criticism. Nabokov's stylistic notion of Gogol's art heralded a new shift in criticism, dealing a sensational and devastating blow to Belinskij's views.

In the 1960s, Frederik Driessen's discovery of Gogol's mastery of composition in his early work led to another shift. He found the source of grotesque and humor in Gogol' to be anxiety in the form of horror, grotesque or humor, thus grafting the stylistic with the psychological approach. Although his criticism has been received well, Driessen does not mention Gogol's most important works such as *The Inspector General* and *Dead Souls*. Vsevolod Setchkarev's stylistic study produced another new approach to *The Nose* and *The Carriage*: the former was seen as a work playing with narrative devices and the latter as a work of compact composition. His study of absurdity and hyperbole in *Dead Souls* completely rejected the realistic approaches in *Dead Souls*. Carl Proffer thoroughly explored imagery in *Dead Souls* with emphasis on similes. Comparing Homeric similes in *Taras Bulba* to *The Iliad*, he pointed out Gogol's tendency to decrease hyperbolic and grotesque similes. James Woodward's criticism produced another shift in criticism of poetics, finding new stylistic techniques in *The Overcoat* such as contrasting devices,

juxtaposition of the comic and solemn, and repeated confrontations between affirmation and negation. He also saw the frequency of direct and indirect questions and the mass of indefinite words as important to the story's deliberate vagueness. His criticism contains some features common to Formalist approaches. Victor Erlich offered a general study of Gogol's life and works, including criticism of poetics, focusing on the grotesque. He correctly noted that Gogol is one of the best writers to condense the grotesque imagination fully and boldly, rejecting psychological approaches dealing with Gogol's personality. Most of his claims, however, look like a reflection of Nabokov's views. In that sense, Erlich's explorations were not influential.

In the 1970s, James Bailey explored Gogol's technique of composition in *The Overcoat* as a broad symmetry -- a story within the framework of introduction and conclusion. His findings concerning the role of time, opposition, and shocking extremes in structure signalled yet another new approach. Criticism by Paul Debreczeny also dealt with poetics, with emphasis on stylistic devices, narrative mannerism, and language varieties in *Two Ivans*. Leo Hulanicki's critique pointed out stylistic devices in *The Carriage*: parallelism, repetition, absurdity, the grotesque, and narrative structure. Lee Jennings emphasized the role of visual imagery in the grotesque of *Dead Souls*. Another critic, Robert Maguire, examined narrative devices in *Two Ivans*, including digression, triviality, and parallelism. Čiževskij's criticism contributed a new direction in criticism, emphasizing both form and content in *The Overcoat*. His claims pioneered a new direction in criticism of poetics, providing a close link between the story's verbal texture and its moral universe, stressing form, pattern, function and content. His criticism can be considered a reaction to stylistic approaches, and a convincing one. Donald Fanger also revealed new keys to Gogol's artistic world such as metamorphosis, identity, recognition, and evasion. His search for the artistic value of Gogol's universe is well-balanced, since he investigated not only stylistic devices but also poetic messages. In the 1980s, rebuttals by

some critics appeared which emphasized text and context equally: Richard Peace's characterization of Gogol's artistic world as a reconciliation with life, and James Woodward's exploration of the Gogolian pattern of symbolism which converts the illogical to the logical. Woodward also contended that at the basis of Gogol's works, behind a mask of digression, absurdity, and puns are the grotesque, lie symbolic meanings which create harmony through the logic of their repeated patterns.

Overall, Gogol' criticism from 1915 throughout 1991 was utterly positive and most comprehensive. No one can dispute its variety, depth, and substance. Most scholarship, represented in the conclusion of this dissertation, laboriously explored the features of Gogol's artistic world, and unveiled countless facets of Gogol's literary legacy. There were constant shifts and changes in Gogol' criticism and a proliferation of approaches and methodologies throughout the entire period. Criticism singled out *Dead Souls* and *The Overcoat* as Gogol's most celebrated accomplishments. Among the approaches in criticism, psychological approaches deserve credit for their originality. They provided a new method in treating Gogol's enigmatic works, yet they often fell short in backing up their claims. Focusing on context, religious approaches elaborated Gogol's spiritual longing from his work and gave critics another new look, interpreting Gogol's artistic views in terms of his religious searching. They contributed to criticism by exploring the interrelationships of religion and literature in Gogol's writings. The wealth of comparative criticism that has been amassed bears witness to Gogol's eminent position in world literature. Comparative studies dealing with internal elements -- plots, themes, structures, narrative devices, similes, among others -- have served to shed light on the unique features of Gogol's stylistic mastery. Many critics thoroughly scrutinized his poetics, and praised his stylistic devices -- absurdity, the grotesque, digression, hyperbole, triviality, "skaz," and many others. Gogol' was a many-faceted writer quite deserving of a wealth of differing interpretations and analyses. Such variety, even controversy, became a unique

feature of Gogolian scholarship. Finally, it is still fitting that a definitive interpretation of Gogol' has never been achieved despite the voluminous scholarship published in the 150 years since Gogol's death. Many scholars are still addressing Gogol' as a mysterious, unsolved writer, a puzzling figure, the strangest prose-poet, bizarre, weird, ambiguous, elusive, and, above all, enigmatic, among many other attributes. Gogol', thus, continues to remain *terra incognita*, awaiting never-ceasing interpretations.

SUBJECT INDEX

- Aksakov, Konstantin Sergeevič, 1970s. 8; 1980s. 5; 1990s. 6
- Aksakov, Sergej Timofeevič, 1980s. 36
- Annenkov, Pavel Vasilievič, 1960s. 26
- Arabesques*, 1960s. 6; 1970s. 41, 58, 63
- Areopagite, 1990s. 4
- Aristophanes, 1970s. 27, 42
- Author's Confession*, 1970s. 56
- Bachelard, Gaston, 1970s. 55
- Balzac, Honore de, 1960s. 10; 1980s. 45
- Bantyš-Kamenskij, Dmitrij, 1990s. 3
- Baroque, 1980s. 25
- Baxtin, Mixail Mixailovič, 1960s. 5; 1980s. 4, 30, 33; 1990s. 5
- Beauplan, Guillaume, 1990s. 3
- Belinskij, Vissarion Grigorievič, 1960s. 15, 34; 1970s. 8, 44; 1980s. 18, 19, 36
- Belyj, Andrej, 1980s. 7, 8, 19
- Becužev, Aleksandr Aleksandrovič, 1960s. 22
- Bible, 1970s. 24
- Biographical information, 1920s. 1; 1930. 1; 1950s. 5; 1960s. 9; 1970s. 63
- Bloody Bandura-Player, A*, 1980s. 31
- Bulgakov, Mixail Afanasevič, 1980s. 24
- Bulgarin, Faddej Vasilievič, 1960s. 1, 6
- Byron, George, 1930s. 1; 1970s. 28
- Carriage, The*, 1960s. 28; 1970s. 26; 1980s. 26, 42
- characters in, 1970s. 26
- composition in, 1960s. 28
- narrative in, 1970s. 26
- Cassirer, Ernst, 1970s. 67
- Cervantes, Miguel, 1910s. 1; 1950s. 3; 1950s. 8; 1970s. 22; 1980s. 13
- Černigovskogo namestništva topografičeskoe opisanie*, 1990s. 3
- Čexov, Anton Pavlovič, 1960s. 25; 1970s. 1, 39; 1980s. 25
- Čudakov, Gregorij, Ivanovič, 1960s. 22
- Comparative studies, 1910s. 1, 2; 1930s. 1, 2, 3; 1950s. 3, 8; 1960s. 1, 17, 20, 22, 25, 33; 1970s. 22, 31, 39, 42, 47, 50, 61, 66; 1980s. 3, 8, 19, 24, 28, 41, 44, 45
- Contemporary, The*, 1960s. 19
- Cossack theme in, 1950s. 10, 1960s. 3, 30; 1970s. 6, 52; 1980s. 3, 10; 1990s. 3
- Dante, Alighieri, 1930s. 1; 1960s. 35; 1980s. 12, 13
- Dead Souls*, 1910s. 1, 2; 1930s. 1; 1940s. 1; 1950s. 3, 8, 12; 1960s. 4, 11, 18, 21, 24, 27, 31, 33, 35; 1970s. 1, 8, 10, 18, 20, 22, 28, 31, 32, 54, 55, 66, 68, 70; 1980s. 4, 5, 6, 13, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24, 28, 32, 36, 41; 1990s. 1, 6
- aesthetics in, 1970s. 1
- airborne imagery in, 1970s. 55
- characters in, 1910s. 2; 1950s. 8; 1960s. 1; 1970s. 1, 8, 18, 22, 66, 70; 1980s. 17, 23, 31
- Čičikov, 1910s. 2; 1930s. 1; 1950s. 12; 1960s. 21, 27; 1970s. 1, 17, 18, 22, 32, 36, 41, 54, 68; 1980s. 5, 6, 13, 17, 23, 29, 40; 1990s. 1
- comparison to, 1950s. 8; 1960s. 33; 1970s. 22, 31, 66; 1980s. 5, 24, 28, 41; 1990s. 1
- comparison to *Pickwick Papers*, 1910s. 1, 2; 1950s. 3
- digression in, 1960s. 24; 1970s. 70
- feminine images in, 1970s. 10
- grotesque in, 1970s. 28

- mirror images in, 1970s. 18
 picaresque elements in, 1970s. 32;
 1980s. 23
 poshlost' in, 1980s. 13
 religious views in, 1960s. 35
 romantic elements in, 1960s. 27
 satire in, 1970s. 54
 similes in, 1960s. 21
 social views in, 1950s. 12; 1980s. 17,
 36; 1990s. 1
 structure in, 1980s. 22
 themes in, 1960s. 4; 1980s. 4
 translation of, 1960s. 18
 typification of characters in, 1960s. 11
- Diary of a Madman, The*, 1950s. 9;
 1960s. 12, 13, 25, 36; 1970s. 2, 17,
 44, 59; 1980s. 37
 absurdity in, 1960s. 13; 1980s. 37
 insanity theme in, 1960s. 25, 36;
 1970s. 2
 comparison to, 1960s. 25
 Popriščin, 1960s. 12, 13, 36
 psychological views in, 1960s. 12;
 1970s. 44
- Dickens, Charles, 1910s. 1, 2; 1950s. 3;
 1960s. 10; 1980s. 45
- Divine Comedy, The*, 1960s. 35; 1980s.
 12, 13
- Dostoevskij, Fëdor Mixailovič, 1930s.
 1; 1960s. 10, 14, 17; 1970s. 1, 64;
 1980s. 25
- Dread Wild Boar, The*, 1970s. 45
- Ducange, Victor, 1960s. 19
- Dumas, Alexandre, 1960s. 19
 "dumas," 1960s. 30
- Ejxenbaum, Boris Mixailovič, 1960s. 7,
 8; 1970s. 3, 14, 24; 1980s. 30
- Eluard, Paul, 1980s. 45
- Ermakov, Ivan Dmitrievič, 1960s. 24;
 1970s. 71; 1980s. 33
- Ermilov, Vladimir Vladimirovič, 1950s.
 11
- Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka,*
 1930s. 2; 1950s. 7; 1960s. 6; 1970s.
 34, 41, 45, 63; 1980s. 9, 12, 19, 27,
 40
 characters in, 1960s. 7; 1970s. 13
 comparison to, 1930s. 2; 1980s. 19
 fairy tales in, 1980s. 40
 love theme in, 1950s. 7
 satire in, 1970s. 34
 sexual imagery in, 1980s. 9
- Fair at Soročincy, The*, 1980s. 27, 29
 characters in, 1980s. 27
 sexual theme in, 1980s. 27, 29
- Fielding, Henry, 1950s. 3; 1980s. 45
- Flaubert, Gustave, 1960s. 23
- Formalism, views of, 1960s. 8, 32;
 1970s. 14, 16, 33, 51, 53, 64; 1980s.
 32, 38
- Freud, Sigmund, 1950s. 4; 1970s. 71;
 1980s. 30
- Gamblers, The*, 1980s. 31
 characters in, 1980s. 31
- Garnett, Constance, 1960s. 18
- genre
 black humor, 1970s. 47
 caricature, 1960s. 23; 1970s. 49
 comedy, 1920s. 1; 1960s. 5, 33;
 1970s. 27, 34, 42, 53; 1980s. 11,
 23, 39; 1990s. 5
 farce, 1960s. 23, 29
 folklore, 1970s. 38, 60
 parody, 1960s. 5; 1970s. 9, 46, 57,
 64; 1980s. 28; 1990s. 5
 picaresque novel, 1950s. 8; 1960s. 2;
 1970s. 22, 32; 1980s. 23
 satire, 1910s. 2; 1950s. 1; 1960s. 15;
 1970s. 9, 54; 1980s. 11, 22
 vaudeville, 1980s. 24, 39, 44
- Gippius, Vasilij Vasilievič, 1970s. 21,
 72; 1980s. 12, 13, 38
- Glazunov, Ilija Sergeevič, 1980s. 25
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang, 1930. 1;

- 1980s. 45
Gogol and the Natural School, 1980s. 38
 Gončarov, Ivan Aleksandrovič, 1960s. 17; 1970s. 1, 66
 Guernsey, Bernard Guilbert, 1960s. 18
Hans Kjuixelgarten, 1970s. 10
 Hasek, Jaroslav, 1960s. 33
 Hawthorne, Nathaniel, 1980s. 40
Hetman, The, 1970s. 45; 1980s. 31
 Cossack theme in, 1970s. 45

 historianism in, 1950s. 10
 Hoffmann, E. T. A., 1930s. 2; 1960s. 14, 28; 1970s. 6, 42, 61; 1980s. 12
 Homer, 1960s. 2, 20, 21; 1970s. 6, 8; 1980s. 5; 1990s. 1, 6
 Hugo, Victor, 1960s. 19
 Hulak-Artemovskij, Petro, 1960s. 3
 Hussar, 1980s. 31
Inspector General, The, 1930s. 1; 1940s. 1; 1960s. 5; 1970s. 19, 21, 62; 1980s. 7, 11, 20, 28, 39, 40, 41
 apocalyptic theme in, 1960s. 5; 1980s. 7, 11
 comparison to, 1980s. 28, 41
 social theme in, 1970s. 21
 motifs in, 1980s. 28
 verbal mannerisms in, 1970s. 19
 Xlestakov, 1930s. 1; 1970s. 19, 36, 62; 1980s. 11, 20
 Xlestakovism in, 1970s. 21; 1980s. 20

 Irving, Washington, 1960s. 22; 1980s. 12
Istorija Maloj Rossii, 1990s. 3
Istorija Rusov ili Maloj Rossii, 1990s. 3
Ivan Fedorovič Šponka and His Aunt, 1970s. 34, 59; 1980s. 42, 43
 motifs in, 1970s. 59
 Šponka, 1970s. 34; 1980s. 43
 themes in, 1970s. 34

 Jakobson, Roman, 1980s. 33
 Janin, Jules, 1960s. 19, 28
 Jouy, Victor-Joseph, 1970s. 40
 Kafka, Franz, 1960s. 17; 1970s. 61

 Katarskij, Ivan, 1980s. 25
 Kiev Academy, 1990s. 3
 Kogan, Petr Semenovič, 1950s. 11
 Komarovič, Vasilij Leonidovič, 1970s. 2
 Koniskij, Georgij, 1990s. 3
 Kotljarevskij, Ivan Petrovič, 1960s. 3
 Kuliš, Panteleimon Aleksandrovič, 1980s. 3
 Kuragin, Anatolij, 1980s. 25
 Lermontov, Mixail Jurievič, 1930s. 1; 1960s. 27; 1970s. 65
 Lesage, Alain Rene, 1950s. 3
Letopisnoe povestvovanie o Maloj Rossii, 1990s. 3
 Levi-Strauss, Claude, 1970s. 5, 67
 "little man." See "melkij činovnik"
Lost Letter, The, 1980s. 2
 Lunačarskij, Anatolij Vasilievič, 1950s. 11
 MacAndrew, Andrew Robert, 1960s. 18
 Mandel'stam, Osip Emilievič, 1980s. 38
Manor of Stepančikovo, The, 1970s. 64
 Marlinskij, Aleksandr Aleksandrovič, See Becužev, Aleksandr Aleksandrovič
Marriage, The, 1980s. 39; 1990s. 2
 Kočkarev, 1990s. 2
 vaudeville influence in, 1980s. 39

 Maturin, Charles, 1980s. 23
 "melkij činovnik," 1960s. 1; 1970s. 35, 50
 Melville, Herman, 1980s. 40
 Mephisto, 1930s. 1
 Merežkovskij, Dmitrij Sergeevič, 1970s. 24, 36
 Michailoff, Helen, 1960s. 18
 Milton, John, 1930s. 1
Mirgorod, 1950s. 7; 1970s. 34; 1980s. 27, 40
 comparison to, 1980s. 19
 love theme in, 1950s. 7
 Ukrainian elements in, 1970s. 34

- Mirsky, D. S., 1980s. 40
 Močul'skij, Konstantin, 1960s. 37;
 1970s. 24; 1980s. 25, 30
 Modernism, views of, 1980s. 36
Month in the Country, A, 1980s. 44
 Moscow, 1960s. 1, 31
 Muratova, Ksenija Dmitrievna, 1970s. 2
 Nabokov, Vladimir Vladimirovič,
 1960s. 15, 23; 1970s. 24, 47; 1980s.
 25, 40, 45
 Narežny, Vasilij T., 1980s. 23
 Natural school, 1940s. 1
 Naturalism, views of, 1980s. 38
 Nekrasov, Nikolaj Alekseevič, 1970s. 1
Nevskij Prospekt, 1930s. 3; 1970s. 39;
 1980s. 32, 43
 comparison to, 1930s. 3; 1970s. 39;
 1980s. 32
 Piskarev, 1980s. 43
- Nikolaj I (Emperor), 1950s. 11; 1970. 2,
 52
Nose, The, 1950s. 1, 2, 4; 1960s. 16, 17,
 28, 29; 1970s. 71; 1980s. 33, 37;
 1990s. 5
 comparison to, 1960s. 17
 fantasy elements in, 1960s. 29
 grotesque image in, 1950s. 1
 intertextuality in, 1990s. 5
 illusion in, 1960s. 16
 Kovalev, 1950s. 2; 1960s. 16, 17, 29
 narrative device in, 1960s. 28; 1980s.
 33, 37
 psychological views in, 1950s. 2;
 1970s. 71
- October Revolution, 1980s. 45
Old-World Landowners, The, 1970s. 69;
 1980s. 14; 1990s. 7
 allegory in, 1970s. 69
Opisanie Ukrainy, 1990s. 3
 Orlos, Kazimierz, 1980s. 41
Overcoat, The, 1920s. 1; 1940s. 1;
 1950s. 6, 9; 1960s. 2, 7, 8, 15, 26, 28,
 36; 1970s. 3, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17,
 24, 30, 35, 37, 40, 43, 46, 49, 50, 51,
 67; 1980s. 30
 Akakij Akakievič, 1950s. 6, 9; 1960s.
 1, 2, 7, 8, 26, 36; 1970s. 3, 7, 11,
 14, 15, 16, 24, 35, 42, 43, 49, 51,
 65, 67; 1980s. 29, 43
 caricature in, 1970s. 49
 characters in, 1970s. 3, 12, 15, 16, 51
 comparison to, 1970s. 42, 50
 Formalist views in, 1960s. 8; 1970s.
 14
 Greek folklore, influence of, 1970s. 42
 lyricism in, 1960s. 26
 motifs in, 1970s. 15, 67
 parody in, 1970s. 46
 picaresque epic in, 1960s. 2
 psychoanalytic views in, 1980s. 30
 psychological realism in, 1970s. 43
 religious views in, 1950s. 6; 1970s. 24
 satire in, 1960s. 15
 social views in, 1970s. 35
 structures in, 1970s. 3
 stylistic devices in, 1960s. 36; 1970s.
 16, 51
 themes in, 1950s. 9; 1970s. 11, 12, 37
- Pavlov, Nikolaj Vasilievič, 1970s. 50
 Peake, Mervyn, 1970s. 31
 Perovskij, Vasilij, 1980s. 23
Petersburg Notes of 1836, 1960s. 19
 Poe, Edgar Allan, 1930s. 2; 1960s. 17;
 1970s. 6
 poetics
 allegory, 1970s. 69, 70; 1980s. 42
 composition, 1960s. 7, 8
 imagery, 1950s. 7; 1960s. 21; 1970s.
 55; 1980s. 9;
 intertextuality, 1990s. 5
 language, 1960s. 32; 1970s. 19, 45;
 lyric, 1960s. 2; 1980s. 22
 metaphors, 1970s. 26, 41
 motifs, 1970s. 15, 59; 1980s. 2, 28
 parallelism, 1970s. 6, 26, 33
 plot, 1960s. 5, 7; 1980s. 41
 similes, 1960s. 11, 20, 21; 1970s. 20

- themes, 1950s. 7, 9; 1960s. 4, 7, 10,
 20; 1970s. 5, 11, 21, 28, 29, 34, 70;
 1980s. 2, 4, 13, 15; 1990s. 4
 value judgment, 1960s. 21
- Pogodin, Mixail Petrovič, 1970s. 29
 Polevoj, Nikolaj Aleksandrovič, 1960s.
 6, 22
- Portrait, The*, 1960s. 22; 1970s. 58;
 1990s. 4
 comparison to, 1960s. 22
 horror motif in, 1970s. 58
- Pseudo-Dionysius, 1990s. 4
 psychological Realism, views of, 1970s.
 43, 44
 psychological views in, 1950s. 2, 1960s.
 12, 13, 29; 1970s. 71; 1980s. 1, 30
- Puškin, Aleksandr Sergeevič, 1930. 1;
 1950s. 3; 1960s. 6, 22, 27; 1970s. 1,
 65; 1980s. 13, 18
- De Quincey, Thomas, 1930s. 3
 Rabelais, Francois, 1970s. 4, 61
 Rabelaisian grotesque, 1970s. 61
 Realism, views of, 1950s. 11, 12; 1960s.
 23; 1980s. 5, 17, 45; 1990s. 1
- Reeve, Franklin D., 1960s. 24; 1970s. 32
 Religious views in, 1950s. 6; 1960s. 4,
 34, 35, 37; 1970s. 24, 49, 56, 72;
 1980s. 7, 10
- Richter, Jean-Paul, 1970s. 53
 Rigel'man, Aleksandr, 1990s. 3
 Romantic Realism in, 1960s. 10
 Romanticism, views of, 1960s. 19, 27;
 1970s. 48, 65; 1980s. 23
- Rome*, 1960s. 34; 1980s. 26
 religious views in, 1960s. 34
- Rousseau, Jean Jacques, 1980s. 45
 Rozanov, Vasilij Vasilievič, 1960s. 26,
 27; 1970s. 9, 24; 1980s. 18, 31
- Saint John's Eve*, 1970s. 29
 sexual theme in, 1970s. 29
- Saltykov-Ščedrin, Mixail Evgrafovič,
 1970s. 1
- Schillinger, John, 1970s. 24, 49
 Scott, Walter, 1960s. 22; 1980s. 2, 45
- Selected Passages from Correspondence
 with Friends*, 1930s. 1, 2; 1960s. 6,
 28, 37; 1970s. 8, 10, 30, 56, 58, 63,
 64; 1980s. 34
 artistic views in, 1970s. 56; 1980s. 34
 comparison to, 1930s. 2
 religious views in, 1930s. 1; 1960s.
 37; 1970s. 10
- Senkovskij, Osip, 1960s. 6
 Setchkarev, Vsevolod, 1960s. 28, 29
 sexual theme in, 1950s. 7; 1960s. 7, 29;
 1970s. 29, 71; 1980s. 1, 9, 29, 30
- Shafonskij, Afanasij, 1990s. 3
 Shakespeare, William, 1990s. 6
 Shevryev, Stepan P., 1960s. 6
 Šklovskij, Victor Borisovič, 1960s. 24;
 1980s. 32
- Simmons, Earnest J., 1930s. 3; 1960s. 14
 Sinjavskij, Andrej, 1970s. 17
- Slonimskij, Aleksandr, 1970s. 3, 53
 Smollett, Tobis George, 1980s. 45
- Sologub, Fedor, 1970s. 1
 St. Acacius of Sinai, 1970s. 49
 St. Petersburg, 1960s. 1, 28; 1970s. 4,
 42, 46, 50; 1980s. 32
- St. Petersburg stories, 1960s. 10; 1970s.
 17
- Stender-Peterson, Adolf, 1980s. 38
- Sterne, Laurence, 1960s. 28
- Structurist, 1990s. 7
- stylistic devices
 absurdity, 1940s. 1; 1960s. 8, 13, 15,
 28, 35; 1970s. 4, 14, 28, 53, 61;
 1980s. 4, 22, 27, 29, 37, 42; 1990s.
 5
 banality. *See* stylistic devices - pošlost'
 digression, 1940s. 1; 1960s. 23, 24;
 1970s. 5, 20, 23, 33, 38, 53, 69, 70;
 1980s. 5, 22, 28, 37, 42, 45; 1990s.
 7
 exaggeration. *See* stylistic devices -
 hyperbole
 grotesque, 1940s. 1; 1950s. 1; 1960s.
 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 21, 29; 1970s. 4,

- 5, 14, 16, 19, 26, 28, 39, 43, 48,
51, 53, 61, 66; 1980s. 18, 41, 42
hyperbole, 1930s. 2; 1950s. 10; 1960s.
21, 23, 28; 1970s. 9, 19, 34, 48;
1990s. 2, 6
narrative, 1950s. 5; 1960s. 8, 12, 22,
28; 1970s. 13, 14, 26, 30, 32, 33,
37, 43, 54, 69; 1980s. 19, 23, 37,
40
pošlost', 1960s. 4, 33; 1970s. 9, 20,
34, 36, 56, 60, 72; 1980s. 4, 11, 13,
23, 25
pun, 1960s. 8; 1970s. 11, 14, 43;
1980s. 42
repetition, 1960s. 30; 1970s. 6, 26, 30;
1990s. 2
skaz, 1920s. 1; 1960s. 22; 1970s. 3,
14, 26, 33; 1980s. 23, 30
triviality, 1920s. 1; 1960s. 13; 1970s.
11, 33, 34, 45; 1980s. 5, 11
vulgarity. *See* stylistic devices -
pošlost'
word-play. *See* stylistic devices - pun
- Symbolism, views of, 1970s. 6, 9, 36;
1980s. 6
Tale of Captain Kopejkin, 1980s. 32
*Tale of How Ivan Ivanovič Quarreled
with Ivan Nikiforovič, The*, 1970s.
13, 29, 33, 34, 59; 1980s. 15
boredom theme in, 1980s. 15
characters in, 1970s. 33; 1980s. 1,
40
narrative style in, 1970s. 13, 33
sexual theme in, 1970s. 29
social views in, 1970s. 34
- Tamarčenko, Dmitrii E., 1970s. 32
Taras Bulba, 1950s. 10; 1960s. 2, 20,
21, 30; 1970s. 4, 52; 1980s. 3, 10, 31;
1990s. 3, 4
characters in, 1980s. 10, 40
comparison to, 1960s. 2, 20, 21;
1980s. 3
Cossack theme in, 1950s. 10; 1970s.
52
religious views in, 1980s. 10
similes in, 1960s. 21
Taras Bulba, 1980s. 10, 40
Ukrainian folklore, influence of,
1960s. 30; 1970s. 4
Ukrainian history in, 1990s. 3
Ukrainian puppet theater, influence of,
1980s. 31
- Tawney, Richard Henry, 1960s. 27
Terrible Vengeance, The, 1960s. 7;
1970s. 29, 58, 60; 1980s. 8, 35
comparison to, 1980s. 8
horror motif in, 1970s. 58
Katerina, 1970s. 6; 1980s. 8
reverse symbolism in, 1980s. 35
sexual theme in, 1970s. 29
structure in, 1960s. 7
Ukrainian folklore, influence of,
1970s. 60
- Thackeray, William Marepeace, 1980s.
45
Tixonravov, Nikolaj Sergeevič, 1960s.
26; 1970s. 2
Tolstoj, Lev Nikolaevič, 1960s. 17;
1970s. 1; 1980s. 25
Trinity, 1980s. 10
Turgenev, Ivan Sergeevič, 1970s. 1, 8;
1980s. 44
Turkevič, Ludmilla Buketoff, 1950s. 8;
1970s. 22
Ukrainian elements in, 1950s. 10; 1960s.
3, 30; 1970s. 4, 13, 34, 60; 1980s. 12;
1990s. 3
Ukrainian writers, influence of, 1960s. 3
Uniate Church, the, 1990s. 3
vertep, 1980s. 31
Vij, 1950s. 4; 1960s. 7; 1970s. 4, 29, 38,
57, 58, 59, 60; 1980s. 29, 35
horror motif in, 1970s. 58
parody in, 1970s. 57
reverse symbolism in, 1980s. 35
sexual theme in, 1960s. 7; 1970s. 29;

- 1980s. 29
 Ukrainian folklore, influence of,
 1970s. 4; 38, 60
 Xoma, 1970s. 38, 57
- Vinogradov, Victor Vladimirovič,
 1960s. 32; 1970s. 35; 1980s. 38
- Vojnovič, Vladimir, 1980s. 28
- West, Nathanael, 1960s. 17,
Woman, 1970s. 10
- Xrapčenko, Mixail Borisovič, 1950s.
 11,
- Zenkovskij, Vasilij, 1970s. 24, 72,
 Žukovskij, Vasilij Andreevič, 1980s.
 12,

AUTHOR INDEX

- Aksakov, Konstantin Sergeevič, 1990s. 1
 Alexander, Alex E., 1980s. 1
 Alkire, Gilman H., 1960s. 1
 Altshuller, Mark, 1980s. 2
 Annenskij, Innokentij Fedorovič, 1970s. 1
 Asch, Laurie, 1970s. 2
 Bahrij-Pikulyk, Romana, 1980s. 3
 Bailey, James, 1970s. 3, 12
 Barksdale, Ethelbert Courtland, 1970s. 5
 Baumgarten, Murray, 1960s. 2
 Baxtin, Mixail Mixailovič, 1970s. 4
 Belinskij, Vissarion Grigorievič, 1980s. 5
 Belyj, Andrej, 1970s. 6; 1980s. 6
 Bernheimer, Charles C., 1970s. 7
 Besoushko, Volodymyr, 1960s. 3
 Birkhead, Alice, 1910s. 1
 Bodin, Per-Arne, 1980s. 7
 Bogojavlensky, Marianna, 1960s. 4
 Bortnes, Jostein, 1960s. 5
 Bosch, Hieronymous, 1960s. 16
 Bowen, C. M., 1910s. 2
 Bowman, Herbert, 1950s. 1
 Boyd, Alexander, 1970s. 8
 Brasol, Boris, 1930s. 1
 Brjusov, Valerij, 1970s. 9
 Byrns, Richard, 1970s. 10
 Čiževskij, Dmitrij, 1970s. 11
 Clyman, Toby W., 1970s. 12
 Cooke, Olga Muller, 1980s. 8
 Cox, Gary D., 1980s. 9
 Debreczeny, Paul, 1960s. 6; 1970s. 13
 Deutsch, Judith E., 1980s. 10
 Driessen, Frederik C., 1960s. 7
 Ehre, Milton, 1980s. 11
 Ejxenbaum, Boris Mixailovič, 1960s. 8; 1970s. 14
 Emerson-Topornin, Alexis E., 1970s. 15
 Erlich, Victor, 1960s. 9
 Ermakov, Ivan Dmitrievič, 1970s. 71
 Even-Zohar, Itamar, 1970s. 16
 Fanger, Donald Lee, 1960s. 10; 1970s. 17, 18,
 Fedorenko, Eugene, 1970s. 19
 Freeborn, Richard, 1970s. 20
 Friedman, Paul, 1950s. 2
 Futrell, Michael A., 1950s. 3
 Galperina, Inna, 1990s. 2
 Gifford, Henry, 1960s. 11
 Gippius, Vasilij Vasilievič, 1970s. 21; 1980s. 12, 13
 Glass, Elliot S., 1970s. 22
 Graffy, Julian, 1980s. 14
 Gregg, Richard, 1980s. 15
 Gustafson, Richard F., 1960s. 12
 Hallet, R. W., 1970s. 23
 Heldt, Barbara, 1980s. 16
 Herzen, Alexandr, 1980s. 17
 Hippius, Anthony, 1970s. 24
 Holquist, James M., 1970s. 25
 Hulanicki, Leo, 1970s. 26
 Ivanov, Viačeslav Ivanovič, 1970s. 27
 Jackson, Robert, L., 1980s. 18
 Jennings, Lee Byron, 1970s. 28
 Juran, Sylvia, 1960s. 13
 Kanzer, Mark, 1950s. 4
 Karlinsky, Simon, 1970s. 29
 Karpuk, Paul A., 1990s. 3
 Kaun, Alexander, 1930s. 2
 Kent, Leonard Joseph, 1960s. 14
 Key, Roger, 1980s. 19
 Landry, Hilton, 1960s. 15
 Lavrin, Janko, 1920s. 1
 Lindstrom, Thais S., 1970s. 30
 Little, Edmund, 1970s. 31
 Little, T. E., 1970s. 32
 Lotman, Jurij Mixailovič, 1980s. 20, 21

- Mann, Jurij, 1980s. 22
 Maguire, Robert A., 1970s. 33; 1990s. 4
 Margarshack, David, 1950s. 5; 1960s. 18
 Martin, Mildred, 1950s. 6
 Matthews, Irene, 1970s. 34
 McFarlin, Harold A., 1970s. 35
 McLean, Hugh, 1950s. 7
 Merežkovskij, Dmitrij Sergeevič, 1970s. 36
 Mersereu, John Jr., 1980s. 23
 Mills, Judith Oloskey, 1970s. 37
 Milne, Lesley, 1980s. 24
 Moyle, Natalie K., 1970s. 38
 Nabokov, Vladimir Vladimirovič, 1940s. 1
 Nagle, John J., 1970s. 39
 Nebolsine, Arcadi, 1980s. 25
 Nilsson, Nils Ake, 1970s. 40
 Obolensky, Alexander P., 1970s. 41
 Oinas, Felix J., 1970s. 42
 Oulianoff, Nikolas I., 1960s. 16
 Parry, Idris, 1960s. 17
 Peace, Richard Arthur, 1970s. 43, 44; 1980s. 26, 27
 Peppard, Victor, 1980s. 28
 Pereverzev, Valerjan Fedorovič, 1970s. 45
 Proffer, Carl Ray, 1960s. 18, 19, 20, 21, 22
 Proffitt, Edward, 1970s. 46
 Rahv, Philip, 1960s. 23
 Rancour-Laferrriere, Daniel, 1980s. 29, 30
 Reeve, Franklin D., 1960s. 24
 Rosebacher, Peter, 1960s. 25
 Rowe, William Woodin, 1970s. 47, 48
 Rozanov, Vasilij Vasilievič, 1960s. 26
 Schillinger, John, 1970s. 49
 Van Schooneveld, C. H., 1970s. 65
 Seeley, Frank F., 1960s. 27
 Selig, Karl Ludwig, 1950s. 8
 Setchkarev, Vsevolod, 1960s. 28
 Shapiro, Gavriel, 1980s. 31
 Shepard, Elizabeth C., 1970s. 50
 Sherry, Charles, 1970s. 51
 Šklovskij, Victor Borisovič, 1980s. 32
 Shukman, Ann, 1980s. 33
 Sicher, Efraim, 1990s. 5
 Simmons, Earnest J., 1930s. 3
 Sirsky, Wasyl, 1970s. 52
 Slonimskij, Aleksandr, 1970s. 53
 Smith, Thomas A., 1970s. 54
 Snyder, Harry Charles Jr., 1970s. 55
 Sobel, Ruth, 1970s. 56, 57; 1980s. 34; 1990s. 6
 Spycher, Peter C., 1960s. 29
 Stilman, Leon, 1950s. 9; 1970s. 58, 59
 Strakhovsky, Leonid I., 1950s. 10
 Stromecky, Ostap, 1960s. 30; 1970s. 60; 1980s. 35
 Strong, Robert L., 1950s. 11
 Struc, Roman, 1970s. 61
 Tabakov, Oleg, 1970s. 62
 Timmer, Charles B., 1960s. 31
 Todd, William Mills, 1980s. 36
 Toumanoff, Susan, 1990s. 7
 Trott, Liz, 1980s. 37
 Troyat, Henri, 1970s. 63
 Tynjanov, Jurij Nikolaevič, 1970s. 64
 Vinogradov, Victor Vladimirovič, 1960s. 32; 1980s. 38
 Vlach, Robert, 1960s. 33
 Vogel, Lucy, 1960s. 34
 Vroon, Ronald, 1970s. 66,
 Waszink, Paul M., 1970s. 67,
 Weathers, Winston, 1950s. 12,
 Wigzell, Faith, 1980s. 39
 Wilson, Edmund, 1980s. 40
 Wilson, Ruel K., 1980s. 41
 Wittlin, Joseph, 1960s. 35
 Wolterstorff, Nikolas, 1970s. 68
 Woodward, James B., 1960s. 36; 1970s. 69, 70; 1980s. 42
 Woodward, S., 1980s. 43,
 Worrall, Nick, 1980s. 44,
 Yelistratova, Anna, 1980s. 45
 Zeldin, Jesse, 1960s. 37; 1970s. 72
 Zoščenko, Mixail, 1970s. 73

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1910-1919

- Anon. "*The Cloak*." Lippincott's Monthly Magazine, 92 (1913), 249-62.
- Birkhead, A. "Russian Pickwick." Living Age, 287 (1915), 312-15.
- Bowen, C. M. "*Dead Souls* and *Pickwick Papers*." Living Age, 280, (1916), 369-73.
- Hapgood, Isabel F. Introduction to *Taras Bulba: A Tale of the Cossacks*. Translated by Isabel F. Hapgood. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1915, 7-30.
- Kropotkin, P. "Gogol." In his Ideals and Realities in Russian Literature. New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1919, 67-87.
- Noyes, George Rapall. "Gogol, a Precursor of Modern Realists in Russia." Nation, 101 (18 November 1915), 592-94.
- Phelps, William Lyon. "Gogol." In his Essays on Russian Novelists. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1912, 35-61.
- _____. Introduction to *Revizor: A Comedy*. Translated by Max S. Mandell. New Haven, Connecticut: Tuttle, Morehouse and Taylor Company, 1910, vii-ix.
- Shedden-Ralston, William Ralston. "Gogol, Nikolai Vasilievich." In Encyclopaedia Britannica. Vol. 12, 11th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910, 190-91.
- Tsanoff, Radoslav Andrea. "The Russian Soil and Nikolai Gogol." Rice Institute Pamphlet, 4, no. 2 (1917), 119-43.
- De Vogue, Vicomte E. M. "The Realistic and National Evolution: Gogol." In The Russian Novel. Edited and translated by H. A. Sawyer. London: Chapman and Hall, 1913, 87-142.

1920-1929

Coleman, Arthur P. Humor in the Russian Comedy from Catherine to Gogol. New York: Columbia University Press, 1925.

_____. "Humor in Russian Comedy from Catherine to Gogol." Ph. D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1925.

Graham, Stephen. Introduction to Dead Souls. Edited by Edward G. Hawke. London: Ernest Benn LTD., 1929, v-ix.

Lavrin, Janko. Gogol. London: Routledge, 1925.

Littell, Robert. "Gogol." The New Republic, 48 (13 October 1926), 218-19.

Manning, Clarence Augustus. "Nikolas Gogol." Slavonic and East European Review, 4 (1926), 573-87.

Mirsky, D. S. Review of Gogol, by Janko Lavrin. In Slavonic and East European Review, 5 (1926/1927), 223.

Olgin, Moissaye J. "N. V. Gogol." In his A Guide to Russian Literature: 1820-1917. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Howe, 1920, 41-8.

Rapin, Rene. "Comparison of Chichikov in *Dead Souls* and Lavengro." Revue de Geneve, (November 1926), 601-10.

Shakhnovski, I. K. "Gogol." In his A Short History of Russian Literature. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1921, 106-16.

Waliszewski, K. "Gogol." In his A History of Russian Literature. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1927, 246-65.

1930-1939

Brasol, Boris. "Gogol." In his The Mighty Three: Poushkin-Gogol-Dostoevsky. New York: William Farquhar Payson, 1934, 117-90.

Charques, R. D. "Nikolay Gogol." Fortnightly Review, 130 (1931), 230-42.

Cournos, John. Introduction to Taras Bulba and Other Tales. Edited by Ernest Rhys. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1930, vii-xvi.

Hutton, John A. "A Story from Gogol." In his Guidance on Russia from Her Literature. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930, 57-66.

Kaun, Alexander. "Poe and Gogol: A Comparison." Slavonic and East European Review, 15, no. 44 (1937), 389-99.

Odets, Clifford. Introduction to Dead Souls. Translated by Edward Garnett. New York: Modern Library, 1936, iii-vi.

Simmons, Earnest J. "Gogol and English Literature." Modern Language Review, 26 (1931), 445-50.

1940-1949

Bertensson, Sergei. "The Premiere of *The Inspector General*." Russian Review, 7, no. 1 (1947), 88-95.

Fadiman, Clifton. Foreword to Chichikov's Journeys: or Home Life in Old Russia. Translated by Bernard Guilbert Guerney. New York: The Readers Club, 1942, v-viii.

Guerney, Bernard Guilbert. Review of Nikolai Gogol, by Vladimir Nabokov. In New Republic, (25 September 1944), 376-78.

Hare, Richard. "The Age of Pushkin, Lermontov and Gogol." In his Russian Literature from Pushkin to the Present Day. London: Methuen and Co., 1947, 42-9.

Lavrin, Janko. "Gogol and Realism." In his An Introduction to the Russian Novel. New York: Whittlesey House, 1947, 25-39.

_____. "Nikolai Gogol." In his From Pushkin to Mayakovsky. London: Sylvan Press, 1948, 33-62.

Lefevre, Carl A. "Gogol and Anglo-Russian Literary Relations During the Crimean War." American Slavic and East European Review, 8 (April 1949), 106-25.

_____. "Gogol's First Century in England and America (1841-1941)." Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1944.

Manning, Clarence Augustus. "The Neglect of Time in the Russian Novel." In Slavic Studies. Edited by Alexander Kaun, and Ernest J. Simmons. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1943, 99-116.

Nabokov, Vladimir V. Nikolai Gogol. Norfolk, Connecticut: New Directions Books, 1944.

Sandomirsky, Vera. Review of Nikolai Gogol, by Vladimir Nabokov. In Russian Review, 4, no. 2 (1945), 99-101.

Wellek, Rene. Introduction to Dead Souls. Translated by Bernard G. Guerney. New York: Rinehart and Company, 1948, vi-ix.

Whitfield, F. J. Review of Nikolai Gogol, by Vladimir Nabokov. In Slavic Review, 4, nos. 1-2 (1945), 217-18.

Wilson, Edmund. "Nikolai Gogol." The New Yorker, 20 (9 September 1944), 72-3.

Yarmolinsky, Avrahm. Introduction to Chichikov's Journeys: or Home Life in Old Russia. Translated by Bernard Guilbert Guerney. New York: Heritage Press, 1944, vii-xvi.

1950-1959

Anon. "Gogol, Nikolai Vasilyevich." In The Century Cyclopedia of Names, Vol. 2, New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1954, 1773.

Anon. "Gogol, Nikolai Vasilievitch." In The New Theatre Handbook and Digest of Plays. New York: Crown Publishers, 1959, 319.

Benson, Morton. "The Development of Predicate Adjective Usage in Russian Literary Prose from Pushkin." Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1954.

Bowman, Herbert. "The Nose." Slavonic and East European Review, 31, no. 76 (1952), 204-11.

Brodiansky, Nina. "Gogol and his Characters." Slavonic and East European Review, 31, no. 76 (1952), 36-57.

Bryner, Cyril. "Gogol's *The Overcoat* in World Literature." Slavonic and East European Review, 32, no. 79 (1954), 499-509.

Chizhevsky, Dmitry. "Gogol: Artist and Thinker." Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., 2, no. 4 (Summer 1952), 261-78.

_____. "The Unknown Gogol." Slavonic and East European Review, 30 (June 1952), 476-93.

Chizhevsky, Dmitry and Philip Hofer. "An Illustrated Manuscript of Gogol." Harvard Library Bulletin, 6 (1952), 397-400.

Erlich, Victor. "Gogol and Kafka: Note on Realism and Surrealism." In For Roman Jakobson. Edited by Morris Halle. Hague: Mouton, 1956, 100-08.

Friedman, Paul. "The Nose." The American Imago, 8 (December 1951), 337-50.

Futrell, Michael A. "Dickens and Three Russian Novelists: Gogol, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy." Ph. D. Dissertation, University of London, 1954.

- _____. "Gogol and Dickens." Slavonic and East European Review, 34, no. 83 (1956), 443-459.
- Harkins, William Edward. "Gogol, Nikolay Vasilyevich." In Dictionary of Russian Literature. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956, 131-42.
- Hasenclever, Nora. "Gogol and Dostoevsky." Ph. D. Dissertation, Bennington College, 1951.
- Kanzer, Mark. "Gogol: A Study on Wit and Paranoia." Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 3, no. 1 (January 1955), 110-25.
- Lavrin, Janko. "Nikolai Gogol." In his Russian Writers: Their Lives and Literature. New York: D. van Nostrand Company, 1954, 55-79.
- Magarshack, David. Gogol: A Life. New York: Grove Press, 1957.
- _____. Introduction to Tales of Good and Evil, translated by David Magarshack. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1957, 1-11.
- _____. Introductory to Gogol: A Life, by David Magarshack. New York: Grove Press, 1957, 13-6.
- Malkiel, Yakov. "Cervantes in Nineteenth Century Russia." Comparative Literature, 3, no. 4 (1951), 310-29.
- Manning, Clarence Augustus. "Gogol and Ukraine." Ukrainian Quarterly, 6, no. 4 (1950), 323-30.
- Martin, Mildred. "The Last Shall Be First: A Study of Three Russian Short Stories." Bucknell Review, 6, no. 1 (1956), 13-23.
- Masson, Edmond. "Russia's Gogol: A Centenary." Pacific Spectator, 7, no. 3 (1953), 322-31.
- McLean, Hugh. "Gogol's Retreat from Love: Towards an Interpretation of *Mirgorod*." In his American Contributions to the Fourth International Congress of Slavists. Hague: Mouton, 1958, 225-45.
- Mirsky, D. S. "The Age of Gogol: Gogol." In his A History of Russian Literature from Its Beginnings to 1900. New York: Vintage Books, 1958, 149-62.
- Montagu-Nathan, M. "Gogol and Music." Monthly Musical Record, 82 (May 1952), 92-8.
- Poggioli, Renato. "Realism in Russia." Comparative Literature, 3, no. 3 (1951), 253-67.
- Posin, Jack A. Review of Gogol: A Life, by David Magarshack. Russian Review, 17, no. 4 (1958), 318-20.

- Selig, Karl Ludwig. "Concerning Gogol's *Dead Souls* and *Lazarillo de Tormes*." Symposium, 8 (1954), 138-40.
- Spector, Ivar. "Nikolai Vasilyevitch Gogol." In his The Golden Age of Russian Literature. Caldwell, Idaho: The Caxton Printers, 1952, 70-83.
- Spilka, Mark. "Kafka's Sources for the Metamorphosis." Comparative Literature, 11, no. 4 (1959), 289-308.
- Stilman, Leon. "Gogol's *Overcoat*: Thematic Pattern and Origins." American Slavic and East European Review, 11, no. 2 (1952), 138-48.
- . "Nikolai Gogol: Historical and Biographical Elements of His Creative Personality." Ph. D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1953.
- Strakhovsky, Leonid I. "The Historicism of Gogol." American Slavic and East European Review, 12, no. 3 (1953), 360-71.
- Strong, Robert L. "The Soviet Interpretation of Gogol." American Slavic and East European Review, 14, no. 4 (1955), 528-39.
- Weathers, Winston. "Gogol's *Dead Souls*: The Degrees of Reality." College English, 17 (1956), 159-64.
- Young, Murray. Review of Gogol: A Life, by David Magarshack. New World Review, 26 (April 1958), 37.
- Yurieff, Zoya. "Gogol as Interpreted by the Russian Symbolists." Ph. D. Dissertation, Rodcliffe College, 1956.

1960-1969

- Adamov, Arthur. Dead Souls: A Dramatic Version of Gogol's Novel. Translated by Peter Meyer. New York: Studio Duplicating Service, 1961.
- Alkire, Gilman H. "Gogol and Bulgarin's *Ivan Vyzhigin*." Slavic Review, 28 (1969), 289-96.
- Annenkov, Pavel Vasilevich. The Extraordinary Decade: Literary Memoirs. Edited by Arthur P. Mendel. Translated by Irwin R. Titunik. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1968.
- Anon. "Gogol, Nikolai Vasilyevich." In The Columbia-Viking Desk Encyclopedia. New York: Columbia University Press, 1968, 421.

- Anon. Review of Gogol as a Short Story Writer, by Frederik C. Driessen. Times Literary Supplement, (2 June 1966), 496.
- Anon. Review of Gogol: His Life and Works, by Vsevolod Setchkarev. Booklist, 62 (1 February 1966), 514.
- Anon. Review of Gogol: His Life and Works, by Vsevolod Setchkarev. Choice, 2 (February 1966), 863.
- Anon. Review of Gogol: His Life and Works, by Vsevolod Setchkarev. New York Times Book Review, 71 (2 January 1966), 20.
- Anon. Review of Gogol: His Life and Works, by Vsevolod Setchkarev. Saturday Review, 49 (11 June 1966), 57.
- Anon. Review of The Simile and Gogol's *Dead Souls*, by Carl R. Proffer. Times Literary Supplement, (10 October 1968), 1153.
- Baring, M. "Gogol and the Cheerfulness of the Russian People." In his Landmarks in Russian Literature. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1960, 26-49.
- Baumgarten, Murray. "Gogol's *The Overcoat* as a Picaresque Epic." Dalhousie Review, 46 (1966), 186-99.
- Belknap, Robert. Review of Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism: A Study of Dostoevsky in Relation to Balzac, Dickens and Gogol, by Donald Lee Fanger. Slavic Review, 24 (1965), 561-62.
- Besoushko, Volodymyr. "Nikolas Gogol and Ukrainian Literature." Ukrainian Quarterly, 16, no. 3 (1960), 263-68.
- Bogojavlensky, Marianna. Reflections on Nikolai Gogol. Jordanville, New York: Holy Trinity Monastery, 1969.
- Bortnes, Jostein. "Gogol's *Revizor*: A Study in the Grotesque." Scando Slavica, 15 (1969), 47-63.
- Bowra, C. M. Introduction to *Dead Souls*. Translated by George Reavey. London: Oxford University Press, 1961, v-ix.
- Brustein, Robert. "Russian Evenings: *Dead Souls* Adapted by Mikhail Bulgakov from the Novel by Nikolai Gogol." New Republic, 152 (27 February 1965), 26-8.
- Bryner, Cyril. "Gogol, Dickens and the Realistic Novel." Etudes Slaves et Est Europeennes, 8 (1963), 17-42.
- Cook, Albert. "Reflexive Attitudes: Sterne, Gogol, Gide." Criticism, 2 (Winter 1960), 164-74.

- Costello, Bella. Introduction to Marriage. Translated by Bella Costello. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1969, ix-xix.
- David, Donald. "Tolstoy, Lermontov and Others: Gogol and Dickens." In his Russian Literature and Modern English Fiction. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1965, 172-76.
- Davies, Ruth. "Gogol and the *Dead Souls*." In his The Great Books of Russia. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1968, 26-49.
- Debreczeny, Paul. Nikolai Gogol and His Contemporary Critics. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1966.
- _____. "A Study of Gogol's Style." Ph. D. Dissertation, University of London, 1960.
- _____. "Nikolay Gogol and His Contemporary Critics." Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, 56, no. 3 (1966), 5-68.
- Driessen, Frederik C. Gogol as a Short Story Writer: A Study of His Technique of Composition. Translated by Ian F. Finlay. Hague: Mouton, 1965.
- _____. Introduction to Gogol as a Short Story Writer: A Study of his Technique of Composition, by F. C. Driessen. Hague: Mouton, 1965, 13-5.
- Ehrhard, Marcelle. "Gogol." In his Russian Literature. Translated by Philp Minto. New York: Walker and Company, 1963, 63-9.
- Eikhenbaum, Boris. "The Structure of Gogol's *The Overcoat*." Translated by Beth Paul and Muriel Nesbitt. Russian Review, 22, no. 4 (1963), 377-99.
- Erlich, Victor. Gogol. New Haven, Massachusetts: Yale University Press, 1969.
- _____. "A Note on the Grotesque. Gogol: A Test Case." In his To Honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday, October 11, 1966. Vol. 1, Hague: Mouton, 1967, 630-33.
- _____. "Some Western Interpretations of Gogol." In Actes du Ve Congres de L'Association Internationale de Litterature Comparee. Edited by Nikola Banashevich. Belgrade: U. de Belgrade, 1969, 595-602.
- Fanger, Donald Lee. "Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism: Balzac, Dickens, Gogol." Ph. D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1962.
- _____. Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism: A Study of Dostoevsky in Relation to Balzac, Dickens and Gogol. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

- _____. "Gogol: The Apotheosis of the Grotesque." In his Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism: A Study of Dostoevsky in Relation to Balzac, Dickens and Gogol. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1967, 101-26.
- Florovsky, Georges. "Three Masters: The Quest for Religion in Nineteenth Century Russian Literature." Comparative Literature Studies, 3 (1966), 119-37.
- Gifford, Henry. "Gogol's *Dead Souls*." In his The Novel in Russia, London: Hutchinson University Library, 1964, 42-52.
- Gregorovich, Andrew. Introduction to Taras Bulba. Edited by Andrew Gregorovich. Toronto: Acropolis Press, 1962, 5-13.
- Guerney, Bernard G. Foreword to Dead Souls. Translated by Bernard G. Guerney. New York: Modern Library, 1965, viii-x.
- Gustafson, Richard F. Review of The Simile and Gogol's *Dead Souls*, by Carl R. Proffer. Russian Review, 28 (1969), 110-11.
- _____. "The Suffering Usurper: Gogol's *Diary of a Madman*." Slavic and East European Journal, 9, no. 3 (1965), 268-80.
- Hlobenko, N. "Ukraine in Literary Works Written in the Russian Language." In Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia. Vol. 1, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963, 1089-90.
- Holquist, James Michael. "The Devil in Mufti: the Marchenwelt in Gogol's Short Stories." Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, 82 (1967), 352-62.
- _____. "Non-Realistic Modes in the Prose Fiction of Gogol and Dostoevsky." Ph. D. Dissertation, Yale University, 1968.
- Ivask, Astrid. Review of Nikolai Gogol, by Vladimir Nabokov. Books Abroad, (Autumn 1961), 391.
- Juran, Sylvia. "*Zapiski Sumasshedshego*: Some Insights into Gogol's World." Slavic and East European Journal, 5 (1961), 331-3.
- Kent, Leonald Joseph. Introduction to The Collected Tales and Plays of Nikolai Gogol. Edited and translated by Leonard J. Kent. New York: Pantheon, 1964, vi-ix.
- _____. Introduction to The Subconscious in Gogol and Dostoevskij, and Its Antecedents, by Leonald J. Kent. Hague: Mouton, 1969, 11-4.
- _____. The Subconscious in Gogol and Dostoevskij, and Its Antecedents. Hague: Mouton, 1969.

- _____. "The Subconscious in Gogol and Dostoevsky, and Its Antecedents." Ph. D. Dissertation, Yale University, 1965.
- Kropotkin, P. "Gogol." In his Russian Literature. New York: Benjamin B., 1967, 67-87.
- Landolfi, Tommaso. "Gogol's Wife." In his Gogol's Wife and Other Stories. Edited by Raymond Rosenthal. Translated by Wayland Young. Norfolk, Connecticut: New Directions, 1963, 1-16.
- Landry, Hilton. "Gogol's *The Overcoat*." Explicator, 19 (1961), item 54.
- Lindstrom, Thais S. "Nikolay Gogol: Genius of the Comic-Grotesque." In his A Concise History of Russian Literature. Vol.1, New York: New York University Press, 1966, 129-42.
- MacAndrew, Andrew R. "Gogol, Nikolai Vasilevich." In The Reader's Encyclopedia of World Drama. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1969, 362-3.
- Magarshack, David. Introduction to Mirgorod. Translated by David Magarshack. New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1962, vii-xi.
- Magidoff, Robert. Review of Letters of Nikolai Gogol. Edited by Carl R. Proffer. Russian Review, 27 (1968), 374-5.
- Maguire, Robert A. Review of Letters of Nikolai Gogol. Edited by Carl R. Proffer. Slavic Review, 28 (1969), 674-5.
- Markov, Vladimir. "The Poetry of Russian Prose Writers." California Slavic Studies, 1 (1960), 77-82.
- Maurois, Andre. "Nikolas Gogol." In his The Art of Writing. New York: Dutton and Company. 1960, 265-94.
- Muchnic, Helen. Review of Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism: A Study of Dostoevsky in Relation to Balzac, Dickens and Gogol, by Donald Fanger. Comparative Literature, 19, no. 1 (Winter 1967), 78-80.
- _____. The Unhappy Consciousness: Gogol, Poe, Baudelaire. Baltimore, Maryland: Smith College Press, 1967.
- Ohloblyn, Oleksander. "Ancestry of Mykola Gogol (Hohol)." Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States, 12, nos. 1-2 (1969-1972), 3-43.
- Ostrander, Sheila and Lynn Schroeder. "Off Stage with *The Inspector General* in the USSR." Texas Quarterly, 11, no. 2 (1968), 209-13.

- Oulianoff, Nicholas I. "Arabesque or Apocalypse? On the Fundamental Idea of Gogol's Story *The Nose*." Canadian Slavic Studies, 1, no. 2 (Summer 1967), 158-71.
- Ovcharenko, Maria M. Hohol and Osmachka. Winnipeg, Canada: UVAN, 1969.
- Panichas, G. A. Review of Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism: A Study of Dostoevsky in Relation to Balzac, Dickens and Gogol, by Donald Fanger. Modern Language Journal, (January 1967), 50.
- Parry, Idris. "Kafka, Gogol and Nathanael West." In Kafka. Edited by Ronald Gray. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1962, 85-90.
- Passage, Charles E. "Gogol: the Moral Artist." In his The Russian Hoffmannists. Hague: Mouton, 1963, 140-75.
- Poggioli, Renato. "Gogol's *Old Fashioned Landowners*: An Inverted Eclogue." Indiana Slavic Studies, 3 (1963), 54-72.
- Proffer, Carl Ray. "The Comparisons in Gogol's *Dead Souls*." Ph. D. Dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1963.
- _____. "Dead Souls in Translation." Slavic and East European Journal, 8, no. 4 (1964), 420-33.
- _____. "Gogol's Definition of Romanticism." Studies in Romanticism, 6, no. 2 (1967), 120-27.
- _____. "Gogol's *Taras Bulba* and *the Iliad*." Comparative Literature, 17, no. 2 (1965), 142-50.
- _____. Introduction to Letters of Nikolai Gogol. Edited by Carl R. Proffer. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1967, 1-21.
- _____. Review of Dead Souls. Translated by Bernard G. Guerne. Slavic and East European Journal, 11, no. 1 (1967), 115-6.
- _____. Review of Gogol: His Life and Works, by Vsevolod Setchkarev. Russian Review, 25 (1966), 211.
- _____. Review of Nikolay Gogol and His Contemporary Critics, by Paul Debreczeny. Slavic and East European Journal, 11, no. 3 (1967), 363-64.
- _____. The Simile and Gogol's Dead Souls. Hague: Mouton, 1967.
- _____. "Washington Irving in Russia: Pushkin, Gogol, Marlinsky." Comparative Literature, 20, no. 4 (1968), 329-42.

- Pushkin, Aleksandr S. "*Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka*." In The Critical Prose of Alexander Pushkin. Edited and translated by Carl R. Proffer. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1969, 172-3.
- Rahv, Philip. "Gogol as a Modern Instance." In Russian Literature and Modern English Fiction. Edited by Donald Davie. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1965, 239-44.
- Reeve, Franklin D. "*Dead Souls*." In his The Russian Novel. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966, 64-103.
- Rosebacher, Peter. "The Function of Insanity in Chekhov's *The Black Monk* and Gogol's *Notes of a Madman*." Slavic and East European Journal, 13, no. 2 (1969), 191-9.
- _____. Review of Nikolay Gogol and His Contemporary Critics, by Paul Debreczeny. Russian Review, 26 (1967), 416.
- _____. Review of The Simile and Gogol's *Dead Souls*, by Carl R. Proffer. Slavic and East European Journal, 13, no. 2 (1969), 247-8.
- Rozanov, Vassily. "How the Character Akaky Akakiyevich Originated." Translated by Spencer E. Roberts. Ohio University Review, 10 (1968), 42-56.
- Seeley, Frank F. "Gogol's *Dead Souls*." Forum for Modern Language Studies, 4 (1968), 33-44.
- Setchkarev, Vsevolod. Gogol: His Life and Works. Translated by Robert Kramer. New York: New York University Press, 1965.
- Simmons, Ernest J. "Gogol: Live or Dead Souls." In his Introduction to Russian Realism. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1965, 44-90.
- Slonim, Marc. "Gogol." In his The Epic of Russian Literature. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964, 159-81.
- Spycher, Peter C. "N. V. Gogol's *The Nose*: A Satirical Comic Fantasy Born of an Impotence Complex." Slavic and East European Journal, 7, no. 4 (1963), 361-74.
- Stilman, Leon. Afterword to *The Diary of a Madman and Other Stories*. Translated by A. MacAndrew. New York: New American Library, 1961, 145-9.
- _____. "Nikolaj Gogol and Ostap Hohol." In Orbis Scriptus. Edited by Dietrich Gerhardt, Wiktor Weintrauss, and Hans-Jurgen zum Winkel. Munchen: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1966, 811-25.
- Stromecky, Ostap. "Ukrainian Elements in Mykola Hohol's *Taras Bulba*." Ukrainian Quarterly, 25, no. 4 (1969), 350-61.

- Strong, Robert L. Review of Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism: A Study of Dostoevsky in Relation to Balzac, Dickens and Gogol, by Donald Lee Fanger. Slavic and East European Journal, 10, no. 4 (1966), 469-71.
- _____. Review of Gogol: His Life and Works, by Vsevolod Setchikarev. Slavic Review, 25 (1966), 358-59.
- Struve, Gleb. "Gogol, Nikolai Vasilevich." In Chamber's Encyclopaedia. Vol. 6, Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1967, 410.
- _____. Review of Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism: A Study of Dostoevsky in Relation to Balzac, Dickens and Gogol, by Donald Lee Fanger. Russian Review, 25 (1966), 419-21.
- Thorlby, A. K. "Gogol, Nikolay Vasilyevich." In The Penguin Companion to European Literature. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.
- Timmer, Charles B. "Dead Souls Speaking." Slavonic and East European Review, 45 (1967), 273-91.
- Titunik, Irwin Robert. "The Problem of 'Skaz' in Russian Literature." Ph. D. Dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1963.
- Vinogradov, Victor Vladimirovich. "The Language of Gogol." In The History of the Russian Literary Language from the Seventeenth Century to the Nineteenth. Translated by Lawrence L. Thomas. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969, 209-36.
- Vlach, Robert. "Gogol and Hasek: Two Masters of Poshlost'." Etudes Slaves et Est Européennes, 7 (1962), 239-42.
- Vogel, Lucy. "Gogol's Rome." Slavic and East European Journal, 11, no. 2 (1967), 145-58.
- Vuchich, Olga Victoria. "Stylistic Contrasts in Gogol's Artistic Works: An Analysis." Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Pittsburg, 1969.
- Wiener, Leo. "Nikolay Vasilievich Gogol." In his Anthology of Russian Literature. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1967, 185-7.
- Wittlin, Joseph. "Gogol's Inferno." Polish Review, 7, no. 4 (1962), 5-20.
- Woodward, James B. Review of The Simile and Gogol's Dead Souls, by Carl R. Proffer. Canadian-American Slavic Studies, 3 (1969), 141-2.
- _____. "The Threadbare Fabric of Gogol's *Overcoat*." Canadian Slavic Studies, 1 (1967), 95-104.

- Yarmolinsky, Avrahm. "Gogol's Masterwork." In his The Russian Literature: Imagination. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1969, 43-55.
- Zaslave, Jerald. "The Ideology and Poetics of Poshlost: The Work of Nikolai Gogol and Its Importance in Our Time." Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Washington, 1968.
- Zeldin, Jesse. Introduction to Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends. Translated by Jesse Zeldin. Nashville, Tennessee: Vanderbilt University Press, 1969, vii-xxvii.
- _____. "A Revaluation of Gogol's *Selected Passages*." Russian Review, 27, no. 4 (1968), 421-31.

1970-1979

- Annenskii, Innokentij F. "The Aesthetics of Gogol's *Dead Souls* and Its Legacy." In Twentieth Century Russian Literary Criticism. Edited by Victor Erlich. Translated by Elizabeth Traham and John Fred Beebe. New Haven, Massachusetts: Yale University Press, 1975, 51-60.
- Anon. "Gogol, Nikolai Vasilievich." In Britannica Junior Encyclopedia. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1975, 2859-60.
- Anon. Review of The Creation of Nikolai Gogol, by Donald Fanger. Booklist, 76 (1 December 1979), 534.
- Anon. Review of Gogol from the Twentieth Century. Edited by Robert A. Maguire. Choice, 12 (September 1975), 852.
- Anon. Review of Gogol from the Twentieth Century. Edited by Robert A. Maguire. Russian Literature Triquarterly, 10 (Fall 1974), 429.
- Anon. Review of Gogol from the Twentieth Century. Edited by Robert A. Maguire. Virginia Quarterly Review, 51 (Summer 1975), 108.
- Anon. Review of Gogol's *Dead Souls*, by James B. Woodward. Choice, 15 (January 1979), 1526.
- Anon. Review of Gogol: A Life, by David Magarshack. Choice, 6 (February 1970), 1758.
- Anon. Review of The How of Gogol: Iak Tvoriv Hohol, by Ostap Stromecky. Russian Literature Triquarterly, 14 (Winter 1976), 508-9.
- Anon. Review of Nikolay Gogol, by Thais S. Lindstrom. Choice, 11 (January 1975), 1642.

- Anon. Review of Nikolai Gogol's Quest for Beauty: An Exploration into His Works, by Jesse Zeldin. Choice, 16 (March 1979), 86.
- Anon. Review of The Subconscious in Gogol and Dostoevskij, and Its Antecedents, by Simon Karlinsky. Choice, 14 (March 1977), 69.
- Anon. Review of The Subconscious in Gogol and Dostoevskij, and Its Antecedents, by Simon Karlinsky. Virginia Quarterly Review, 53 (Spring 1977), 54.
- Anon. Review of Twentieth Century Russian Literary Criticism, edited by Victor Erlich. Choice, 13 (March 1976), 78.
- Anon. Review of Twentieth Century Russian Literary Criticism, edited by Victor Erlich. Virginia Quarterly Review, 52 (Autumn 1976), 120.
- Asch, Laurie. "The Censorship of Nikolai Gogol's *Diary of a Madman*." Russian Literature Triquarterly, 14 (1976), 20-35.
- Bahrij-Pikulyk, Romana Myroslawa. "*Taras Bul'ba* and *The Black Council*: The Adherence to and Divergence from Walter Scott's Historical Novel Pattern." Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Toronto, 1978.
- Bailey, James. "Some Remarks about the Structure of Gogol's *Overcoat*." In Mnemozina: Studia Litteraria Russica in Honorem Vsevolod Setchkarev. Edited by Joachim T. Baer and Norman W. Ingham. Munich: Fink, 1974, 13-22.
- Bakhtin, M. M. "The Art of the Word and the Culture of Folk Humor: Rabelais and Gogol." In Semiotics and Structuralism: Readings from the Soviet Union. Edited by H. Baran. New York: White Plains, 1976, 284-96.
- Barksdale, E. C. "Gogol: The Myth and the Grotesque." In his The Dacha and the Duchess. New York: Philosophical Library, 1974, 105-12.
- Barratt, Andrew. "Plot as Paradox: The Case of Gogol's *Shinel*." New Zealand Slavonic Journal, 2 (1979), 1-24.
- Barrett, Constance McIntock. "Artist as Missionary: A History of Gogol's Literary Development in Terms of His Attitude Towards the Reading Public." Ph. D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 1975.
- Bazhenov, N. N. "Gogol." In The Completion of Russian Literature. Compiled by Andrew Field. New York: Atheneum, 1971, 83-99.
- Belinskii, Vissarion G. "Letter to N. V. Gogol." In Belinsky, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov. Edited by Ralph Matlaw. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1976, 83-92.

- Belyi, Andrei. "Gogol." In The Completion of Russian Literature. Compiled by Andrew Field. New York: Atheneum, 1971, 100-2.
- . "Gogol." Translated by Elizabeth Trahan. Russian Literature Triquarterly, 4 (1972), 131-44.
- . "Gogol." In Twentieth Century Russian Literary Criticism. Edited by Victor Erlich. Translated by Elizabeth Trahan and Fred Beebe. New Haven, Massachusetts: Yale University Press, 1975, 35-50.
- Bem, Alfred Liudvigovich. "*The Nose and the Double*." In Dostoevsky and Gogol: Text and Criticism. Edited by Priscilla Meyer and Stephen Rudy. Translated by Peter B. Stetson. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1979, 229-48.
- Bernheimer, Charles C. "Cloaking the Self: The Literary Space of Gogol's *Overcoat*." Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, 90, no. 1 (January 1975), 53-61.
- Berry, Thomas E. "*Arabesques*, N. V. Gogol." In his Plots and Characters in Major Russian Fiction. Vol. 2, Hamden, Connecticut: Shoe String, 1978, 8-13.
- . "*Dead Souls*, N. V. Gogol." In his Plots and Characters in Major Russian Fiction. Vol. 2, Hamden, Connecticut: Shoe String, 1978, 26-30.
- . "*Mirgorod*, N. V. Gogol." In his Plots and Characters in Major Russian Fiction. Vol. 2, Hamden, Connecticut: Shoe String, 1978, 46-53.
- . "*The Overcoat*, N. V. Gogol." In his Plots and Characters in Major Russian Fiction. Vol. 2, Hamden, Connecticut: Shoe String, 1978, 59-61.
- Beyer, Thomas R. "Belyj's *Serebrjanyj Golub*: Gogol in Gugolevo." Russian Language Journal, no. 107 (1976), 79-88.
- Binyon, T. J. Review of Twentieth Century Russian Literary Criticism. Edited by Victor Erlich. Times Literary Supplement, (12 March 1976), 293.
- Bonnet, Gail. "Deity to Demon: Gogol's Female Characters." In Proceedings of the Pacific Northwest Conference on Foreign Languages. Edited by Walter C. Kraft, Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University, 1973, 253-67.
- Boyd, Alexander. "In the Town of N: Nikolai Gogol and *Dead Souls*." In his Aspects of the Russian Novel. London: Chatto and Windus, 1972, 46-67.
- Brown, Clarence. "The Not Quite Realized Transit of Gogol." In Mnemozina: Studia Litteraria Russica in Honorem Vsevolod Setchkarev. Edited by Joachim T. Baer and Norman W. Ingham. Munich: Fink, 1974, 41-5.

- Bryusov, Valery. "Burnt to Ashes." In Gogol from the Twentieth Century. Edited and translated by Robert A. Maguire. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974, 103-32.
- . "Burnt to Ashes." Translated by Robert A. Maguire. Russian Literature Triquarterly, 3 (1972), 106-25.
- Bulgarin, Mikhail A. "The Adventure of Chichikov." In Diaboliad and Other Stories. Edited by Ellendea Proffer and Carl R. Proffer. Translated by Carl R. Proffer. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1972, 159-74.
- Buyniak, Victor O. Review of Food-Notes on Gogol, by Alexander P. Obolensky. Canadian Slavonic Papers, 16, no. 1 (1974), 133-4.
- Byrns, Richard Howard. "Gogol and the Feminine Myth." Etudes Slaves et Est Europeennes, nos. 20-21 (1975-1976), 44-60.
- . "Memory and Myth in Thomas de Quincey, Gerard de Nerval, and Nikolai Gogol." Ph. D. Dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1973.
- Calder, Angus. "Literature and Serfdom: Gogol, Lermontov and Goncharov." In his Russia Discovered: Nineteenth-Century Fiction from Pushkin to Chekhov. New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 1976, 47-63.
- Chances, Ellen. Review of Through Gogol's Looking Glass, by William Woodin Rowe. Modern Fiction Studies, 23 (Summer 1977), 326-8.
- Chizhevskii, Dmitrii. "About Gogol's *Overcoat*." In Gogol from the Twentieth Century. Edited and translated by Robert A. Maguire. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974, 295-322.
- . "On Gogol's *the Overcoat*." In Dostoevsky and Gogol: Text and Criticism. Edited by Priscilla Meyer and Stephen Rudy. Translated by Peter B. Stetson. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1979, 137-60.
- . "Romantic Prose." In his History of Nineteenth-Century Russian Literature. Vol. 1, Edited by Sergei A. Zenkovsky and translated by Richard Noel Porter. Nashville, Tennessee: Vanderbilt University Press, 1974, 110-30.
- Christensen, Julie Ann. "The Shaping of the Russian Philosophical Heroine. Feminine Images of Beauty in Russian Philosophical Aesthetics and the Heroines of Nikolai Gogol." Ph. D. Dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1978.
- Clayton, J. Douglas. "Soviet View of Parody: Tynianov and Morozov." Canadian American Slavic Studies, 7, no. 4 (Winter 1973), 485-93.

- Clive, Geoffrey. "Gogol and the Absurd." In his The Broken Icon. New York: MacMillan Company, 1972, 1-29.
- Clyman, Toby W. "The Hidden Demons in Gogol's *Overcoat*." Russian Literature, 7, no. 6 (1979), 601-10.
- Cohen, Barry Mendel. Review of Divided Soul: The Life of Gogol, by Henri Troyat. Southwest Review, 59 (1974), 334-5.
- Cosman, Tatiana M. "The Letter as a Literary Device in the Fiction of Pushkin, Lermontov and Gogol." Ph. D. Dissertation, New York University, 1973.
- Cox, Gary Duane. Review of Gogol's Dead Souls, by James B. Woodward. Russian Review, 38, no. 1 (1979), 124-5.
- _____. "A Study of Gogol's Narrators." Ph. D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1978.
- _____. "The Writer as a Stand-up Comic: A Note on Gogol and Dickens." Ulbundus Review, 2 (1979), 45-61.
- Debreczeny, Paul. "Gogol's Mockery of Romantic Taste: Varieties of Language in the *Tale of the Two Ivans*." Canadian American Slavic Studies, 7 (1973), 327-41.
- Edgerton, William B. Review of Between Gogol and Shevchenko: Polarity in the Literary Ukraine: 1798-1847, by George S. N. Luckyj. Slavic Review, 34, no. 1 (1975), 189.
- Eikhenbaum, Boris. "How Gogol's *Overcoat* is Made." In Dostoevsky and Gogol: Text and Criticism. Edited by Priscilla Meyer and Stephen Rudy. Translated by Peter B. Stetson. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1979, 119-35.
- Emerson-Topornin, Alexis E. "*Shinel*: The Devil's Ovals: Motif of the Doubles." Forum at Iowa on Russian Literature, 1, no. 1 (1976), 34-56.
- Erich, Victor, ed. Twentieth-Century Russian Literary Criticism. New Haven, Massachusetts: Yale University Press, 1975.
- _____. Introduction to Twentieth Century Russian Literary Criticism. Edited by Victor Erlich. New Haven, Massachusetts: Yale University Press, 1975, 3-30.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. "The Tailor Petrovich Pronounces the Verdict on Akakij: A Note on a Stylised Scene and a Pragmatic Connective." Slavica Hierosolymitana, 3 (1978), 1-7.
- Fanger, Donald Lee. The Creation of Nikolai Gogol. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1979.

- _____. "Dead Souls: Mirror and Road." Nineteenth Century Fiction, 33, no. 1 (1978), 24-47.
- _____. "Dickens and Gogol: Energies of the Word." In Veins of Humor. Edited by Harry Levin. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1972, 131-45.
- _____. "Gogol and His Reader." In Literature and Society in Imperial Russia, 1800-1914. Edited by William Mills Todd III. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1978, 61-95.
- _____. "Gogol as a Man of Letters: Writer and Audience in 19th Century Russia." In Proceedings of the 6th Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association. Edited by Michel Cadot. Stuttgart, Germany: Biebr, 1975, 421-5.
- _____. "The Gogol Problem: Perspectives from Absence." In Slavic Forum: Essays in Linguistics and Literature. Edited by Michael S. Flier. Hague: Mouton, 1974, 103-29.
- Fedorenko, Eugene. "Gogol's *Revizor*: A Reexamination of Language Characteristics." Russian Language Journal, no.106 (1976), 39-50.
- Feher, Zoltan. Review of Gogol from the Twentieth Century. Edited by Robert A. Maguire. Library Journal, 100 (1 March 1975), 483.
- Fiene, Donald M. "The Story of *How Ivan Ivanovich Quarreled with Ivan Nikiforovich*." Explicator, 34 (1976), item 55.
- Freeborn, Richard. "Dead Souls: A Study." Slavonic and East European Review, 49 (1971), 18-44.
- _____. "Dead Souls." In his The Rise of the Russian Novel. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1973, 74-114.
- _____. Review of "Gogol", by A. De Jonge. In Nineteenth Century Russian Literature, edited by John Fennell. Slavonic and East European Review, 52, no. 127 (1974), 277-80.
- _____. Review of Gogol, by Victor Erlich. Modern Language Review, 65, no. 4 (October 1970), 958-9.
- _____. Review of Gogol, by Victor Erlich. Times Literary Supplement, (6 November 1970), 1290.
- _____. Review of Gogol's Dead Souls, by James B. Woodward. Times Literary Supplement, (20 October 1978), 1204.



- _____. Review of The Subconscious in Gogol and Dostoevskij and Its Antecedents, by Leonald Joseph Kent. Slavonic and East European Review, 48 (1970), 443-5.
- Garrad, John G. Review of "Gogol", by A. De Jonge. In Nineteenth Century Russian Literature. Edited by John Fennell. Russian Review, 33, no. 3 (1974), 331-2.
- _____. "Worm's Eye View in Gogol's Fiction." In Expression, Communication and Experience in Literature and Language. Edited by Ronald G. Popperwell. London: Modern Humanities Research Association, 1973, 166.
- _____. "Some Thoughts on Gogol's *Kolyaska*." Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, 90, no. 5 (October 1975), 848-60.
- Gippius, Vasilii V. "*The Inspector General*: Structure and Problems." In Gogol from the Twentieth Century. Edited and translated by Robert A. Maguire. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974, 216-65.
- Glass, Elliot S. "*Dead Souls* and the Hispanic Picaresque Novel." Revista de Estudios Hispánicos, 11 (1977), 77-90.
- Goodliffe, J. D. "*Dead Souls* and the Mock Epic." In Proceedings and Papers of the 16th Congress of the Australian Universities Language and Literature Association. South Australia: University of Adelaide, 1974, 330-41.
- Green, Benny. "The Comedy of a Dead Soul." Spectator, 234 (17 May 1975), 614.
- Grumbach, D. Review of The Sexual Labyrinth of Nikolai Gogol, by Simon Karlinsky. New York Times Book Review, (12 June 1977), 16.
- Hallet, R. W. "The Laughter of Gogol." Russian Review, 30, no. 4 (1971), 373-84.
- Hart, Pierre R. "In Search of a Real Ideal: Gogol's Critical Prose." Canadian American Slavic Studies, 7, no. 3 (1973), 342-9.
- Harussi, Yael. "Gogol's *Dead Souls*: A Reading." Ph. D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1974.
- Hippisley, Anthony. "Gogol's *The Overcoat*: A Further Interpretation." Slavic and East European Journal, 20, no. 2 (Summer 1976), 121-9.
- Hitchcock, D. R. Reading the Russian Text of the 'Memoirs of a Madman' of N. V. Gogol. Washington, D. C.: V. P. Kamkin, 1974.
- Holquist, James M. "The Burden of Prophecy: Gogol's Conception of Russia." Review of National Literatures, 3, no. 1 (1972), 39-55.
- Hrishko, Wasyl I. "Gogol's Ukrainian-Russian Bilingualism and the Dualism of Gogolian Style." Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Washington, 1973.

- _____. "Nikolai Gogol and Mykola Hohol: Paris, 1837." Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States, 12, nos. 1-2 (1969-1972), 113-42.
- Hughes, Olga Raevsky. "The Apparent and the Real in Gogol's *Nevsky Prospekt*." California Slavic Studies, 8 (1975), 77-91.
- Hulanicki, Leo. "The Carriage by N. V. Gogol." Russian Literature, 12 (1975), 61-77.
- Ingham, Norman W. "Gogol." In his E. T. A. Hoffmann's Reception in Russia. Würzburg, Germany: Jal-verlag, 1974, 165-76.
- Ivanov, Viacheslav. "Gogol's *Inspector General* and the Comedy of Aristophanes." In Gogol from the Twentieth Century. Edited and translated by Robert A. Maguire. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974, 200-14.
- Jennings, Lee B. "Gogol's *Dead Souls* Grotesqueries." In Vistas and Vectors: Essays Honoring the Memory of Helmut Rehder. Edited by Lee B. Jennings and George Schulz-Behrend. Austin, Texas: Department of Germanic Languages, University of Texas at Austin, 1979, 136-41.
- De Jonge, A. "Gogol." In Nineteenth-Century Russian Literature: Studies of Ten Russian Writers. Edited by John Fennell. Berkely, California: University of California Press, 1973, 69-129.
- _____. Review of Divided Souls: The Life of Gogol, by Henri Troyat. New York Review of Books, (18 April 1974), 30.
- _____. Review of Gogol from the Twentieth Century. Edited by Robert A. Maguire. Times Literary Supplement, (7 March 1975), 251.
- Karlinsky, Simon. "Portrait of Gogol as a Word Glutton, with Rabelais, Sterne, and Gertrude Stein as Background Figures." California Slavic Studies, 5 (1970), 169-86.
- _____. The Sexual Labyrinth of Nikolai Gogol. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Karriker, Alexandra Wojcechowsky. "The Grotesque Metamorphosis: Gogol's Anthroponyms and Toponyms." Ph. D. Dissertation, Brown University, 1970.
- Keefer, Lubov. "Gogol and Music." Slavic and East European Journal, 14, no. 2 (1970), 160-81.
- Kirkoff, Milicia Dorceska. "The Impact of Gogol upon the Works of Milovan Glisic, Steven Serenac and Branslav Nusic." Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Toronto, 1974.

- Kolb-Seletski, Natalia M. "Gastronomy, Gogol, and His Fiction." Slavic Review, 29 (1970), 35-57.
- _____. Review of Gogol, by Victor Erlich. Slavic Review, 30 (1971), 438-40.
- Konick, Willis. "The Theme of Brotherhood in Gogol's *The Overcoat*." In Proceedings of the Pacific Northwest Conference on Foreign Languages. Edited by Walter C. Kraft. Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University, 1973, 253-8.
- Lavrin, Janko. Gogol. New York: Haskell House Publishers, 1973.
- _____. "Nikolai Gogol." In his A Panorama of Russian Literature. London: University of London Press, 1973, 64-78.
- Leong, Albert. "Idea and Technique in Gogol's *Notes of a Madman*." In Proceedings of the Pacific Northwest Conference on Foreign Languages. Edited by Walter C. Kraft. Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University, 1973, 247-53.
- Levitsky, Ihor. Review of The Subconscious in Gogol and Dostoevskij, and Its Antecedents, by Simon Karlinsky. World Literature Today, 51 (Autumn 1977), 639.
- Lindstrom, Thais S. Nikolay Gogol. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1974.
- _____. Preface to Nikolay Gogol, by Thais S. Lindstrom. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1974, 7-9.
- Little, Edmund. "Gogol's Town of N N and Peake's *Gormenghast*: The Realism of Fantasy." Journal of Russian Studies, 34 (1977), 13-8.
- Little, T. E. "*Dead Souls*." In Knaves and Swindlers: Essays on the Picaresque Novel in Europe. Edited by Christine J. Whitbourn. London: Oxford University Press, 1974, 112-38.
- _____. Review of Gogol's Dead Souls, by James B. Woodward. Modern Language Review, 74, no. 3 (July 1979), 764-5.
- Lotman, Iurii M. "Gogol and the Correlation of 'The Culture of Humor' with the Comic and Serious in the Russian National Tradition." In Semiotics and Structuralism: Readings from the Soviet Union. Edited by H. Baran. New York: White Plains, 1976, 297-300.
- Luckyj, George Stephen Nestor. Between Gogol and Shevchenko: Polarity in the Literary Ukraine: 1798-1847. Munchen: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1971.
- _____. "Gogol's Ukrainian Interests: A Reappraisal." In Symbolae in Honorem Georgii Y. Shevelor. Edited by William E. Harkins. Munchen: Logos, 1971, 285-96.

- Magarshack, David. Introduction to *Dead Souls*. Translated by David Magarshack. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1975, vii-x.
- _____. Introduction to *The Overcoat and Other Tales of Good and Evil*. Translated by David Magarshack. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Robert Bentley Inc., 1979, 1-11.
- Maguire, Robert A., ed. *Gogol from the Twentieth Century*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974.
- _____. Introduction to *Gogol from the Twentieth Century*. Edited and translated by Robert A. Maguire. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974, 3-56.
- _____. "Some Stylistic Approaches to Gogol's *Two Ivans*." *Teaching Language Through Literature*, 15, no. 2 (1976), 25-39.
- Massey, Irving. "Metamorphosis in Gogol: *The Nose*." In his *The Gaping Pig: Literature and Metamorphosis*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1976, 59-75.
- Matthews, Irene. "Gogol's Early Satire." *Satire Newsletter*, 9, no. 1 (1971), 6-17.
- McFarlin, Harold A. "*The Overcoat* As a Civil Service Episode." *Canadian American Slavic Studies*, 13 (1979), 235-53.
- McLean, Hugh. "Gogol and the Whirling Telescope." In *Russia: Essays in History and Literature*. Edited by L. H. Legters. Seattle, Washington: Leiden, 1972, 79-99.
- _____. Review of *Gogol from the Twentieth Century*. Edited by Robert A. Maguire. *Slavic Review*, 35, no. 2 (1976), 383-4.
- Merezhkovskii, Dmitrii. "Gogol and the Devil." In *Gogol from the Twentieth Century*. Edited and translated by Robert A. Maguire. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974, 57-102.
- Mersereau, John Jr. "The Chorus and Spear Carriers of Russian Romantic Fiction." In *Russian and Slavic Literature*. Edited by Richard Freeborn, R. R. Milner-Gulland, and Charles A. Ward. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Slavica Publishers, 1976, 38-62.
- _____. "Normative Distinctions of Russian Romanticism and Realism." In *American Contributions to the Seven International Congress of Slavists*. Vol. 2, Edited by Victor Terras. Hague: Mouton, 1973, 393-417.
- Miller, J. Hillis. Review of *Twentieth Century Russian Literary Criticism*. Edited by Victor Erlich. *New Republic*, 173 (29 November 1975), 30-2.

- Mills, Judith Oloskey. "Gogol's *Overcoat*: the Pathetic Passages Reconsidered." Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, 89 (1974), 1106-12.
- Milne, Lesley M. "M. A. Bulgakov and *Dead Souls*: The Problems of Adaptation." Slavonic and East European Review, 52, no. 128 (1974), 420-40.
- Monter, Barbara H. Review of The Subconscious in Gogol and Dostoevskij and Its Antecedents, by Leonald Joseph Kent. Slavic Review, 30 (1971), 703-4.
- Moyle, Natalie K. "Folktale Patterns in Gogol's *Vij*." Russian Literature, 7, no. 6 (1979), 665-88.
- Muchnic, Helen. Review of Divided Soul: The Life of Gogol, by Henri Troyt. New York Times Book Review, (23 December 1973), 7.
- _____. Review of The Sexual Labyrinth of Nikolai Gogol, by Simon Karlinsky. New York Review of Books, (31 March 1977), 10.
- _____. "The Unhappy Consciousness: Gogol, Poe, Baudelaire." In her Russian Writers: Notes and Essays. New York: Random House, 1971, 22-46.
- Nagle, John J. "Idealism: The Internal Structure in Gogol's *Nevsky Prospect* and Chekhov's *An Attack of Nerves*." West Virginia University Philological Papers, 19 (1972), 20-8.
- Nebolsine, Arcadi. "Poshlost': A Study of the Writings of Gogol, Dostoevsky and Annensky." Ph. D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1972.
- Nilsson, Nils Ake. "Gogol's *The Overcoat* and the Topography of Petersburg." Scando Slavica, 21 (1975), 5-18.
- Nordby, Edward Lamar. "Gogol's Comic Theory and Practice in *the Inspector General*." Ph. D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 1971.
- Noyes, George Rapall. "Gogol, a Precursor of Modern Realists in Russia." Nation, 101 (18 November 1915), 592-4.
- Obolensky, Alexander P. Food-Notes on Gogol. Winnipeg, Canada: Trident Press Ltd., 1972.
- _____. "Nikolas Gogol and Hieronimous Bosch." Russian Review, 32, no. 2 (1973), 158-72.
- Ohloblyn, Oleksander. "Ancestry of Mykola Gogol (Hohol)." Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States, 12, nos. 1-2 (1969-1972), 3-43.

- Oinas, Felix J. "Akakij Akakievich's Ghost and the Hero Orestes." Slavic and East European Journal, 20 (1976), 27-33.
- Olson, Kenneth James. "Gogol and the Natural School." Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1972.
- Ovsianiko-Kulikovskiy, D. N. "Gogol and Ivan Goncharov." In The Completion of Russian Literature. Compiled by Andrew Field. New York: Atheneum, 1971, 102-4.
- Peace, Richard A. "Gogol and Psychological Realism: *Shine!*" In Russian and Slavic Literature. Edited by Richard Freeborn, R. R. Milner-Gulland, and Charles Ward. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Slavica Publishers, 1976, 63-91.
- _____. "The Logic of Madness: Gogol's *Zapiski Sumasshedshego*." Oxford Slavonic Papers, 9 (1976), 28-45.
- Pereverzev, Valerian Fedorovich. "The Evolution of Gogol's Art." In Gogol from the Twentieth Century. Edited and translated by Robert A. Maguire. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974, 134-54.
- Pickle, Charles DeWitt. "Nikolaj Gogol and Black Humor." Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Colorado, 1974.
- Posell, Elsa Z. "Nikolai Vasilyevich Gogol." In his Russian Authors. Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970, 44-64.
- Proffer, Carl R. "Nikolai Gogol." In his Russian Romantic Prose: An Anthology. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Translation Press, 1979, 231-2.
- _____. Review of The Subconscious in Gogol and Dostoevskij and Its Antecedents, by Leonald Joseph Kent. Slavic and East European Journal, 14, no. 3 (1970), 375-7.
- Proffitt, Edward. "Gogol's Perfectly True Tale: *The Overcoat* and Its Mode of Closure." Studies in Short Fiction, 14, no. 1 (Winter 1977), 35-40.
- Rancour-Laferriere, Daniel. "The Identity of Gogol's *Vij*." Harvard Ukrainian Studies, 2 (1978), 211-34.
- Reilly, Robert T. Review of Divided Soul: The Life of Gogol, by Henri Troyat. America, 130 (23 February 1974), 139.
- Rowe, William Woodin. "Gogolesque Perception: Expanding Reversals in Nabokov." Slavic Review, 30 (1971), 110-20.

- _____. "Gogol's Descriptive Double Image and Its Use in *Dead Souls*." In his Nabokov and Others: Patterns in Russian Literature. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1979, 37-46.
- _____. "Observations on Black Humor in Gogol and Nabokov." Slavic and East European Journal, 18, no. 4 (1974), 392-9.
- _____. Through Gogol's Looking Glass: Reverse Vision, False Focus, and Precarious Logic. New York: New York University Press, 1976.
- Schillinger, John. "Gogol's *The Overcoat* as a Travesty of Hagiography." Slavic and East European Journal, 16, no. 1 (1972), 36-41.
- Van Schooneveld, C. H. "Gogol and the Romantics." In Slavic Poetics: Essays in Honor of Kiril Taranovsky. Edited by R. Jakobson, C. H. van Schooneveld, and D. S. Worth. Hague: Mouton, 1973, 481-4.
- Shepard, Elizabeth C. "Pavlov's *Demon* and Gogol's *Overcoat*." Slavic Review, 33, no. 2 (1974), 288-301.
- Sherry, Charles. "The Fit of Gogol's *Overcoat*: An Ontological View of Narrative Form." Genre, 7 (1974), 1-29.
- Shevryev, Stepan. "*The Adventures of Chichikov*, or *Dead Souls*, A Narrative Poem by N. Gogol." In Literature and National Identity. Edited and translated by Paul Debreczeny and Zesse Zelden. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1970, 17-64.
- Sirskyj, Wasyl. "Ideological Overtones in Gogol's *Taras Bulba*." Ukrainian Quarterly, 35, no. 3 (1979), 279-87.
- Slonimskii, Aleksandr. "The Technique of the Comic in Gogol." In Gogol from the Twentieth Century. Edited and translated by Robert A. Maguire. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974, 324-73.
- Smith, G. S. Review of Gogol, by Victor Erlich. Journal of European Studies, 2 (1972), 229.
- Smith, Thomas A. "Gogol's Hollow Men: Teaching *Dead Souls*." English Journal, 61 (1972), 32-5.
- Snyder, Harry Charles Jr. "The Airborne Imagery in Gogol's *Dead Souls*." Ph. D. Dissertation, Brown University, 1974.
- _____. "Airborne Imagery in Gogol's *Dead Souls*." Slavic and East European Journal, 23 (1979), 173-89.



- Sobel, Ruth. "Gogol's *Selected Passages* and Its Contemporary Critics: An Analysis of Its Contents and the Reactions of the Literary Critics and the Readers of the Time." Ph. D. Dissertation, Leeds University, 1976.
- _____. "Gogol's Views on Art and Literature in *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends*." *Journal of Russian Studies*, 31 (1976), 29-37.
- _____. "Gogol's *Vij*." *Russian Literature*, 7, no. 6 (1979), 565-84.
- Stahlberg, Lawrence. "The Grotesque in Gogol and Poe." Ph. D. Dissertation, State University of New York at Binghamton, 1978.
- Steiner, G. Review of *The Sexual Labyrinth of Nikolai Gogol*, by Simon Karlinsky. *New Yorker*, (28 February 1977), 99.
- Stilman, Leon. "The All Seeing Eye in Gogol." In *Gogol from the Twentieth Century*. Edited and translated by Robert A. Maguire. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974, 376-89.
- _____. "Men, Women and Matchmakers." In *Gogol from the Twentieth Century*. Edited and translated by Robert A. Maguire. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974, 390-403.
- Stromecky, Ostop. *The How of Gogol: Iak Tvoriv Hohol*. Huntsville, Alabama: University of Alabama Huntsville Press, 1975.
- Strong, Robert L. Review of *Nikolay Gogol*, by Thais S. Lindstrom. *Slavic Review*, 34, no. 2 (1975), 430-1.
- Struc, Roman. "Categories of the Grotesque: Gogol and Kafka." In *Proceedings of the Comparative Literature Symposium*. Edited by Wolodymyr T. Zyla. Lubbock, Texas: Texas Tech University press, 1971, 135-54.
- _____. "Petty Demons and Beauty: Gogol, Dostoevsky, Sologub." In *Essays on European Literature in Honor of Liselotte Dieckmann*. Edited by Peter U. Hohendahl. St. Louis, Missouri: Washington University press, 1972, 61-82.
- Tabakov, Oleg. "A Soviet Actor and Director Looks at Gogol and *the Government Inspector*." *Journal of Russian Studies*, 35 (1978), 24-8.
- Thomson, R. D. B. Review of *Twentieth Century Russian Literary Criticism*, edited by Victor Erlich. *Slavic Review*, 35, no. 4 (1976), 773-4.
- Todd, William Mills. "Gogol's Epistolary Writing." In *Columbia Essays in International Affairs*. Vol. 5, Edited by Andrew W. Cordier. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970, 51-76.



- _____. Review of Divided Soul: The Life of Gogol, by Henri Troyat. Russian Review, 33, no. 3 (1974), 334-5.
- Troyat, Henri. Divided Soul: The Life of Gogol. Translated by Nancy Amphous. Garden City, New York: Double Day and Company, 1973.
- Tschizhewskij, Dmitrij. "The Composition of Gogol's *Overcoat*." Translated by Edward V. Lawler and Elizabeth W. Trahan. Russian Language Triquarterly, 14 (1976), 378-401.
- Turkevich, Ludmilla. Review of Food-Notes on Gogol, by Alexander P. Obolensky. Russian Review, 32 (1973), 453.
- Turner, Charles Edward. "Life and Genius of Gogol." In his Studies in Russian Literature. New York: Kraus, 1971, 155-77.
- _____. "The Works of Gogol." In his Studies in Russian Literature. New York: Kraus, 1971, 178-208.
- Tynianov, Iurii Nikolaevich. "Dostoevsky and Gogol: Towards a Theory of Parody." In Dostoevsky and Gogol: Text and Criticism. Edited by Priscilla Meyer and Stephen Rudy. Translated by Peter B. Stetson. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1979, 101-17.
- _____. "Dostoevsky and Gogol." In Twentieth Century Russian Literary Criticism. Edited by Victor Erlich. Translated by Elizabeth Trahan and John Fred Beebe. New Haven, Massachusetts: Yale University Press, 1975, 102-16.
- _____. "Fyodor Dostoevsky and Nikolai Gogol." In The Completion of Russian Literature. Compiled by Andrew Field. New York: Atheneum, 1971, 66-83.
- Varnai, Paul. Review of Divided Soul: The Life of Gogol, by Henri Troyat. Canadian Slavonic Papers, 16, no. 4 (1974), 666-8.
- Vinogradov, Victor V. "The School of Sentimental Naturalism: Dostoevsky's Novel Poor Folk Against the Background of the Literary Evolution of the 1840's" In Dostoevsky and Gogol: Text and Criticism. Edited by Priscilla Meyer and Stephen Rudy. Translated by Peter B. Stetson. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1979, 161-215.
- _____. "Towards a Morphology of the Naturalist Style." In Dostoevsky and Gogol: Text and Criticism. Edited by Priscilla Meyer and Stephen Rudy. Translated by Peter B. Stetson. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1979, 217-28.
- Vinokur, G. O. "The Literary Language in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries." In The Russian Language: A Brief History. Translated by Mary A. Forsyth. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971, 126-38.

- Vroon, Ronald. "Gogol in Oblomovka." Russian Literature Triquarterly, 3 (1972), 282-96.
- Waszink, Paul M. "Mythical Traits in Gogol's *The Overcoat*." Slavic and East European Journal, 22, no. 3 (Fall 1978), 287-300.
- Wilson, Edmond. "Gogol: The Demon in the Overgrown Garden." In his A Window on Russia. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1972, 38-51.
- Wolterstorff, Nikolas. "Characters and Their Names." Poetics, 8, nos. 1-2 (1979), 101-27.
- Woodcock, George. Review of Gogol's *Dead Souls*, by James B. Woodward. Sewanee Review, 87 (July 1979), 486-7.
- _____. Review of Nikolai Gogol's Quest for Beauty: An Exploration into His Works, by Jesse Zeldin. Sewanee Review, 87 (July 1979), 489-90.
- _____. Review of The Sexual Labyrinth of Nikolai Gogol, by Simon Karlinsky. Sewanee Review, 85 (April 1977), 324-6.
- Woodward, James B. "Allegory and Symbol in Gogol's Second Idyll." Modern Language Review, 73 (1978), 351-67.
- _____. Gogol's Dead Souls. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1978.
- _____. Introduction to Gogol's Dead Souls, by James B. Woodward. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1978, ix-xvii.
- _____. "The Symbolic Logic of Gogol's *the Nose*." Russian Literature, 7, no. 6 (1979), 537-64.
- Worrall, Nick. "Meyerhold Directs Gogol's *Government Inspector*." Theatre Quarterly, 2, no. 7 (July-September, 1972), 75-95.
- Wright, A. Colin. "Three Approaches to Russian Nineteenth Century Literature, and the Purpose of Reading." The Humanities Association Review, 30 (1979), 322-7.
- Yermakov, Ivan. "*The Nose*." In Gogol from the Twentieth Century. Edited and translated by Robert A. Maguire. Princeton New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974, 156-98.
- Young, Donald Allen. "N. V. Gogol in Russian and Western Psychoanalytic Criticism." Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Toronto, 1977.
- Zeldin, Jesse. Nikolai Gogol's Quest for Beauty: An Exploration into His Works. Lawrence, Kansas: Regents Press of Kansas, 1978.

1980-1989

- Ages, Rose Shoshana. "Gogol's Correspondence and *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends*." Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Toronto, 1980.
- Alexander, Alex E. "The Two Ivans' Sexual Underpinnings." Slavic and East European Journal, 25 (1981), 24-37.
- Altshuller, Mark. "The Walter Scott Motifs in Nikolay Gogol's Story *The Lost Letter*." Oxford Slavonic Papers, 22 (1989), 81-8.
- Andrew, Joe. "Nikolay Gogol." In his Writers and Society During the Rise of Russian Realism. Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey: Humanities, 1980, 76-113.
- _____. "Nikolai Gogol: The Russian Malleus Maleficarum." In his Women in Russian Literature, 1780-1863. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988, 79-111.
- Anon. Review of Gogol and Natural School, by V. V. Vinogradov. Choice, 25 (January 1988), 773.
- Anon. Review of Out from Under Gogol's Overcoat: A Psychoanalytic Study, by Danial Rancour-Laferriere. Choice, 20 (January 1983), 709.
- Anon. Review of The Creation of Nikolai Gogol, by Donald Fanger. Choice, 17 (March 1980), 80.
- Anon. Review of The Enigma of Gogol: An Examination of the Writing of N. V. Gogol and Their Place in the Russian Literary Tradition, by Richard A. Peace. Choice, 19 (July 1982), 1565.
- Anon. Review of The Symbolic Art of Gogol: Essays on His Short Fiction, by James B. Woodward. Choice, 20 (February 1983), 837.
- Bahrij-Pikulyk, Romana. "Superheroes, Gentlemen or Pariahs?: The Cossacks in Nikolai Gogol's *Taras Bulba* and Panteleimon Kulish's *Black Council*." Journal of Ukrainian Studies, 5, no. 2 (Fall 1980), 30-47.
- Bakhtin, M. M. "Verbal Art and the Folk: Culture of Laughter." In Dead Souls: The Reavey Translation, Backgrounds and Sources, Essays in Criticism. Edited by George Gibian. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1985, 569-77.
- Barnstead, John A. "Nabokov, Kuzmin, Chekhov and Gogol: Systems of Reference in 'Lips to Lips'." In Studies in Russian Literature in Honor of Vsevolod Setchkarev. Edited by Julian W. Connolly and Sonia I. Ketchian. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, 1986, 50-60.



- Bayley, John. Review of The Creation of Nikolai Gogol, by Donald Fanger. Times Literary Supplement, (22 February 1980), 195.
- _____. "The Vacancies of Gogol." Times Literary Supplement, (22 February 1980), 195-7.
- Belinsky, V. G. "*Chichikov's Adventures*, or *Dead Souls*: Gogol's Epic Poem." In Dead Souls: The Reavey Translation, Backgrounds and Sources, Essays in Criticism. Edited by George Gibian. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1985, 453-7.
- Bely, Andrei. "The Figure of Fiction in *Dead Souls*." In Dead Souls: The Reavey Translation, Backgrounds and Sources, Essays in Criticism. Edited by George Gibian. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1985, 517-31.
- Beresford, M. Review of Gogol's *Dead Souls*, by James Woodward. Durham University Journal, (December 1981), 148.
- Bodin, Per-Arne. "The Silent Scene in Nikolaj Gogol's *The Inspector General*." Scando Slavica, 33 (1987), 5-16.
- Bowie, Robert. "Nabokov's Influence on Gogol." Journal of Modern Literature, 13 (1986), 251-66.
- Brown, William Edward. "Gogol's *Dead Souls* and *Selected Passages*." In his A History of Russian Literature of the Romantic Period. Vol. 4, Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1986, 341-78.
- _____. "Nikolai Gogol: Poem and Ukrainian Tales." In his A History of Russian Literature of the Romantic Period. Vol. 4, Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1986, 266-92.
- _____. "Nikolai Gogol: St. Petersburg Stories and Comedies." In his A History of Russian Literature of the Romantic Period. Vol. 4, Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1986, 293-340.
- Busch, Robert L. "Gogol and the Russian Freneticist Cycle of the Early 1830s." Canadian Slavonic Papers, 22 (1980), 28-42.
- _____. "Russian Freneticism." Canadian American Slavic Studies, 14 (1980), 269-83.
- Cave, Richard Allen. Review of Nikolai Gogol and Ivan Trugenev, by Nick Worrall. British Book News, (May 1983), 324-5.
- Chizhevsky, Dmitry. "Gogol: Artist and Thinker." In Dead Souls: The Reavey Translation, Backgrounds and Sources, Essays in Criticism. Edited by George Gibian. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1985, 558-64.

- Clardy, Jesse V. and Betty S. Clardy. "Gogol and Dostoevsky." In their The Superfluous Man in Russian Letters. Washington, D. C.: University Press of America, 1980, 31-51.
- Connolly, Julian W. "Boris Vakhtin's *The Sheepskin Coat* and Nikolai Gogol's *Overcoat*." In Studies in Russian Literature in Honor of Vsevolod Setchkarev. Edited by Julian W. Connolly and Sonia I. Ketchian. Columbia, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, 1986, 74-86.
- Cooke, Olga Muller. "Gogol's *Strasnaja mest'* and Belyj's Prose Fiction: The Role of Karma." Russian Language Journal, 43, nos. 145-146 (1989), 71-84.
- Corbett, G. G. "A Note on Grammatical Agreement in *Shinel*." Slavonic and East European Review, 59 (1981), 59-61.
- Corliss, Frank J. Review of The Creation of Nikolai Gogol, by Donald Fanger. Criticism, 22 (Summer 1980), 286-7.
- Cornelia, Elizabeth. "Speaking for not Spoken by: Contractual Representation in Balzac, Austen, and Gogol." Ph. D. Dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1988.
- Cox, Gary Duane. "Geographic, Sociological, and Sexual Tensions in Gogol's Dikanka Stories." Slavic and East European Journal, 24, no. 3 (Fall 1980), 219-32.
- David, Hugh. Review of Nikolai Gogol and Ivan Turgenev, by Nick Worrall. Times Educational Supplement, (26 November 1982), 30.
- Deutsch, Judith E. "The Cossack Hero in Russian Literature: Topoi and Change." Ph. D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1985.
- _____. "The Zaporozhian Cossacks of Nikolaj Gogol: An Approach to God and Man." Russian Literature, 22, no. 3 (1987), 359-77.
- Edmunds, Catherine J. "Pushkin and Gogol: As Sources for the Librettos of the Fantastic Fairy Tale Operas of Rimskijkorsakov." Ph. D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1985.
- Ehre, Milton. Introduction to The Theater of Nikolay Gogol. Translated by Milton Ehre. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980, ix-xxvi.
- _____. "Laughing Through the Apocalypse: The Comic Structure of Gogol's *Government Inspector*." Russian Review, 39 (1980), 137-49.
- Fanger, Donald Lee. "*Dead Souls*: The Mirror and the Road." In Dead Souls: The Reavey Translation, Backgrounds and Sources, Essays in Criticism. Edited by George Gibian. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1985, 459-82.

- _____. "Gogol, Nikolai Vasilievich." In Handbook of Russian Literature. Edited by Victor Terras. New Haven, Massachusetts: Yale University Press, 1985, 174-7.
- _____. Review of The Enigma of Gogol, by Richard Peace. Times Literary Supplement, (4 June 1982), 621.
- Finke, Michael. "Metapoesis in Pushkin, Gogol, Dostoevskii and Chekhov." Ph. D. Dissertation, Indiana University, 1989.
- Frantz, Philip Edward. "A. A. Perovskij: Gentleman and Litterateur." Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1981.
- Fusso, Susanne Grace. "Cicikov on Gogol: The Structure of Oppositions in *Dead Souls*." Ph. D. Dissertation, Yale University, 1984.
- Gibian, George. ed. Dead Souls: The Reavey Translation, Backgrounds and Sources, Essays in Criticism. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1985.
- Gippius, Vasilii V. Gogol. Edited and translated by Robert A. Maguire. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1981.
- _____. "An Introduction to *Dead Souls*." In Dead Souls: The Reavey Translation, Backgrounds and Sources, Essays in Criticism. Edited by George Gibian. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1985, 489-517.
- Grabowicz, George G. "Three Perspectives on the Cossack Past: Gogol, Shevchenko, Kulish." Harvard Ukrainian Studies, 5, no. 2 (1981), 171-94.
- Graffy, Julian. "Passion versus Habit in *Old World Landowners*." In Nikolay Gogol: Text and Context. Edited by Jane Grayson and Faith Wigzell. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989, 34-49.
- Grayson, Jane, and Faith Wigzell. ed. Nikolay Gogol: Text and Context. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989.
- Grayson, Jane. Introduction to Nikolay Gogol: Text and Context. Edited by Jane Grayson and Faith Wigzell. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989, xi-xiii.
- Gregg, Richard. "The Curse of Sameness and the Gogolian Esthetic: *The Tale of the Two Ivans* as Parable." Slavic and East European Journal, 31 (1987), 1-9.
- _____. "An Inquiry into the Genealogical and Onomastic Origins of *The Nose*." Russian Review, 40 (1981), 365-77.
- Heldt, Barbara. "*Dead Souls*: Without Naming Names." In Nikolay Gogol: Text and Context. Edited by Jane Grayson and Faith Wigzell. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989, 83-91.

- Herzen, Alexander I. "Diary Entries on *Dead Souls*." In *Dead Souls: The Reavey Translation, Backgrounds and Sources, Essays in Criticism*. Edited by George Gibian. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1985, 458-9.
- Hurych, Jitka. Review of *The Creation of Nikolai Gogol*, by Donald Fanger. *Reprint Bulletin Book Reviews*, 25, no. 1 (1980), 21.
- Jackson, Robert Louis. "Two Views of Gogol and the Critical Synthesis Belinskij, Rozanov, and Doestoevskij: An Essay in Literary Historical Criticism." *Russian Literature*, 15, no. 2 (1984), 223-42.
- Johnson, C. A. Review of *The Enigma of Gogol: An Examination of the Writing of N. V. Gogol and Their Place in the Russian Literary Tradition*, by Richard A. Peace. *British Book News*, (May 1982), 323.
- Karlinsky, Simon. "Portrait of Gogol as a Word Glutton." In *Dead Souls: The Reavey Translation, Backgrounds and Sources, Essays in Criticism*. Edited by George Gibian. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1985, 546-58.
- Karpuk, Paul Anton. "N. V. Gogol's Unfinished Historical Novel *The Hetman*." Ph. D. Dissertation, University of California at Berkeley. 1987.
- Karriker, Alexandra H. Review of *Gogol's Dead Souls*, by James B. Woodward. *Russian Language Journal*, 36, nos. 123-4 (Winter/Spring 1982), 291.
- Katz, Michael R. "Gogol's Mixed Vegetable Salad." In his *Dreams and the Unconscious in Nineteenth-Century Russian Fiction*. Hanover, New Hampshire: University of New England Press, 1984, 66-83.
- Kent, Leonard Joseph. Introduction to *The Complete Tales of Nikolai Gogol*. Edited by Leonard J. Kent. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1985, xiii-xxxix.
- Keys, Roger. "The Unwelcome Tradition: Bely, Gogol and Metafictional Narration." In *Nikolay Gogol: Text and Context*. Edited by Jane Grayson and Faith Wigzell. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989, 92-108.
- Little, T. E. "Gogol and Romanticism." In *Problems of Russian Romanticism*. Edited by Robert Reid. Aldershot, England: Gower Publishing Company, 1986, 96-126.
- Lotman, Iurii M. "Concerning Khlestakov." In *The Semiotics of Russian Cultural History*. Edited by Alexander D. Nakhimovsky and Alice Stone Nakhimovsky. Translated by Louisa Vinton. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1985, 150-87.
- . "Gogol's Chlestakov: The Pragmatics of a Literary Character." In *The Semiotics of Russian Culture*. Edited by Ann Shukman. Translated by Ruth Sobel. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Michigan Slavic Contributions, 1984, 177-212.

- _____. "Gogol's Tale of Captain Kopejkin: Reconstruction of the Plan and Ideo-Compositional Function." In The Semiotics of a Russian Culture. Edited by Ann Shukman. Translated by Julian Graffy. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Michigan Slavic Contributions, 1984, 213-30.
- _____. "The Problem of Artistic Space in Gogol's Prose." In Dead Souls: The Reavey Translation, Backgrounds and Sources, Essays in Criticism. Edited by George Gibian. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1985, 577-83.
- Maguire, Robert A. "The Formalists on Gogol." In Russian Formalist: A Retrospective Glance. A Festschrift in Honor of Victor Erlich. Edited by Robert Louis Jackson and Stephen Rudy. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, 1985, 213-30.
- _____. "Gogol's 'Confession' as a Fictional Structure." Ubandus Review, 2 (1982), 175-90.
- _____. "The Legacy of Gogol Criticism." In Dead Souls: The Reavey Translation, Backgrounds and Sources, Essays in Criticism. Edited by George Gibian. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1985, 441-53.
- Mann, Yuri. "On the Two Opposing Structural Principles of *Dead Souls*." In Dead Souls: The Reavey Translation, Backgrounds and Sources, Essays in Criticism. Edited by George Gibian. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1985, 482-9.
- Markof-Belaëff, Olga. "*Dead Souls* and the Picaresque Tradition: A Study in the Definition of Genre." Ph. D. Dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1982.
- McLean, Hugh. "Gogol's Retreat from Love: Toward and Interpretation of *Mirgorod*." In Russian Literature and Psychoanalysis. Edited by Daniel Rancour-Laferriere. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1989, 101-22.
- _____. Review of Nikolay Gogol: Text and Context. Edited by Jane Grayson and Wigzell Faith. Slavic and East European Journal, 33, no. 3 (1989), 453-4.
- Mersereau, John Jr. "Gogol's *Dead Souls*." In his Russian Romantic Fiction. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1983, 319-23.
- _____. "Gogol's *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka*." In his Russian Romantic Fiction. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1983, 163-73.
- _____. "Gogol's *Mirgorod* and Petersburg Tales." In his Russian Romantic Fiction. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1983, 247-65.
- _____. "Gogol's *Overcoat*." In his Russian Romantic Fiction. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1983, 301-6.

- Milne, Lesley. "Gogol and Mikhail Bulgakov." In Nikolay Gogol: Text and Context. Edited by Jane Grayson and Faith Wigzell. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989, 109-26.
- Nabokov, Vladimir. "Nikolay Gogol: *Dead Souls* and *The Overcoat*." In Vladimir Nabokov: Lectures on Russian Literature. Edited by Fredson Bowers. New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich Publishers, 1981, 15-62.
- _____. "Our Mr. Chichikov." In *Dead Souls: The Reavey Translation, Backgrounds and Sources, Essays in Criticism*. Edited by George Gibian. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1985, 531-41.
- Nebolsine, Arcadi. "Gogol and Poshlost: Some Question." In *Studies in Slavic Literatures and Culture in Honor of Zoya Yurieff*. Edited by Munir Sendich. East Lansing, Michigan: Russian Language Journal, 1988, 225-30.
- Peace, Richard Arthur. *The Enigma of Gogol: An Examination of the Writings of N. V. Gogol and Their Place in the Russian Literary Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- _____. "Gogol: *The Greatcoat* (1842)." In *The Voice of A Giant*. Edited by Roger Cockrell and David Richards. Great Britain: A. Wheaton and Company, 1985, 27-40.
- _____. Introduction to *The Enigma of Gogol*, by Richard Peace. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981, 1-27.
- _____. "The Mirror-World of Gogol's Early Stories." In *Nikolay Gogol: Text and Context*. Edited by Jane Grayson and Faith Wigzell. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989, 19-33.
- _____. Review of *Gogol*, by Vasilii V. Gippius. Edited and translated by Robert A. Maguire. *Times Literary Supplement*, (18 December 1981), 1470.
- Pearson, I. "Raphael as Seen by Russian Writers from Zhukovsky to Turgenev." *Slavonic and East European Review*, 59 (1981), 354-8.
- Peppard, Victor. "Gogolian Substrata in Zhizn' i Neobychajnye Prekljuchenija Soldata Ivana Chonkina." *Russian Language Journal*, 131 (1984), 131-8.
- Pomorska, Krystyna. "On the Problem of Parallelism in Gogol's Prose: *A Tale of the Two Ivans*." In *The Structural Analysis of Narrative Text: Conference Papers*. Edited by Andrej Kodjka, Michael J. Connolly, and Krystyna Pomorska. Columbia, Ohio: Slavica Publisher, 1980, 31-43.



- Ponomareff, Constantin V. "Gogol and Lermontov: Two Russian Demons." In his On the Dark Side of Russian Literature: 1709-1910. New York: Peter Lang, 1987, 95-116.
- Popkin, Cathy Lynn. "The Pragmatics of Insignificance." Ph. D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 1985.
- Proffer, Carl Ray. Introduction to Arabesques. Translated by Alexander Tulloch. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1982, 6-10.
- Rancour-Laferriere, Daniel. "All the World's a Vertep: The Personification /Depersonification Complex in Gogol's *Sorochinskaja Jarmarka*." Harvard Ukrainian Studies, 6, no. 3 (1982), 339-71.
- _____. Out from Under Gogol's Overcoat: A Psychoanalytic Study. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1982.
- Rowe, W. W. "Gogolesque Perception-Expanding Reversals in Nabokov." In his Patterns in Russian Literature II: Notes on Classics. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1988, 114-24.
- _____. "Gogol's Phonetic Emphasis." In his Patterns in Russian Literature II: Notes on Classics. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1988, 104-13.
- _____. "On Black Humor in Gogol and Nabokov." In his Patterns in Russian Literature II: Notes on Classics. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1988, 125-33.
- Saunders, D. B. "Contemporary Critics of Gogol's *Vechera* and the Debate about Russian Narodnost (1831-1832)." Harvard Ukrainian Studies, 5, no. 1 (1981), 66-82.
- Shapiro, Gavriel. "The Hussar: A Few Observations on Gogol's Characters and Their Vertep Prototype." Harvard Ukrainian Studies, 9 (1985), 133-8.
- _____. "N. V. Gogol and the Baroque." Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1984.
- Shklovsky, Victor. "The Literary Genre of *Dead Souls*." In Dead Souls: The Reavey Translation, Backgrounds and Sources, Essays in Criticism. Edited by George Gibian. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1985, 564-9.
- Shukman, Ann. "Gogol's *the Nose* or the Devil in the Works." In Nikolay Gogol: Text and Context. Edited by Jane Grayson and Faith Wigzell. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989, 64-82.
- Simmons, Ernest J. "Gogol, Nikolai." In Collier's Encyclopedia. Vol. 11, New York: Macmillan Educational Co., 1988, 195-7.



- Sobel, Ruth. Gogol's Forgotten Book: Selected Passages and Its Contemporary Readers. Washington D. C.: University Press of America, 1981.
- . Introduction to Gogol's Forgotten Book, by Ruth Sobel. Washington D. C.: University Press of America, 1981, 1-12.
- Sosa, Michael. "Gogol's from the 1920s: Tynjanov's Scenario for *Shinel*." Slavic and East European Journal, 30 (1986), 553-8.
- Spitzer, Catherine Anne. "The Image of the City in the Novels of Gogol, Dostoevsky and Bely." Ph. D. Dissertation, McGill University, 1982.
- Stableford, Tom. "N. V. Gogol." In his The Literary Appreciation of Russian Writers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981, 10-6.
- Stephen, Halina. "Tynjanov's Film Theory in Practice: Tynjanov's Film of Gogol's *Overcoat*." In Purdue University Fifth Annual Conference on Film, Oct. 30-Nov. 1 1980. Edited by Maud Walther. West Lafayette, Indiana: Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Purdue University, 1980, 193-9.
- Stevenson, Joan Nabseth. "Literary and Cultural Patterns in Gogol's *Arabeski*." Ph. D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 1984.
- Stromecky, Ostop. "Gogol's Reverse Symbolism." Ukrainian Quarterly, 38, no. 2 (1982), 151-63.
- Terras, Victor. "The Russian Short Story 1830-1850: Gogol as the Early Master." In The Russian Short Story: A Critical History. Edited by Charles A. Moser. Boston, Massachusetts: Twayne Publishers, 1986, 21-8.
- Todd, William Mills III. "*Dead Souls*: Charmed by a Phrase." In his Fiction and Society in the Age of Pushkin: Ideology, Institutions, and Narrative. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1986, 164-206.
- Toomre, Joice S. Review of The Creation of Nikolai Gogol, by Donald Fanger. Library Journal, 105 (15 January 1980), 205.
- Trott, Liz. "*Diary of a Madman*: the Hidden Absurd." In Nikolay Gogol: Text and Context. Edited by Jane Grayson and Faith Wigzell. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989, 50-63.
- Tulloch, Alexander. Introduction to Arabesques. Translated by Alexander Tulloch. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1982, 11-20.
- Vasilaky, Ludmilla Jakowenko. "Irony as Device in Gogol's Short Stories." Ph. D. Dissertation, New York University, 1983.



- Vinogradov, V. V. Gogol and the Natural School. Translated by Debra K. Erickson and Ray Parrott. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1987.
- Weiss, Robert Mark. "The Hidden World of Gogol: A Study of the Irrational in *Dead Souls*." Ph. D. Dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1985.
- Wigzell, Faith. "Gogol and Vaudeville." In Nikolay Gogol: Text and Context. Edited by Jane Grayson and Faith Wigzell. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989, 1-18.
- Wilson, Edmund. "Gogol: The Demon in the Overgrown Garden." In Dead Souls: The Reavey Translation, Backgrounds and Sources, Essays in Criticism. Edited by George Gibian. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1985, 542-6.
- Wilson, Reuel K. "A *Marvelous Hangout* or *Dead Souls* Revisited." World Literature Today, 54 (1980), 376-81.
- Woodward, James B. Preface to The Symbolic Art of Gogol: Essays on His Short Fiction, by James B. Woodward. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, 1981, 5-6.
- _____. The Symbolic Art of Gogol: Essays on His Short Fiction. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, 1982.
- Woodward, S. "Pro-Creative Disorder in Gogolian Fiction." Russian Literature, 26 (1989), 297-303.
- Worrall, Nick. Nikolai Gogol and Ivan Turgenev. London: Macmillan Press, 1982.
- Yelistratova, Anna. Nikolai Gogol and the West European Novel. Moscow: Raduga Publishers, 1984.

1990-1991

- Aksakov, Konstantin. "A Few words on Gogol's Poem *Chichikov's Adventures* or *Dead Souls*." Translated by Ruth Sobel. Russian Literature Triquarterly, 23 (1990), 253-62.
- Frank, Joseph. "From Gogol to the Gulag." In his Through the Russian Prism: Essays on Literature and Culture. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1990, 89-91.
- Galperina, Inna. "Critical Relativism: Gogol's *Marriage*, a Multifaceted Play or Playing in a Play." Russian Literature, 28, no. 2 (1990), 155-74.
- Goodliffe, John. Review of Nikolay Gogol: Text and Context, by Jane Grayson and Faith Wigzell. New Zealand Slavonic Journal, 14 (1991), 178-80.

- Karpuk, Paul A. "Reconciling Chronological Inconsistencies in Gogol's *Taras Bulba*." Russian Language Journal, 45, nos.151-152 (1991), 93-110.
- Kopper, John. Review of Nikolay Gogol: Text and Context, by Jane Grayson and Wigzell Faith. Russian Review, 49 (April 1990), 212-4.
- Lotman, Yury. "Artistic Space in Gogol's Prose." Russian Literature Triquarterly, 23 (1990), 199-241.
- Maguire, Robert A. "Gogol and the Legacy of Pseudo-Dionysius." In Russianness: Studies on a Nation's Identity. Edited by Robert L. Belknap. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1990, 44-55.
- Meyer, Ronald. Introduction to Hanz Kuechelgarten. Leaving the Theater and Other Works. Edited by Ronald Meyer. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1990, 9-15.
- Sicher, Efraim. "Dialogization and Laughter in the Dark, or How Gogol's *Nose* Was Made: Parody and Literary Evolution in Bachtins Theory of the Novel." Russian Literature, 28, no. 2 (1990), 211-33.
- Sobel, Ruth. "K. Aksakov's Essay on Gogol's *Dead Souls*: A Short Evaluation." Russian Literature Triquarterly, 23 (1990), 263-8.
- Terras, Victor. "Gogol." In his A History of Russian Literature. New Haven, Massachusetts: Yale University Press, 1991, 254-63.
- Terras, Victor. "Gogol's Theater." In his A History of Russian Literature. New Haven, Massachusetts: Yale University Press, 1991, 277-80.
- Toumanoff, Susan. "Afterword to Yury Lotman's Artistic Space in Gogol's Prose." Russian Literature Triquarterly, 23 (1990), 243-51.
- Waddington, Patrick. Review of Gogol: A Bibliography. Compiled and edited by Philip E. Frantz. New Zealand Slavonic Journal, 14 (1991), 227-9.



MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIE



31293010317802