

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

YULIYA ILCHUK
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

In his “Avtorskaia ispoved” [“The Author’s Confession,” 1847], Gogol begged his readers not to rely on his works as a source of information about himself (Gogol *Vybrannye* 236). Although his words were targeted at those critics who tried to draw parallels between the writer’s personality and his authorial persona in *Vybrannye mesta iz peregiskoi s druž’iami* [*Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends*, 1847], they also epitomize the fate of Gogol’s earlier work—*Vechera na khutore bliz' Dikan'ki* [*Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka*, 1831-32]. The transformations that the tales underwent in numerous editions in the 1830-40s iconically reflect Gogol’s constant vacillations between his Russian and Ukrainian identities. Gogol’s “Russification” of *Vechera* in the transition from the first to the second edition suggests his attempt to resolve a disturbing duality in his sense of national identity.¹ I would argue that the duality of Gogol’s national identity was artistically realized in the hybridization of the literary language in *Vechera*. In this paper, I will study the hybridization of the literary language in *Vechera* and the history of the editing of the tales in order to demonstrate how the language duality palpable in the first edition of the tales of 1831-1832 was subdued in the second edition of 1836, and then reestablished in the edition of his *Sochineniia* [*Works*] of 1842. The collective editing of the text of *Vechera*, in which Gogol himself, Nikolai Prokopovich, Vissarion Belinskii, and Mikhail Likhonin participated, was nothing short of the act of Gogol’s self-fashioning through the use and manipulation of language. The editing of *Vechera* can be interpreted as a performative act in which Gogol realized a translation of self across the boundaries of two languages.

Mistakes in *Vechera* through the Prism of Gogol’s Bilingualism

When the first edition of *Vechera* came out in 1831, it “amazed” the Russian audience—not so much because of the “exotic” subject matter (there already existed a rich tradition of Ukrainian tales written

by Vasili Nareznyi and Orest Somov), but mostly because of Gogol's idiosyncratic and "odd" language.² The major Russian critics responded favorably to the publication of *Vechera*, since they espied in them everything that Russian culture lacked at the time: the expression of nationality, a Romantic interest in folklore, and a taste of "local color." However, the language of the tales was criticized for containing so many vulgarisms, colloquialisms, and Ukrainianisms. As Viktor Vinogradov fairly observed, "his [Gogol's] language, being that of a man from another country, was not entirely bound by the old aristocratic speech culture; it was full of dialectical 'inaccuracies'" (209). Many of Gogol's contemporaries repeatedly pointed out these "inaccuracies." For example, Pushkin, in his notes of 1830-1831, spoke ironically of Gogol's proficiency in Russian:

Вот уже 16 лет, как я печатаю, и критики заметили в моих стихах пять грамматических ошибок (и справедливо); я всегда был им искренно благодарен и всегда поправляя замеченное место. Прозой я пишу гораздо неправильнее, а говорю еще хуже, и почти так, как пишет Гоголь.³ (qtd. Tikhonravov 198)

In 1836, promoting the second edition of Gogol's *Vechera*, Pushkin again emphasized Gogol's imperfect literary language in the first edition: "Мы так были благодарны молодому автору, что охотно простили ему неровность и неправильность его слога ... Автор оправдал такое снисхождение" (VII 237).⁴ The idea of Gogol's illiteracy was further developed in the Russian criticism of the 1840s. For example, Vladimir Dal', commenting on the effect that Gogol's *Mertvye dushi* [*Dead Souls*, 1842] produced on him, described Gogol's language in terms of delight and confusion: "Greedily you swallow up the whole [story] to the end, then you read it again and still do not notice that he is writing in *a wild language* [emphasis mine]. You try, pedantically, to figure out, and you see that one absolutely should not write or talk like this. You try to correct it—you spoil it. You cannot touch a word" (617).

Throughout the nineteenth century, Russian writers and critics perpetuated the myth of Gogol as a semi-literate Little Russian writer encroaching upon the status of a Great Russian writer. They prompted the writer to polish his style by eliminating evident elements of Ukrainian lexicon (and not only lexicon, but also inverted syntax and intonation) from his works, particularly, from the first edition of

Vechera. However, what in fact was labeled as Gogol's "illiteracy" was nothing more than an example of a bilingual speaker making his way in a monolingual imperial culture. These ungrammaticalities were above all due to the interference between two related languages, which usually occurs in the bilingual mind. The fact that Gogol was bilingual in Russian and Ukrainian has been rarely discussed in literary criticism.⁵ Scholars usually point out his profound knowledge of Ukrainian folklore, his use of Ukrainian lexicon as local color in *Vechera*, and scanty notes and letters written in Ukrainian, thereby defining bilingualism strictly in terms of descriptive linguistics.⁶

When I use the term "bilingualism" in relation to Gogol, I refer both to his linguistic consciousness and to the bilingualism of his text as an aesthetic discourse feature. My approach to Gogol's bilingualism as manifested in the literary language of *Vechera* serves to establish the relationship of ethnicity to language. In doing this, I follow Pierre Bourdieu in his treatment of regionalist or ethnic identities which he claims to be "performative":

Regionalist discourse is a performative discourse which aims to impose as legitimate a new definition of the frontiers and to get people to know and recognize the region that is thus delimited in opposition to the dominant definition, [...] which does not acknowledge that new region. (223)

The important implication of Bourdieu's theory is that although regional and ethnic identities essentialize what are actually arbitrary divisions among peoples, and in this sense are not "real," once they are established they exist as mental representations and are as real as if they were grounded in something "natural" (Bourdieu 221). My assumption is that the regional form of Russian in which Gogol is psychologically rooted is more "real" and creative than the standard form of Russian used as a kind of *lingua franca*. Regional language was, for young Gogol, one of the channels through which his cultural identity was processed; it created a sense of belonging to a common language and culture and provided some transitional space for his cultural migration to the heart of the Russian empire.

One might claim, however, that bilingualism was not entirely atypical to the Russian cultural situation in the beginning of the nineteenth century. The Russian literary elite readily employed French for correspondence and society talk. Yet, the proficiency of the Russian gentry in French was acquired over time and cannot be treated on par

with the “natural” bilingualism of Ukrainian writers who were exposed to both languages, Russian and Ukrainian, since their birth. Moreover, with the difference being in the value and prestige of the second language, the *additive* bilingualism of the Russian elite occurred in the situation when both languages—Russian and French—were considered equally valued and useful, whereas the *subtractive* bilingualism of Gogol indicated an unequal relationship between the Russian language and Little Russian dialect (*narechie*). The chauvinistic attitude towards Ukrainian language was so common among Russian intellectuals that it made Gogol think of his mixed language in *Vechera* as a personal flaw he needed to fix. It was a rather common attitude among Little Russian gentry to disavow their regional language and demonstrate excellence in Russian. The acquisition of Russian very often resulted in the gradual loss of their native language and ethnic identity. In the case of Gogol’s family, however, the bilingualism of its members was a cultural rather than social phenomenon; neither Gogol’s parents, nor their relatives, abandoned Ukrainian. Instead, they operated within the two languages—Russian and Ukrainian—all their lives. Gogol’s father, Vasilii Afanas’evich Gogol, wrote his comedies in the mixed Ukrainian-Russian language, now known as *surzhyk*.⁷ The constant code-switching was imprinted not only on his creative works, but also in his correspondence to his wife.

Gogol’s mother spoke two versions of Russian: one, a largely Ukrainianized version of Russian; and the other, the literary Russian language. Her correspondences with family contain various Ukrainian linguistic forms: lexicon (“копица,” “шинок,” “вечерял,” “карбованець,” etc.); grammar (“с Лубен,” “за коровы,” “в тетинькы,” “негодяться доробити,” etc.); and orthography (“нихто,” “несоветувала,” “пробувать,” “вже,” “Антошки,” “болять,” “пишеш,” etc.). At the same time, her correspondence with the Aksakov family is written in more standard Russian. This differentiation between the Ukrainianized Russian language for colloquial usage and the more or less standard form of Russian for use in polite society occurred in many Little Russian families who had just been admitted into the Russian high society and aspired to assimilate. Already during his study at the Nizhyn Lyceum, Gogol coexisted in two different linguistic modes: his letters to home include many Ukrainian words and grammatical forms (“сюды,” “позычил,” “прыймете,” “влюблен у вас,” “разов,” “мета,” “халстухи,” “шлахбаум,” etc.), incorrectly formed neologisms (“уроченное

время,” “не поразскажете ли чего-нибудь животрепящего,” “жить в разрознении,” “несбытодумие,” etc.),⁸ and various orthographic mistakes.

Strategies of Hybridization in *Vechera*

The astonishing effect that Gogol's tales produced on the metropolitan audience can be accredited to the artistry of his language. It was not so much the subject matter, but his innovative language, which comprised elements of the Russian vernacular mixed with the Ukrainian vernacular and *surzhyk*, all fused in a hybrid conglomerate, that made the author successful. Roman Koropeckyj and Robert Romanchuk argue that Gogol used Ukrainian elements in a burlesque tradition, à la Ivan Kotliarevs'ky in *Eneïda* (1798), in order to present Ukraine to the imperial public as an “unconscious” souvenir (547). It is fair to admit, however, that the Ukrainian elements in *Vechera* function not only to “lower” the overall style, but to install a metonymic gap between the Russian language, in which the tales are written, and the Ukrainian language, with its inserted and un glossed words, phrases, and quotes that were vaguely known to the metropolitan reader. Although these elements occur in the speech of all the narrators in *Vechera*, the language of Rudy Pan'ko, the fictitious editor, and that of Foma Grigor'evich, Dikan'ka's sexton, is the most hybridized. Both of them represent the local Dikan'ka community and therefore incorporate in their language various forms of local dialects and idiomatic expressions. Pan'ko's language, especially that of the “Predislovie” (“Preface”) to Book One, clearly manifests his intentional ignorance of standard Russian grammar. It is intentional because the “Predislovie” to Book Two and the tales “Noch' pered Rozhdestvom” (“Christmas Eve”) and “Strashnaia mest” (“A Terrible Revenge”), which he presumably authors, are written in more or less normative Russian. The first group of ungrammaticalities embraces misspelled words that reflect the phonemic nature of Pan'ko's regional language (“слышило” instead of “слышало”; “раскащик” instead of “разсказчик”; “скрыпка” instead of “скрипка”; “имянно” instead of “именно”; “к щастью” instead of “к счастью”; “грушовый” instead of “грушевый,” etc.).⁹ Clearly, the peculiarities of Pan'ko's spelling bear some traces of Ukrainian grammar and pronunciation and reveal his preference of sound over letter. The second group of ungrammatical forms consists of the grammatical and punctuation mistakes admissible neither in Russian, nor in Ukrainian:

1. most of the verbs with the negative particle “не” are written together, breaking the grammatical rules of the normative Russian of the time (“невидал,” “неплачь,” “неизвольте,” “неносил”);
2. some of verbs in the second person present tense have “ь” as in Ukrainian instead of “ъ” as in Russian (“зайдешь,” “можешь,” “упросишь”);
3. adverbs, adjectives, and nouns are written together with the negative particle “не” in words that should be written as separate words (“неслишком,” “нислова”);
4. or vice versa, adjectives are separated from the particle “не,” whereas they should be written as one word (“сладость не описанная”);
5. the spelling of adverbs are odd: adverbs, such as “вовсе,” is written separately as “во все,” thereby it becomes another part of speech (a noun and a preposition); “во-свояси,” “на-бекрень,” “на-стороже.”

Another strategy for hybridizing the literary discourse is achieved by the use of glosses to the Ukrainian words and idioms unknown to the Russian audience. First, Pan'ko provides two glossaries of Ukrainian words (about 130 entries) that accompany both of his “Predislovie” to Books One and Two (see Appendix). This strategy signifies not only that the discourse is directed toward the other and not a local audience, but it also indicates that the text itself activates the process of language variation. Just as the text includes language variance as a signifying difference, so do the glosses employ Ukrainian words as linguistic variants to denote the insertion of the other into the discourse. Therefore, the glosses function as a bridge between the “center” and “periphery,” simultaneously establishing their unbridgeable separation.

Second, Pan'ko, as the author of the whole cycle of tales, intrudes into the text of Foma Grigor'evich, translating or commenting on his use of Ukrainian words and expressions. In the first edition of the tales, Pan'ko's translation of Foma Grigor'evich's Ukrainian words and expressions appeared in italics in the footnotes without any reference to Pan'ko. However, in all subsequent editions of the tales, these comments (with the exception of the one in the beginning of “Noch' pered Rozhdestvom,” which is accompanied by the words “primechanie pasichnika” (“the bee-keeper's footnote”) are accompa-

nied by the note “primechanie N.V. Gogolia” (“N. V. Gogol’s comment”). In the first edition, Pan’ko’s “Predislovie”—his introduction to “Vecher nakanune Ivana Kupala” (“St. John’s Eve”)—and all the comments in the footnotes are printed in the same font that is larger and in cursive, unlike the main text of all the tales. Therefore, this gives grounds to attribute all comments in the footnotes to Pan’ko. In the examples below, he provides glosses to the Ukrainian idiomatic expressions, translating them literally into Russian, which not only creates a comic effect, but also neutralizes the original connotation of the expressions.

1. Да, расскажу я вам, как ведьмы играли с покойным дедом в дурня.¹⁰
То есть в дурачки [emphasis in original] (I, 136).
2. Люлька-то у меня есть, да того, чем бы зажечь ее, чорт-ма.
Не имеется [emphasis in original] (I, 141).¹¹
3. Дывысь, дывысь, маты, мов дурня, скаче.
Смотри! Смотри! мать, как сумасшедшая, скачет! [emphasis in original] (I, 144).¹²

Pan’ko’s Russian translations of highly idiomatic Ukrainian expressions have a neutralizing effect: they acquire neutrality in a linguistic context where the native language is functionally marked.

While Foma Grigor’evich’s macaronic language does not transgress Russian grammar, it nevertheless contains various Ukrainian elements that penetrate his discourse as a result of code-switching and code-mixing, such as the insertion of Ukrainian lexical material into a structure of Russian or alternation of two structures from Russian and Ukrainian. Usually, these insertions are italicized in Foma Grigor’evich’s text, as in the passage from “Vecher nakanune Ivana Kupala”: “Плюйте ж на голову тому, кто это напечатал! *бреше, сучий москаль*. Так ли я говорил? *Що то вже, як у кого чорт-ма клепки в голові!* Слушайте, я вам расскажу ее сейчас” (I, 99).¹³ The switching from one language to another in one paragraph is typically used to reveal to the audience the regional identity of the speaker, thus enabling the speaker to establish kinship with the audience. However, the way in which Foma Grigor’evich resorts to code-switching conceals his regional identity from the Russian audience; he establishes an affinity only with those who belong to his inner circle and excludes others who do not belong to his class and region. In the beginning of his

story, Foma Grigor'evich renders his village listeners' request to tell another creepy story in Ukrainian: “Фома Григорьевич! Фома Григорьевич! *А нуте яку-небудь страховинну казочку! А нуте, нуте! ... – тара-та-та, та-та-та, и пойдут, и пойдут ...*” (I, 136).¹⁴ Therefore, this code-switching shows how he demarcates in his audience those who can understand his local language from those who cannot.

In sharp contrast to Pan'ko and Foma Grigor'evich, Makar Nazarovich demonstrates his questionable knowledge of local culture.¹⁵ In his use of language, he remains within the cultural code that descends from the imperial center. This code regulates, for example, the use of Ukrainian in the tale “Sorochinskaya iarmarka” (“Sorochintsy Fair”), in which all the epigraphs in Ukrainian are transliterated into Russian: “Що, Боже ты мій, Господе! Чого нема на тій ярмарці! Колеса, скло, деготь, цибуля, крамари всяки ... так, що хоч би в кишени було рублив и с тридцять, то й тогди б не закупив усіен ярмаркы” (I, 79).¹⁶ Within the Russian imperial literary code of the beginning of the century, Ukrainian folklore and burlesque literature served to metonymically represent Ukraine, and the transliteration of the epigraphs only reinforces the presumption of imperial consumption. Roman Koropeckyi and Robert Romanchuk suggest that “the *panich* from Poltava represents and reintegrates the Ukrainian material of the epigraphs into a single, Russian voice ... Indeed, it is only in and through the medium of the imperial literary language that the Ukrainian setting actually coalesces and comes to life ...” (543).

Makar Nazarovich's arsenal of Ukrainian elements is limited to the use of doublets, names of ethnic food, etc. The abundance of doublets in his texts (кружка - кухоль (“a mug”), ад - пекло (“hell”), сорванец - шибеник (“a scamp”), жена - жинка (“a wife”), девушка - дивчина (“a girl”), спешить - поспешать (“to hurry”), узнать - познать (“to know”), любимый - любый (“beloved”) in close proximity makes the use of the Ukrainian words redundant; they function only for the sake of local color. In the examples below, translations in the text present functionally undifferentiated lexical items, between which the ontological hierarchy is erased. The Ukrainian words retain their material texture, but in joining the single, homogeneous cultural space, they lost their ontological essence.

4. Другой цыган, ворча про себя, поднялся на ноги, два раза

осветил себя искрами, будто молниями, раздул губами трут и, с **каганцом** в руках, обыкновенною малороссийскою **светильнею**, состоящею из разбитого черепка, налитого бара ным жиром, отправился, освещая дорогу [emphasis mine] (I, 91).¹⁷

5. В **мирской сходке**, или **громаде**, [emphasis mine] несмотря на то что власть его ограничена несколькими голосами, голова всегда берет верх и почти по своей воле высылает, кого ему угодно, ровнять и гладить дорогу или копать рвы (I, 118).¹⁸

As demonstrated before, the various strategies of hybridization of the literary language by Pan'ko, Foma Grigor'evich, and Makar Nazarovich differ in one important aspect: while Pan'ko tends to de-territorialize the very grammatical norms of Russian, as if they were processed through the consciousness of a non-native speaker of Russian, Foma Grigor'evich remains within them.¹⁹ In regards to the use of Ukrainian elements, Foma Grigor'evich and Makar Nazarovich are polar opposites: whereas the former uses them without translation or explanation, the latter exploits the Ukrainian material for the sake of exoticism by providing translations, thereby making it easier for the Russian metropolitan audience to process.

Language Ideology at Work: the Editing of *Vechera*

In nineteenth-century Russia, the development of the institution of authorship accompanied the emergence of the institution of editing. The editors usually performed an ideological function, which consisted in the control and dissemination of texts. They typically coalesced with censors in a single apparatus regulating literary production by changing authors' texts and significantly distorting them. Gogol was personally deeply dissatisfied with this practice, and he expressed his indignation²⁰ when Senkovskii published Balzac's novel *Le Père Goriot* [*Father Goriot*, 1835], having completely rewritten the conclusion of it. In fact, Senkovskii's attempt at "correcting" somebody else's texts for publication in his journal *Biblioteka dlia chteniia* [*Library for Reading*] clearly illustrates the common practice of butchering authors' works.

The history of publication and editing of Gogol's *Vechera* serves as a vivid illustration of these tendencies. The first attempt at "correcting" the language of the tales was made about a year prior to

about the position of Lemkivshchyna in the imaginary geography of Harasymowicz's poem. The phrase "wyprawić się za morze" ["to set out beyond the sea"] (136) implies a long and distant journey, but if read literally it also presupposes a vast distance between Lemkivshchyna and the place of destination. The sea, whether understood directly or metaphorically, is a boundary between two worlds—the world of men, in which they search for *the* word, and the world of women, rooks, and birch trees. The latter is a clearly a marginalized and, in a sense, peripheral place. Here the feminine is associated with nature, invoking classical stereotypical distinctions between men and women. Such an arrangement of space returns the reader to the problems surrounding the binary oppositions on which Harasymowicz's representation of gender is constructed. These will be discussed in the next section, but first I will turn to another issue related to the space and performance of gender and identity: namely, the notion of Lemkivshchyna as a contact zone.

The concept of the contact zone, applied by Mary Louise Pratt to colonial encounters, is explained by her as "the space in which peoples geographically and historically separated come into contact with each other and establish ongoing relations, usually involving conditions of coercion, radical inequality, and intractable conflict" (6).⁸ "Jakie to przedwiośnie będzie" presents an encounter of two people who have been separated both geographically and temporally. Their inequality is not, however, related to the colonial order, but to gender roles established by patriarchal culture. This proves that any space—not just a colonial space, as Gayatri Spivak sees it—can be "a complex deployment of gender" (227). Lemkivshchyna is, therefore, a space in which the feminine and the masculine, as well as the internal and the external, the peripheral and the central, come into contact and reveal the inherent tension inscribed in their differences. While these binary oppositions can be multiplied, what is crucial here is the problem of the power they imply and the inequality contained in them. Harasymowicz's contact-zone identities are entirely fixed. In this way, they support the patriarchal apparatus of power, since it connotes rigidity and an unchangeable order, which, according to Homi Bhabha, results in "disorder, degeneracy and daemonic *repetition* [emphasis mine]" (94). The next section will address this issue in detail by analyzing the representation of woman and deconstructing the intrinsic interdependence between this representation and the image of man discussed earlier.

“I gdzieś mnie komuś sprzedano ...”⁹

“Jakie to przedwiośnie będzie” replicates most of the above-mentioned gender clichés. This replication and repetition of stereotypes contributes to the process of constructing the image of woman as contradictory to the image of man.¹⁰ These facets of gender, in turn, put into motion the process of “othering”: defining oneself in distinction to someone else or, in other words, establishing one’s own identity in relation to another identity.

While the performativity of the male persona is based on two verbs of motion, *jechać* [to travel] and *wyprawić się* [to be setting out], the female character’s performativity concludes with the verbs *czekać* [to wait] and *stać* [to stand]. Although she is given the right to speak and, consequently, to perform her identity, the woman’s performativity is based primarily on motionlessness. Her self-representation projects an image of a passive, and almost lethargic, person whose independent acts are limited to waiting for the hero(s), and then to standing by the table. While the man is “crossing the seas,” the woman is being hampered and sold, which is a metaphor for her unwanted and imposed marriage. This subjugation of the female character is depicted not only by the poem’s imagery, which has much in common with scenes of slavery, but it is also reflected in the use of language:

I w ten mój płaszcz włosów
Zawinięto mnie wreszcie całą
Tu nikt nie słucha bożych głosów
I gdzieś mnie komuś sprzedano (135)¹¹

The above stanza employs the passive voice in order to emphasize the enslavement of a forced marriage, for the woman does not do anything: things are being done by others. The passive voice—“zawinięto mnie” [“I was wrapped”] and “sprzedano” [“I was sold”]—is used here not only to present female passivity, but also to conceal the identity of the perpetrators. Who performed the symbolic act of selling the woman into marriage, offering her in return a cupboard of cutlery and a pillow? If we rely on common knowledge of patriarchal societies, the answer is simple: the woman’s father and her husband-to-be most likely agreed on this deal. For, as Luce Irigaray notes in her famous work *This Sex Which is Not One* (1977), “woman is traditionally a use-value for man, an exchange value among men; in other words a commodity” (355).

Despite being presented as a commodity, the woman is credited with sanctity. Her voice is supposedly god-like, whereas her hair, in

their publication as a cycle by Pavel Svin'in, the editor of *Syn otechestva* (*Son of the Fatherland*). The tale “Vecher nakanune Ivana Kupala” appeared in the January 1830 issue of the magazine under a slightly different title: “Bisavriuk, ili Vecher nakanune Ivana Kupala” (“Bisavriuk, or St. John’s Eve”). Svin'in disfigured the tale, having changed the title and “corrected” the oral locutions and Ukrainian dialectical elements that were part of the tale’s artistic design. Trying to avoid such gross editorial intrusions, Gogol decided to collect the tales into a book and in the preface of “Vecher nakanune Ivana Kupala,” he mocked the whole situation.²¹

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

Один из тех господ – нам простым людям мудрено и назвать их – писаки они, не писаки; а вот то самое, что барышники на наших ярмарках. Нахватают, попросят, накрадут всякой всячины, да и выпускают книжечки, не толще букваря, каждый месяц, или неделю. Один из этих господ и выманил у Фомы Григорьевича эту самую историю, а он и вовсе позабыл о ней (I, 99).²²

The very specific details characterize people who acted like profiteers: they swindled somebody else’s stories and then made money on publishing them, and this arrangement sheds light on the relationship between Gogol and Svin'in. A year after the publication in *Syn otechestva*, Gogol published Book One of his tales without Svin'in’s corrections and, until now, this edition remains the only representation of the author’s authentic text—an authenticity not present in any subsequent editions. Gogol was therefore conscious of the editorial practices of Russian publishers and magazine editors and, in a sense, he predicted the fate of his *Vechera*, which he saw significantly distorted after numerous corrections. Already by the second edition the text did not contain as many misspellings and grammatical mistakes, which constituted part of the author’s artistic intention. Both of Pan'ko’s “Predislovie” were especially damaged; his “Afterword,”²³ in which he begged editors for mercy to ignore his misspellings, was discarded *in toto*.

However dissatisfied with such dishonest editorial practices, Gogol changed his own attitude to his texts and began to correct his language and style, mainly by eliminating Ukrainianisms and Russian

colloquialisms. Gogol's letter to Mikhail Maksimovich, in which he advised on how to write for Russian audience, can account for the nature of those changes:

Есть пропасть таких фраз и выражений, оборотов, которые нам, малороссиянам, кажется будут понятны для русских, если мы переведем их слово в слово, но которые иногда уничтожают половину смысла подлинника. Почти всегда сильное лаконическое место становится непонятным на русском, потому что оно не в духе русского языка; и тогда лучше десятью словами определить всю обширность его, нежели скрыть его [...] Помни, что твой перевод для русских, и потому все малорусские обороты и конструкции прочь.²⁴ (X, 311-2)

Two moments in the letter deserve consideration: Gogol's concern with addressing the broader audience in a comprehensible literary language and his belief in the richness of Ukrainian idiomatic expressions that become lost in Russian translation and so should be avoided. This became an urgent task for Gogol and his contemporary editors of *Vechera*: Prokopovich, Shevyriov, and Likhonin, who began to eliminate the bilingualism of the first edition of the tales and standardize it according to established literary norms. The standardization of the language took place in two directions: on the one hand, the peculiar Ukrainian lexicon, grammatical forms, and orthography were replaced with Russian equivalents; and on the other, the ungrammaticalities, misprints, colloquialisms, and vulgarisms of the Russian language were neutralized. In fact, it was the imperial education system itself that prompted Gogol and the editors to adhere to a standard version of the Russian language as the norm, marginalizing all variants as impurities. It is possible to claim that language in *Vechera* became the medium through which a hierarchical structure of power was perpetuated.

When in 1836 Gogol decided to publish the second edition of *Vechera*, he grouped together the tales and the new collection *Mirgorod*, which had a subtitle "Povesti, sluzhashchie prodolzheniem 'Vechev na khutore bliz Dikan'ki'" ("Tales that Are the Sequel of 'Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka'"). In order to emphasize continuity between the two cycles, the writer began to refine his style in *Vechera*. It is important that in the same year, 1836, Gogol was preparing his *Arabeski*

(*Arabesques*) for publication and begged Pushkin to proofread it mercilessly.²⁵ Although it is probable that Gogol remained under the impression of Pushkin's corrections when he decided to correct the style of *Vechera*, it is unlikely that Pushkin or anyone else had a hand in its editing. The corrections were unsystematic; more intensive editing occurred in the text of the "Predislovie" and in the first three tales of Book One. In those texts, the average number of corrections per page was 2.5; in the fourth tale "Propavshaia gramota" ("A lost dispatch")—less than 2; and for Book Two—less than 1.5. Gogol's editing for the second edition of 1836 reflected his conscious striving to make the *skaz* style of his storytellers more vivid, while at the same time standardizing their speech manner in accordance with the norms of Russian. To this end he eliminated some Ukrainianisms and Russian dialectisms, replacing: "пьяненок" with "пьянехонек," "анбар" with "амбар," "полудник" with "полдник," "чудеса деются" — "чудеса делаются," "чего ж вы перепугались" — "чего ж вы испугались," "сткло" — "стекло," etc.

Another attempt to "improve" the tales was made when Gogol launched the first publication of his *Sochineniia* in 1842, in which *Vechera* and *Mirgorod* formed Volume One. Because Gogol did not feel himself competent in Russian to edit his works, he authorized his classmate from Nizhyn Lyceum, Nikolai Prokopovich, to do it, who by that time as a Russian teacher had received the reputation of being an expert in Russian grammar. Delegating to him the enormous rights to correct the language and style of his works for the publication of his *Sochineniia*, Gogol wrote:

При корректуре второго тома прошу тебя действовать как можно самоуправней и полновластней: в Тарасе Бульбе много есть погрешностей писца. Он часто любит букву и; где она не у места, ее там выбрось. В двух-трех местах я заметил плохую грамматику и почти отсутствие смысла. Пожалуйста, поправь везде с такою же свободою, как ты переправляешь тетради своих учеников. Если где частое повторение одного и того же оборота периодов, дай им другой, и никак не сомневайся и не задумывайся, будет ли хорошо — все будет хорошо.²⁶ (XII, 84-5)

Prokopovich really took the writer's advice to correct every mistake.

The only problem was that his definition of mistakes was too broad: he understood his task as correcting not so much Gogol's orthography, grammar, and punctuation, but improving Gogol's overall style. His corrections can be classified as such:

1. elimination of inversions: in "Strashnaia mest'" instead of «...вышел потихоньку из двора промеж спавшими своими козаками в горы» - «...промеж спавшими своими козаками вышел потихоньку из двора в горы»;²⁷
2. insertion of new words whenever Prokopovich thought they were missing (especially in dialogues between characters, which in principal are incomplete sentences);
3. replacement of the ungrammatical, yet very characteristic to the personages' colloquial speech, elements. All ungrammaticalities in the language of Rudy Pan'ko were standardized according to the standard Russian grammar and orthography. Vakula in "Noch' pered Rozhdestvom" tries to speak Russian: "Но Боже мой, от **чево** она так чертовски хороша."²⁸ Prokopovich corrected one word "чево" replacing it with "чего" and the phrase began to sound grammatically perfect, but the effect of deterritorialization had been lost. Similarly, in "Maiskaia noch" ("A Night in May"), a village clerk reads a letter from the district commissioners: "приказываю тебе сей же час [...] **ПОДЧИНИТЬ** мосты на столбовой дороге."²⁹ Prokopovich thought that it was one of Gogol's blunders and replaced it with "починить," (to fix) which is logically fits better, but it neutralizes the clerk's bureaucratic manner of speech;
4. elimination of Ukrainianisms and Gogol's neologisms, which were dubious from the point of view of the linguistic purist: all nouns ending in -ць were replaced with -ц ("голодрабець" - "голодрабец," "оселедець" - "оселедец," "хлопець" - "хлопец"); ending of nouns ("Купалы" - "Купала," "по церкве" - "по церкви"); adverbs and prepositions ("ниначе з неба" - "с неба," "по-над самым провалом" - "над самым провалом," "заплакал что дитя" - "заплакал как дитя").

Moreover, Prokopovich eliminated "ь" in the word "bliz'" in the title, combined the two glossaries of Ukrainian words from Book One and Book Two and placed it at the end of *Mirgorod*, thereby emphasizing the link between two cycles. Because Gogol neither approved nor

disapproved these changes, it can be viewed as a supreme violation of his will as an author. Since Prokopovich's corrections were sanctioned by the author himself, this version of Gogol's text should be acknowledged as the most valid text. However, there is evidence that Gogol was not completely satisfied with Prokopovich's work. In his letter to the editor, the writer obscures his dissatisfaction in self-condemnation:

Издание сочинений моих вышло не в том вполне виде, как я думал, и виною, разумеется, этому я, не распорядившись аккуратнее ... Вкрались ошибки, но, я думаю, они произошли от неправильного оригинала и принадлежат писцу или даже мне. Все, что от издателя, то хорошо, что от типографии – то мерзко. Буквы тоже подлые. Я виноват сильно во всем. Во-первых, виноват тем – ввел тебя в хлопоты, хотя тайный умысел мой был добрый. Мне хотелось пробудить тебя из недвижности и придвинуть к деятельности книжной; но вижу, что еще рано ... (XII, 215-6)³⁰

In all senses, Prokopovich became an editor par excellence, i.e. an Enlightenment figure who claimed authority explicitly or implicitly. The straightforward Enlightenment effect of his editing was to mediate unintelligible, divergent meanings, and translate them for the benefit of readership of the time. In his letter to Gogol dated October 21, 1842, Prokopovich reported about his work: “ I can guarantee the exactness of my correction of which I am proud: I have become a skilled hand (“nabil ruku”) at this enterprise and read two proofs by myself; Belinskii read it one more time after me” (qtd. Shenrok 54) The appearance of Belinskii, who was notorious for his attitude to Ukrainian, in the editing process can account for the high range of corrections: the ratio of them drastically increased in the tales following “Maiskaia noch” and consisted of 3.5 corrections per page. Prokopovich had indeed become a skilled hand at correcting the tales.

In 1850, Gogol initiated a new collection of his works in five volumes and contracted Stepan Shevyrev for its publication. Shevyrev, as a Slavophile and a professor of Russian literature, was very concerned with polishing Gogol's Russian and convinced the writer to hire Mikhail Likhonin, a colleague from the journal *Muscovite*, for the position of the editor. Presumably, Likhonin was assigned to the position because of his excellent knowledge of Russian; he already

published his textbooks *Russkaia grammatika dlia pervonachal'nogo obucheniia dlia russkikh* [*Russian grammar for Primary Russian Instruction*; 1839] and the article “O pravopisanii inostrannykh sobstvennykh imen” [“On the Orthography of Foreign Proper Names”] in *Moskovitianin* (*The Moscovite*) in 1849. Technically, Likhonin played the same role that Prokopovich played in the first publication of Gogol’s *Sochineniia* (1842).

This time, Gogol wanted to correct the proofs with his own hand and was working on them at the time of his death in February, 1852. He managed to proofread the first nine sheets of the first volume (up to the middle of “Noch' pered Rozhdestvom”), the first nine sheets of the second volume (up to the middle of *Taras Bul'ba*), the first thirteen sheets of the third volume (up to *Zapiski sumashedsbego* [*Madman's Notes*]), and the first seven sheets of the fourth volume (up to *Revizor* [*Inspector General*]). Since Gogol’s corrections were not systematic, one cannot claim that the edited texts became the new versions of the Gogol’s works. Because Gogol was unable to finish his proofreading, it is hard to determine how much damage was done by Likhonin. Taking into account that Gogol did not authorize the final correction of Book Two and that he made his own corrections of Book One in addition to Prokopovich’s, it can be said that all these were layered on top of each other, with Gogol’s text as a palimpsest. Despite the fact that beginning with Nikolai Tikhonravov, who aimed to rectify Gogol’s text by removing Prokopovich’s corrections, and Nikolai Korobka, who continued this task in the end of the nineteenth century, the text of *Vechera* nowadays does not coincide with the text of the first edition and the only way to rectify the situation is to reprint the very first edition of the tales.³¹ It is important to do so not only because the integrity of the author’s work needs to be maintained, but because the reprint of *Vechera* could also shed light on Gogol’s hybrid language and identity. Nowadays, all editions, including the last one initiated by the Academy of Sciences of Russia, do not reproduce Gogol’s idiosyncratic Russian orthography. The Ukrainian elements appear in the text either in modernized Russian or, as in editions popular with scholars, transliterated in Ukrainian with adherence to modern Ukrainian orthography. I believe Gogol’s language can be neither transliterated in Russian, nor translated into Ukrainian because of its hybrid nature.

Conclusion

The history of Gogol's reworkings and the collective editing of the text of *Vechera* vividly demonstrate the writer's persistent striving to be comprehensible to the broad Russian reading audience, on the one hand, and to manifest his hybrid national identity by preserving the "impure" Russian language, on the other. The "improvement" of Gogol's Russian language over the 1830s and 40s inevitably involved the self-translation of his identity, or his "discursive assimilation," to a new linguistic and cultural community. In a sense, Gogol's identity became a form of "doing:" i.e. a local construction that occurred in a particular community of practice. Striving to acquire standard Russian, Gogol at the same time did not entirely abandon the speech of his childhood. Moreover, by appropriating the imperial language, its discursive forms, and its modes of representation, Gogol was able to intervene more readily into the dominant discourse and to interpolate his own cultural realities. Insofar as Russian society at the beginning of the nineteenth century was repressing linguistic diversity, the minorities of the Russian Empire who did not speak the standard Russian were subject to symbolic domination.³² Under the hegemonic ideology of homogenization, Gogol became subject to the "symbolic violence" of monolingual standardization, and his integration into the standard linguistic community naturally involved the monolingualization of his literary language.

There is a strong belief among Russian Gogol scholars that after the publication of *Vechera* and *Mirgorod*, when Gogol eliminated the Ukrainian elements from his literary language, that the quality of his Russian improved drastically in a short span of time. Not only being an overt simplification, this statement is also used as a main argument in discussions of Gogol's belonging exclusively to the Russian culture. The changes in Gogol's literary language throughout his career have never been studied, but even a passing glance at the texts of *Mertnye dusbi* and *Vybrannye mesta iz perepiski s druž'iami* provides information to debunk the idea of the purity of Gogol's Russian language.³³ Not only had Gogol overcome the "impurity" of his bilingual mind by the 1840s, but his quest for the appropriate language in which he could address the entire Russian nation was indeed a continual process of de- and reterritorialization.³⁴ The history of the editing of Gogol's *Vechera* vividly demonstrates these processes: deterritorialization occurs in his non-standard, sometimes ungrammatical use of Russian; however, it is immediately followed by reterritorialization centered on the

normative use of Russian. Gogol's odd usage of the Russian language lies not only in creating ungrammatical forms and neologisms, but also in his complicated (compared to, for example, Pushkin's laconic verbal one) syntax—a syntax based on the multiplication of adjectives and abuse of the pronominal. These innovative, yet strange, linguistic usages (or “tensors” as Deleuze and Guattari refer to them) open new possibilities for language play that are not available in major languages. In *Vechera*, Gogol does not so much challenge and subvert the dominant discourse, as much as he distances himself from his St. Petersburg territoriality. In doing so, Gogol created a minor literature that signaled the undecipherable quality of becoming Ukrainian and becoming Russian, while never providing readers with a sense that these terms denoted a finite territorial belonging. Positioned on the interstices of two cultures, Gogol's *Vechera* opens up the *in-between* space of cultural ambivalence and dilutes the imaginary essence of the Russian nation through a distorted Russian language.

Notes

1. More information on Gogol's dual national identity can be found in Zviniatskovskii.
2. Pushkin, for example, wrote in his letter to A. Voeikov in August 1831 that Gogol's tales “amazed” (*izumili*) him.
3. [“I have been printing [my works] for 16 years already and critics have found only five grammatical mistakes in my poems (and they were right); I have always been grateful to them and have always corrected the marked mistake. I write much worse in prose, and speak even worse, almost as bad as Gogol writes. All translations are mine, unless otherwise noted.”]
4. [“We were so grateful to the young author that gladly forgave him his uneven and inaccurate language.”]
5. For a discussion of Gogol's bilingualism, see Barabash. See also Mandelshtam's analysis of the interference of the Ukrainian grammar into Gogol's Russian.
6. See, for example, Karpiuk.
7. Here is an excerpt from Afanasii Gogol's comedy “Roman i Paraska” rendered by Panteleimon Kulish and transliterated by him in Russian:
 «Действие происходит в малороссийской хате, убогой, но чистенькой. Параска сидит у печи и прядет. Входит мужик, хорошо одетый, и говорит:
 - Здорова була, кумо! А кум де?
 Параска. – На печи.

Кум. – Упять на печи? Або, може, и не злазывает сёгодня?

Тут между кумом и кумою происходит секретный разговор. Она выпрашивает у него зайца, чтоб подурочить мужа и выжить его на время из хаты. Кум замечает ей: «Ты, кумо, у лыха граеш», однако ж отдаёт ей свою добычу.

Когда гость удалился, Параска обращается к мужу с увещаниями:

- Ты б такы пишов хочь зайця пыймав, щоб мы оскоромылись хочь заячиною.

Роман (громко с печи). – Чим я ёго буду ловыть? У мене чортыма ни собаки, ни рушниці.

Параска. – Кум поросям зайця ловыть; а наше коване таке прудке!

Роман (радно). – То-то й е! Я дывлюсь, а воно так швидко побигло до корыта!

Параска. – От бачиш! Уставай лыш та убирайся.

Роман. – Треба ж поснидаты.

Параска. – Ты знаешь, що у нас ничего нема. Я зроблю хыба росольцо та накрыву сухарив; ты и попонсы.» (qtd. Kulish 95-6)

8. More information on Gogol's mistakes in his early correspondence can be found in Tikhonravov's article "Zametki o slovare, sostavlennom Gogolem", pp. 197-8.
9. It is important to pinpoint the differences in the orthographical principles of Russian and Ukrainian. Russian orthography, quite phonemic in practice, is based mostly on morphological (the spelling of prefixes; suffixes and endings vary significantly from their pronunciation) and grammatical (it specifies conventional orthographic forms to mark grammatical distinctions, gender, and participles vs. adjectives) principles, rather than on phonetic one. Ukrainian orthography, however, is phonemic (all morphemes are written as they are pronounced in isolation, without vowel reduction) and morphemic, although some historical forms unrelated to its phonemic and morphemic structures have been retained.
10. ["I'll tell you about the time the witches played Jackass with my old grand father (80)."] All English translations from Gogol's *Večera na khotore bliz Dikan'ki* are quoted from *N.V. Gogol Village Evenings near Dikan'ka and Mirgorod*. Trans. and Ed. Christopher English. NY: Oxford UP, 1994.
11. ["I've got myself a pipe, but damn-all to light it with (86)."]
12. ["Look, look, Mama is jumping about like a looney! (90)."]
13. ["Damn the lying Russian dog who printed it – I spit in his face! He hasn't a scrap of wit in his head! Listen and I'll tell you the real story now (35)."]
14. ["Foma Grigorievich! Foma Grigorievich! Do tell us one of your scary stories about the old days! Go on! Tell us, please! ..." (80).]
15. Rudy Pan'ko mocks Makar Nazarovich's incompetence in the proper method of pickling apples. Unlike everyone present at Pan'ko's party,

Makar Nazarovich insists on a certain grass to be added to the brine. His idea sounds so ridiculous that Pan'ko discourages him from spreading it in order to not make a complete fool of himself.

16. ["Merciful Lord, the things they have at that market! Wheels, glass, tar, tobacco, straps, onions, all sorts of wares ... and even if you had as much as thirty rubles in your pocket you wouldn't be able to buy up the whole of it (12)."]
17. ["The other gypsy, grumbling away to himself, rose to his feet, struck two bright showers of sparks, pursed his lips to blow on the tinder, and brandishing a rough-and-ready lamp, the usual form of illumination in Little Russia, consisting of a potsherd filled with melted mutton fat, set off on his way" (26).]
18. ["At the village council, or rural assembly, where his power is limited to a couple of votes, the headman somehow always gets the upper hand and sends out whomever he wants to do jobs like leveling roads or digging ditches" (59).]
19. In the speech of Foma Grigor'evich there are very few vernacular elements (like "кажись," "тузить," "турнуть") and ungrammatical forms (like "куды" instead of "куда," "за нелюбого ляха" instead of "за нелюбимого ляха").
20. See Gogol's letter to M. Pogodin from January 11, 1834.
21. Foma Grigor'evich asks Pan'ko whose story he is reading: "- Постоите! Наперед скажите мне, что это вы читаете? ... - Как что читаю, Фома Григорьевич? Вашу быль, ваши собственные слова ... - Плюйте ж на голову тому, кто это напечатал! *Бреши, сучий Москаль!*" (I, 99). ["Wait! Tell me first what it is you're reading?... 'What I'm reading? Why, Foma Grigorievich, it's your story, your own words.' ... 'Damn the lying Russian dog who printed it—I spit in his face!'" (35).]
22. ["Once one of those gentry types—it's hard for us simple folk to know what to call them—they may know how to push a pen, but they're no better than the horse-traders at our markets. They snatch, beg, and steal whatever they can, and produce little books no bigger than an ABC book every month or even week—well, one of those gents wheedled this story out of Foma Grigorievich, who went and forgot all about it" (35).]
23. ["Please don't take it amiss, good sirs, if there are more mistakes in this little book than there are grey hairs on my old head. What can I do? I've never had much to do with book-learning and the like before ... See how many misprints I've found! All I ask, if you find any of them, is that you pay no attention, and read them as if they were spelt correctly" (216).]
24. ["There are loads of phrases, idioms and expressions which we, Little Russians, think will be clear for Russians, if we translate them literally, but which sometimes destroy half of the original. Almost always a strong laconic passage becomes unclear in Russian because it is not in

- the spirit of the Russian language; in this case it is better to express it [the Ukrainian word] with ten words, than to conceal it ... Remember that your translation is intended for Russians and therefore all Little Russian idioms and phrases off.”]
25. “Do not stop yourself from indignation when you see mistakes,” wrote Gogol to Pushkin in his letter from January 22, 1835 (X, 348).
 26. [“While correcting the second volume, I beg you to do it as brutally and autocratically as you can: in *Taras Bul’ba*, there are many mistakes that a copyist had made. He likes letter ‘i’; get rid off it wherever it is misplaced. In two or three places I have noticed bad grammar and almost the complete absence of sense. Please, correct everywhere with as much freedom as when you are correcting the notes of your students. If there is a repetition of the same expression, find another one, and do not doubt or think about it whether it will be good—everything will be good.”]
 27. [“Danilo...walked quietly out of the yard, stepping between sleeping Cossacks, and made for the hills” – [stepping between sleeping Cossacks [Danilo] walked quietly out of the yard and made for the hills.”]
 28. [“Oh my God, why does she have to be so devilish pretty?”]
 29. [“... I forthwith direct you ... to subjugate the bridges on the highway ...”]
 30. [“The publication of my works came out not as I intended them to be, and I am the only one who should be blamed, because I did not gave accurate orders ... Some misprints have crept into the text, but I think they were because of the bad original and belonged to the copyist, or even to me. Everything that came from the publisher is good, everything from the typography—bad. Letters are also mean. I am so guilty in everything. First of all, I gave you so much trouble, although I meant well. I wanted to awaken you from immobility and get you involved in the book printing; but now I see it was too early ...”]
 31. On the necessity to publish the initial text of *Vechera*, see Motorin
 32. For more on this, see Bourdieu.
 33. In the texts of these Gogol works, the Ukrainian elements penetrate not only the Russian lexicon (“прислужиться,” “куды,” “завгодно,” “досягнул,” “накласть,” “мармор,” “схватился со стула,” etc.) but also its grammar (“послать по художнику”).
 34. In Deleuze and Guattari’s theory of Kafka as a “minor” writer (1986), de-territorialization and re-territorialization figure prominently in tandem with the concepts of “decoding” and “recoding.” Territory, in the ethological sense, is created through the process of de-territorialization, whereby milieu components are detached and given greater autonomy, and re-territorialization, through which these components receive new functions within the newly created territory. The scholars describe the liminal status of the “minor” writer as one who uses the language of a

dominant culture or class but “de-territorializes” that majority language in a politically enabling and subversive manner. “Minor” writer, writing in a “major” language, can defamiliarize that language by allowing the “minor” language—particularly its grammatical categories—to infiltrate the syntax of the “major” language, allowing “one function” to be played off against the other in order that “all the degrees of territoriality and relative de-territorialization” may be “played out” (26). According to this reasoning, the “minority” language therefore “inhabits” or “occupies” the dominant language, undermining any sense of univocal authority. Deleuze and Guattari emphasize that in using these disruptive linguistic techniques, the “minor” writer’s objective is to shift the parameter of meaning in a political act which serves to represent the interests of the writer’s regional culture.

Works Cited

- Barabash, Iu. *Pochva i sud'ba: Gogol' i ukrainskaia literatura u istokov*. Moscow: Nasledie, 1995.
- Bojanowska, E. *Nikolai Gogol: Between Ukrainian and Russian Nationalism*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2007.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power: the Economy of Linguistic Exchanges*. Ed. John B. Thompson. Trans. Gino Raymond & Matthew Adamson. Cambridge: Polity, in association with Basil Blackwell, 1991.
- Chaplenko, V. *Ukrainizmy v movi Hobolia. Slavistika. Part 2 (I-X)*. Augsburg: Ukrains'ka Vil'na Akademiia Nauk, 1948.
- Dal', V. Letter to M.P. Pogodin, April 1842. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* 58 (1952): 617.
- Deleuze, G. and F. Guattari. “What is a Minor Literature.” *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*. Trans D. Polan. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1986: 16-27.
- Gogol', N.V. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem: v 23 tomakh*. Vol. 1. Moskva: Nauka IMLI RAN, 2003.
- . *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii: v 14 tomakh*. Moskva: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1937-1952.
- . *Vechera na khutore bliz' Dikan'ki: povesti / Pervaia knizhka*. St-Petersburg: Tip. Dep. Narod. Prosvieshcheniia, 1831-1832.
- . *Village Evenings near Dikan'ka and Mirgorod*. Trans. and ed. Christopher English. Intro. Richard Peace. Oxford; New York: Oxford UP, 1994.
- . *Vybrannye mesta iz perepiski s druz'iami*. Sobranie sochinenii v 9-ti tomakh. Vol. 5. Moscow: Russkaia kniga, 1994.
- Karpuk, Paul A. “Gogol’s Research on Ukrainian Customs for the “Dikan'ka” tales.” *The Russian Review* 56 (1997): 209-232.

- Koropec'kyj, R. and Robert Romanchuk. "Ukraine in Blackface: Performance and Representation in Gogol's 'Dikan'ka Tales,' Book 1." *Slavic Review* 62 (2003): 525-47.
- Kulish, P.A. *Zapiski o zhizni Nikolaia Vasil'evicha Gogolia*. V 2-kh tomakh. Moskva: IMLI RAN, 2003.
- Mandel'shtam, I. *O kharaktere gogolenskogo stilja*. Gel'singfors: Tip. Guvudstadobladet, 1902.
- Motorin, A. "K voprosu o nauchnom izdanii sochinenii Gogolia." *N.V. Gogol' i russkaia literatura XIX veka*. Leningrad: Leningradskii gos. pedagog. in-t im. A.I. Gertsena, 1989: 103-121.
- Pushkin, A.S. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v desiaty tomakh*. Leningrad: Nauka, 1977-1979.
- Shenrok, V.I. *Materialy dlia biografii Gogolia v 4-kh tomakh*. Vol. 4. Moskva: Tipografia G.Lissner and A.Geshel', 1897.
- Tikhonravov, N. "Zametki o slovare, sostavlennom Gogolem." *Sbornik Obshchestva ljubitelei Rossijskoi slovesnosti na 1891 g.* Moskva: Tipo-lit. I.N. Kushnerev, 1891: 196-208.
- Vinogradov, V. V. *The History of Russian Literary Language from the Seventeenth Century to the Nineteenth*. Condensed Adaptation into English. Intro. Lawrence L. Thomas. Madison: The U of Wisconsin P, 1969.
- Zviniatskovskii, V. *Nikolai Gogol: Tainy natsional'noi dusi*. Kiev: Likei, 1994.