

Niprò

RIVISTA DI STUDI UCRAINI

4/2025

DIRETTORE

Oleg Rumyantsev (Università degli Studi di Palermo)

COMITATO DI REDAZIONE

Alessandro Achilli (Università degli Studi di Cagliari)
Maria Grazia Bartolini (Università degli Studi di Milano)
Simone Bellezza (Università del Piemonte Orientale)
Giovanna Brogi (Università degli Studi di Milano)
Liana Goletiani (Università degli Studi di Bergamo)
Francesco Guida (Università degli Studi Roma Tre)
Giulia Lami (Università degli Studi di Milano)
Tamara Mykhaylyak (Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II)
Laura Orazi (studiosa indipendente)
Oxana Pachlovska (Università degli Studi La Sapienza)
Olena Ponomareva (Sapienza Università di Roma)
Marco Puleri (Università degli Studi di Bologna)
Giovanna Siedina (Università degli Studi di Firenze)
Massimo Tria (Università degli Studi di Cagliari)
Olga Trukhanova (Sapienza Università di Roma)

CONTATTI

nipro.rivista@gmail.com

WEBSITE:

PALERMO UNIVERSITY PRESS

<https://unipapress.com/categoria-prodotto/unipapress/riviste/rivista-di-studi-ucraini/>

ASSOCIAZIONE ITALIANA DI STUDI UCRAINI

https://aisu.it/nipro_presentazione/

EDITORE

New Digital Frontiers S.r.L

Piazza Marina 29/34

90145 – Palermo

Cell. (+39)3349828155

ndfedizioni@gmail.com

newdigitalfrontiers@pec.it

<https://unipapress.com/>

ARTWORK COPERTINA:

Illia Razdelskyi

ISSN 2974-6531

ISBN 978-88-5509-815-1



Quest'opera è distribuita con Licenza

[Creative Commons Attribuzione - Non commerciale - Non opere derivate 4.0 Internazionale](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

Questo numero è stato finanziato dal

Dipartimento di Scienze Umanistiche dell'Università degli Studi di Palermo

Oleh S. Ilnytskyj. *Nikolai Gogol. Ukrainian Writer in the Empire. A Study in Identity*, Berlin-Boston, de Gruyter, 2024, 193 pp., € 109,95.

Nikolai Gogol (ukr. Mykola Hohol) has remained a riddle – for his Russian audience, for the scholars in Slavic studies, and ultimately for himself. In the recent years, important books have shed a new light on the much debated problem of Gogol’s national identity. Most prominently, Edyta Bojanowska and Yuliya Illchuk focused on Gogol’s Ukrainian-Russian identity that was in their view either “hyphenated” or “hybrid”. In his new book, Oleh Ilnytskyj challenges both interpretations and states bluntly: Gogol was “a Ukrainian writer who was appropriated from within an Imperial culture by a Russian nationalist discourse” (170). Ilnytskyj goes as far as to contend that Gogol “boldly challenged taboos concerning Ukraine’s potential for independent statehood, refusing to perpetrate the clichés about the fraternal union between Ukraine and Russia” (169).

Before coming to this conclusion, Ilnytskyj carefully examines both literary and biographical texts that support his view of a genuinely Ukrainian Gogol. First, he describes Gogol's biography against the backdrop of Russian national history in the first half 19th century. Ilnytskyj highlights the frail status of the Russian national project at the time. Unlike the largely self-sufficient Ukrainian national project, the Russian national project forced the other East Slavic nations both politically and ideologically into its statehood. Ilnytskyj points to the fact that the Russian national project was only possible in the framework of an "Imperial culture" (15). As a consequence, Gogol who came in 1828 from Ukraine to St. Petersburg produced his works not in the system of a Russian national literature but in a "fluid multiethnic economy of texts" (26). In his discussion of Gogol's most popular works *The Government Inspector* and *Dead Souls* Ilnytskyj maintains that Gogol failed to provide a "sympathetic portrayal of ethnic Russia", not because – as Bojanowska argues – he was incapable of doing so, but based on "a conscious decision informed by Gogol's Ukrainian nationalism" (35).

Ilnytskyj gives an excellent overview over the Russian and the Ukrainian responses to Gogol's early prose that did not indicate the real author's name but heralded the name of the fictional story teller Rudyi Panko. The Russian critics praised the *Dikanka*-stories as a true expression of the Ukrainian people and a stylistic masterpiece, but claimed that this innovative prose was certainly part of Russian literature (41, 51). Ukrainian critics hailed the new author as a forerunner of a coming "Ukrainian Walter Scott" (43).

The heart piece of Ilnytskyj's argument is the rebuttal of two "false narratives": first, that Gogol was a Russian writer, and second, that the late Gogol – especially in the second version of *Taras Bulba* – eventually embraced Russian imperial nationalism. Ilnytskyj reconstructs in great detail how Russian critics such as Vissarion Belinskii and Konstantin Aksakov appropriated Gogol for mainstream Russian literature. One of the main obstacles for Ilnytskyj's interpretation is, however, Gogol's famous self-description in a letter to Anna Smirnova from 1844. The writer candidly states that he does not know "what kind of soul" he has: "a Russian or a Ukrainian (khokhlatskaia)" one (79). Ilnytskyj holds that Gogol's answer to Smirnova was a "delicate balancing act that preserved his integrity while mollifying Russians" (81). Certainly, Ilnytskyj is right to challenge the simplistic notion that Gogol was a Russian writer. However, he completely downplays the important aspect of Gogol's own literary ambitions. Gogol came to St. Petersburg to embark on a career as a writer for the reading public in the Russian empire. His debut, the poem "Ganz Kiukhel'garten", was clearly modelled on the dominant Romantic fashion. However, this work was – quite adequately – perceived as epigonal and received negative reviews. Only after this failure, Gogol turned to Ukrainian topics and a Ukrainianized Russian prose style. In fact, he managed to establish a Ukrainian model, the "kotliarevshchyna", in the Russian literary system of his time. Ivan Kotliarevskyj's *Eneida* was published in 1798 in St. Petersburg but failed to attract the attention of the Russian reading public. Distancing himself from Kotliarevskyj, Gogol changed two elements: he shifted the genre from poetry to prose and he wrote in a Ukrainianized Russian instead of Ukrainian. Gogol's use of the Russian language is the result of a clever marketing strategy. Gogol knew exactly that he eventually would share the bitter literary fate of Ivan Kotliarevskyj if he would not opt for a consequent use of the Russian language or that of Ievhen Hrebinka if he would not introduce the Ukrainian topic into his texts. In a sense, Gogol can be likened to Joseph Conrad: As a prose writer, Józef Teodor Konrad Korzeniowski could have embarked on a Polish language literature career. But Conrad intentionally targeted the English language book market that promised much broader opportunities. However, as Zdzisław Najder has shown in many publications, Joseph Conrad hid the Polish topic in many of his novels, most notably in *Lord Jim*, where the protagonist jumps his ship "Patna" (which can be read with a slight typographical alteration as "Patria"). The Polish prose writer Eliza Orzeszkowa publicly scolded Joseph Conrad for his betrayal of the endangered Polish literature in her article "The Emigration of Talent" (1899).

Ilnytskyj criticizes in great detail the "false narrative" of a "russified" second version of *Taras Bulba*. He directs his argument against traditional interpretations by Simon Karlinsky, Robert Maguire, Michel Aucouturier or Edyta Bojanowska who claim that Gogol "glorified Russian nationalism" in the reworked version of *Taras Bulba*. Gogol produced two versions of *Taras Bulba*, a shorter one in 1835

and an extended one in 1842. Famously, the second version includes Taras Bulba's final speech to his cossack comrades before he dies at the hands of his Polish enemies: "A time will come, when you will learn what the Russian Orthodox faith can do! Even now, nations far and near sense that our own Tsar is rising from the Russian lands, and there will be no power on earth that will not submit to him!" (145) A superficial reading will quickly come to the conclusion that Gogol hails here the Russian autocracy of his own time in a historical allegory. Ilnytzkyj convincingly argues that Gogol's use of the word "russkij" should not be translated as "Russian" but as "Rus'ian", i.e. belonging to the Ukrainian Rus'. From such a viewpoint, Bulba's announcement of an "own Tsar" acquires an entirely different meaning. Ilnytzkyj draws attention to the Ukrainophile *Istoriia Rusov* that addressed the Kievan princes as "Tsars" (151). Gogol knew the *Istoriia Rusov* well and based his historical views of Ukraine on this narrative. "Our own Tsar" would then refer to a future Ukrainian ruler in the tradition of the Kyivan princes.

Ilnytzkyj's innovative and text-based hermeneutical approach yields important and valid results. However, he seems to downplay the most important insight of his own interpretation by insisting overly on Gogol's exclusive Ukrainian identity. Ilnytzkyj comes closest to Gogol's literary strategy in the following sentence: "When it came to Taras Bulba, Gogol could be confident that Russians would understand the novel in accordance with their own self-centered ideas and prejudices – and miss his real message." (156f.) Here, Ilnytzkyj commits a logical error. If Gogol's "real message" was the claim for an independent Ukrainian statehood, why would he disguise his message so thoroughly that it would not be understood anymore by the readership at large? The truth is probably not a question of "identity", but of "strategy": Gogol knew exactly that his Russian audience would perceive the new ending of *Taras Bulba* as a declaration of loyalty to the Russian autocracy and to the existing social order. It is Ilnytzkyj's great merit to detect this subversive undercurrent in the second version of *Taras Bulba*. However, he tends to overstate Gogol's allegiance to the Ukrainian national project and to understate the overwhelming significance of Gogol's religious asceticism that eventually led to his self-inflicted death.

Ulrich Schmid
(St. Gallen)