NARRATING THE NATIONAL FUTURE: THE COSSACKS IN UKRAINIAN AND RUSSIAN ROMANTIC LITERATURE

by

ANNA KOVALCHUK

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Department of Comparative Literature
and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

June 2017

DISSERTATION APPROVAL PAGE

Student: Anna Kovalchuk

Title: Narrating the National Future: The Cossacks in Ukrainian and Russian Romantic Literature

This dissertation has been accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in the Department of Comparative Literature by:

Katya Hokanson	Chairperson
Michael Allan	Core Member
Serhii Plokhii	Core Member
Jenifer Presto	Core Member
Julie Hessler	Institutional Representative

and

Scott L. Pratt	Dean of the Graduate School

Original approval signatures are on file with the University of Oregon Graduate School.

Degree awarded June 2017

DISSERTATION ABSTRACT

Anna Kovalchuk

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Comparative Literature

June 2017

Title: Narrating the National Future: The Cossacks in Ukrainian and Russian Romantic Literature

This dissertation investigates nineteenth-century narrative representations of the Cossacks—multi-ethnic warrior communities from the historical borderlands of empire, known for military strength, pillage, and revelry—as contested historical figures in modern identity politics. Rather than projecting today's political borders into the past and proceeding from the claim that the Cossacks are either Russian or Ukrainian, this comparative project analyzes the nineteenth-century narratives that transform pre-national Cossack history into national patrimony. Following the Romantic era debates about national identity in the Russian empire, during which the Cossacks become part of both Ukrainian and Russian national self-definition, this dissertation focuses on the role of historical narrative in these burgeoning political projects. Drawing on Alexander Pushkin's *Poltava* (1828), Nikolai Gogol's *Taras Bulba* (1835, 1842), and Taras Shevchenko's *Haidamaky* (1842), this dissertation traces the relationship between Cossack history, the poet-historian, and possible national futures in Ukrainian and Russian Romantic literature. In the age of empire, these literary representations shaped the emerging Ukrainian and Russian nations, conceptualized national belonging in terms of the domestic family unit, and reimagined the genealogical relationship between

Ukrainian and Russian history. Uniting the national "we" in its readership, these Romantic texts prioritize the poet-historian's creative, generative power and their ability to discover, legitimate, and project the nation into the future. This framework shifts the focus away from the political nation-state to emphasize the unifying power of shared narrative history and the figurative, future-oriented, and narrative genesis of national imaginaries.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF AUTHOR: Anna Kovalchuk

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

University of Oregon, Eugene
University of California, San Diego

DEGREES AWARDED:

Doctor of Philosophy, 2017, University of Oregon
Bachelor of Arts, Literature, 2007, University of California, San Diego
Bachelor of Arts, International Studies, 2007, University of California, San Diego

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST:

Ukrainian and Russian Literature
Cossack Literature, History and Myth
Empire and Nation
Nationalism and Narrative
World Literature and Postcolonial Literature

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Instructor of Comparative Literature, University of Oregon, 2013-2017

Instructor of English Composition, University of Oregon, 2012-2015

GRANTS, AWARDS, AND HONORS:

Dissertation Fellowship, Oregon Humanities Center, 2016

Russian Language Teachers Program, American Councils, Russian State Pedagogical University, St. Petersburg, Russia, 2015

STARTALK Summer Institute, Middlebury Russian School, 2014

NEH Summer Seminar, "The Late Ottoman and Russian Empires: Citizenship, Belonging, and Difference," George Washington University, 2014

The Theodosius and Irene Senkowsky Prize for Demonstrated Achievement in Ukrainian Studies, Harvard University Ukrainian Research Institute, 2011

Summer Writing Fellowship, University of Oregon, 2011

Beall Educational Opportunity Award, University of Oregon, 2010, 2014, 2015, 2016

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am especially grateful to the director of my dissertation, Katya Hokanson, for the years of conversations, feedback, support and collegiality that have made this project possible and often enjoyable. I feel deeply honored to have benefited from the generosity and mentorship of all my committee members. I would like to thank Michael Allan, for the term id exams and for always questioning the stakes of reading, and Jenifer Presto, whose perspicacious readings bring clarity. I would also like to thank Julie Hessler for her excellent questions and Serhii Plokhii, whose prolific scholarship and kindness continues to inspire. The project has benefitted from the comments and questions of the panels and audiences at the American Comparative Literature Association at Harvard University, the Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies at Washington, DC, the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and Eastern European Languages at Vancouver, BC, Austin, TX, and San Francisco, CA as well as those at the University of Oregon. All errors that remain are my own. I would also like to thank the Oregon Humanities Center for their invaluable support of this research.

I am deeply indebted to my past and present professors, colleagues, and friends, especially those in the Department of Comparative Literature and especially Rachel Eccleston, whose friendship made every step of the way better. I owe my sanity to my husband Chris, whose perspective, love, and support always reminds me what is truly meaningful. Words fail me in thanking my parents, who brought me here and to whom I owe everything.

For my family

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In 1995, a thought-provoking discussion in *Slavic Review* began with Mark von Hagen's essay, "Does Ukraine Have a History?"[1] Von Hagen defines history as "a written record of [an] experienced past that commands some widespread acceptance and authority in the international scholarly and political communities" (658). Due to a lack of statehood in the nineteenth century, the essay explains that Ukraine and other central and eastern European states are "suspect candidates in the international order" and "have been denied full historiographical legitimacy" in the twentieth century (659-60). While arguing that no, Ukraine does not have a history, von Hagen understands Ukraine's historiographical weakness as a strength "precisely because it challenges so many of the clichés of the nation-state paradigm" (673). While von Hagen's article and the response essays focus on the twentieth century, another rich context for this debate can be found amidst the shifting imperial borders and emerging national narratives of the early nineteenth-century Romantic era. Though the nation-state dominates our contemporary understanding of borders, histories, and literatures, the concept of the nation is relatively modern and gained currency in the late eighteenth century amidst the declining legitimacy of autocratic and dynastic frameworks of power.[2] While military might and imperial expansion legitimated civilizations in the eighteenth century, the post-Napoleonic world also required proof of national uniqueness and autonomous historical development made visible in literary language and narrative history. This dissertation focuses on the intertwined and overlapping development of national, historical, and

literary narratives in the early nineteenth-century Russian empire and situates the ongoing debates about Ukrainian history within a global story of national and narrative discovery.

The nation's relative modernity and its concomitant claims to antiquity evidence the importance of history to past and present nationalisms.[3] Via a simultaneous discovery of the past, legitimation of the present, and projection into the future, national narratives give form to and transform the past and future possibilities of the communities they represent. In the early nineteenth century, the distinction between historical and literary narratives was itself being debated, and the Romantics understood the poet-historian as vital to the discovery or rediscovery of native histories and national subjects.[4] Against the empirical historicism dominant in the eighteenth century, the Romantic poet-historian focused on the common people, their history, and their language and claimed that the people, not the state, formed the national core and determined its historical destiny. In conceptualizing the relationship between peoples and states, between vernaculars and language of power, between filiation and affiliation, the Romantics prioritized poetic synthesis over historical chronology and argued that narrative and the poetic voice were the means to unite and give form to the generic heterogeneity and the multi-ethnic imperial populations of the day. This dissertation considers the relationship between the national and the textual body and demonstrates that literary-historical narratives are vital to legitimizing the national family—or the state and its relationship to the nation.

In the multi-ethnic Russian empire, the question of internationally-recognized history became one of national historical uniqueness in the post-Napoleonic era. Vissarion Belinsky declared that "Our age—is a historical age par excellence" (Век наш—по преимуществу исторический век), and an obsession with history dominated

the discourse of the day.[5] As Enlightenment preoccupations with universal principles gave way to concerns about national uniqueness and historical legitimation, Russian national consciousness developed under the shadow of an imitative cultural heritage. Within the emerging discourse of Romantic nationalism, the Petrine reforms and the imitative nature of Russian classicism were debated as literary, historical, and political problems. Peter's foreign importations and dramatic transformations, as well as the resulting schism between the common person and the elite, were difficult to reconcile with the German Romantic focus on vernacular language, folk culture, and native narrative history.

Nikolai Karamzin's twelve-volume *History of the Russian State* (1818-1826), the first narrative history written in Russian for Russians, spoke to these concerns and paradoxically naturalized Peter's imperial reforms and foreign importations in Russian historiography as emblematic of a natural autocratic tradition. Against the terror, chaos, and revolution that shook Europe during the post-Napoleonic reaction, autocracy and orthodoxy strengthened their status as Russian institutions, and while Karamzin argued that the people's fervent love unites them with the autocratic framework that guarantees their national development, the continued attempt to bridge the gap between the Russian people and the Russian state was to reach its apogee in Nicholas I and Sergei Uvarov's policy of Official Nationality (1833). Uvarov, echoing the argument already found in Karamzin's *History* and Pushkin's narrative poem *Poltava*, frames the Petrine reforms and the imperial, autocratic state as the preconditions of possibility for national development and reasserts the primacy of the state within a Romantic framework of national identity. In this framework, the national family is modeled on the domestic

family and while the nation forms the basis for civil society, it is the state, as the embodiment of sacred power, that makes possible both history and the fulfillment of national destiny.

The search for the Russian national self within the multi-ethnic Russian empire of the early nineteenth century shifts our attention to the role of narrative in legitimizing the state and uniting the national body. Russian national self-definition—or the question of Russian *narodnost'*—was both a political and a literary debate and the discussion often focused on the peoples and nationalities of the empire's multi-ethnic and expanding borderlands.[6] The Russian imperial-national framework was especially challenged in the empire's western borderlands, and the history of Russia's eighteenth-century imperial acquisitions was highly contested political and literary terrain. In the late eighteenth-century, a significant portion of today's Ukraine and the former Cossack lands, the right bank (the Polonized borderlands west of the Dnipro), left bank (the former Cossack Hetmanate), and Novorossiya (Crimea and the sparsely-populated steppe lands north of the Black Sea), were incorporated into the Russian empire.[7] This history of imperial expansion forms an important backdrop for the Romantic era search for *narodnost'* within the Russian empire.

In 1648, Bohdan Khmelnytsky led a Cossack revolt against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The inordinately successful rebellion against Polish-Lithuanian rule led to the establishment of an independent Cossack state, and it was in 1654 that Khmelnitsky negotiated the Treaty of Periaslav, which linked this Cossack state with Muscovy. After Ivan Mazepa's attempt to regain Cossack independence was defeated at the Battle of Poltava in 1709, and after the conclusion of the Great Northern War, Peter

the Great declared Russia an empire. The autonomy of the former Cossack Hetmanate was significantly restricted, and by the late eighteenth century the Russian empire had grown considerably. Under Catherine II, Russia pursued a course of administrative unification in its southwestern borderlands. Catherine abolished the office of the hetman in 1764, and in 1775, the main stronghold of the Zaporozhian Cossacks on the Dnipro River was disbanded and destroyed. Crimea was annexed in 1783, and this and the transfer of Ochakov in 1792, expanded the Russian Empire's domain to Novorossiya or New Russia.[8] During the second partition of Poland in 1793, the lands west of the Dnipro or right-bank Ukraine, which had been under Polish rule since 1569, also came under Russian rule. With the acquisition of Novorossiya and the right bank, the Russian empire stretched uninhibited from the Baltic to the Black Seas and the Dnipro was no longer directly bordered by Poland and Turkey. By 1834, ethnic Russians accounted for less than half of the imperial population. The rapid geographical expansion and changing demographics of the Russian empire necessitated a reconsideration of the relationship between the imperial state, the Russian nation, and national historical and literary narratives.

Perhaps unexpectedly, an obsession with Cossack history and Ukrainian folk culture dominated the Russian literary scene in the 1820s and 1830s. Though exotic and Romantic, the Cossack past was also understood and framed as a unique, native historical phenomenon. Given their history of autonomy and their subsequent political incorporation into the Russian empire, the Cossacks were vital to conceptualizing the relationship between the Russian national self and the peoples and histories of the Ukrainian Cossack lands. However, in the Romantic era, political assimilation did not

necessarily indicate cultural assimilation, and Ukrainian and Cossack elites were accustomed to imperial structures that allowed for multiple coexisting, often overlapping and conflicting, local, imperial, and eventually national loyalties. The influential Ukrainian Romantic critic and loyal Russian imperial subject Orest Somov is indicative of these complex loyalties and of the complexity of Romantic national discourse. Somov's 1823 essay, "On Romantic Poetry," is one of the first to theorize the relationship between Russian *narodnost'* and Romanticism. Somov argues that originality and the poetic voice are necessary to overcome Russian hurdles to national development and that a new species, a new taxonomy of Russianness, is made possible by the imperial incorporation of Novorossiya and "fruitful Ukraine". For some writers, such as Orest Somov and Nikolai Gogol, Cossack history and the Ukrainian lands, newly acquired by the Russian empire, were to form the basis for Russian nationality. Alongside the argument that statehood, secured in military battle, is the necessary precondition for national development, writers such as Somov and Gogol argued that it was the poetic voice that united the peoples with the state into a national community bound by the Russian language and the narrative past.

Though maintaining the distinct nature of the Ukrainian Cossack past, Gogol offers himself up as a conduit between the people and the state, between the Ukrainian past and the Russian national future. Identifying a future Russian patrimony in the history of the Cossack borderlands, Gogol's Russian-language texts find a welcome reception in the Russian empire and his arguments about the Cossack past are echoed in the literary criticism of Vissarion Belinsky. Belinsky, who praises Gogol's talents, rejects the idea that folk culture, the peasantry, or any state-less peoples can embody the national

community. Instead, he argues that these pre-political peoples are entirely domestic as he reasserts the power of the state to foster independent nationality and thus a national literature. Despite Belinsky's insistence on the elite literary critic and the role of the state, the arrival of Taras Shevchenko on the literary scene once again challenged the Russian national framework. Choosing to write in Ukrainian and choosing to imagine a non-elite audience for his verses, Shevchenko's poetics reassert the power of history and the poetic voice, not as the means to weld peoples and power, but as the means to narrative rebirth amidst the failure of political paternity. Though the Cossacks and the Cossack lands were fully incorporated into the Russian empire, Shevchenko's poetry expanded the horizons of Ukrainian national aspirations into the future. Writing to fellow compatriots without a state, Shevchenko reimagines the possibilities of narrative history, vernacular language, and folk culture. Like Gogol, Shevchenko also offers himself as a conduit between the national past and the national future. However, unlike Gogol, Shevchenko asserts the living presence of the past and seeks to reanimate the stateless national community in danger of forgetting itself and its own history.

Shevchenko's colossal role in shaping and sustaining the Ukrainian national imaginary in the past, and undoubtedly in the future, places tension on the frameworks of national history and national literature that find their origin in the state. This dissertation demonstrates that Ukrainian history and literature find a narrative home in comparative literature and supports von Hagen's claim that Ukraine is indeed "intrinsically interesting because it challenges so many of the clichés of the nation-state paradigm." Arguing that all nationalisms are narrative projects, this project engages with scholars of nationalism such as Benedict Anderson, Tom Nairn, and Homi Bhabha to focus on the narrative

means by which the national body begins to imagine a collective past, a collective unity, and its possible futures. Specifically focusing on literary texts that represent a vital historical past, this dissertation emphasizes the symbolic nature of the national and textual body, the metaphorical constructions of familial models, the role of the poet-historian, and the future-oriented aims of national narrative within and without the state.

Late-Soviet and post-Soviet scholars of Ukrainian literature in the United States, most notably George G. Grabowicz, and George S. N. Luckyj, have had to navigate national literary departments and nationalistically antagonistic frameworks that pre-conceptualize Ukrainian and Russian historical-literary relationships as a series of oppressions or antagonisms rather than as a "complex literary, cultural, and historical problem."[9] My dissertation echoes George Grabowicz's insistence that the multi-lingual, multi-ethnic, and imperial frameworks of the nineteenth-century require a move away from the contemporary nation-state and the contemporary understanding of national literatures. For scholars of Russian literature, this framework has often fused into one body the multi-national peoples, texts, and audiences of the Romantic era and led to claims such as, "the works under consideration were written for a Russian audience, in Russian, and by authors who principally identify themselves as Russian," even when the authors under consideration include Gogol.[10] In response, more recent scholarship has set out to question the Russian national framework for writers such as Gogol and to question whether Gogol is indeed a Russian author.[11] However, the claim that Gogol is a Ukrainian national writer is only as tenable as the claim that Gogol is a Russian national writer, as both claims rely upon a the powerful teleology of the nation-state and understandings of national identity not yet formed in the past. Instead, my work speaks to

that of Edyta Bojanowska, whose important monograph on Gogol notes: "*Whether* Gogol was Russian *or* a Ukrainian is thus the wrong question to ask. This book asks instead *how* Gogol's writings participated in the discourses of *both* Russian and Ukrainian nationalisms."[12] Adding Shevchenko to this discussion, which often focuses solely on Pushkin and Gogol, my dissertation also seeks to consider how Pushkin, Gogol, and Shevchenko's literary treatment of Cossack history and the Ukrainian borderlands shaped the very discourses and possibilities of Ukrainian and Russian nationalisms and the future Ukrainian and Russian nations.

The national narratives of the Cossack past under consideration here demonstrate that the very contours of the nation itself were being debated in the imperial era. The literature of the Cossack past in the Romantic era demonstrates the imperial, multi-ethnic origins of all national narratives. Considering the early- and mid-nineteenth-century relationship between the emerging nation and historical narratives, origin stories, familial models, and possible futures, this comparative project contributes to the discussion of Ukraine's historical past from a literary perspective and emphasizes that the political incorporation of the Cossack lands and the subsequent Romantic revival of Cossack history in narrative form is a vital part of both past and future Ukrainian and Russian national imaginaries.

Chapter Descriptions

The first chapter, "The Illicit Bridegroom and the Autocrat: Ukrainian Uprising and National Consolidation in Pushkin's *Poltava*" focuses on Pushkin's narrative poem

Poltava, which turns to Peter's victory in the Great Northern War, the emergence of the Russian Empire, and the relationship between Russia and Ukraine to conceptualize Russian *narodnost'*. During the Great Northern War, the Battle of Poltava (1709) heralded Russia's ascent as a world imperial power. Pushkin's "Poltava" (1828), depicts Peter's victory against Sweden's King Charles XII and the Ukrainian Cossack Hetman Ivan Mazepa. In the early nineteenth century, the rebellious Ivan Mazepa, who turned against the Russian tsar in a bid for independence, came to represent the suffering artist and the desire for freedom in the Byronic Romantic tradition and in the works of the Decembrist Kondratii Ryleev. In the post-Napoleonic and post-Decembrist age of nations, Pushkin narrative poem provides a Russian national-historical corrective to the Romantic image of the freedom-loving Mazepa. In *Poltava*'s invented romantic plot, an aged Mazepa, who seduces his young goddaughter Maria, is depicted as an unnatural and unviable bridegroom. Meanwhile, the epic historical plot narrates Peter's political triumph, which lays the foundation for imperial glory and begets a national patrimony. Scholarship has focused on *Poltava's* national character, and most critics claim there is a dissonance or tension between Pushkin's romantic and epic or historical modes. This chapter argues that the poem's romantic and historical narratives are not in conflict or disharmony. Instead, the symbolically unnatural or unviable Ukrainian family buttresses the consolidating function of the Russian national narrative. The resulting multiplicity of narrative voices calls attention to the potential alternatives, histories, uprisings, and upstarts that are silenced in writing a national narrative within a multi-ethnic empire.

The second chapter, "Ancient Models and National Regeneration in Nikolai Gogol's *Arabesques* and *Taras Bulba*," focuses on Gogol's representations of the

recently incorporated Cossack lands, the Crimean Peninsula, and the Black Sea region and his conceptualization of the Russian present and its futures. Nikolai Gogol's novella *Taras Bulba* was first published in 1835. It was significantly revised and published again in 1842. While the plot remains stable in both version of the novella, scholarship tends to agree that the latter text Russifies the Ukrainian Cossacks as Russian nationals. Like Orest Somov before him, in his two version of *Taras Bulba* and in his collection of miscellany, *Arabesques*, Gogol overcomes Russia's geographical and historical hurdles to national development by arguing that the national poet can forge a new species, a new taxonomy of Russianness, out of the fertile imperial possessions of Novorossiya and "fruitful Ukraine." However, rather than minimizing the differences between the Cossack past and the Russian present, Gogol emphasizes these differences to secure poetic glory amidst political demise and to emphasize the role of the poet in the imperial process of national consolidation. The later redaction of the novella emphasizes the Russian (as opposed to Polish) patrimony over the Cossack lands and Gogol claims that the Cossack past, like ancient Greece, forms the cultural wellspring for the Russian nation. This chapter argues that the changes to *Taras Bulba* evidence the impact of the Black Sea space as the unexpected heart of the Russian nation and as the horizon of both imperial and national ambitions.

The third chapter, "The Hymen and the Burial Mound: Taras Shevchenko and the Politics and Poetics of National Rebirth," analyzes Shevchenko's narrative poem, *Haidamaky* (1842), which takes place in right-bank Ukraine and is set alongside the last in a series of eighteenth-century rebellions against Polish rule. Written in St. Petersburg after the full political incorporation of the Cossacks into the Russian Empire,

Shevchenko's verses reanimate an independent, national community between life and death. Russian critics such as Vissarion Belinsky, who prioritized the power of the political state and argued that without a state structure, the folk community and Ukrainian vernacular could not transcend domestic concerns, understood the Cossack burial mound as the symbol of a vibrant but now buried past. In Shevchenko's *Haidamaky* the Cossack burial mound, or *mohyla*, symbolizes a national history and independent spirit that is in constant danger of being forgotten. While the Cossack leaders of the past have failed to produce a viable lineage, the Cossack grave secures their history of independence and allows the poet to reanimate this history and generate its future potential. Arguing that violence or political action alone is incapable of generating a viable national community, the poem's romantic narrative tells the story of the unconsummated marriage and forestalled future of Yarema and Oksana, two orphans whose union reflects Ukraine's possible genealogical futures. This chapter argues that Shevchenko narrative poem is an act of literary parthenogenesis amidst the failure of political paternity. Foregrounding the role of the poet-historian, Shevchenko's narrative poem declares that the Ukrainian nation, despite its lack of state and self-rule, exists in the language and history the poet brings to life and in the generative union between the poet and each new community of readers.

Notes

1. Mark von Hagen, "Does Ukraine Have a History?" *Slavic Review* 54, no. 3 (1995): 658-673. See also Serhii Plokhy, "Quo Vadis Ukrainian History?" in *The Future of the Past: New Perspectives on Ukrainian History*, ed. Serhii Plokhy (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2016), 1-26.

2. See Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (New York: Verso, 2006); Tom Nairn, *The Break-up of Britain* (London: New Left Books, 1977); Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008); and Homi Bhabha, *Nation and Narration* (New York: Routledge, 1990).

3. The first academic chairs in History were established after the French Revolution, in the University of Berlin in 1810 and in Napoleon's Sorbonne in 1812.

4. Lauren Gray Leighton, ed., *Russian Romantic Criticism: An Anthology* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987).

5. V.G. Belinskii, "Rukovodstvo k vseobshchei istorii," in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (Moscow: Izd. Akad. nauk SSSR, 1953-59), 6:90. On the early nineteenth-century Russian imperial obsession with history, see Svetlana Evdokimova, *Pushkin's Historical Imagination* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999); Andrew Wachtel, *An Obsession with History: Russian Writers Confront the Past* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994); and Dan Ungurianu, *Plotting History: The Russian Historical Novel in the Imperial Age* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2007).

6. *Narodnost'* is a poly-semantic term that emphasizes the difficulty of reconciling the concepts of nation and empire. Coined in a letter by Prince P.A. Viazemskii in 1819, the meaning was debated throughout the century. As a translation for the French nationalité, *narodnost'* was meant to envelop the French 'populaire' and 'national.' See Katya Hokanson, "Literary Imperialism, *Narodnost'* and Pushkin's Invention of the Caucasus," *The Russian Review* 53, no. 3 (1994): 336-39.

7. While the chapters in this dissertation do not focus on Galicia or Bukovina and Carpatho-Ukraine, the future direction of this project includes an expansion of the geographical focus and an extension on temporal focus on the nineteenth-century Russian empire to consider Cossack literature in the Polish national imaginary, the Austro-Galician context, and the early twentieth century. I will consider the Galician imaginary in Ukrainian national thought within the context of political populism and the debates about vernacular language and national specificity, as well as the eventual implementation of the Valuev Edict (1863) and the Emz Ukaz (1876), which effectively prevented publication of texts in the Ukrainian language within the Russian empire and shifted the nexus of Ukrainian national thought to Galicia and the Austrian Empire.

8. Noting the predominance of "new" political and religious sites such as New York, Nueva Leon, Nova Lisboa, and Nieuw Amsterdam in the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries, Benedict Anderson argues that "in these names 'new' invariably has the meaning of 'successor' to, or 'inheritor' of, something vanished. 'New' and 'old' are aligned diachronically, and the former appears as always to invoke an ambiguous blessing from the dead… an idiom of sibling competition rather than of inheritance," in *Imagined Communities*, 187.

9. George G. Grabowciz, "Ukrainian-Russian Literary Relations in the Nineteenth Century: A Formulation of the Problem," in *Ukraine and Russia in Their Historical Encounter*, ed. Peter J. Potichnyj, et. al. (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Stuides Press, 1992), 215.

10. Judith Deutsch Kornblatt, *The Cossack Hero in Russian Literature: A Study in Cultural Mythology* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1992), 4.

11. Oleh S. Ilnytzkyj, "Cultural Indeterminacy in the Russian Empire: Nikolai Gogol as a Ukrainian Post-Colonial Writer," in *A World of Slavic Literatures: Essays in Comparative Slavic Studies in Honor of Edward Mozejko*, ed. Paul D. Morris (Bloomington: Slavica, 2002).

12. Edyta Bojanowska, *Nikolai Gogol: Between Ukrainian and Russian Nationalism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), 6.

CHAPTER II

THE ILLICIT BRIDEGROOM AND THE AUTOCRAT: UKRAINIAN UPRISING AND NATIONAL CONSOLIDATION IN PUSHKIN'S *POLTAVA*

В его "Истории" изящность, простота
Доказывают нам без всякого пристрастья
Необходимость самовластья
И прелести кнута.

In his *History*, eloquence and simplicity
Disinterestedly demonstrate to us
The necessity of autocracy
And the charms of the knout
-Pushkin, "Na Karamzina"

During the Great Northern War, the Ukrainian Cossack Hetman Ivan Mazepa allied with Sweden's Charles XII against Peter the Great of Russia. As Charles begins his fateful detour through Ukraine, Voltaire's *History of Charles XII* (1731) introduces the reader to "the country of the Cossacks, between lesser Tartary, Poland, and Russia:"

> Ukraine has always aspired to freedom; but being surrounded by Muscovy, the dominions of the Grand-Seignior, and Poland, she had to seek a protector, and therefore a master, in one of these three states. First, she put herself under the protection of Poland, who treated her too much like a subject; then she gave herself to Muscovy, who ruled her like a slave as long as he could. At first the Ukrainians enjoyed the privilege of electing a prince, called a general [Hetman], but soon they were deprived of this right, and their general [Hetman] was nominated by the Moscow Court.
>
> The office was then filled by a Polish gentleman named Mazepa. Born in the Palatinate of Podolia, he had been the high page to King John Casimir and had gotten a smattering of belles-lettres at his court. A Polish nobleman, after discovering Mazepa's affair with his wife, had him bound naked to a wild horse and set him off in this state. The horse, which was from Ukraine, returned to her, carrying Mazepa half dead from hunger and fatigue.[1]

Though Sweden's short-lived alliance with the Cossack Hetman ended in defeat at the Battle of Poltava (1709), the young Mazepa's tumultuous flight from Poland became

fertile subject matter for the European Romantics. Early nineteenth-century artists such as Théodore Géricault, Eugène Delacroix, Horace Vernet, and Louis Boulanger, and later Western European writers and composers, all depicted this dramatic moment from Voltaire's account.[2] Mazepa's involuntary journey across the untamed Ukrainian steppes, most likely untrue, came to represent the suffering artist and the Romantic desire for freedom. Lord Byron's influential poem, "Mazeppa" (1818), was prefaced by three quotations from Voltaire's history. While told from the perspective of the old Hetman after his defeat at the Battle of Poltava, most of the poem lingers on the ride of the youthful lover exiled for adultery. Byron's very name and his treatment contributed the additional association of civic liberty to the mythology surrounding Ivan Mazepa. These Romantic representations took little notice of the Russian context, in which Mazepa was a well-known traitor to the Russian state for turning against Tsar Peter to join with Sweden in a bid for independence. Eastern European writers who turned to the Mazepa theme were aware of these competing mythologies. The Byronic association of Mazepa with civil liberty and the competing narrative of his disloyalty found resonance in the writings of Kondratij Ryleev, the Decembrist and leader of the Northern Society, who portrayed Mazepa as a patriot and defender of Ukrainian freedom in his *Voinarovsky* (1825).[3] Pushkin's *Poltava* responds to these predominating Romantic depictions of the Cossack Hetman as well as to Ryleev's *Voinarovsky* and to Adam Mickiewicz's heroic traitor in *Konrad Wallenrod.*[4]

In his "Refutation to the Critics" (1831), Pushkin addresses the frequent comparisons drawn by the critics between his *Poltava* and Byron's "Mazeppa." He notes that both Byron and Voltaire were seduced by the romantic vision of Mazepa's naked

ride through the steppes and states that Byron's poem is merely a series of images (он выставил ряд картин […] вот и всё).[5] Alluding to his own unique inspiration (the story of Mazepa's seduction of his goddaughter, deleted from Ryleev's *Voinarovsky*) Pushkin exclaims: "If only the story of the seduced daughter and executed father had gotten under Byron's pen, then, most likely, no one would have dared touch this terrible subject after him" (Если ж бы ему под перо попалась история обольщенной дочери и казненного отца, то, вероятно, никто бы не осмелился после него коснуться сего ужасного предмета). Pushkin's response to his critics emphasizes the lack of context and narrative development in previous representations of Mazepa. Whether the "terrible subject" alluded to is the romance or Ivan Mazepa himself, it is clear that Pushkin's representation is meant to fill a lacuna in the dominant mythology surrounding the Hetman. While Voltaire and Byron were unaware of Mazepa's later, alleged romance with his goddaughter, Ryleev had purposefully passed over the incident. And though Pushkin notes that burdening historical characters with fictional horrors is slanderous and unwise, he finds it even more inexcusable that such a striking, perhaps telling, historical tale had been undeveloped: "пропустить столь разительную историческую черту, было еще непростительнее."

On August 28, 1826, Pushkin was recalled from exile in Mikhailovskoe by Nicholas I to serve as a national poet, and *Poltava* was written during an especially complex time in the poet's relationship to the Russian state and to his literary critics. Prior to publishing *Poltava*, the poet had to defend himself against the charge that his "Andre Chenier" was composed to commemorate the Decembrist uprising.[6] After proving that the poem had been written much earlier, Pushkin did have to admit to

authorship of the *Gavriiliada* and pen a humiliating confession to the tsar. It was during these years that Pushkin wrote on the Petrine theme and deemed Nicholas Peter's successor.[7] *Poltava* signals a transition in Pushkin's oeuvre from the critical success of his Byronic, Southern poems to his later more mature, national works and a troubled relationship with his critics. Writing in October of 1828, Pushkin's *Poltava* begins with an epigraph from Byron's "Mazeppa." It is divided into three cantos of relatively equal length and framed by a dedication and historical endnotes written by Pushkin. The first edition of the poem, published March 27-8, 1829 also included an introduction dated January 29, 1829, which was never seen in manuscript form and was not included in later editions. Scholars have noted the persistent allusions to the Decembrists throughout the poem and it has been shown the Decembrists were very much on Pushkin's mind as he was writing it. Pushkin's poem is both a Russian national corrective to the image of the freedom-loving Mazepa and a confirmation of his role as a post-Decembrist national poet. Referencing both Western European Romantic treatments and Ryleev's poem, Pushkin rewrites the dangerous thematic association of Mazepa and freedom from the Russian national perspective. Unlike Byron, who never mentions Peter, Pushkin restores the Russian tsar as the victor of Poltava and the rightful leader of Russia and Ukraine. The poetic parallel between Peter and Nicholas I reaffirms the role of the Russian autocratic in the post-Napoleonic and post-Decembrist era of nations.

Poltava provides a Russian corrective to the prevailing image of Mazepa, and the narrative poem moves away from the image of the young, virile persona associated with liberty and the restless Cossack lands. Instead, Pushkin depicts Mazepa as old statesman who turns against the Russian tsar and as an incestuous lover who betrays his Ukrainian

goddaughter, Maria. In *Poltava,* the historical narrative of Mazepa's alliance with Charles is told alongside the poem's romantic plot, wherein the old, sly Mazepa courts his young, Ukrainian goddaughter. Pushkin largely invents the nature of the relationship between the aged Cossack Hetman and the Ukrainian maiden, and this romantic plot functions to demonstrate the infertile or unnatural union between the Cossacks and the freedom loving Ukrainian lands represented in her person. Unlike the critical consensus, which argues that the main flaw in Pushkin's narrative poem is the structural inadequacy resulting from the juxtaposition of its romantic and epic modes, I argue that the unnatural and infertile romantic union functions to buttress the epic plot, in which Peter triumphs over both Sweden's Charles XII and Mazepa. Read together, this juxtaposition marks Mazepa as an unnatural, incestuous bridegroom and elevates the autocrat Peter as the divinely sanctioned Pater of the Russian national family. The political and romantic plots reinforce each other, and I argue that the tension between them, which generates a multiplicity of narrative voices, is the key to understanding Pushkin's *Poltava*.

Poltava is set during the Great Northern War (1700-22) in the Poltava province of what was then left-bank Ukraine, a semi-autonomous Cossack polity east of the Dnieper River that came under Russian control after the signing of the Treaty of Periaslav in 1654.[8] The poem begins by describing the Cossack and Little Russian nobleman Vasiliy Kochubey, his lands, his wife, and his daughter Maria. Ivan Mazepa, the Hetman of left-bank Ukraine, and Kochubey have a long history of friendship and military service together. Both Mazepa and Kochubey are noble-born, wealthy, and powerful Cossack military leaders. Ivan Mazepa, as Hetman, is at once the elected head of the Cossack state and an appointed figure subjected to the Russian tsar; he is also godfather to Maria. He

asks Kochubey for Maria's hand in marriage and is refused because a union with one's goddaughter would be considered incest in the Orthodox Church. Nonetheless, Maria and Mazepa run away together and Kochubey, the enraged father, denounces Mazepa as a traitor to Tsar Peter. Though Mazepa is indeed planning a Cossack revolt against the Russian Tsar, Peter does not believe the denunciation against the historically loyal Hetman of left-bank Ukraine. Unbeknownst to Maria, Mazepa orders Kochubey's execution. Maria's mother informs her of Mazepa's order, but the women arrive too late to stop the beheading. Kochubey dies, his wife is exiled, and Maria disappears into the night. Meanwhile Mazepa openly turns against Russia and joins forces with the young Charles XII to fight against Peter in the Battle of Poltava. Mazepa is defeated, Peter is victorious, and Russian imperial might is secured.

Pushkin narrates the Battle of Poltava as a historical moment of triumph for the Russian state. Yet, the victorious battle is overshadowed by the tragic romantic narrative, which lends a decidedly melancholy tone to the imperial victory, and the poem itself ends with Maria, the Hetman, and their less-prominent but still-remembered story. Though the poem foregrounds the Russian triumph, multiple competing perspectives are exposed by the juxtaposition of the epic and lyric modes. Pushkin's *Poltava* is a narrative of Russian national development that calls attention to the uprisings defeated and voices silenced in the process of national consolidation. While the odic voice proclaims a victorious national trajectory and deems Nicholas the successor to Peter, the lyrical voice mourns and records the internal dissidents and alternative historical trajectories that cede to the Russian tsar. Together, the juxtaposition and the resulting multiplicity and dissonance of

the narrative voices make visible the tension inherent in the process of writing a national history and literature within a multi-ethnic empire.

After the Battle of Poltava (1709), Tsar Peter began referring to himself as Emperor, and after the victorious conclusion of the Great Northern War (1700-1722), he formally accepted the titles of Peter the Great (Петр Великий), Father of the Fatherland (отец отечества), and Emperor of All [the] Russia[s] (император всероссийский).[9] Russia's victory heralded a new geopolitical reality: "The imperial title[s] stressed the formal similarity of the Russian autocrat to great European potentates and thus, conceptually, drew Russia closer to Europe."[10] At the ceremony, the state chancellor Count Golovkin lauded Peter for his unceasing labors, which lifted his loyal subjects "from the ignorant darkness onto the stage of universal glory . . . from non-existence into being, united with the political society of nations (народов)."[11] Voltaire, in his *History of Charles XII* (1731), echoed a similar sentiment: "This immense country was hardly known to Europe before Czar Peter. The Muscovites were less civilized than the Mexicans when they were discovered by Cortez."[12] In the Age of Reason, both Golovkin and Voltaire equated Europe with statehood, civilization and enlightenment, and the Battle of Poltava was interpreted as the political, imperial ascent of Russia onto the European stage.

Enlightenment thought assigns primacy to the enlightened ruler, and the image of Peter the Great towers in this regard. However, in setting Russia's course towards the West, Peter's reforms created an educated elite whose "very *raison d'être* was the turning of the country toward the West."[13] As Enlightenment preoccupations with universal principles gave way to conceptualizations of national uniqueness, Russian national

consciousness developed under the shadow of an imitative cultural heritage. The Romantic national requirements of a unique, narrative history and a native, literary language ushered in a new set of concerns: "What used to be a pedagogical problem of learning and progressing according to the universal postulates of the Age of Reason became a metaphysical issue of establishing and asserting the true principles of the unique Russian national organism, of ensuring its historical mission."[14] Peter the Great's reforms resulted in a legacy of imitation and the debate over Russia's unique national identity that continues today.[15]

In his "Письмо о русских романах" (Letter on Russian Novels) (1827), Mikhail Pogodin responds to his imaginary hostess, Countess O, who expresses the generalized lament of the Russian elite:

> Как жаль . . . что мы не можем иметь Вальтера Скотта . . . у нас нечего описывать: древние русские – варвары, а новые – подражатели. Наш характер не имеет никаких отличительных признаков, – везде утомительное однообразие, такое же почти, как и на земле нашей, которая состоит из ровной степи.[16]
>
> What a pity . . . that we cannot have a Walter Scott . . . we have nothing to describe: ancient Russians are barbarians, and the moderns are imitators. Our character lacks distinguishing features – exhausting monotony is everywhere, almost like our geography, which consists of the flat steppe.

The leap from barbarity to imitation implies a lack of autonomous historical development and the charge of geographical flatness is here a metaphor for cultural imitation. When Pogodin interjects to remind the gathered audience of the Caucasus, Crimea, and Siberia, Countess O responds that Russian history does not include the Caucasus (Но в истории нашей нет Кавказа). Pogodin's interlocutor fears that authentic national cultural production requires a type of historical development, geography, and subject matter lacking in the Russian empire. Pogodin takes the opportunity, at the party and in the

essay, to elaborate on Russia's history and charms at length. His long speech is interrupted by a dinner announcement, and he is ultimately unable to keep his audience or their interest. The party guests rush to the dining room forgetting all about Walter Scott, his novels, Russian history, and everything else in the world (и все на свете). As the guests flee Pogodin and the essay ends, the writer subtly hints that his interlocutors' preference for culinary domesticity over the world of historical fiction is ultimately to blame for the lack of Russian national literature. Yet, the reader – who has just suffered Pogodin's lengthy and often dry rendering of historical events and general national traits – cannot help but sympathize with the hungry dinner guests, and Pogodin's exhaustive list of Russia's historical events and climates fails to meet the narrative standards for national history set by the wildly popular Walter Scott.[17]

In the post-Napoleonic and post-Decembrist age of nations, Russia needed a poet-historian who could successfully narrate a native cultural identity to rival the military might that defeated Charles XII and elevated Russia to the status of Europe in the age of empire.[18] Voiced by a Russian iteration of Walter Scott, this national narrative was to reconcile the barbarity of the past, the imitative stain of the present, the variegated imperial peripheries and the smooth immensity of the core. Though once again victorious in battle after the defeat of Napoleon in 1812, a national history and culture was being identified to compete with the histories and literatures of the European nations; this preoccupation was the search for Russian *narodnost'*. [19]

The tension between *narodnost'* and the state as a multinational, autocratic empire gave rise to what Andrew Wachtel termed an "obsession with history." "[The] preoccupation with history was, above all, a deliberate effort to awaken national self-

awareness and establish a national identity."[20] Russia's national development was both a political problem and a literary one, and Greenleaf and Moeller-Sally emphasize the codependence of the political and narrative aspects in legitimizing the state and discovering its national core: "By this time it was a sine qua non for any European state to legitimate its existence historically. The most powerful narrative for an elite to gain control of was, therefore, the nation's history."[21] The publication of Nikolai Karamzin's twelve-volume *History of the Russian State* (1818-1826), Russia's first history written in Russian for Russians, was indeed a watershed moment coalescing historical, national, and cultural concerns.[22] While Voltaire praises Peter by problematically honoring him as the Cortez of Russia, Pushkin deems Karamzin the Columbus of Russian history.[23] While Peter discovers and civilizes Russia in the eyes of Europe, Karamzin discovers and civilizes Russian history for the Russian reading public.

After the Patriotic War against Napoleon elevated imperial pride and ethnic national consciousness, Karamzin, Russia's official historiographer since 1803, found a receptive audience. In order to trace the development of a unique people, their history must be discovered and narrated, and Karamzin's history provided the imperial state a historical framework for its national narrative. His treatment of Peter the Great and his emphasis on autocracy as the only natural structure for the Russian state proved to be influential and enduring: "Historical narratives now incorporated the Russian people into the dominant Petrine myth, giving the monarchy a patina of democracy by showing it to be the choice of the nation."[24] In his *History*, Karamzin emphasizes the parallels between the invitation of the Viking princes in 862 by the people of Novgorod and the Petrine reforms. Karamzin depicts both painful importations as resulting from the demands of the

populace. Along with ancient popular governments, Russia's native cultural traditions are voluntarily given up in exchange for the foreign sovereigns and models necessary to preserve Russia's statehood and ensure its viability.

In his "О любви к отечеству и народной гордости" (On Love of Country and National Pride), originally published in *Вестник Европы* in 1802, Karamzin defines patriotism as a nationally specific virtue that requires both civilization and reasoning/judgment (рассуждения).[25] The state guarantees civilization to its peoples, and the people understand themselves as inexorably linked with their state. While noting that some nations, due to favorable circumstances, are more enlightened, Karamzin emphasizes Russia's civilizational competence has been already guaranteed by the military might of the state:

> Петр Великий, *соединив* нас с Европою и показав нам выгоды просвещения, ненадолго унизил народную гордость русских. Мы взглянули, так сказать, на Европу и одним взором присвоили севе плоды долговременных трудов ее. . . . Скоро другие могли и должны были перенимать у нас; мы показали, как бьют шведоб, турков – и, наконец, французов. (Karamzin's emphasis, 284)
>
> Peter the Great, who made us one with Europe and showed us the benefits of enlightenment, did not demean Russian national pride for long. We glanced, so to speak, at Europe, and with one gaze appropriated for ourselves the fruits of her extended labors. . . . Soon others could and had to learn from us; we demonstrated how to beat the Swedes, the Turks, and finally, the French.

Russia, part of Europe since the efforts of Peter the Great, is not only equal to Europe, but is its repeated savior.[26] The price of this civilization is the temporary humiliation of imitation, but the mastery of foreign knowledge—evidenced first by the victory at Poltava and again in the defeat of Napoleon—signals that the time for imitation is over.

In this essay, an early conceptualization of *narodnost'*, the national family is modeled on the domestic family. Karamzin highlights the ancient Greeks and Romans

and the modern English as successful, patriotic nations: "Thus, the Greeks and Romans considered themselves the first nations, and all others—barbarians; thus, the English, who in recent times are more renowned than others for their patriotism, dream [fantasize] about themselves more than others do" (Так, греки и римляне считали себя первыми народами, а всех других—варварами; так, англичане, которые в новейшие времена более других славятся патриотизмом, более других о себе мечтают). These communities, which claim the power to define barbarity, and thus civilization, and to create collective fantasies of self, depend on state power and national confidence. For Karamzin, the national subject's ability to judge or reason (to think themselves Russian) is directly connected to a patriarchal and patrimonial understanding of the nation as an extension of the domestic family unit:[27]

> …мы должны любить пользу отечества, ибо с нею неразрывна наша собственная; что его просвещение окружает нас самих многими удовольствиями в жизни; что его тишина и добродетели служат щитом семейственных наслаждений; что слава его есть наша слава; и если оскорбительно человеку называться сыном презренного отца, то не менее оскорбительно и гражданину называться сыном презренного отечества (282).
>
> …[W]e should love the advantages of our fatherland, for they are inseparable from our own: its enlightenment surrounds us with the pleasures of life; its peace and virtues serve as a shield for domestic/familial pleasures; its glory is our glory; and if it is insulting for a man to be called the son of a contemptible father, then it is no less insulting for a citizen to be called the son of a contemptible fatherland.

The national family guarantees the vitality of the domestic family, and the truly reasoning citizen is a subject who understands that the two aspects of self are intimately connected.

The national fantasies of the English and the national myths of the Greeks and Romans lead Karamzin to the claim that Russians must know their own worth (знать цену свою). Karamzin emphasizes that the great virtue of patriotism is instilled via

national history, which foments pride in the state's victories and growth. He proceeds to narrate Russia's history as a series of calamities that are overcome by a heroic patriotism in order to evidence the eventual triumph of the state as a reflection of its peoples' will and as the embodiment of its national spirit. Military victories against world powers have demonstrated that Peter's appropriation has been beneficial and necessary. Karamzin signals that it is time for Russia's writers to foster patriotism by narrating a native literature to unite the state, its history, and the people as reasoning, national subjects.

Karamzin's preference for narrative over historical analysis and his mode of drawing historical parallels aligns with the Romantic view of history, which sought to revise the empirical historicism of the Enlightenment by emphasizing the "creative mythmaking" power of the poet-historian,[28] "a national bard (or, using the romantic terminology of the day a national 'genius') whose poetry expressed Russia's innermost 'spirit' and uncovered the metaphysical import of the nation's historical destiny."[29] This mode of simultaneous discovery, legitimation, and projection is vital to Tom Nairn's conceptualization of the nation as a modern Janus.[30] The outlook of national narratives is temporally aligned with an ever-receding horizon; they transform and restructure old attachments in a future-oriented projection. However, all nations are also legitimized by primordial fantasies of an authentic, communal past. Karamzin naturalizes Peter's difficult reforms and foreign importations in Russian historiography as emblematic symptoms of a native, unalterable autocratic tradition and finds that the possibilities for a new national Russian history stem from these very reforms. Yet, the outlook represented by Karamzin and the revolutionary sentiment of the Decembrists can be seen as intertwined reactions to the French Revolution and the Jacobin Terror. The Decembrists

and other incipient upstarts were perceived to be serious threats to the empire's stability, and autocracy and orthodoxy strengthened their status as native, Russian institutions against the terror, chaos, and revolution that shook Europe during the post-Napoleonic reaction.

The Enlightened monarch was understood as the divinely-appointed father or Pater of his family of subjects. His absolute rule ensured the stability of the imperial domains. After the French Revolution, the crumbling belief in absolute power led to a reassessment of the metaphorical relationship between the father-monarch and his citizen-subjects. Hegel's argument that the highest potential for development occurs when the state embodies the national spirit rearticulates the Enlightenment understanding of the political family in light of the fear of instability and fragmentation in the post-revolutionary era. Unlike the German Romantics, who sought the nation in the common people and folk culture, the overarching world view of *Poltava* is more akin to Hegel's understanding of the bond between citizen and state. Hegel argues that subjection to the state is necessary for the development and fulfillment of national destiny: "The basis of the patriarchal condition is the family relation; which develops the *primary* form of conscious morality, succeeded by that of the State as its *second* phase."[31] Family, the first unit of civil society, is found lacking in relation to the power of the state, which appears as an earthly embodiment of God himself: "The State is the Divine Idea as it exists on Earth. We have in it, therefore, the object of History in a more definite shape than before" (41). Rather than mere subjects of the autocrat, the national family is ultimately redefined by its responsibility and natural attachment to the Pater, who guarantees their historical development. Paternal power as a metaphor of social and political stability and the idea

of the family representing loyal national citizens continued to hold symbolic ground in the age of nations.

The sentencing of the Decembrists on July 13, 1826 reaffirmed the power of *narodnost'* as it inextricably linked this national fervor to a love of both fatherland and the autocratic state. The sentencing manifesto emphasizes that the punishment of the perpetrators is a common cause (дело всей Россий) that cleanses the fatherland of infection (отечество очищено от следствий заразы). The document deems the Decembrists an internal blight and an ulcer (язва)— especially dangerous because of its proximity or intimacy (сокровенность) with the national body—and distances the perpetrators from true Russians, who unite to excise the familial contagion:

> Не посрамится имя русское изменою престолу и отечеству. Напротив, мы видели при сем самом случае новые опыты приверженности; видели, как отцы не щадили преступных детей своих, родственники отвергали и приводили к суду подозреваемых; видели все состояния соединившимися в одной мысли, в одном желании: суда и казне преступникам. [32]
>
> The Russian name will not be shamed by the betrayal of the throne and the fatherland. Against these instances [of betrayal], we saw new attempts at commitment; we saw how fathers did not spare their criminal children, how their own relatives rejected the suspects and brought them to trial; we saw the state united in a single thought, in one desire: the trial and execution of the criminals.

The loyal nation unites around the betrayed state, symbolized by the figure of the tsar, and forgoes filial attachments and domestic loyalties for the security and stability of Russia. The manifesto merges the autocratic state and the Russian nation in a kind of ouroboros.[33] Echoing Karamzin, the manifesto emphasizes that autocracy, as the natural manifestation of the Russian nation (народ), is the only rational choice of the Russian people. Those who struggle for an alternative state structure are deemed insane (безумны); their efforts are futile (тщетны), and this is evidenced in the failure of the

Decembrists and, by extension, the already-complete historical incorporation of the Cossack Hetmanate.

Within Petrine documents, Greenfeld finds some of the earliest uses of the term fatherland (отечество, отчизна) in Peter's addresses to loyal Little Russian Cossacks and troops after Mazepa's alliance with Sweden and notes that this terminology "made possible the exhortation to patriotism of individuals previously ignorant of suchlike sentiments."[34] Addressing loyal Cossacks and Little Russians, these post-Poltava documents recall the era of Bohdan Khmelnytsky and emphasize the sacred, inviolable, and whole (свято нерушимо и цело) unification of the Cossacks and Little Russian people (народ) under the all-powerful hand of the Tsar (под Свою Высокодержавую руку) who assures their liberties, rights, and privileges (вольности, права и привили):

> In these documents, Peter purports to represent Mazepa's intentions as anti-national (seeking to wrong "the Little Russian people [народ]") and anti-Christian, although Mazepa's breach of personal loyalty to the tsar is mentioned in the first place. Peter's own motives, by contrast, being those of altruistic concern for the well-being of the said "people," [народ] he exhorts them to think about the good of their "fatherland" [свою отчизну] and forget Mazepa, saying that Mazepa's actions tended to the "injury of Russia" as a whole, "the Russian State" [Нашего Российского Государства].

Mazepa's anathema, his expulsion from the Orthodox family, is first and foremost a result of his personal treachery before the divinely appointed pater.[35] Then, his exile is figured in terms of his lack of allegiance to the Little Russian people, whose loyalty to the Russian autocrat is assumed and assured. Mazepa is both a subject of the autocrat and the Hetman of Little Russia. The post-Poltava imperial narrative stresses that Little Russia's viability is indivisible from her connection to the fatherland, which is equated with the Russian State.

After the decisive suppression of the Decembrists, the Russian empire was once again confronted with the relationship between the Russian nation and the Russian state. Nicholas I, who had recalled Pushkin from Mikhailovskoe in September of 1826, "regarded as one of his most urgent ideological tasks the development of a Russian national culture… Pushkin's task in this enterprise was to become a national bard."[36] Reaffirming the role of the Russian autocrat in the post-Decembrist age of nations, Pushkin's *Poltava* emphasizes the parallels between Peter and Nicholas I. This tendency to draw illustrative comparisons between historical epochs and to seek meaning for the present in the past is a marker of Romantic and Russian historiography, and Aronson notes the preponderance of the Petrine theme during the late 1820s: "Never before in Russian literature had Peter's name flickered so often across the page . . . Rare was the writer, possessing a sense of history, who did not respond to this Petrine theme, the essence of which is Russia's transformation" (никогда в русской литературе не мелькало так часто имя Петра. . . . Редкий писатель, имеющий историческое чутье, не откликнулся на эту петровскую тему, в сущности теми преобразования России).[37] Symbolized by the powerful figure of Peter, autocracy is deemed the precondition for Russian *narodnost'*.[38] Pushkin's *Poltava* identifies Nicholas as Peter's successor and imitator in what Steiner calls "Pushkin's myth of young Russia," and demonstrates that the Russian nation is to mature during Nicholas' reign with the help of Pushkin's pen."[39]

Nicholas's decisive suppression of the Decembrists is paralleled to Peter's devastation of the capital of the Cossack Hetmanate after Mazepa's alliance with Sweden. After suppressing the Decembrists, like Peter, Nicholas also severely abridged

the independence and privilege of the gentry class.[40] Both independent Cossack history and the alternative state structures envisioned by the Decembrists are overcome in political defeat and narrative consolidation. Yet, despite the adulatory representation of Peter, *Poltava* also exposes the costs of this idealized image and emphasizes the alternative histories and possibilities lost in the process of narrative reification. Pushkin's relationship to autocracy and empire is not fully represented within *Poltava*, and the narrative poem makes visible the various interpretations of history that cede to the autocrat who personally governs the composition of the national narrative. These less odic, less strident notes are still evident in Pushkin's poetic rendering of national consolidation.

Pushkin creates a narrative of national development already evident in the historical speeches addressed to loyal Cossacks and Little Russians after Mazepa's defection, and *Poltava* emphasizes a vision of Russian *narodnost'* dependent on the necessity of autocracy and "the charm of the knout." This biting criticism, which seems to be leveled at Karamzin, speaks equally expressively to the creation of any national narrative. History is transformed into a *History* and its eloquence, simplicity, and supposedly disinterested treatment can subtly justify the autocratic state, even as it can critique. My analysis of *Poltava* interrogates the relationship between the romantic and political arguments of the poem as a productive tension evidencing the fundamental gap between the imperial and national frames and between the Russian national core and the peoples of the Russian empire. I argue that the failed romance between the Ukrainian Cossack Hetman and the Ukrainian maiden Maria serves a conservative consolidating function on the path to *narodnost*'. The failed family union of Mazepa and Maria

evidences the impossibility of an autonomous Ukrainian state within the poem. Ultimately, the historical parallel within *Poltava* argues that while the suppression of external enemies (Charles and Napoleon) guarantees Russian imperial might, it is the suppression of internal dissidents (the Cossacks and the Decembrists) that unites the Russian national body. However, the dissonance between the epic and romantic frames also highlights the alternative histories, state structures, and identities that give way to the national narrative. Rather than excising the non-loyal, non-Russian history of the Russian nation-state, Pushkin's *Poltava* accounts for on these incompatible upstarts while making its ultimately conservative argument.

The introduction to the first edition of *Poltava* positions the narrative poem as a response to the representations of Mazepa predominating in the European Romantic tradition. It begins by lauding Peter as the victor of Poltava and emphasizing the role of the battle in Russian national historiography. The Battle of Poltava "demonstrated to the state the success and necessity of the transformations perpetuated by the tsar" (доказала государству успех и необходимость преобразования, совершаемого царем).[41] The image of the restless Ukrainian lands evokes Voltaire's *History,* yet these lands are now named according to their current imperial designation, Little Russia. Pushkin goes on to remark that some writers had tried to make Mazepa a hero of freedom, or a new Bohdan Khmelnytsky ("Некоторые писатели хотели сделать из него героя свободы, нового Богдана Хмельницкого"). The reference to Bohdan Khmelnytsky by the official voice of the introduction is meant to evoke the 1654 Treaty of Periaslav.[42] Yet, it opens the space for competing interpretations as it invites a comparison between the uprisings led by Mazepa and Khmelnytsky.

Khmelnytsky was the leader of a Cossack revolt against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in 1648. The inordinately successful rebellion against Polish-Lithuanian rule led to the establishment of an independent Cossack state, and it was in 1654 that Khmelnytsky negotiated the Treaty of Periaslav, which linked this Cossack state with Muscovy. In Pushkin's day, this Cossack state had already been fully incorporated into the Russian empire and few vestiges of its prior political independence remained.

In this evocation of Khmelnytsky and freedom, the rebellion of 1648 exists as a palimpsest of the unification of 1654. The comparison between Khmelnytsky rising up against the Poles (aligning with Russia) and Mazepa rising up against Russia (aligning with Sweden) cannot be avoided even as the narrative voice continues to provide a corrective to the Romantic image of Mazepa as a hero of independence by damning him as a traitor to Russia. *Poltava* continuously evokes these competing perspectives even as the official voice stridently defends the Russian national narrative and Pushkin's introduction to the first edition concludes on the argument that "it would have been better to develop and explain the real character of the rebellious Hetman, instead of willfully distorting the historical person" (Лучше было бы развить и объяснить настоящий характер мятежного гетмана, не искажая своевольно исторического лица). Yet, as it claims historical truth for its own narrative, this introduction points the reader to the other variations of the historical person. Rather than presenting the Battle of Poltava and the Hetman Ivan Mazepa objectively or historically, Pushkin represents this pivotal battle in terms of the development of the Russian nation. It is this Russian, national truth, not seen in the Romantic European depictions of the young Polonized Mazepa, that *Poltava* lays

claim to. It is from this perspective that the freedom loving Bohdan Khmelnytsky is deemed a hero and the freedom loving Ivan Mazepa is anathematized.

Pushkin's contemporaries generally lauded the poem for its national character and deemed it a model narrative of *narodnost'*. Their main critique was the perceived structural dissonance between the romantic and odic modes. Along with his claim that the poem lacked unity, I. Kireevsky (*Moskovskii vestnik*, no.6 1828) also saw in it Pushkin's maturation towards his last, national stage of literary development. K. Polevoi's influential review (*Moskovskii telegraf*, no. 10, 1829) also heralded *Poltava* as a harbinger of national literature.[43] Most also deemed it significantly ahead of its time, and thus unappreciated by its public. *Poltava* was neither a critical nor financial success for the poet and later critics all emphasize the transitional nature of the work.[44] It stands, they claim, between Pushkin's Southern poems and his more mature or national poetic works. The poem also signals a transition between the critical praise of the earlier period to the critical confusion over his later more mature works. This transitional status of the poem is often read as justification for its perceived lack of structural unity.[45] Of Pushkin's contemporaries, Nadezhdin (*Vestnik Evropy*, no. 9, 1829) penned the most negative review (one that Pushkin himself mocked later in *Journey to Arzrum*). Both Nadezhdin and Bulgarin's critiques focused on the characters' lack of verisimilitude and quibbled with the narrative poem's fragmentary construction. However, it was Belinsky's later, ultimately positive review, (*Otechestvennye zapiski*, no. 5, 1844) that most critics cite as the decisive proof that a certain conflict exists between the epic and romantic modes and results in the poet's failure to create a unified whole.[46]

Contrary to most critics, I argue that the romantic and political modes of the poem are not in conflict or disharmony; instead, Maria and Mazepa's illegitimate union and ultimate disunion in the first two cantos functions to support and illuminate the historical worldview of the third canto. This understanding of the poem adds a critical depth to the line of thought that highlights the multiplicity of narrative voices within *Poltava*.[47] By emphasizing that a significant number of these voices are Ukrainian, and by linking the family romance to the political narrative, I argue that the conservative argument of the poem is tempered by the narrative's acknowledgement of the peoples, uprisings, and upstarts that are written over in the consolidating function of national history.

Poltava begins on the Kochubey family estate and describes the vast holdings that Kochubey has acquired through his military expeditions with the Cossacks. Pushkin's footnote states that *Poltava's* Kochubey is a hereditary relative of living Little Russian nobles and thus situates the historical Cossacks in relation to their current position within the Russian Empire. Kochubey's boundless meadows, his freely roaming herds, and his vast lands populated by ancestral village homes (хутора) are described.[48] The lyrical quality of these descriptions evokes a utopic idyll and a familial Eden nestled in the fertile landscape of Russia's recent imperial acquisition. This fertile, bucolic landscape is equated with Kochubey's proudest possession—his daughter Maria. While scholarship agrees that Maria is represented in terms of the Ukrainian landscape, she is also a representative of historical continuity and depicted as the ideal procreative prize. The poem emphasizes Maria's beauty, modesty, and intelligence, and Ukraine and Russia are represented as two distinct nations vying for union with her:

За то завидных женихов
Ей шлет Украйна и Россия;
Но от венца, как от оков,
Бежит пугливая Мария.
Всем женихам отказ — и вот
За ней сам гетман сватов шлет. (5:20)

This is why Russia and Ukraine / Send eager suitors to the palace; / But fearful, as from ball and chain, / She shrinks from wedding crown and chalice. / All suitors are refused – but then / The very Hetman sends his men. (325)[49]

The wedding crown evokes the ruler's crown and Maria's future union is equated with a loss of independence. Mazepa the suitor is called Hetman to emphasize the political parallel of the sought after romantic alliance.[50]

Another footnote explains that the real Kochubey had several daughters and acknowledges that the historical Maria's true name was Matrena, and yet another footnote alleges that Mazepa did indeed pursue his goddaughter, but he was refused. Historical evidence suggests that while Matrena did run away to be with Mazepa, he sent her home to the Kochubeys and the affair was concluded long before the Hetman's defection.[51] Lotman argues that the footnotes introduce a dialogue between poetry and history and "function as the "embryo of Pushkin's historical prose."[52] He sees *Poltava* marking Pushkin's transition to a more prosaic, realist mode. However, neither the imagined elopement of the narrative, nor the history in the footnotes function as history, instead both emphasize the narrative function of Mazepa and Maria's courtship. Pushkin's *Poltava* evokes the historical novel in its ability to call attention to, and thus to question, the narrative's own claim to historical veracity.[53]

The literary union casts the unification of a Ukrainian maiden and her Cossack Hetman as an unnatural, incestuous aberration in allegiance and rule. Mazepa is depicted as an illicit bridegroom in his attempt to rule Ukraine by turning her against the natural

pater, the Russian tsar. The romantic plot of Mazepa's betrayal of Maria buttresses the epic plot and Mazepa's duplicity. The narrative poem demonstrates the unnatural family configuration of a Cossack-ruled Ukraine, in order to argue that it must cede power to the historical growth and development of the Russian state. In his analysis of *Poltava* Grabowicz notes that, "In the general context of romanticism, incest unequivocally denotes the violation of the strongest taboo and a fundamental disruption of the social order. Inevitably, its wages are the death of the perpetrator, and often, as we see here, of the society he represents."[54] While in my analysis Maria represents a freedom-loving Ukraine and Mazepa is representative of Cossack rule and doomed independence, the Hetman is punished with political death and exile. However, though he is shot at, he is not physically killed in the narrative poem. A character called Voinarovksy saves Mazepa, and Pushkin's poem allows rebellious upstarts and heroic traitors to survive in the narrative.

Unlike the Romantic depictions of a youthful and naked Mazepa lashed to a steed, *Poltava* introduces us to an old man with an inscrutable character. He is distinct from both Ukraine and Russia, and the poem emphasizes Mazepa as a figure in-between; he is the appointed Hetman of Little Russia, a Ukrainian poet-patriot, and a Russian traitor. He represents the Cossacks in his official capacity, but he is held apart from them since he cannot represent both the rebelling Ukrainian factions (he feigns his loyalty to the Tsar as the angry crowds call for an uprising) and the loyal Little Russian nobles and troops (who stand with the Tsar during the battle). The narrative voice first contemplates Mazepa's incomprehensibility, then damns him for his ability attract hearts and rule minds (сердца привлечь, умами править). He is described as a dangerous chameleon that can

transform into whatever people want of him. The heated tone intensifies as Mazepa is deemed indomitable (неукротим), and the passage reaches a crescendo of damning statements. Few may know: "That he revered to sacred action / That from his heart all love was banned […] That he held freedom fit for slaughter, / That he avowed no fatherland" (331). (Что он не ведает святыни … Что он не любит ничего … Что презирает он свободу / Что нет отчизны для него [5:25].) Because we cannot know him, Mazepa is described in terms of what he lacks: religion, the ability to love, a belief in freedom, and a fatherland. The passage sets Mazepa apart from the Cossacks, Ukraine, and Maria. He is shown to be an imposter and unworthy of rule. The line "That he avowed no fatherland" (Что нет отчизны для него) is most often read to mean that Mazepa has no loyalty to Ukraine. However, the line functions in an alternative sense as well and emphasizes that there is no native land that Mazepa can legitimately claim. Ukraine is part of the Little Russia noble family whose position is secured within Russia. Mazepa's natural role is not to woo and wed Maria, but to watch over her in his appointed role as her godfather.

The subsequent stanza, voiced by Maria's father, emphasizes this reading. Kochubey calls Mazepa a brash predator, a destroyer (дерзкий хищник, губитель), and a sub-species of hawk (коршун) that is especially known for preying on domestic fowl.[55] Kochubey vows that a Moscow execution, not a Cossack saber, will kill Mazepa for snatching his dove Maria (голубка), who is also described as desecrated (поруганную). With the eagle eye of a father and a loyal subject (орлиным взором), Kochubey searches for someone to deliver a denouncement against Mazepa to the Russian Tsar. Mazepa's unnatural crime of passion evidences his political crime.

Kochubey's wife delivers the most damning assessment of Mazepa. It is her lyric voice that emphasizes the unnatural, barren nature of the potential union between the Hetman and the Ukrainian maiden. She derides his age (старец, на закате дней) and his godlessness (нечестивый, грех совершит, крестницы своей). He is godless because a union with his goddaughter is prohibited in the Orthodox Church and his old age, so often returned to in the narrative, hints at his inability to procreate and produce viable future generations. After Maria flees with Mazepa and the fatal news (роковая весть) reaches the Kochubeys, Maria's unfeminine interests are explained:

> Зачем с неженскою душой
> Она любила конный строй,
> И бранный звон литавр и клики
> Пред бунчуком и булавой
> Малороссийского владыки… (5:22)
>
> Why, flouting girlish rule and grace, / She watched the charging squadrons race, /
> Loved growling drums and rough opinion / About the horsetail-crested mace, /
> Ukrainian emblem of dominion . . . (328)

This rebellious, unfeminine aspect of Maria's bellicose character is contrasted to her expected path into marital bondage (семейственных оков), and the narrative elucidates her desire for independence while showing her escape to be ultimately futile and barren.

The young Cossack who Kochubey finds to deliver the denunciation is Maria's true mate and the bridegroom she should have chosen. He is one of the suitors whom Maria disdained, but he was never brave enough to court her. He is young and, like Maria, he is described in terms of the natural landscape of Ukraine (На берегу реки родной, В тени украинских черешен). He continues to love Maria despite her fall. The youth, ardor, natural affinity and loyalty of this alternative (yet unviable) groom is juxtaposed to the traitorous Mazepa, who is now depicted amidst his non-Russian, non-

Ukrainian, and non-Orthodox associates, the Jesuit Zalensky, the Polish Princess Dulskaya, a Bulgarian archbishop, and Orlyk, who a footnote pointedly identifies as a subsequent convert to Islam. These non-Russians are described operating in the cover of night like thieves (Во тьме ночной они как воры) and plotting a national or people's mutiny (Мятеж народный). Again, Mazepa's potential rule is undermined as these collaborators are implied to be sent or planted by foreign powers (Его подосланные слуги), and these same foreign powers are also connected to the Don Cossack revolts, which occurred at approximately the same time. Instead of semi-autonomous polities revolting against Peter's policies and political rule, both the Don Cossacks and Mazepa are depicted as puppets controlled by Catholic Poland and the Muslim Ottomans (Там за порогами Днепра / Стращают буйную ватагу / Самодержавием Петра). Here, the Zaporozhian and Don Cossacks are not rebelling against the autocratic force of Peter. Instead, they are pawns at the hands of foreign powers and their collaborators.

A puzzling quatrain follows Mazepa's initial description:

Не серна под утес уходит,
Орла послыша тяжкой лёт;
Одна в сенях невеста бродит,
Трепещет и решенья ждет. (5:20)

As chamois cleave to mountain faces / Beneath the eagle's rushing wing, / Thus, tremulous, Maria paces / And bides, alone, what fate must bring. (326)

The chamois is a light, agile goat inhabiting the mountains of the Caucasus and today's Western Ukraine. These goats prefer mountainous regions and hillsides where they can scan for predators and danger below. Thus, they are exposed to predators from above and on occasion eagles prey upon them. Maria is depicted as a chamois on a cliff side. The word flight (тяжкой лёт) is also used here as a parallel to the old age (лет) of Mazepa,

and yet, the eagle suggests the imperial symbol of Russia. The quatrain reaffirms that Maria as the prize and prey is pursued by both Russia and Ukraine. She is pictured here trembling and awaiting her fate.

When we return to Maria, "Maria – pitiful Maria" ("Мария, бедная Мария"), the narrative voice pities her misguided love and deems her a victim of Mazepa's machinations (Кому ты в жертву отдана?). The passive voice absolves her as it damns her for choosing Mazepa, and the narrator contrasts the regenerative image of the family to Maria's incestual bed with Mazepa: «Ты мать забыть для них [его седины, морщины, взор и разговор] могла, / Соблазном постланное ложе / Ты отчей сени предпочла». Maria is depicted as Mazepa's sleepwalking disciple; she is shown to be mindlessly intoxicated (безумном упоеньи). She is both chastised and exempted for passively, religiously following her dangerous groom, who kneels before her and rests his proud head in her lap. She is both the Virgin Mary and Mary Magdalene, and Mazepa is condemned for her fall. The first Canto ends with an image of the lonely Kochubeys seen through Maria's eyes:

> Она унылых пред собой
> Отца и мать воображает;
> Она, сквозь слезы, видит их
> В бездетной старости, одних,
> И, мнится, пеням их внимает . . .
>
> Across her soul like cloud-shade – token / of rue – her parents, grieving, broken; /
> She sees them, through a mist of tears, / Round out their bitter, childless years, /
> And hears reproaches never spoken . . . (337)

Maria's choice, to leave her Little Russian family, loyal to Tsar, for the old, sly Cossack Hetman, results in the foretold end of the Ukrainian familial lineage and the end of the possibility of autonomous Cossack rule.

Mazepa's own *dumy* are described in one of *Poltava's* footnotes:

> Предание приписывает Мазепе несколько песен, доныне сохранившихся в памяти народной. Кочубей в своем доносе также упоминает о патриотической думе, будто бы сочиненной Мазепой. Она замечательна не в одном историческом отношении. (PSS 5:65)
>
> Tradition [legend] attributes to Mazepa a number of songs which popular [national/folk] memory has preserved to this day. Kochubey in his denunciation likewise mentions a patriotic ballad [duma] allegedly composed by Mazepa. It is remarkable not merely in a historical sense.[56]

This footnote confirms that Mazepa's memory does live on; however, this is a dangerous, uncodified repository kept out of official histories. These songs, daring enough to be used as evidence of Mazepa's perfidy, are deemed patriotic. It is clear that the Ukrainian patriot is also here a traitor to the empire. Mazepa's *dumy* are not just reminders of an historical uprising, they are also echoed in the sad fate of the Decembrists. The Decembrists, patriots to some, are dissidents in the narrative of national consolidation. Mazepa, a Romantic hero in the Western European Romantic tradition and a writer of patriotic Ukrainian *dumy*, is still undoubtedly a villain in the history of the Russian state. The poem consistently suggests that while the causes for uprising may be noble or just, the outcomes are doomed to fail, for it is the Russian state that creates the conditions for national development and narrative.

Critics have identified multiple allusions to the Decembrists in Pushkin's *Poltava*. Among the most frequent are allusions to the Decembrist leader Kondratii F. Ryleev, who wrote traditional Ukrainian narrative poems (*dumy*) proclaiming the independence of the Cossack past and who was executed for his role in the uprising. Steiner notes that Ryleev's *Voinarovsky* (1824) features Mazepa as a defender of the free, Ukrainian, Cossack past, and Debreczeny highlights that Kochubey's execution scene in *Poltava*

parallels a similar one in Ryleev's tale and finds it telling that "Voinarovskii, of all the Hetman's retinue, kill[s] the ardent young Cossack who wished to revenge Mazepa."[57] The manuscript version of *Poltava* includes drawings of hanged men on the gallows with the words «И я бы мог как шут», which many interpret to signify Pushkin's feeling that he was only saved by chance from participation in the Decembrist uprising.[58]

In Pushkin's *Poltava*, these multiple references serve to connect the Cossacks of the Petrine era to the Decembrists, among whose numbers were prominent Ukrainians and Little Russians. This parallel emphasizes their comparable fates and serves as a warning to potentially revolutionary forces within the national body. Unlike the European Romantics, Pushkin's poem makes clear that Mazepa is a subject of the Russian tsar. The pre-publication title change from *Mazepa* to *Poltava* once again emphasizes that Mazepa, as a disloyal subject of the Russian state, is being put in his rightful place as a traitor in the Russian national-historical narrative.

In *Poltava's* dedication, the poetic voice reaches out to an unnamed and silent "you" (тебе) and wonders whether the stanzas, like the poet's love, will reach his subject and go unanswered and unacknowledged. Scholarship agrees that the woman in question is Maria Nikolaevna Raevskaia, the famous wife of Decembrist Sergey G. Volkonsky who in December of 1826 followed her husband into exile in Siberia.[59] Pushkin was among those who saw her as she passed through Moscow on her way to civic death. She had been forced the leave her young son behind her, and Pushkin wrote the epitaph for his tombstone when he died a year later. The initial description of *Poltava's* Maria includes the lines: "…her gait as gliding, / One moment, as the silken shift / Of swans on lonely [of the wilderness] tarns adrift" (325). (Ее движенья / То лебедя пустынных вод

/ Напоминают плавный ход [5:19]). The invocation of the wilderness echoes the dedication: "The memory of words last spoken / By you, and your sad wilderness, / Have been my only sacred token / Sole refuge, ultimate redress" (324). (Твоя печальная пустыня / Последний звук твоих речей / Одно сокровище, святыня, / Одна любовь души моей [5:17].) In a draft of the dedication, the line "the cold wilderness of Siberia' (Сибири хладная пустыня) was replaced by the phrase here: "your sad wilderness" (*PSS*, 5:324). This haunting association between the two exiled Marias, with its undercurrent of tragic unresponsiveness, is seen again in the vows that Mazepa and Maria break and the sad fate of the Ukrainian Maria. Maria Raevskaia follows her husband into northern exile as Pushkin returns from his southern exile. The poetic voice of *Poltava's* dedication assures his distant love that her fate and her last words are his treasure, his religion, and his soul's only love. If the poetic voice is autobiographical, then Pushkin's words to Maria, like Mazepa's later vows to the literary Maria, are not enough to guarantee their union. In each case, the lover steps aside to the nation-building poet-statesman: но дочери любовь / … не искупит. / Любовник гетману уступит (5:32). (But the daughter's love / … cannot redeem. / The lover to the Hetman cedes).[60]

As Maria runs off with her illicit bridegroom, the narrator expatiates on the time:

Была та смутная пора,
Когда Россия молодая,
В бореньях силы напрягая,
Мужала с гением Петра.
Суровый был в науке славы
Ей дан учитель; не один
Урок нежданый и кровавый
Задал ей шведской паладин.
Но в искушеньях долгой кары
Перетерпев судеб удары,
Окрепла Русь. Так тяжкой млат,
Дробя стекло, кует булат. (5:23)

> Then stood we at the clouded stage / In youthful Russia's destined courses / When she, exerting all her forces, / With Peter's genius came of age. / Harsh was the taskmaster of glory / Fate had assigned her: no small meed / Of lessons unforeseen and gory / Were dealt her by the royal Swede. / Yet the ordeal of searching trials, / Fortune's harsh blows and long denials, / Steeled Rus. The heavy hammer thus / Shapes iron while it shatters glass. (328)

In this poeticized history, which evokes not only the 1710s and the Great Northern War, but the *smutnoe vremia* of 1612 and the Napoleonic invasion of 1812, Peter raises young Rus' into viable statehood. The verb *мужать* here means to mature or to grow up. However, in the context of the Maria's elopement with Mazepa, the word clearly connotes that Peter is the natural, fecund groom of the young Russian state. Russia's emergence is represented as a series of military victories culminating in the war against Sweden. The victory at Poltava propels Russia into mature statehood, and the narrative poem ultimately identifies statehood, secured in military battle, as the precondition for the development of *narodnost'*. The word Rus' and the use of the Church Slavonic version of молот (hammer – млат) invoke the interconnected Slavic history of Kievan Rus'. In the final couplet, the heavy hammer of battle deals the blows of fate and forges steel; constant geopolitical competition and imperial consolidation makes a strong material stronger. However, the same heavy hammer splits or fractures weaker materials such as glass. In this formulation, Mazepa's faction is fundamentally too weak to stand the blows of its neighbors and of fate. Ukraine, embodied in Maria, has chosen a spouse too old and weak to withstand the tests of time. The incorporation of the Hetmanate, which had occurred by Pushkin's day, is presaged as an inevitable law of history. The forge of fate strengthens the autocracy, while weaker materials such as the Cossacks and

the Decembrists are splintered, for they can only fail in securing the prerequisite state structures necessary for national development.

The faithless nature of power and glory is echoed in the epigraph to *Poltava*, which is taken from Byron's *Mazepa*. It reads, "The power and glory of the war, / Faithless as their vain votaries, men, / Had pass'd to the triumphant Tsar." While the divinely sanctioned Orthodox Tsar fulfills Russia's destiny by securing statehood on the battlefield, Charles XII is subjected to these fateful laws: "Crowned by useless glory / Brave Charles slipped before the abyss. / He marched on ancient Muscovy" (my translation). ("Венчанный славой бесполезной, / Отважный Карл скользил над бездной. / Он шел на древнюю Москву" [5:23].) Charles is shown to have been passively and futilely crowned, and his march to ancient Moscow is equated with Napoleon's more recent foray. Echoing Byron who also drew the parallel, the two Russian victories prefigure and fulfill each other: Он шел путем, где след оставил / В дни наши новый, сильный враг, / Когда падением ославил / Муж рока свой попятный шаг. In this quatrain, Napoleon is termed the helpmate (муж) of fate, and the word again evokes the association between the bridegroom and the ruler. Napoleon is both a powerful enemy and fate's passive helpmate because despite his strength, his loss is already presaged in the defeat of the Poles in 1612 and Charles's defeat before Peter.

This fire that forges Russia's imperial steel is dangerous, flaring up, and capable of splintering Ukraine.

> Украйна глухо волновалась,
> Давно в ней искра разгоралась.
> Друзья кровавой старины
> Народной чаяли войны,
> Роптали, требуя кичливо,
> Чтоб гетман узы их расторг…

> The Cossack land [Ukraine] was mutely seething. / A spark had smoldered long, and breathing / To fan the bloody feuds of yore, / The spokesmen of a people's war / Sought from the Hetman for sedition / A freer rein with angry snarls (329)

The verb расторгать has, since at least the nineteenth century, been used to describe the termination of a marriage. This image of seething, rebellious Ukraine and the phrase «Друзья кровавой старины» refer to the bellicose, independent Cossacks of the past. However, from the perspective of official imperial historiography, the invocation of friendship and a bloody past could also recall the Treaty of Periaslav, signed by the Zaporozhian Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky in 1658 and invoked a few stanzas later in the poem. In the version of history where Periaslav signifies a reunification of Rus'ian lands, these calls for freedom are not the cries of Ukraine, an independent nation, but of a faction that has forgotten the relationship forged in the bloody past and demands a domestic, internecine revolt. The Cossack perspective is also present here, and the phrase Народной чаяли войны highlights the semantic ambivalence of the word народ. Depending on the perspective, the phrase could mean a popular uprising and an internecine war or a nation revolting against the chains of autocracy. However, the phrase ultimately indicates that Ukraine is unviable as a separate nation outside of the Russian empire. The political frame of autocracy binds the entities together and the disembodied voices of protest (мятежный крик) demand independence from Russia and a termination of their contractual union. The unexpected root муж here once again evokes the lack of proper patriarchal rule capable of unifying the cries of protest into a national whole.

Mazepa is not the proper groom of the rebellion; his old age (Он изнемог; он слишком стар) is contrasted with the youthful, rebellious voices (юноши). While these voices call out, Mazepa is shown apart, maintaining his subjection to the Russian Tsar,

biding his time, and indifferently banqueting. In keeping with his being the wrong bridegroom for Maria, Mazepa is shown to be the wrong bridegroom for Ukraine. His union with Maria – a symbol of the potential for independent Ukrainian statehood – is fated to fail. He is set apart from the seething Cossack Ukraine, and through his incestuous pursuit of his goddaughter, he is also isolated from the Orthodox faith.

In opposition to their contemplative and inscrutable figurehead, the masses are demanding immediate action. Pushkin's narrator never indicates that the Cossacks' calls for rebellion are unwarranted. Both the poem itself and Pushkin's historical footnotes list legitimate Cossack grievances against Russia, and name Cossack heroes opposed to Russian rule. However, the poem dooms the uprising by pairing the Cossack demands with the failures of the legitimate rulers Charles and Napoleon. The Ukrainian demands are labeled conceited, impatient, underdeveloped and shortsighted. Yet, they do point to a separate identity against and apart from the Russian empire, which is metonymically referred to via its imperial center (ненавистная Москва). These grievances and Little Russian heroes do not free the rebellious Ukraine. *Poltava* affirms that, other than the Russian tsar, no sovereign is capable of ruling Ukraine. The Cossacks, even if they have a unique and colorful history and heroic predecessors, are still lacking a legitimate ruler.

Despite the Cossack calls for independence, only the Russian Tsar is capable of subduing and subsuming the people, identifying and overcoming internal and external enemies, and running the state. This is the very tension the word *narodnost'* points us to. The rebellious voices evoke an alternative history of rule:

> Когда бы старый Дорошенко,
> Или Самойлович молодой,
> Или наш Палей, иль Гордеенко
> Владели силой войсковой;

Тогда б в снегах чужбины дальной
Не погибали казаки,
И Малороссии печальной
Освобождались уж полки.

If but the grand old Doroshenko, / Of Samoylovich's young resource, / Or our Paley, or Gordeyenko / Commanded now the country's force, / Then snow-sheets would not hump in clusters / On far-flung graves of Cossack folk, / By now the grieving homeland's [Little Russia] musters / Might have thrown off the alien yoke. (329)

This is the most footnote-populated stanza. Here, the footnotes serve an interesting, contradictory function. Upon first glance, the evocation of Ukrainian heroes and grievances supports the rebellious cries of the Cossack youths, and legitimizes the oral history being marshaled for rebellion. The footnotes elaborate that Doroshenko is "an irreconcilable enemy of Russian dominion (владычества)," and Samoylovich is "the son of a Hetman exiled by Peter." The image of Little Russia as an enchained imperial possession recalls earlier descriptions of Maria and, it could be argued, invokes sympathy for the Ukrainian voices aching for rebellion and freedom. However, the footnote for "our" Paley states that Paley sided with Russia during the Battle of Poltava after being exiled by Mazepa. At the time, Paley had been leading an uprising against Poland-Lithuania. The footnote doesn't mention that Paley was ordered to stop his insurrection by both Peter and Mazepa, who were then allied with Poland against Sweden. Mazepa exiles Paley and assumes control of the Right-Bank, and Paley turns against Mazepa in the Battle of Poltava, where Mazepa is ultimately defeated. This again points us to Mazepa's treachery and distances him from the legitimate Cossack rulers of the past as it casts doubt as to whether the position of Hetman can exist without the Russian Empire. Paley returns to the imperial fold, and Gordeenko, a Cossack leader who sided with Charles, is caught and exiled. The only option for the leader of Ukraine is to submit to the

autocratic tsar. The structure of these two quatrains also emphasizes the quest for independence is always-already forestalled as it creates an "If only" (Когда бы) proposition for Little Russia. If only Ukraine's ancient heroes had military might (the might that Peter clearly has), then the injustices against them would not have occurred, could have been prevented, or could be avenged. The injustices may be legitimate, but the conditional structure emphasizes that the uprising lacks a capable leader.

The next stanza casts further doubt upon the viability of the uprising. The young voices are said to have a dangerous craving (опасные алча) and are describe as the expression of youth (юность). This description frames their desires for independence in a temporary and emotional vein and sets them apart from the aged Hetman Mazepa. This rebellious youth does not understand their own history: ""lost sight/ Of the Dominion's servile plight,/ Forgot Bogdan's auspicious quarrels/ Those sacred truces, martial laurels,/ The glories of ancestral might." (Забыв отчизны давний плен, / Богдана счастливые споры, Святые брани, договоры / И славу дедовских времен). In this account, the young rabble has forgotten their fatherland's previous captivity. This can refer to either the precarious geo-political position of the independent Cossacks prior to the Treaty of Periaslav or Cossack dependence on and incorporation into the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Despite calling the unification of the past an agreement (договор), the stanza subtly emphasizes the paternal, patrimonial position of the Cossacks in the poem's present. Here, in an auspicious and glorious victory, the Cossack forefather Khmelnytsky unites the fatherland with Russia. The current alliance with Sweden is now fully framed as an internal uprising, and Mazepa, as a potential leader, is neither the strong forefather

like Khmelnytsky, who chose the correct course, nor the Pater Peter whose glory will triumph; he is instead an illegitimate leader and an unnatural bridegroom.

Kochubey's denunciation reaches Peter, and Mazepa defends himself by invoking his loyalty to the Russian Autocrat and his prior refusal of foreign alliances and Ukraine's crown. His inscrutable character is here reinforced. The narrative begs the question: Why does Mazepa, after over twenty years of loyal service, turn against the Russian Tsar? The question remains unanswered, partly because the logical answer within the narrative itself is the quest for self-rule and independence from the Russian empire, which is emphasized to be a futile or inappropriate enterprise for Ukraine. The history the poem presents to the reader is of a Ukraine unviable and indefensible outside of imperial incorporation. The dangerous idea of self-rule coalesces in the tragic figure of Maria.

The second canto is primarily made up of dramatic dialogue. Echoing the narrator's political condemnations in a romantic frame, it begins with Maria addressing Mazepa. She accuses Mazepa of infidelity with the Princess Dulskaya. This purported infidelity is allegorical, and the romantic infidelity Maria suspects is actually political. She demands reassurance and vows of loyalty from Mazepa, who answers her as he answered Peter – by assuring her of his fidelity and by pleading that his old age makes him incapable of such intrigue. To calm her, he reveals his political plans.

Без милой вольности и славы
Склоняли долго мы главы
Под покровительством Варшавы,
Под самовластием Москвы.
Но независимой державой
Украйне быть уже пора:
И знамя вольности кровавой
Я подымаю на Петра.

> Bereft of pride, of free election, / We bent our heads in futile spite / Beneath the Pole's unsought protection, / The harness of the Muscovite. / Self-rule in free, in sovereign manner / Is due us – overdue by far: / I hoist Ukraina's bloody banner / Of liberty against the Tsar. (340)

The voice is Mazepa's, and while the reader's perception of his duplicitous character has already been framed and reinforced by the narrative voice in the first canto, the impetus for war is clear. When seducing Ukraine, embodied in Maria, Mazepa articulates a clear platform for freedom, glory, and independence from neighboring powers. Maria believes him, and she believes in his ultimate victory: "Ты будешь царь земли родной!" He promises to love her more than glory and power. He asks her what she will do if he is defeated, and she vows to follow him to any end. He asks her if she would save him instead of her father, and she vows her loyalty to her Hetman. As the developments of the next canto demonstrate, both parties are unable to keep their vows, and their unwed union ends barren with Mazepa's plea: "Just remember,/ Maria, what you said today" (Помни же, Мария, / Что ты сказала мне теперь). Maria's last words and vows of loyalty, destined to broken, evoke the distant secret love of the dedication: "The memory of words last spoken/ By you, and your sad wilderness,/ Have been my only sacred token/ Sole refuge, ultimate redress" (324) (Твоя печальная пустыня, / Последний звук твоих речей / Одно сокровище, святыня, / Одна любовь души моей [5:17]).

Before she discovers the murderous secret (убийственная тайна) of her father's impending execution, while still unaware of the full impact of her illicit union, Maria already imagines her parents alone and childless (бездетной старости, одних). On the day of Kochubey's execution, Maria's mother wakes her. Maria agrees to plead with her lover the Hetman to spare her father's life, and the women rush towards the executioner's platform. They arrive too late and the crowd has already forgotten the life they just saw

extinguished. Though Kochubey is blameless before God and described as a martyr (страдалец), each member of the Little Russian family suffers the consequences of their daughter's rebellion. The narrative emphasizes that Kochubey is an innocent casualty in a larger battle, and his virtuous communion is juxtaposed to Mazepa's political duplicity and anathema. After the execution, Mazepa becomes a solitary figure in the narrative and he is depicted as separate from both loyal and rebellious factions: Один пред конною толпой / Мазепа, грозен, удалялся / От места казни. Он терзался / Какой-то страшной пустотой.

In a scene that parallels Maria's escape from her familial home, Mazepa's ruminative emptiness is soon explained as Maria's empty bedchamber is discovered. She disappears without a trace and the passage once again evokes the dedication (пустыня, / Последний звук) as Mazepa waits for news from the Cossack search parties he has sent out:

> Но ни один ему принесть
> Не мог о бедной деве весть.
> И след ее существованья
> Пропал как будто звук пустой,
> И мать одна во мрак изгнанья
> Умчала горе с нищетой.
>
> Not one came forward to relate / Words of Maria or her fate. / Forgetful time was swift to smother / Her imprint like a buried leaf [sound] / And left her lonely stricken mother / To exiled penury and grief. (354)

Kochubey is beheaded, his wife is exiled to poverty and ignominy, and the unfortunate Maria breaks her vows of loyalty and disappears. The Cossack Hetman, in his bid for rule over an independent Ukraine, is shown to have overreached the natural limits of his abilities, and before the actual battle is depicted, the fate of Ukraine is prefigured and fulfilled in a literary manifestation of Romantic historiography.

Mazepa continues his machinations with Charles XII of Sweden and is ironically deemed the leader of Ukraine (вожак Украйны). Unlike an official title, the word вожак implies an unsanctioned leader and can be used in the context of one who leads the blind. In order to confuse the Russian tsar, Mazepa feigns a terminal illness and is anointed during his last rites. Unlike the loyal Little Russian noble Kochubey, who looks for resolution and healing in the sacraments administered by an Orthodox priest before his death (Мой вождь под знаменем креста … служитель / За нас распятого Христа), Mazepa feigns his subservience before Christ and before the Tsar. He duplicitously accepts the holy oil as part of his plot against the autocrat, and his religious and political sins are again intertwined. As Charles changes his course towards Ukraine, Mazepa rises from his feigned death and near-martyrdom (страдалец хилый) an imposter and an imposing enemy, and the poem implies that the Catholic Church and Poland-Lithuania orchestrate Mazepa's alliance with Charles: Согбенный тяжко жизнью старой, / Так оный хитрый кардинал, / Венчавшись римскою тиарой, / И прям, и здрав, и молод стал.

In the bloody dawn of civil war (война народная), the true Tsar takes decisive action. The narrative alludes to Peter's rage while a footnote elaborates that "Strong measures, taken by Peter with his usual speed and energy, kept Ukraine subjected/obedient" (Сильные меры, принятые Петром с обыкновенной его быстротой и энергией, удержали Украйну в повиновении). The anathema rings out throughout the Orthodox lands, the loyal Little Russian Cossacks choose another Hetman, and the exiled relatives of Iskra and Kochubey are recalled into the fold with new privileges and the personal condolences of the Tsar. Order is restored in the empire,

the truly loyal are rewarded, and Mazepa's rebellion is shown to be fully distinct and apart from both the loyal Little Russian people and the rebellious Cossacks (трепещет бунт осиротелый). Sweden is Russia's true enemy in the Great Northern War, while the rebellious Cossacks and Ukrainians are an internal uprising incited by foreign, Catholic forces. Only now does the narrative focus shift to the battle.

Before the battle begins, Mazepa speaks to Orlyk and concedes the battle has already been lost. The reader is always already aware of the futility of Charles' and Mazepa's efforts, but Mazepa himself voices the foregone conclusion: "Too callow visions did we nourish;/ Both frail and rash was the design,/ We have small hope to see it flourish./ Of its own weight my purpose falls" (357) (Поторопились мы некстати: Расчет и дерзкой и плохой, / И в нем не будет благодати. / Пропала, видно, цель моя [PSS: 5:53]). Mazepa's words and the feminine form of the verb (пропала) evoke both Ukraine (Украина) and Maria's flight: И след ее существованья / Пропал как будто звук пустой. Maria's flight forces Mazepa to see the futility of his rule, and as the battle nears, Mazepa also sees the futility of his alliance with Charles: "But he too clearly lacks the weight/ To stay that sovereign titan's course" (Но не ему вести борьбу / С самодержавным великаном). While Mazepa is here speaking about Charles, the poem has made clear this is an argument that applies to Mazepa as well.

While Orlyk suggests reconciliation and resuming relations with Peter, Mazepa evokes a long history that makes reconciliation with the Russian Tsar impossible. Rather than differing political loyalties or a desire for political autonomy, Mazepa narrates a story wherein once (однажды) at a feast, in response to a bold word, Peter grabbed Mazepa by his grey whiskers. The promise made to Maria, the promise of independence

and of self-rule for Ukraine and her Cossacks, is here reduced to a false ideology that covers a petty response to a petty argument. Mazepa's desire for power, which the first two cantos legitimate, is here undermined fully and he is called an изменник, which can refer to both a traitor and an apostate. After this final damnation, the narrative voice addresses the reader. Unlike the second canto, which incorporates in narrative dialogue the voices of Mazepa, Maria, Kochubey, Orlyk, and Kochubey's wife, in the third and final canto, the multiplicity of dissident voices in the narrative ultimately cede power to the autocratic Tsar. The narrative unifies its readership under the blazing glory of war and the autocrat: "The fateful acres thrum and rattle/ And blossom out in flares and dust;/ But, clear to all, the scales of battle/ Already shift to favor us" (И битвы поле роковое / Гремит, пылает здесь и там, Но явно счастье боевое / Служить уж начинает нам). Previously, the pronoun "us" was only uttered in dramatic dialogue, and even then only by the Ukrainian characters. The narrative voice unifies all Slavic peoples in the triumph of the Russian Tsar and the Russian nation, here composed of all loyal members of the empire.[61]

Peter's suppression of internal uprisings and external enemies in the Battle of Poltava is a holy war or a storm sent by God (божия гроза). Peter's retinue is composed of favorites, darlings, or minions (любимцы), and the poem evokes a romantic devotion. The autocrat is horrifying (ужасен) in the Romantic and odic sense of awe-inspiring and splendid (прекрасен); he is the Orthodox, natural groom of his loyal subjects. Peter rushes into battle on a zealous and humble steed (ретив и смирен), and personifies fate and the battle itself (Могущ и радостен как бой.). In stark opposition, wounded Charles

commands his troops with a weak flick of the wrist (слабым манием руки) as he is borne by his servants in a chair (качалка), which evokes a child's cradle.

While the Ukrainian landscape, the Kochubey family, and Mazepa dominate the majority of *Poltava*, the depiction of the battle turns to Russia and Sweden. Loyal Little Russian Cossacks and nobleman are now enveloped in the Russian national banner: "Swede, Russian—stabbing, splitting, slashing" (361). And during the battle, Peter's divinely-inspired voice resounds:

> Тесним мы шведов рать за ратью;
> Темнеет слава их знамен,
> И бога браней благодатью
> Наш каждый шаг запечатлен.
> Тогда-то свыше вдохновенный
> Раздался звучный глас Петра:
> «За дело, с богом!» Из шатра,
> Толпой любимцев окруженный,
> Выходит Петр. Его глаза
> Сияют. Лик его ужасен.
> Движенья быстры. Он прекрасен,
> Он весь, как божия гроза.
>
> And rank on rank we are compressing / The Swede, aground his banner drags; / The god of battle's patent blessing / Is blazoned on our eager flags. / Then Peter's booming voice resounded / Like the Almighty's instrument: / "To work, with God!" And from the tent, / By his close favorites surrounded, / Emerges Peter: living fire / His blazing eyes; his step resilient;/ His visage fearsome; he is brilliant, / Embodiment of godly ire. (359)

In this passage, which critics identify with the celebratory, Lomonsovian ode, the Swedes are Russia's proper enemies and the true opponents.[62] Cossacks, Little Russians, and Russians alike are united against Sweden, the excommunicated Mazepa, and his band of rebels. God, history, and fate are on the Russian side. The battle is chronicled for posterity, and Pushkin's readers are already familiar with the glorious conclusion of the war prefigured and fulfilled as a divine plan.[63]

Just before the battle ends, the young Cossack who was once in love with Maria and who delivered Kochubey's denunciation takes a shot at Mazepa. In turn Voinarovsky, a loyal member of Mazepa's retinue, kills the young man and the Hetman is unharmed. Voinarovsky's loyalty to Mazepa, and K.F. Ryleev's loyalty to the Decembrists are neither condoned nor forgotten. The youthful Cossack dies with Maria's name on his lips, and Mazepa is saved from narrative near death by an allusion to the work of a Decembrist poet. Ryleev's much more sympathetic portrayal of the Ukrainian Hetman is allowed to coexist within *Poltava*. However, the last echoes of the rebellion are suppressed at this point in the narrative, and the battle ends abruptly after the young Cossack's death. The Russian narrative unites the reader in odic victory: "We've broken through; the Swede is routed" (362)! (Ура! мы ломим; гнутся шведы.)

Yet, Steiner offers a compelling, competing conclusion, noting that this odic "we" also evokes the Decembrists, especially Ryleev's "Civic Virtue" (Grazdanskoe muzhestvo) and his celebration of freedom and Byron, "On the Death of Byron" ("Na Smert' Beirone'):

> The pronoun 'we' is significant in this regard. At first glance the above-quoted lines sound like an echo from Lomonosov. However, a true imperial bard writing in the style that Harsha Ram has baptized 'the imperial sublime' would never use the pronoun 'we' in the way Pushkin uses it here. As a result, I believe that these lines do more than gesture toward Lomonosov's heroic odes; they also recall the works of the Decembrists 'civic' poets, works that were addressed not to tsars and rulers, but to like-minded citizens" (106).

This dissonance between the celebratory national "we" and the failed uprisings is evoked again in the battle. Russia is elevated to a world power as the benevolent Peter feasts with his foes, and Pushkin's 1826 poem "Stansy," with its plea for autocratic leniency, is once again evoked by the juxtaposition of Ryleev's text with this victorious feast:

В шатре своем он угощает
Своих вождей, вождей чужих,
И славных пленников ласкает,
И за учителей своих
Заздравный кубок подымает. (5:59-60)

He bids the lords beneath his scepters/ Both Swede and Russian, to his tent; / And gaily mingling prey and captors / Lifts high his cup in compliment / To the good health of his "preceptors" [teachers]. (363)

Peter celebrates Russia's imperial victory with native and foreign leaders alike and shows kindness to those captured. He toasts his teachers, and the narrative again connects Charles' futile foray against Peter with Napoleon's equally disastrous assault: "But where's our foremost, fiercest coach [teacher]? / [And where's our first invited guest?] (363). (Но где же первый, званый гость? / Где первый, грозный наш учитель.)[64] Charles is but one of the many tests of fate which the Russian empire will withstand. As he was never a legitimate opponent, Mazepa is almost forgotten. While Charles is called a king, a guest, and a formidable teacher (король, гость, грозный наш учитель), Mazepa is deemed a Judas, a villain and a traitor (Иуда, злодей, изменник). He is not an enemy; he is a turncoat. He is a failed member of the narrative's collective "we" and his failed uprising, which from Maria's earlier perspective and in Voinarovksy's view was a bid for independence, is framed as a necessary concession to the natural strengthening and progression of the Russian empire and is collective national family.

Poltava concludes by emphasizing the battle's legacy and Russia's national trajectory. The narrator asks what happened to the proud lords (мужей) of Poltava one hundred years after the battle (approximately 1812). Peter, as the rightful spouse of the empire, begets a national patrimony in the Russian state: "In the state of northern power, / In her martial fate, / Only you, the hero of Poltava, have erected / An enormous

monument to yourself" (my translation). (В гражданстве северной державы, / В ее воинственной судьбе, / Лишь ты воздвиг, герой Полтавы, / Огромный памятник себе.) While Peter fortifies his rule in stone and empire, Charles' inadequate monument is found in the bucolic countryside of Ukraine. It consists of three moss-covered steps marking the spot where he died in inglorious battle.[65]

While in the final stanzas of *Poltava* the narrator claims there is no trace of Mazepa and that he has been forgotten since long ago, the whole narrative poem has focused on the illicit bridegroom and the anathema against him is still chanted yearly (Грозя, гремит о нем собор.) Mazepa's memory is remembered and forgotten as a ritual, yearly reminder of the threat of internal instability. The relatives of the unfortunate Kochubeys still live in Dikanka and can recall the lamentable fates of their great grandfathers. Instead of Mazepa's songs of independence, Cossack grandchildren hear stories of the loyal Kochubey. By the time Pushkin writes his narrative poem, these Cossack grandchildren, who had ridden victoriously with Alexander into Paris, had seen all Cossack units in Ukraine disbanded and witnessed the full imperial incorporation of the once independent regiments.

Maria's story, the story of a potentially independent Cossack polity, is not official history. Yet, *Poltava's* concluding stanza returns to it:

> Но дочь преступница… преданья
> Об ней молчат. Ее страданья,
> Ее судьба, ее конец
> Непроницаемою тьмою
> От нас закрыты. Лишь порою
> Слепой украинский певец,
> Когда в селе перед народом
> Он песни гетмана бренчит,
> О грешной деве мимоходом
> Казачкам юным говорит. (5:64)

> But legends keep silent . . . about / the guilty daughter. Her suffering, / Her fate, her end / Are hidden from us / In an impenetrable fog. / Only sometimes / A blind Ukrainian bard, / In a village, before the people, / Tells Cossack youth / In passing, of the sinful maiden / And strums the Hetman's songs. (my translation)

Maria's memory is unofficially preserved in the blind Cossack bards' songs, in Ukrainian villages, and in the memory of the commoners and the Cossacks. While Maria is hidden from the loyal, collective "we" represented in official historiography, Pushkin's *Poltava* also records her story. The Ukrainian maiden and the wife of the Decembrist Volkonsky are both casualties in the official narrative of national consolidation, which requires a homogenizing conformity to autocratic rule and dominion. Pushkin, under scrutiny for his involvement with the Decembrists and their ideas, can no longer write to, for, or about Maria Raevskaia. Like Ukrainian Maria's trail in the night, Maria Raevskaia disappears out of official national history into the Siberian desert. The tragic Maria is visible in every tragic story of insurrection and uprising, and Pushkin's text ensures that she is not forgotten.

Thus, before ending on such a determined note—one that reads the permanent death of Ukrainian national identity and alternative state structures within the Russian empire in Pushkin's *Poltava*—I would like to return to the image of the agile chamois. After the battle, as Charles and Mazepa flee Ukraine, Pushkin's imagery echoes the prevalent depictions of Mazepa in the European Romantic literary tradition: "Across the steppeland lone [wild] and bare [naked] / Hetman and King […] are speeding" (363). (Верхом, в глуши степей нагих, / Король и гетман мчатся оба.) However, unlike the European depictions, in *Poltava*, Mazepa's ride though the naked steppes is decidedly less Romantic. Mazepa has lost more than his unlawful young bride; he has lost Ukraine.

As they travel, Mazepa is haunted by the vision of the deserted Kochubey homestead and the dilapidated and emptied Ukrainian household. Unlike the glorious battle that is chronicled for posterity, Mazepa's potential rule is depicted as some sort of forgotten fairy tale (Какой-нибудь рассказ забвенный). The narrative addresses Mazepa in the familiar register (ты) to remind him of the family he has wrecked, and the anathema against him rings out annually in Orthodox churches.

Night falls and on the craggy banks of the Dnieper River the villains lightly sleep. Whether in reality, a hallucination or a dream, Maria appears before Mazepa. She materializes as a specter and a haunting illuminated by the moon. Before her threatening finger (грозя перстом) Mazepa shudders as if before the executioner's ax (Он вздрогнул как под топором). In her crazed dialogue, Maria calls Mazepa her friend and asks him to be quiet because her parents might hear them. Beginning with the night of their illegitimate elopement, Maria quickly moves through the events that Pushkin has already covered. She remembers her mother delivering the news of Kochubey's impending execution and she remembers that her father died, but she cannot quite recall the face of his murderer: "that head […] wasn't even human, / But like a wolf's" (365). (эта голова / была совсем не человечья, / А волчья.) Maria exhibits the symptoms of shock and cannot come to terms with Mazepa's betrayal. She reasons that it must all be a lie and that her mother must have tried to scare her so she would not elope. Maria then recalls a holiday crowd, a platform and dead bodies, though she cannot quite recognize the platform as an executioner's platform and her father's flesh. In this moment, she refuses to identify the living, murderous Mazepa before her as the lover of her memories:

> Я принимала за другого
> Тебя, старик. Оставь меня.

Твой взор насмешлив и ужасен.
Ты безобразен. Он прекрасен:
В его глазах блестит любовь,
В его речах такая нега!
Его усы белее снега,
А на твоих засохла кровь! . . . (5:62)

Old man, I took you for another, / I know that now. No – I must go! / Your gaze is wry, your warmth pretended; / Why, you are loathesome . . . He is splendid! / His eyes have such a loving glow, / His words are tender, to be trusted; / His whiskers are white as snow, / But yours . . . yours are . . . all blood-encrusted! . . . (365)

The man she sees before her reflects a failed autocrat and the destroyer of her familial happiness, and she cannot recognize the image. She rejects the living man for the memory of his glory and for the freedom and the ideas that he represented.

Maria flees into the night: "She gave a strident [wild] peal of laughter, / And, nimbler than a hind [chamois] in flight, / Jumped up, and as he started after, / Had vanished in the depth of night" (366). (И с диким смехом завизжала, / И легче серны молодой / Она вспрыгнула, побежала / И скрылась в темноте ночной.) The chamois, like Maria at the very beginning of the poem, escapes her bridegroom, her chains and her predators. If, as I have argued, Maria represents the idea of a politically autonomous Ukrainian nation, then the defeat of the potential Hetman ruler is not the defeat of his ideas. The prey, the idea of Ukraine, is hidden in the night, but the resurgence of regional nationalisms and revolutionary upstarts is still a possibility within the empire. Written after the victorious defeat of Napoleon, and the anxiety-ridden Decembrist uprising, *Poltava* subtly suggests that the exile of the perpetrators does not necessarily mean the death of their ideas. The specter of the chamois remains.

Notes

1. François Marie Arouet de Voltaire, *Histoire de Charles XII*, in *Oeuvre complètes de Voltaire*, 52 vols. (Paris: Garnier frères, 1877-85), 16:236-37. Unless otherwise indicated, translations are my own.

2. For further elaboration on Mazepa in the Romantic tradition, see Hubert F. Babinski, *The Mazeppa Legend in European Romanticism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1974), 5-74; Patricia Mainardi, "Many Ways to Ride a Horse: Mazeppa," in *Husbands, Wives, and Lovers: Marriage and its Discontents in Nineteenth-century France* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003); and Dmytro Nalyvaiko, "Mazepa v evropeiskii literature XIX st.: Istoriia ta mif," *Slovo I chas* no. 8/9 (2002): 3-17 and 39-48.

3. For an overview of Ryleev's *Voinarovsky*, its sources, and the history of its creation, see George G. Grabowicz, "The History and Myth of Cossack Ukraine in Polish and Russian Romantic Literature," PhD diss., Harvard University, 1975. For a close comparison of the two texts, see V. Sipovskii, "Pushkin i Ryleev," in *Pushkin i ego sovremenniki* 1 no. 3 (St. Petersburg: Akademiia nauk, 1906), 68-88.

4. Mickiewicz published *Konrad Wallenrod* in St. Petersburg in 1828 and Pushkin received one of the first copies. In return, perhaps in reply, Mickiewicz was one of the first to receive a copy of Pushkin's *Poltava*. In Mickiewicz's narrative poem, the young Lithuanian Konrad Wallenrod is captured by the Teutonic Knights who are waging war against his people. Wallenrod grows up among the knights and eventually leads them to defeat. He is thus both a traitor and a national hero willing to sacrifice all for his cause.

5. A. S. Pushkin, "Oproverzhenie na kritiki," in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii,* 16 vols. (Leningrad: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1937-1959), XI:160. All subsequent references to Pushkin are to this edition, hereafter *PSS*.

6. Blagoi and others argue that this context confirms *Poltava* was written to demonstrate Pushkin's loyalty to the tsar. See D.I. Blagoi, "Poltava v tvorshestve Pushkina. Sotsio-literaturnyi analiz," in *Moskovskii Pushkinist*, vol. II (Moscow: Federatsia, 1930), 5-54, and for a critique of Blagoi, see Paul Debreczeny, "Narrative Voices in Pushkin's *Poltava*," *Russian Literature* 24, no. 3 (1988): 333-4.

7. This parallel between Nicholas and Peter can be seen in Pushkin's "Stansy" (1826), which can be interpreted to argue that "only autocracy had the strength and the opportunities necessary to overcome society's inertia and carry out the reforms which were vital to the country," while at the same time insisting on autocratic reform and leniency as necessary redeeming factors. See Oleg Proskurin, "Pushkin and Politics," in *The Cambridge Companion to Pushkin*, ed. Andrew Kahn (Oxford: Cambridge UP, 2006), 112. I do not wish to argue that the support for autocracy evidenced in *Poltava* is fully reflective of Pushkin's personal views. Pushkin's support for the power and status of the Russian empire is less contested than his support for the monarchy, which waxes and wanes throughout his life. While most scholars do note that this period in Pushkin's oeuvre evidences a phase of reconciliation with the monarchy, the multiplicity of viewpoints in *Poltava* and the poet's evolving politics preclude such a clean understanding of Pushkin's narrative poem.

8. The Treaty of Periaslav marks the beginning of the long incorporation of the Cossack lands into the Russian Empire. After the Treaty of Periaslav (1654), in 1667, Russia and Poland divided the Ukrainian territories along the Dnieper River. The land east of the Dnieper (Left-Bank Ukraine) was controlled by Russia, while the land west of the Dnieper (Right-Bank Ukraine) was under Polish control. Over the course of the eighteenth century, by Pushkin's day, Left-Bank Ukraine (the Cossack Hetmanate) was fully incorporated into the political and administrative structure of the Russian Empire as the Little Russian Governorate. In the early nineteenth century, the term Little Russia most often refers to the already-incorporated territory of the Hetmanate on the Left Bank (Eastern side) of the Dnieper River. I use Little Russia and Little Russians when discussing the imperial lands, noblemen, and loyal subjects and the terms Ukraine and Ukrainians when discussing ideas and characters that seem to argue for an autonomous, non-imperial, or non-Russian state structures. For both historical and contemporary uses of the terms Ukraine, Little Russia, and Rus', see Zenon Kohut, "The Development of a Little Russian Identity and Ukrainian Nationbuilding," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 10, no. 3/4 (1986): 559-76, and Serhii Plokhy "Ukraine or Little Russia? Revisiting an Early Nineteenth-Century Debate," *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 48, no. 3/4 (2006): 335-53.

9. Occurring after 1654 (Periaslav) and 1656 (Vilnius), this title refers to "Great, Little, and White Russia." For a multi-disciplinary collection of articles focusing on the battle and its aftermath, see Serhii Plokhy, ed., *Poltava 1709: The Battle and the Myth* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012).

10. Liah Greenfeld, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), 195.

11. *Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov Rossiiskoi Imperii,* 1721, vol. 6 *(*St. Petersburg, 1830), #3840, 445.

12. Voltaire, *Histoire de Charles XII*, 16:157. While Voltaire never travelled east of Berlin, Wolff emphasizes that his *Charles XII* was "powerfully influential in mapping Eastern Europe on the mind of the Enlightenment." Larry Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994), 90.

13. Nicholas Riasanovsky, *A Parting of Ways: Government and the Educated Public in Russia, 1801-1855* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 22.

14. Riasanovsky, *A Parting of Ways*, 150.

15. Scholars of nationalism emphasize that once the concept of the nation was formed in sixteenth-century England, it became modular and transferrable. All nations react to this paradoxical, imported demand for a unique history: "Every society importing the foreign idea of the nation inevitably focused on the source of importation – an object of imitation by definition – and reacted to it. Greenfeld, *Nationalism*, 15. However, Russia's relationship to her non-Russian or near-Russian imperial borderlands was also being articulated alongside her position in relation to the West: "In the ongoing work of establishing national identity, two sets of centre and periphery had to be contended with: that of Russia's metropolitan centers vis-à-vis her distant borders, and that of Russia's peripheral status vis-à-vis European centers of culture." Katya Hokanson, *Writing at Russia's Border* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 7.

16. M.P. Pogodin, "Pismo o russkikh romanakh," in *Severnaia lira na 1827 god*, eds. T. M. Gol'ts and A. L. Grishunin (Moscow: Izd-vo nauka, 1984), 133-34.

17. For a detailed account of Scott's reception in Russia, see Mark Altshuller, *Epokha Valtera Skotta v Rossii. Istoricheskii roman 1830-kh godov* (St. Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 1996). For an elaboration on the relationship between Walter Scott and the nineteenth-century Russian obsession with history, see Dan Ungurianu, *Plotting History: The Russian Historical Novel in the Imperial Age* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2007), 14-39.

18. This is not to suggest that empires are successively replaced by nations. Instead, these models of statecraft overlap and coexist in productive tension. Prior to the nineteenth century, multi-ethnic state structures predominated, and Kappeler and others have convincingly demonstrated that "it is misleading to interpret the history of Russia in terms of the nation state." For a multiethnic history of the Russian empire, see Andreas Kappeler, *The Russian Empire: A Multiethnic History* (New York: Pearson Education Limited, 2001), 3. For a more detailed discussion of Russian imperial expansion in the nineteenth century and its relation to *narodnost'* and narrative, see the Introductions to Hokanson, *Writing at Russia's Border*, 1-22, and Mark Bassin, *Imperial Visions Nationalist Imagination and Geographical Expansion in the Russian Far East, 1840-1865* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 1-18.

19. *Narodnost'* is a poly-semantic term that emphasizes the difficulty of reconciling the concepts of nation and empire. Coined in a letter by Prince P.A. Viazemskii in 1819, the meaning was debated throughout the century. As a translation for the French nationalité, *narodnost'* was meant to envelop the French 'populaire' and 'national.' See Katya Hokanson "Literary Imperialism, *Narodnost'* and Pushkin's Invention of the Caucasus," *The Russian Review* 53, no. 3 (1994), 336-39.

20. Svetlana Evdokimova, *Pushkin's Historical Imagination* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 31. See also Andrew Wachtel, *An Obsession with History: Russian Writers Confront the Past* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994), 1-18. Belinskii echoed this sentiment as late as 1841 noting, "Век наш – по преимуществу *исторический век*. …История сделалась теперь как бы общим основанием и единственным условием всякого живого знания: без нее стало невозможно постижение ни искусства, ни философии. … все величие гения Вальтера Скотта именно в том и состоит, что он был органом и провозвестником века, давши искусству историческое направление." V. G. Belinskii, "Rukovodstvo k vceobshchei istorii," in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (Moskva: Izd-vo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1954), 6:90. (Our age – is an historical age par excellence . . . History has now become the common ground and sole precondition for living knowledge: without history, it has become impossible to comprehend art, to comprehend philosophy. … [All] the splendor of Walter Scott's genius consists in this: he was the organ and herald of the age that gave art its historical bearing.)

21. Monika Greenleaf and Stephen Moeller-Sally, eds., *Russian Subjects: Empire, Nation, and the Culture of the Golden Age* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1998), 10-11.

22. In Pushkin's *Poltava*, the Cossack Hetman Ivan Mazepa is denounced as a traitor before his alliance with Charles. Mazepa defends himself before the Russian tsar by invoking his long history of loyalty. In a footnote to the poem, to support Mazepa's claim and emphasize the writer's historical fidelity, Pushkin points the reader to the first scholarly history of Ukraine, Dmitrii Bantysh-Kamensky's *Istoriia Maloi Rossii* in two volumes (1822). Pushkin had also studied the *Istoria rusov* (*History of Rus'*) when preparing to write his own history of Ukraine and

the *History* had greatly influenced the Decembrist and poet K.F. Ryleev. For a detailed investigation of the mysterious authorship of the *History of Rus'* and the history's relationship to Cossackdom as an autonomous polity, a social estate within empires, and a nation-building myth see Serhii Plokhy, *The Cossack Myth: History and Nationhood in the Age of Empires* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012). For more on Pushkin's unfulfilled project to write a history of Ukraine, see Iu. G. Oksman, "Neosuschestvlennyii zamysel istorii Ukrainy" in *Literaturnoe Nasledstvo* (Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1952), 58: 211-21.

23. "Древняя Россия, казалось, найдена Карамзиным, как Америка Колумбом." (Karamzin, it seemed, discovered ancient Russia, like Columbus discovered America). A. S. Pushkin, "Otryvki iz pisem, mysli i zamechaniia," *PSS*, XI: 57. First published in *Severnye tsvety* in 1828.

24. Richard S. Wortman, "National Narratives in the Representation of Nineteenth-Century Russian Monarchy," in *Extending the Borders of Russian History: Essays in Honor of Alfred J. Rieber*, ed. Marsha Siefert (New York: CEU Press, 2003), 53.

25. N. M. Karamzin. "O liubvi k otechestvu i narodnoi gordosti," in *Izbrannye sochineniia* (Moscow: Khudozh. literatura, 1964), 2:280-87.

26. After Peter, "Alexander came to the peace table of Versailles (1814) and Vienna (1816) not as an Eastern potentate, but as the savior of the European nations from promiscuous fusion in Napoleon's empire. Russia's imperial might thus served, paradoxically, to guarantee the privilege of nationality to Europeans, while absorbing into her own body any incipient non-European struggles for self-determination." Monika Greenleaf, *Russian Subjects*, 4.

27. On the family unit as a model of statecraft, see Doris Sommer, *Foundational Fictions: The National Romances of Latin America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991); Lisa Pollard, *Nurturing the Nation: The Family Politics of Modernizing, Colonizing, and Liberating Egypt, 1805-1923* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005); and Lynn Hunt, *The Family Romance of the French Revolution* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1992).

28. Evdokimova, *Pushkin's Historical Imagination*, 33. Ungurianu also emphasizes the poetic mode of Romantic historiography: "A prominent feature of romanticism is that the outside world is seen as a text, a language, someone else's (ultimately the Creator's) encoded message. History is a part of this larger text of the universe, full of 'symbols' or 'hieroglyphs,' which must be deciphered. But the scrolls of history will remain dead dry unless they are revived through artistic imagination." Ungurianu, *Plotting History*, 50.

29. Lina Steiner, "'My Most Mature Poèma:' Pushkin's *Poltava* and the Irony of Russian National Culture," *Comparative Literature* 61, no. 2 (2009): 98.

30. Tom Nairn, *The Break-up of Britain* (London: New Left Books, 1977), 329-63. Homi Bhabha also focuses on this "prodigious doubling," noting that "Nations, like narratives, lose their origins in the myths of time and only fully realize their horizons in the mind's eye." Bhabha, *Nation and Narration* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 1-7.

31. G. W. F. Hegel, *Lectures on the Philosophy of History*, trans. John Sibree (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1861), 43.

32. Quoted in Shil'der, N. K. *Imperator Nikolai Pervyi: ego zhizn' i tsarstvovanie,* vol. I, (St. Petersburg: Izdanie A.S. Suvorina, 1903), 704-706. I have modernized the Russian orthography in the quoted text.

33. This continued attempt to bridge the gap between the Russian people and the Russian state, a gap many in Russian historiography saw stemming from the Petrine reforms, was to reach its apogee in Nicholas and Uvarov's eventual policy of Official Nationality (1833) where autocracy, orthodoxy, and *narodnost*' are perhaps unnaturally fused. In the unforgettable words of Benedict Anderson, what official nationalism sought to achieve was the "stretching [of] the short, tight, skin of the nation over the gigantic body of empire." Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism,* rev. ed. (London: Verso, 2006), 86.

34. Greenfeld, *Nationalism*, 195. See *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi Imperii s 1649 goda,* vol. IV, 424-425, 440-442, 444-448. #2210, #2221, #2224. In these documents, the term Ukraine is used to delineate a geographical entity, while the term Little Russia is used to delineate the inhabitants of Ukraine as subjects loyal to Russia and unwillingly represented by Mazepa's change of alliance, which is consistently equated with Polish intrigue.

35. Nadieszda Kizenko emphasizes that during Peter's reign, arguments for Cossack incorporation did not emphasize a shared ethnic bond, and Cossacks and Little Russians are distinctly referred to as a separate people (narod). "Most of the rhetoric surrounding Mazepa [in liturgical service] – a thief and a betrayer, a second Judas, an apostate and devil – was already present in the letters and manifestos that Peter was writing about him. It is noteworthy that Peter's arguments were primarily religious, not ethnic: in using them, he was implicitly acknowledging that, rather than using the arguments of belonging to a single nation, he had to emphasize the bonds of a shared faith." Nadieszda Kizenko, "The Battle of Poltava in Imperial Liturgy," In *Poltava 1709*, ed. Serhii Plokhy, 233. Eighteenth-century Cossacks, as Cossacks, Little Russians or Ukrainians, were not imagined as the same peoples as Russians, instead their bonds were religious and historical. Peter, as the Orthodox Tsar, appealed to his role as the divinely-appointed pater of the fatherland.

36. Steiner, "My Most Mature Poèma," 98.

37. M. I. Aronson, "'Konrad Vallenrod' i 'Poltava,'" on *Vremennik Pushkinskoi komissii*, vol. II (Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1936), 45.

38. Tomashevskii argues that in Pushkin's oeuvre, the image of Peter is consistently equated with the Russian state. See his "Istorizm Pushkina," in *Pushkin* (Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1956-61), 2:154-99.

39. Steiner, "My Most Mature Poèma," 99.

40. This is a reversal of the trend that occurred during Catherine's rule, during which the gentry estate defined itself in relation to the state and won immunity from corporal punishment. Monika Greenleaf, *Russian Subjects*, 12.

41. Pushkin, "Предисловие к Первому Изданию," *PSS*, 5:335.

42. For a collected volume that approaches Khmelnytsky's complex legacy from the perspective of Ukrainian, Jewish, Russian, and Polish literature see Amelia M. Glaser ed. *Stories*

of Khmelnytsky: Competing Literary legacies of the 1648 Ukrainian Cossack Uprising (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2015). For more on the many ways that Bohdan Khmelnytsky and Ivan Mazepa have been interpreted as both similar and antithetical historical personas, see Taras Koznarsky's essay in Glaser's volume, "Heroes and Villains in the Historical Imagination: The Elusive Khmelnytsky," 90-109, and Koznarsky's, "Obsessions with Mazepa," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 31, no. 1/4 (2009): 569-615

43. K. Polevoi, "O Sochineniiakh Pushkina," reprinted in V.A. Zelinskii, ed. *Russkaia kriticheskaia literatura o proizvedeniiakh A.S. Pushkina: Khronologicheskii sbornik kritikobibliograficheskikh statei* (Moscow, 1887-99), II: 146-7.

44. For more on *Poltava's* reception in the early nineteenth-century, see: Steiner, "My Most Mature Poèma," 99-106; Paul Debreczeny, "The Reception of Pushkin's Poetic Works in the 1820s: A Study of the Critic's Role," *Slavic Review* 28, no. 3 (1969): 394-415; and Virginia Burns, "Pushkin's 'Poltava': A Literary Structuralist Interpretation" (Lanham: University Press of America, 2005), 19-60. On the reception of *Poltava* amongst Ukrainians in the early nineteenth century, see Taras Koznarsky, "Obsessions with Mazepa".

45. I.V. Kireevskii, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (Moskva: Moskovskii Universitet, 1911), 2: 19, and N.V Izmailov "Pushkin v rabote nad *Poltavoi*." *Ocherki tvorchestva Pushkina*. (Leningrad: Nauka, 1975), 114.

46. V.G. Belinskii, *Sochinenia Alexandra Pushkina* (Moskva-Leningrad, 1949), 195-204.

47. Lazar Fleishman and Lina Steiner see this multiplicity as a complex and mature deliberate technique for creating irony within the author's perspective. See Fleishman, "Poezia kak proza: narrator v Pushkinskoi 'Poltave,'" in *Analysieren als Deuten. Wolf Schmidum 60. Geburstag.* eds. Schmid, Wolf, et al. (Hamburg: Hamburg UP, 2004), 229-336 and Steiner, "My Most Mature Poèma," 106. While Paul Debreczeny argues that this multiplicity itself creates unity and that "the most innovative feature of *Poltava* was that its overall message was not interpreted for the reader […] the poem should be perceived as the sum of all its components, revealing the poet's complex attitude to his subject." Debreczeny, "Narrative Voices in Pushkin's *Poltava*,'" *Russian Literature* 24 (1988): 347.

48. Pushkin, *PSS* 5:19. The second footnote defines the word хутор as a загородный дом and the term further distinguishes the space as the imperial south, Little Russia, or Ukraine. Each of these terms is used within the narrative poem.

49. Walter Arndt, *Poltava*, in *Pushkin: Collected Narrative and Lyrical Poetry* (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1984), 325. All subsequent translations of *Poltava* are Arndt's unless otherwise noted.

50. Maxwell argues that, especially for women and female characters, national or confessional conversion is typically framed in terms of sexual conquest. He demonstrates that "cross-national relationships thus endanger the nationality of female patriots, but constitute an opportunity for sexually attractive patriot men." Alexander Maxwell, "National Endogamy and Double Standards: Sexuality and Nationalism in East-Central Europe during the 19th Century," *Journal of Social History* 41, no. 2 (Winter, 2007): 420. While at first Maxwell's analysis does not seem to apply to Andrii, Nikolai Gogol's character from the novella *Taras Bulba* (discussed in the next chapter), Andrii is identified as feminine within the text and his conversion to the Catholic Poles only strengthens the gendered depiction of his character. Much worse than mere

love for the nameless, speechless, Polish princess, Andrii's conversion evidences his desire for Polish rule and results in his death at the hands of his father, Taras.

51. *PSS* 5:65. Most scholars refer to the letters between Mazepa and Matrena, also mentioned in a footnote by Pushkin. These were also published in the 1830 edition of Bantysh-Kamensky's *Istoriia Maloi Rossii*.

52. Iu. M. Lotman, "K strukture dialogicheskogo teksta v poemakh Pushkina: (Problema avtorskikh primechanij k tesktu)," in *Pushkin: Biografiia pisatelia* (Sanktpeterburg: Iskusstvo SPB, 1995), 235.

53. See Dan Ungurianu, "Fact and Fiction in the Romantic Historical Novel" *Russian Review* 57 no.3 (1998): 385.

54. Grabowicz, "The History and Myth" 49.

55. хищник also refers to a hawk

56. Unless otherwise noted, all subsequent translations of *Poltava* are taken from Walter Arndt, "Poltava" in *Pushkin: Collected Narrative & Lyrical Poems* (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1984), 368.

57. Debreczeny, "Narrative Voices," 333

58. On the sketches of the hanged men, see Dmitrii Blagoi, "Poltava' v tvorchestve Pushkina," 43

59. See Iu. M. Lotman, "Posviashchenie 'Poltavy': (Adresat, tekst, funktsiia)," in *Pushkin: Biografiia pisatelia* (Sanktpeterburg: Iskusstvo SPB, 1995), 253-57.

60. This stanza is missing in the Arndt; the translation is my own.

61. The very plurality of speaking perspectives in the poem emphasizes Dixon's argument regarding Pushkin's view of history. We should be cautious when declaring Peter the unqualified victor: "Since it was part of the purpose of his experiments with genre to show that the same events could be experienced by different people in radically different ways, Pushkin's underlying pluralism of approach is matched by a multiplicity of perspectives that makes it perilous to identify heroes in his historical writings." Simon Dixon, "Pushkin and History," in *The Cambridge Companion to Pushkin*, ed. Andrew Kahn (Oxford: Cambridge UP, 2006), 120.

62. On Lomonsov's poetic revolution, which "forged a profound intimacy, ideological and even institutional, between poetry and imperial autocracy," and the resurgence of the ode in the civic poetry of the Decembrists, see Harsha Ram, *The Imperial Sublime: A Russian Poetics of Empire* (Madison: U Wisconsin Press, 2003), 6.

63. In contemporary Russia and Ukraine, Pushkin's odic representation of Peter's victory continues to feature prominently as historical evidence in the renewed deliberations over Ivan Mazepa and the historical legacy of the Battle of Poltava. On the debates surrounding the commemorations of the 300th anniversary of the battle in 2009, see Connor Doak, "Poltava at 300: Re-Reading Byron's *Mazeppa* and Pushkin's *Poltava* in the post-Soviet Era." *Australian Slavonic & East European Studies* 24, no. 1-2 (2010):83-101 and Serhii Plokhii, "The Battle that Never Ends," in *Poltava 1709*: *The Battle and the Myth*, xiii-xxv.

64. While *uchiteli* could allude to Peter's foreign education and its accompanying enlightenment, its use in the poem suggests Peter's foreign enemies. It is seen in Pushkin's earlier evocation of Russian national maturation: Суровый был в науке славы / Ей дан учитель; не один / Урок нежданый и кровавый / Задал ей шведской паладин (5:23). (Harsh was the taskmaster [teacher] of glory / Fate had assigned her: no small meed / Of lessons unforeseen and gory / Were dealt her by the royal Swede [328].)

65. In 1824, after reading Ryleev's *Voinarovksy*, Pushkin had himself tried and failed to locate Mazepa's grave. Binyon relates that an unhelpful Little Russian guide was unwilling to claim any knowledge about Mazepa and unable to lead them to the grave. See T.J. Binyon, *Pushkin: A Biography* (London: HarperCollins*Publishers*, 2002), 168.

CHAPTER III

ANCIENT MODELS AND NATIONAL REGENERATION IN GOGOL'S *ARABESQUES* AND *TARAS BULBAS*

Though fire is at war with water, their combination produces the
whole of nature—procreation from friendly enmity.
--Ovid, *Metamorphoses*

Two souls, alas, are housed within my breast,
And each will wrestle for the mastery there.
– Goethe, *Faust*

As mentioned in the previous chapter, Voltaire's *History of Charles XII* (1731) depicts the short-lived alliance between Sweden's King Charles and the Ukrainian Cossack Hetman Ivan Mazepa during the Great Northern War. Travelling between Poland and Russia, Charles arrives in the Ukrainian steppes and prepares for battle against Peter the Great. The text describes the land of the Zaporozhian Cossacks, which is bisected by the Borysthenes (the ancient name for the Dnieper):[1]

> This land is that of the Zaporozhians, the strangest people on earth: they are a rabble composed of ancient Rus'es, Poles, and Tatars, all professing a kind of Christianity and a brigandage resembling that of the pirates. They elect a chief, whom they often depose or slaughter. They do not tolerate women in their midst; together they kidnap all the children twenty or thirty leagues round and raise them in their customs. In the summer, they are always on campaign; during the winter, they sleep in spacious barns containing four or five hundred men. They fear nothing; they live free...

For Voltaire, the Zaporozhians are situated between Ottoman, Polish and Russian powers and described as a miscellany. While united by their customs and their religion, they are composed of diverse origins. A purely masculine brotherhood, the Cossacks do not reproduce by biological means. Instead, their numbers are sustained by brigandage, by

culture, and by faith. Wolff links this depiction to Linnaeus, the father of modern taxonomy and Voltaire's influential contemporary, who "looked to sexual reproduction as a key to defining individual species. Voltaire imagined the Zaporozhians as a people who did not sexually reproduce or a strange and unnatural miscellany of ancient peoples. Yet, the Cossacks possessed something to pass on to the children they abducted: *mœurs,* that is, manners or customs."[2] In the early nineteenth century, the German Romantics understood the nation as a unique species defined by language, history, and genealogy. Yet, when conceptualizing Russian *narodnost'*, a striking number of writers in the Russian empire turned to the recently incorporated Cossack lands and to Cossack history.[3] Historians, poets, and statesmen alike considered the relationship between the wild miscellany of the Cossacks and the Russian national self. Dan Unguriano notes that during this period, ten percent of historical novels concerned themselves with Ukrainian history, and Nikolai Gogol's literary success symbolizes the imperial obsession with Ukrainian folk culture and Cossack history that rapidly lost its appeal towards the end of the 1840s, due to factors that will be discussed later in this chapter.[4]

Orest Somov: Romantic Nationalism and Ancient Models

Romantic writers, despite their fixation on exotic historical characters and themes, located the source of literary inspiration and legitimation in native histories and national subjects: "The Romantic Idealist concept that most attracted the Russian Romantics was the national or native originality (autochthony); the word coined to express that dream, *narodnost*, became almost synonymous with the new word *romantizm.*"[5] In the Russian

empire, Orest Somov (1793-1833) was among the first to theorize the connection between Romanticism and *narodnost'* in his 1823 essay "On Romantic Poetry" (*O romanticheskoi poezii*). Somov was an influential Ukrainian writer and critic who wrote almost exclusively in Russian on Cossack themes.[6] Educated at the University of Kharkov/Kharkiv, he spent his life in St. Petersburg where he edited the journals of the literary elite. Though he participated in the major literary societies and literary periodicals of the day, he was never fully accepted socially, even as his literary success is said to have influenced Gogol's move to St. Petersburg.[7] Gogol's story, "The Terrible Boar" (*Strashnyi kaban*), was published under Somov's editorship in *Literaturnaja gazeta* in 1831.

In "On Romantic Poetry," Somov praises the ancient Greeks and Romans for their vitality while bemoaning the eighteenth-century Classicists whose stylistic rules prevent natural literary development. Somov discusses the German Romantics in depth and mentions Schlegel in passing to claim that despite their belated maturity, the Germans were the most nationally developed people. Somov argues that German Romantic literature paved a new, unique path for German nationality because of its "special originality and the great talents of its singers" (свойственной оригинальности, по высоким дарованиям Певцов) and he links Russia's national potential to the German Romantics citing "our great proximity and almost continuous contact" (близкое соседство наше и почти беспрерывные сношения).[8] Somov addresses detractors who argue that Russia is incapable of a national Romantic literature due to her lack of history, her "flat and monotonous" (ровна и однообразна) geography, and her belated literary development, occurring after "all the appanages of Parnassus had been taken" (когда уже

все уделы Парнасса были заняты).[9] To rectify the charge that Russia lacks history, Somov cites "the great labor of our illustrious historiographer" (великий труд славного Историографа), in other words Karamzin's twelve-volume *History of the Russian State* (1816-26), which was Russia's first narrative history written in Russian.[10] As a rebuttal to the developmental hurdles set up by his detractors, Somov argues that the Russian language and the skill of a national poet can forge an alternate path to national development. Somov's evocation of the ancient Greeks and of Parnassus, the home of the muses, of poetry, song, and knowledge, recalls the flourishing of Greek culture and connects its regenerative power to the Ukrainian lands and Crimea.

Evoking Greece and Parnassus, Somov's essay describes Crimea, or the "enchanting Tavrida" (*Ocharovatel'naia Tavrida*) with its "captivating lowlands and majestic mountain" (пленительными долинами и величественною горою).[11] Beyond Crimea, he spies the Caucasus, where lie "the rocks to which Prometheus was bound" (скалы, к которым прикован был Прометей). Somov traces the mythical roots of Greek antiquity and national culture to the lands of the Russian empire, exclaiming: "Who, of the young countries, encompasses so much poetic wealth?" (Какая из новых стран заключает в себе столько богатств Поэтических). Forgoing the Enlightenment models of taxonomy, genealogy and imitation, Somov links Russian national development both to the German Romantics and mythical models of regeneration and argues that the national poet can forge a new species, a new taxonomy of Russianness, out of the fertile imperial possessions of Novorossiya and the Cossack lands or "fruitful Ukraine" (*plodonosnoi Ukrainy*). These newly acquired imperial lands are "waiting for their poets

and demanding tribute from native talents" (ждут своих Поэтов и требуют дани от талантов отечественных) (90).

Somov also argues that Russia's geographical and developmental hurdles toward *narodnost'* in literature can be overcome by the unique nature of native Russian historical subjects, which compared to the European histories are "of an entirely different species: all the better!" (совсем в другом роде: тем лучше) (92). When describing the suitable subjects for Russian poetry, Somov begins first with the "not strictly-Russian" (*ne sobstvenno-russkikh*) imperial populations: Little Russians and the Cossacks, the inhabitants of Colchis, an ancient kingdom on the Black Sea ruled by Greece and Rome whose people once witnessed Ovid's exile, all these "merged under the single name Russia, or dependent on Russia, or not separated from us by other lands or wide seas!" (слилось под одно название русских [Рускихь], или зависят от России, не отделяясь ни пространством земель чужих, ни морями далекими).[12] Somov suggests that the next generation of Russian poets turn to these culturally-rich "not strictly-Russian" populations. He notes that the poetic way has been paved by Derzhavin, who "created by himself and for himself a new [species] of lyric poetry" (сам и для себя создал новый род Стихотворства Лирического) and Zhukovsky whose translations allowed "new paths through the world of the imagination" (новые пути в мире воображения).[13] While Derzhavin lacked an audience and Zhukovsky lacked native materials, Somov's ideal Russian national poet will merge Russia's imperial lands with her imperial readers to form a national community.

The Classicists had also conceptualized Russia's history in terms of Greek and Roman antiquity. Ancient Rome, as heir to the cultural riches of Greece, was a powerful

model that legitimated the classical focus on translation and imitation.[14] Petrine elites reconciled the imitative nature of Russian neoclassical culture with their need for historical and civilizational authenticity by imagining themselves as Romans. Vasilii Trediakovskii (1703-69) and Mikhail Lomonsov (1711-65) represent the first generation of Russian writers to benefit from Peter's reforms. In 1745, Trediakovsky argued for the development of the Russian language by evoking the Roman choice to use Latin over Greek despite the cultural superiority of Greece. In his *Ancient Russian History* (1766), Lomonsov emphasized the parallels between Roman and Russian history and claimed an equivalence (*uravnenie*) between their events. This parallel was also legitimated by translations of Roman texts, and both Lomonsov and Derzhavin translated Horace and rewrote his *Exegi monumentum*.[15] Horace, whose origins were lowly, found a friend and patron in Maecenas and became the poetic voice of Augustus' imperial reign. In representing Rome's transition from republic to empire, he set a meaningful precedent for Russian poets and was known for his odes and his *Art of Poetry*.[16] Hokanson notes that Horace's poetry "is used to imperial ends: to enlarge, tame, and bring order to the empire. The poet works hand in hand with the emperor, the latter winning territory, the former Romanizing the populace."[17] For Horace, as for Lomonsov and Derzhavin, and later Pushkin, Somov, and Gogol, imperial expansion and the accompanying concerns of cultural legitimacy emphasize the need for the poetic voice.

Somov's vision of Russian national development culminates in the fusion of people, history, and geography made national by the poetic voice, but Somov also argues that Russian national poetry does not yet exist. He claims that Russian national characteristics (*cherty narodnye russkie*) are most clearly revealed in Pushkin's poetry;

however, for Somov, Russian *narodnost'* is a future-oriented project that is yet to be realized. As Somov summarizes his argument, the word *narod* is used to indicate both a people and a nation: "It has been my intention to show that for the Russian people/nation […] it is necessary to have *a native, national poetry, not imitative and independent of foreign traditions*" (намерение мое было показать, что народу русскому […] необходимо иметь свою народную поэзию, не подражательную и независимую от преданий чуждых).[18] The influence of Somov's call for Romantic literature and *narodnost'* is indeed visible in the works and reception of Nikolai Gogol, whose move to St. Petersburg and literary endeavors were partially undertaken in response to Somov's success and his literary call.

Somov's understanding of Russia in terms of classical Greece finds its roots in Catherine's "Greek Project" during the Russo-Turkish War of 1768-1774.[19] Due to the marriage between the Kievan prince Vladimir and Anna, the daughter of a Byzantine emperor, Russia already saw itself as the heir to Byzantine Orthodoxy and thus, as direct heir to Greek antiquity.[20] Russia's self-definition as an Orthodox stronghold and Europe's geographical shield against the Muslim Ottomans who had once conquered the Holy Roman Empire was also pivotal to its direct identification with ancient Greece. In this understanding of history "religious succession was equated with cultural [succession]" and Constantinople was conflated with Athens: "Russia's role as the single heir to the Byzantine church also made her the indisputable legitimate heir to classical Greek culture" (27-8). The idea gained traction, and Voltaire himself encouraged Catherine to free the modern Greeks from Ottoman rule and to conquer Constantinople, while Petrov heralded the imminent restoration of Greek glory when Russian sailors landed on

continental Greece in 1770. However, Russia's self-identification with the Greeks was short lived, for by the end of the eighteenth century, Greek republicanism also evoked anti-autocratic sentiments and revolutionary upheavals. To minimize the association between Greece and anti-autocratic uprising, Russian writers focused on the unifying power of Orthodoxy (56).

Russia was victorious in the Russo-Turkish War, though the Greeks remained under Turkish control. By April 1783, via protracted and politically complex means, the Russian empire had annexed Crimea. Crimea's incorporation into the Russian empire provided the Russian imaginary another direct link to Greek culture without the European intermediary. As Zorin explains, Crimea was both politically and culturally symbolic:

> It was able at the same time to represent Christian Byzantium and classical Hellas. Above all, it was a territory colonized in the depths of antiquity by Greece and rich in ancient monuments. With the annexation of Crimea, Russia obtained its own share of the antique inheritance, giving it the right to stand in the ranks of the civilized European nations. (95)

Crimea was annexed, as the legend goes, without a single shot, and this mythology was as powerful then as it is today: "This very circumstance produced the greatest impression on Russian public opinion. The acquisition of such an important province without a single shot testified to Russia's power better than any victories. At the same time, it symbolically suggested the natural character of this extension of the empire."[21] Crimea symbolized Russia's very own Greece, and the annexation of Crimea provided the Russian empire a direct link to Greek antiquity. Connected by the Cossack lands, Crimea symbolized a native cultural wellspring and an Orthodox inheritance.

Nikolai Gogol: Between Ukrainian Local Patriotism and Russian National Culture

In ancient Greece, Romantics like Gogol saw a model for securing timeless poetic glory and for imperial and national regeneration. Nikolai Gogol (1809-52) was born in the left-bank Poltava Governorate. Gogol grew up on his family's country estate, and his father, who died when Gogol was a youth, wrote comedies in both Russian and Ukrainian. Gogol entered the gymnasium at Nezhin in 1821, and while he is said to have read Homer and the German Romantics, he did not excel academically. He moved to St. Petersburg in December of 1828, and while claiming to desire a post in civil service, he turned to literature almost immediately. Though Gogol's anonymously self-published *Hans Kuechelgarten* (1829) was nearly universally panned, he found critical success with the two volumes of *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka* (1831-2).[22] Gogol's epigraphs, taken from the works of Ivan Kotliarevsky, Petro Hulak-Artemovsky and Hryhorii Kvita-Osnovianenko, linked his Russian-language tales to a group of Ukrainian-language writers and can be understood as part of a shift away from Ukrainian-language publications and a local literary patriotism and towards Russian-language publications and a Little Russian imperial identity.[23]

In February of 1828, Hulak-Artemovsky (1790-1865), a poet who translated Horace, Goethe, and Mickiewicz into Ukrainian and a professor at Kharkiv University, expressed his fear that the Ukrainian language would become extinct in a letter to Vasyl Anastasevych:

> The thought that perhaps the time is near, when not only the signs of Little Russia's customs and antiquities will be smoothed over forever but the very language itself will merge into the huge stream of the majestic, dominant Great-Russian word, when perhaps it will not leave, even in its wake, the dark traces of

> its existence, this gives me such melancholia, sometimes accompanied by moments when I would venture to renounce the seductive dreams of my confined ambition and escape to a peaceful thicket, a simple glade – to catch the last sounds of my native language, which continues to die each day.
>
> Мысль, что, может быть, близко уже время когда не только признаки малороссийских обычаев и старины будут изглажены навеки, но и самый язык сольется в огромный поток величественного, владычествующего великороссийского слова, и не оставит, быть может, по себе ниже темных следов своего существования, наводит на меня такую хандру, что иногда приходят минуты, в которые я решился бы отказаться от обольстительных надежд моего тесного честолюбия и удалился в мирную кущу простодушного полянина -- ловить последние звуки с каждым днем умирающего родного языка. [24]

Hulak-Artemovksy's local patriotism, prevalent amongst the Ukrainian gentry of the 1820s, focused on the Ukrainian language as a link to the Ukrainian folk. While these local patriots were also loyal Russian imperial citizens (Kotliarevsky organized a Cossack regiment to fight the French in 1812 and served in the Russo-Turkish War), by the 1830s and 1840s their insistence on writing in Ukrainian was met with resistance.[25] As Belinsky's reviews of Shevchenko's Ukrainian-language publications in the 1840s would demonstrate, the Russian imperial center was demanding that Ukrainian local patriotism find Russian-language forms for self-expression.[26] Behind this anxiety was the Romantic connection between linguistic uniqueness and the organic nation-state as well as the 1830-1 Polish uprising and Greek independence in 1830.[27] However, these Ukrainian local patriots did not yet link their cultural ambitions with demands for statehood, and their Ukrainian-language publications did not yet signal imperial disloyalty.

Due to the incorporation of the Hetmanate itself, and "because Russian ideas about Ukraine were so closely associated with a gentry culture and the extinct political order from which it came, the Ukrainian literary revival of the 1830s came to be regarded

by many as the last echo of a dying world."[28] In the Russian empire, the eighteenth-century history of the Cossack lands evidenced this political death. After Ivan Mazepa's attempt to regain Cossack independence was defeated at the Battle of Poltava in 1709, the left bank was incorporated as the Little Russian Governorate. By the late eighteenth century the Russian empire had grown significantly. Under Catherine II, Russia pursued a course of administrative unification in its southwestern borderlands. Catherine abolished the office of the hetman in 1764, and in 1775, the Zaporozhian Sech was disbanded and destroyed. Crimea was annexed in 1783. This and the transfer of Ochakov in 1792, celebrated in odes by Derzhavin and Petrov, expanded the Russian Empire's domain to the region known as Novorossiya or New Russia, the sparsely-inhabited lands just north of the Black Sea. During the second partition of Poland in 1793, the lands west of the Dnieper river (right-bank Ukraine) also came under Russian rule.[29] Known in the Polish context as the "south-eastern borderlands" (*Poludniowo-wschodnie kresy*), these lands had been under Polish rule since the 1569 Union of Lublin. With the acquisition of Novorossiya and the right bank, the Russian empire stretched uninhibited from the Baltic to the Black Seas and the Dnieper was no longer directly bordered by Poland and Turkey.

After the November uprising of 1830-1, the Western European presses largely sided with the Polish cause and equated it with the Greek war for independence, depicting both as republican struggles against despotic and Asiatic powers. This was partly a response to Russian increasing global power and geographical expansion. In 1831, Pushkin's published his anti-Polish poems, "To the Slanderers of Russia" (*Klevetnikam Rossii*) and "Anniversary of Borodino" (*Borodinskaia godovshchina*).[30] In these poems, Pushkin respond to both this political context and to Adam Mickiewicz's

foreword to his *Konrad Wallenrod* (written 1825-17, published 1828), which had inspired the uprising.[31] Mickiewicz's text warns the Russian empire that overzealous imperial expansion can lead to ruin. The foreword first evokes the great historical expanse of the Lithuanian state, "from the Baltic to the Black Sea" (*od Baltuckiego do Czarnego Morza*). It then argues that this great expanse was responsible for the loss of Lithuanian nationality. Evoking the specter of Rome's demise, Mickiewicz argues that "Lithuania presents the curious spectacle of a people that disappeared amidst its huge conquests, as a stream recedes after too copious a flood and flows into a narrower bed than it occupied before."[32] Because it is "unable to develop an internal strength" Lithuania is relegated to a historical past and Mickiewicz quotes Schiller: "What is to have eternal life in song must perish in actual life" (7-8). Citing the rise and fall of the Roman empire and the rise and fall of Lithuanian, Mickiewicz implies that the Russian empire, engorged by the partitions of Poland, may lose its identity in its Polonized borderlands.

Pushkin's "To the Slanderers of Russia" is addressed to the West and responds to Mickiewicz. Pushkin transforms Mickiewicz's image of the bloated stream into a vision of the regenerative Russian imperial sea. Russia's recent annexation of both the Polonized right bank and the steppe lands of Novorossiya provides the imperial strength for Pushkin's declaration: "Who shall stand fast in the uneven quarrel: / The arrogant Pole, or trusty Rus'? / Will the Slavic streams amalgamate in the Russian sea? / Will it dry up? That is the question." (Кто устоит в неравном споре: / Кичливый лях, иль верный росс? / Славянские ль ручьи сольются в русском море? / Оно ль иссякнет? вот вопрос).[33] While already forceful, Oleg Proskurin notes that in Pushkin's initial notes, these Slavic streams, rather than flowing together actually "disappear into the

Russian sea." Metonymically representing the Russian empire, the Russian sea alludes to the incorporation of Cossack lands and right-bank Ukraine, and Mickiewicz' pan-Slavic allusion to the family quarrel is echoed in Pushkin's imperial terms as "a domestic, ancient quarrel, already weighed by fate" (Домашний, старый спор, уж взвешенный судьбою), and one that Europe does not understand: "For you, incomprehensible and foreign / This familial quarrel" (Вам непонятна, вам чужда / Сия семейная вражда). Dixon notes that in Pushkin's poems after the Polish Uprising, "The space Russia refuses to cede (including the territory of Poland) is also the space it demands on which to work out its identity without hindrance."[34] In "The Anniversary of Borodino," Pushkin clarifies the geography and history in question: "Where shall we extend our line of strongholds? Beyond the Bug, the Vorskla, the inlet of the sea? For whom is left Volhynia? For whom the patrimony of Bohdan [Khmelnitsky]?" (Куда отдвинем строй твердынь? / За Буг, до Ворсклы, до Лимана? / За кем останется Волынь? / За кем наследие Богдана?).[35] Invoking Kyivan Rus' before the Mongol invasion and the antagonistic history of the Cossacks and Poland-Lithuania, Pushkin suggests that the future of the Cossack lands exists between the Polish tomb and the Russian sea: "Our decrepit Kiev, golden-domed, / This primogeniture of Russian cities, / Is it akin to violent Warsaw, / The shrine of all its tombs?" (Наш Киев дряхлый, златоглавый, / Сей пращур русских городов, / Сроднит ли с буйною Варшавой / Святыню всех своих гробов?).

Pushkin's position was loudly echoed amongst the Little Russian imperial patriots, and Orest Somov was one such steadfast voice in favor of the empire. Somov only published one Ukrainian-language poem, "A Letter from a Ukrainian to the Poles" (*Lyst od ukrainsia do liakhiv*), which was part of an 1831 poetic cycle entitled "The

Voice of a Ukrainian at the News of the Taking of Warsaw" (*Golos Ukraintsa pri vesti o vziatii Varshavy*).[36] The eight-quatrain poem in Ukrainian was accompanied by a four-page glossary to assist and demarcate its Russian readership. The poetic cycle praises Russian victory and the suppression of the Polish uprising. The collection depicts the Polish uprising as an invasion of Ukraine, evokes Bohdan Khmelnitsky, and claims Ukrainian revenge for the imposition of the Polish "foreign yoke." Somov's solitary Ukrainian poem affiliates itself with the Russian-speaking, Orthodox center of empire and with the dominant anti-Polish sentiment of the day. While Gogol's early works such as *Arabesques* and the first version of the novella *Taras Bulba* focus on the unique and national nature of the Cossack past, the second edition of the novella published in 1842 emphasizes the non-Polish nature of this past even more than it associates or conflates Cossack history with the Russian present.

Aleksei Storozhenko's review of Gogol's *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka* in *Syn otechestva* evidences the Ukrainian local patriot viewpoint. Storozhenko, who was a devoted Ukrainian, pan-Slavist, anti-Polish polemicist, and Russian imperialist, identifies as a Ukrainian writer in his review.[37] He fixates on the ethnographic details of Gogol's collection and finds it lacking in authenticity. He compares the anonymous author of *Evenings* to Kotliarevsky, and perhaps because of Gogol's use of Russian, he deems "the work not Ukrainian enough while not being entirely Russian, either."[38] Meanwhile, V.A. Ushakov, the reviewer for *The Northern Bee*, considers Russian-language Ukrainian literature a positive development and argues that a new Little Russian school of literature has superseded Hulak-Artemovksy and Kotliarevsky's "too local" literary patriotism.[39] Gogol's Russian-language representation of Ukrainian culture "proved useful for

nationalizing Russian culture itself."[40] Saunders notes that these Russian-language Ukrainian texts shifted the argument from foreign influences and European models; "now it ran on internal lines, turning, for example, on 'living' versus 'dead' Russian, the modern versus the medieval."[41] Nadezhdin, in his review, praises Gogol's use of Russian and argues that Ukraine's history and geography functions as Russia's "Ark of the Covenant" (заветным ковчегом).[42] For Nadezhdin, Ukraine's folk culture, "so far separated from foreign influence, sustained by the child-like attachment to native antiquities" preserves the true essence of a national originality and a vibrant historical past for "us" his Russian readers.

After the publication of Gogol's collections *Arabesques* and *Mirgorod* in 1835, Belinsky's initial, short review heralds the tales "Nevsky Prospect" (*Nevskii prospect*) and "Diary of a Madman" (*Zapiski sumasshedshego*) as proof that Gogol's talent is only growing, noting that these works live up to the expectations set up by *Evenings*, are deserving of the public's praise, and "belong amongst the most extraordinary phenomena in our literature" (принадлежат к числу самых необыкновенных явлении в нашей литературе).[43] Belinsky's longer review in 1835 in *Teleskop*, "On the Russian Tale and the Tales of Gogol" (*O russkoi povesti i povestiakh g. Gogolia*), deems the stories of *Evenings on a Farm Near Dikanka* "a whole, full picture of the domestic life of a nation" (целая, полная картина домашней жизни народа).[44] Belinsky then lauds *Arabesques* and *Mirgorod* for their depth and fidelity to life and praises Gogol for "having expanded his scene of action" (расширил свою сцену действия) beyond the peasantry of his beloved Little Russia. He argues that while Russia has many writers, it lacks poets.

Deeming Gogol a poet, Belinsky argues he "fills the role left empty by Pushkin" (становится на место, оставленное Пушкиным).

Published in *Arabesques*, Gogol's essay "A Few Words about Pushkin" (*Neskol'ko slov o Pushkine*), echoes Somov's qualified praise of Pushkin's national status: "None of our poets is superior to him and none is more deserving of being called 'national.' This right belongs undeniably to him" (никто из поэтов наших не выше его и не может более назваться национальным; это право решительно принадлежит ему).[45] Implicit in this statement is Gogol's claim that while Pushkin is most deserving of being called a national poet, the horizon of nationality has not yet been reached: "he is a Russian developed to a point which perhaps all Russians will achieve in two hundred years" (это русской человек в его развитии, в каком он, может быть, явится чрез двести лет). By presenting Russian national identity and national literature *in medias res*, Gogol frames his own literary production as a vital part of the nationalizing process. Bojanowska argues that the purpose of Gogol's "equivocal praise" is to further associate himself with Pushkin and to protect himself from criticism by wrapping his work in "the esteemed poet's mantle."[46] Gogol was successful to the extent that most critics have since deemed him Pushkin's successor.

Gogol argues that Pushkin reaches his poetic maturity because of his southern exile to "there, where Russia's borders are distinguished by a sharp, majestic strength of character; where the smooth immensity of Russia is interrupted by cloud-covered mountains and is fanned by the south" (туда, где границы России отличаются резкою, величавою характерностью; где гладкая неизмеримость России перерывается подоблачными горами и обвевается югом). For Gogol, Pushkin "alone is the singer of

the Caucasus" (он один только певец Кавказа) and it is in the "not strictly-speaking Russian" south, "there" where Pushkin finds his national voice. Gogol again echoes Somov and returns to one of the dominant themes in *Arabesques,* which is that Russia's flat and monotonous geography, and metonymically the Russian self, is unattractive national subject matter for a poet. He argues that Pushkin's mature works lack the brilliance of his southern poems due to the poet's circumstances and his poetic subjects: "when he had been plunged into the heart of Russia, into her ordinary plains and when he had thrown himself into research on the life and customs of his fellow countrymen, in an attempt to become a completely national poet" (он погрузился в сердце России, в ее обыкновенные равнины, предался глубже исследованию жизни и нравов своих соотечественников и захотел быть вполне национальным поэтом).[47] Gogol notes Pushkin's readers, both "educated and uneducated" (образованные и необразованные) demanded "native and historical events" (отечественные и исторические происшествия); yet, they forget that the native subject matter they demand is unsuitable for poetry.

The public, "representing a nation in their visage" (представляющая в лице своем нацию) demand a truthful depiction, yet they deride the reflected image: "In this case, the national body resembles a woman, who instructs an artist to paint her portrait to the very likeness, but woe to him, if he was not able to hide all her defects" (Масса народа похожа в этом случае на женщину, приказывающую художнику нарисовать с себя портрет совершенно похожий, но горе ему, если он не умел скрыть всех ее недостатков). Noting that Russian history only became poetic "under the emperors" (при императорах), he sees two choices for the national poet. He can "give strength to

what is weak" (дать силу бессильному) and be admired, or he can "remain true to truth alone" (быть верну одной истине) and lose the crowd (толпа).[48] Noting that any true poet can only speak the truth, and that both dramatic and pedestrian phenomena "have the right to our attention" (должны иметь право на наше внимание), Gogol still argues that the insistence on native, strictly-Russian subject matter is: "the waste of a poet – waste from the public's point of view, not the poet's" (кроме нерасчет поэта — нерасчет перед его многочисленною публикою, а не перед собою).[49] While the poetic creation can still be an achievement, it will not appeal to the same masses who demand it. To escape the trap of poetic truth and poetic obscurity, Gogol strengthens the conceptually weak Russian nation with the dramatic geographies and diverse characters of Novorossiya and of Cossack Ukraine. To prevent the waste of poetic talent and yet to please the public, Gogol remains true to the poetic geography of the imperial south and the Cossack past. Rather than representing Russia proper, Gogol's early collections, *Evenings*, *Arabesques*, and *Mirgorod*, depict and frame Cossack Ukraine as Russia's historical and cultural heritage.

Chaos and the Quest for Wholeness: *Arabesques* and Cossack History

Sergei Uvarov, the minister of education from 1833 to 1849, conceived his triad of official nationality, "Orthodoxy, Autocracy, Nationality" (*Pravoslavie, Samoderzhavie, Narodnost'*), in the mid-1820s. In 1834, he founded the *Journal of the Ministry of National Education*, which published many of Gogol's essays later included in *Arabesques*. Scholars understand Uvarov's triad as a problematic welding, wherein

orthodoxy and autocracy either inadequately define nationality, as a linguistic-historical community first defined within the Romantic frame, or clash in competition with it.[50] Uvarov's triad did indeed rearticulate the relationship between autocracy and the linguistic-historical national community; however, as Riazanovsky notes, official nationality also "had a romantic frame of reference" (124). While Karamzin had united the people and the state via the people's fervent love, Uvarov followed the model of Friedrich Schlegel, with whose brother he was acquainted while living in Vienna from 1807 to mid-1809. Schlegel understood the nation as an "integral personality, a unity based on blood relations and secured by common customs and language."[51] However, unlike Herder, who focused on the genealogical origins and vernacular of the national organism, Schlegel emphasized the political development of the state: "in natural-historical terms as the spontaneous expression of a people's history" (340). Uvarov's statist-dynastic conceptualization of *narodnost'* welded the Romantic emphasis on common customs and language with Orthodoxy and Autocracy as the natural expressions of Russian historical development.[52] This model allowed for the Petrine reform to be read as a moment of regeneration rather than a rift, and ultimately Gogol's focus on the pre-imperial history of the empire was framed and understood as a pre-history linked by Orthodoxy and Autocracy and nationalized in the Russian poet's voice.

The period in between the publications of *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka* and *Arabesques* marks the height of Gogol's interest in Ukrainian and Cossack history.[53] Gogol began writing a history of Ukraine in 1833; it was never completed, but he published three announcements for its publication and twice published an excerpt from the introduction, which has survived as the only completed piece of this project. Gogol's

introduction was first published in Uvarov's *Journal of the Ministry of Public Instruction* in 1834 and titled "Fragment from a History of Little Russia. Volume I. Book I. Chapter I" (*Otryvok iz Istorii Malorossii. Tom 1, Kniga 1, Glava 1*). Gogol republished this fragment in *Arabesques* under the title "A Glance at the Composition of Little Russia" (*Vzgliad na sostavlenie Malorossii*).[54] With the help of Zhukovsky and Pletnev, he was appointed professor of history at St. Petersburg University in July of 1834. Though he created initial excitement, Gogol was unable to keep up the work successfully, and though his texts of this period evidence a preoccupation with history and historical models, they are often panned by critics for their sweeping, poetic style and inaccuracies.

In the collection, *Arabesques* (*Arabeski*), published just prior to *Mirgorod* in January of 1835, Gogol writes on a dizzying range of topics and locates the roots of Russian *narodnost'* in the open, germinal form of the Ukrainian steppes, only recently fully incorporated into the Russian empire. *Arabesques* originally included two fragments from Gogol's unfinished historical novel *The Hetman* ("A Chapter from a Historical Novel" and "A Captive") and three prose tales set in Petersburg ("Nevsky Prospect," "The Portrait," and "Diary of a Madman") in addition to its historical and critical essays. The initial response to the collection was mixed, and the reviewers for *The Northern Bee* (*Severnaia pchela*) and *The Library for Reading* (*Biblioteka dlia chteniia*) both focused on the fictional pieces while widely disparaging the essay's style and historical veracity. While praising Gogol's poetic talent at length in "On the Russian Tale and the Tales of Gogol," Belinsky ends by brutally dismissing Gogol's essays, noting "I cannot understand how it is possible to so thoughtlessly compromise one's own literary name" (Я не понимаю, как можно так необдуманно компрометировать свое литературное

имя).[55] Like both versions of Gogol's historical novella, *Taras Bulba*, the essays in *Arabesques* prioritize poetic synthesis over historical chronology and "while producing the sensation of historicity" they instead work within an "epic, or rather pre-epic, mythic timelessness."[56] Gogol himself separated the prose tales from the essays for the 1842 publication of his *Collected Works*, and the latter are often ignored altogether by critics.[57] Yet, those who do address the whole collection note that it is sustained by a quest for wholeness and that it "oscillates between creative chaos and unifying structure."[58]

The genre and title of the collection, *Arabesques*, connects Gogol's endeavors to the German Romantics and especially to Schlegel, who praises the literary arabesque as a "germinal form" that "becomes apparently self-(re)producing" in his essay, "Dialogue on Poetry."[59] While the connection was not written about in Gogol's day, contemporary scholars link Gogol's *Arabesques* to Schlegel's definition of the literary arabesque as "an artfully ordered confusion."[60] The highly-structured patterns of non-representational art allow Schlegel to conceptualize the relationship between literary form, freed from its Classical restraints, and generic heterogeneity or chaos, with its ancient Greek connotations of "a primordial fusion of the original elements of the worlds."[61] Deeming the arabesque, a "work of nature" Schlegel's essay and Gogol's collection foreground the role of authorial creation and textual synthesis in the Romantic understanding world-historical development. As Frazier notes, "In Schlegel's theory of genre epistemology and ontology are one, and to name the world is to create it."[62] The literary arabesque forestalls a permanent resolution; instead, in its communion with its critics and readers, it is a germinal form able, through "artfully ordered confusion," to unite the primordial elements of the Russian empire and in a national, textual whole.

The texts included in *Arabesques* are dated, though the dates are somewhat fabricated and critics argue that they were altered as part of Gogol's attempt to relegate these pieces to his youthful stage of writing and to minimize potential criticism.[63] In the preface to the collection, Gogol does note that much of it is "youthful" (молодого) and pans his own "messiness of style" (неисправности в слове).[64] However, Gogol also argues, alongside the German Romantics, that youth is a stage of vitality rather than barbarism and that: "destroying what we have written in the past is just as unjust as forgetting the days of our past youth. Moreover, if a work contains two or three truths not said before, the author is not right not to conceal it from his reader, and for these two or three correct ideas one may forgive the imperfection of the whole" (Истреблять прежде написанное нами, кажется, так же несправедливо, как позабывать минувшие дни своей юности. Притом если сочинение заключает в себе две, три еще не сказанные истины, то уже автор не вправе скрывать его от читателя, и за две, три верные мысли можно простить несовершенство целого). This focus on the truth of an era rather than its place in a civilizational teleology leads critics to argue that *Arabesques* represents Ukraine in the mode "of Herderian ethnic wholeness initiated by the *Dikanka* tales" as a space of cultural integrity and "the cradle of Slavdom."[65]

However, in Gogol's essays, this ethnic wholeness is not capable of genealogical development and Gogol unites the Cossacks with the Russian present via a mythical understanding of historical change made possible by the new imperial possessions of Crimea, Novorossiya, and the right and left banks. While emphasizing this Romantic view of a vital youth throughout his collections, the essays are unable to fully reconcile the hereditary, biological aspect of Romantic historical development with the argument

that the Cossacks represent a unique phenomenon spawned by the precarious geopolitical position of historical Ukraine. In some part, it is this inability, coupled with the demands of his Russian readership, that later compelled Gogol to fully abandon the untrammeled fecundity of the Ukrainian south for the urban monotony of the Russian north.

In *Another Philosophy of History* (1774), Herder responds to Voltaire and Hume, who dismiss the Middle Ages as stagnant and still, by equating the young and developing nations of medieval Europe with the flourishing of Ancient Greece.[66] Herder models history and civilizational development on human life stages, on natural phenomena, and on genealogy, forming a "myth of organic original generation" in which antiquity serves as inheritance rather than prefiguration.[67] Herder argues that while past ages do represent earlier stages of human development, they contribute to history in ways that go unrecognized: "Every plant of nature must fade, but the faded plant scatters its seeds and thereby renews living creation."[68] Herder prioritizes the Greeks as the wellspring of cultural and associates them with youth; he associates republican Rome with manhood and the Holy Roman Empire with old age and decline. Emphasizing that youth is not mere immaturity, Herder continues: "But every kind of human knowledge has its own particular sphere, that is, its nature, time, place, and span of life; Greek civilization, for example, grew out of times, places, and circumstances, and declined with them" (290). Herder mourns the Greeks and their decline, arguing their civilization could not withstand the weight of Roman despotism.[69]

Though decrying the linear, teleological vision of Enlightenment progress, which envisioned youth as underdevelopment or barbarity, Herder disagrees with those who disdain progress all together: "No plan! No Progress! Eternal revolution - weaving and

undoing! - Penelope-work! — They fell into a whirlpool, skepticism about all virtue, happiness, and vocation of mankind, into which they wove all history, religion and ethical doctrines."[70] To create order, to understand history, Herder recommends a genetic approach in which all phenomena are studied in their contextual specificity and linked to their origins. For Herder, the writing of history is the discovery of origin stories and his understanding of the state is dependent on the nation and predicated on the family as a natural model of social belonging evidencing the genealogical link to the past. In his *Arabesques* article "Schloezer, Mueller, and Herder," Gogol lauds Herder and deems him a poet of world history; however, Gogol's model of history, while also emphasizing the unique flowering of youth, rejects the familial model of the nation and turns to mythical models of regeneration to shape a national literature out of the primordial chaos of the past.

While also understanding Greece as youth, Hegel emphasizes its quick flowering and liminal status, in his "Lectures on the History of Philosophy" delivered at the University of Berlin between 1823 and 1831. Hegel's sees the Greek republic as an unproductive flowering, which has not yet reached the freedom of fixed form of "its second birth, its palingenesis."[71] This vitality of youth, active but ultimately unproductive, is embodied in Hegel's association of the Hellenes with the sea and with a restless brigandage:

> The physique of their country led them to this amphibious existence, and allowed them to skim freely over the waves, as they spread themselves freely over the land—not roving about like the nomad populations, nor torpidly vegetating like those of the river districts. Piracy, not trade, was the chief object of maritime occupations; and, as we gather from Homer, it was not yet reckoned discredible. (237)

While vital and energetic, the Greek republic is associated more with piracy than trade despite its skill. Hegel goes on to praise the Greek era for introducing both agriculture and marriage. Alongside these domesticating civilizational developments, Hegel lists Prometheus "whose origin is referred to the distant Caucasus" for teaching man how to produce and use fire (237). While the roving Greek republic is given credit for introducing fire, agriculture, and the filial bond, Hegel notes that in "the *Roman State*, the severe labors of the *Manhood* of History" are fulfilled and it is here that the unity between people and state is achieved (113). This unity, wherein the state is a very reflection of the national family, is the precondition for true freedom, and nations not destined for world-historical greatness are destined to merge with larger states in a similar homogenizing process. It is not until the second redaction of *Taras Bulba* in 1842 that Gogol focuses on this eventual merger or "second birth", and in so doing he joins the Russian imperial response to the growing national self-assertions of the recently incorporated and culturally Polish right-bank Ukrainian lands (the provinces of Kyiv, Podolia, and Volhynia) and to Shevchenko's 1840 *Kobzar* and a new flourishing of Ukrainian-language publications. In the 1830s, in *Arabesques* and the *Mirgorod* redaction of *Taras Bulba*, Gogol avoids reconciliation and these debates. Instead, he focuses on the Cossacks as vibrant phenomenon, whose brief existence can create the geographical and historical materials for a Russian national literature.

Foregrounding Cossack and Ukrainian subject matter, Gogol's *Arabesques* and the *Mirgorod* version of *Taras Bulba* turn to classical models and mythical modes of regeneration to explain the relationship between Russia's present and the Cossack past. In his miscellany, Gogol emphasizes the strange, mixed roots of the Cossacks and claims

that the Cossacks "preserved all those features with which gangs of bandits are depicted" (сохраняло все те черты, которыми рисуют шайку разбойников).[72] Gogol's Cossacks reproduce their stores and their numbers by this very brigandage: "with their gold coins, weapons, and horses, [they] took to abducting Tatars' wives and daughters" (вместе с червонцами, цехинами и лошадьми стали похищать татарских жен и дочерей).[73] Yet, he also emphasizes the unity of the Cossack brotherhood: "This group gradually acquired a completely universal character and national awareness" (Это скопление мало-помалу получило совершенно один общий характер и национальность). The Cossacks are praised for their powers of reconciliation and described as "a nation in which two opposing parts of the world, two vastly different elements, collided with such strange results" (народ, в котором так странно столкнулись две противоположные части света, две разнохарактерные стихии).[74] Maguire emphasizes that the results of this Cossack heterogeneity is "not a dilution but a strengthening of true Cossack attributes."[75] In his *Arabesques*, Gogol depicts the Cossacks as a powerful cultural repository capable of reconciling East and West and the past and future of the Russian nation.

The Power of the Poetic Voice: National Regeneration and the Interpretive Act

Gogol's sweeping portrait of Cossack history, "A Glance at the Composition of Little Russia" (*Vzgliad na sostavlenie Malorossii*) is a meditation on the relationship between chaos and structure. It depicts the Russian north as a space of hereditary kinship and violent disunity, while the Ukrainian south is a chaotic mix of peoples united by their

precarious geographical position. Gogol begins with the claim that despite their kinship, the princes of Russia's appanage period "differed so greatly from each other to a degree that seldom occurs even between [heterogeneous nations]" (были между собою разъединены, как редко случается с разнохарактерными народами).[76] The petty states of the Russian north "united against their will by kinship" (против воли соединяло родство) were wracked by "wars between relatives, between brothers, between father and son" (это были брани между родственниками, между родными братьями, между отцом и детьми).[77] The essay argues that during the appanage period, "except perhaps by physical, iron force" (выключая разве физической железной силы), no one and nothing could have united the Russian north, and that a poet "would be unable to find a single strand which he could grasp" (он бы не нашел в нем; ни одной струны, за которую бы мог ухватиться). The lack of a dominant note in this discordant "composition" (*sostav*) leads Gogol to conclude that "history, it seemed, congealed and was converted into geography: a monotonous life, moving in parts but motionless as a whole, which could be considered the geographical appurtenance of a country" (Тогда история, казалось, застыла и превратилась в географию: однообразная жизнь, шевелившаяся в частях и неподвижная в целом, могла почесться географическою принадлежностью страны). Though united in faith and language, by proximity and kinship ties, Gogol's Russian north is discordant and inconsequential to historical development. Gogol argues that the Mongol invasion saved Russia from Lithuanian conquest and preserved her independence as it "[provided for the origins of] a new Slavonic generation in Southern Russia, whose life was one long struggle" (дало между тем происхождение новому славянскому поколению в южной

России, которого вся жизнь была борьба).[78] Already signaling its temporal liminality, Gogol begins to describe the origins of Slavic life in the south.

In "On the Teaching of World History" (*O prepodavanii vseobshchei istorii*), Gogol argues that a historian must look beyond political and natural boundaries to "compose from the disparate elements a single, clear, eloquent poem" (из них составить одну величественную полную поэму).[79] Gogol's essay focuses on the whole, on the history of humanity, before which "both nations and events are but temporary shapes and forms" (перед которою и государства и события — временные формы и образы). For Gogol, geography determines the natural form of government for a nation, and he warns this is "not entirely the device of men, but that the earth's position devises and develops it imperceptibly; that its forms are sacrosanct and that any change in them must inevitably bring misfortune to the nation concerned" (его не люди совершенно установляют, но нечувствительно устанавливает и развивает самое положение земли; что формы его оттого священны, и изменение их неминуемо должно навлечь несчастие на народ).[80] As visible manifestation of the divine plan, geography represents both the plan and the key to its understanding. It is described as "a deep sea" (*glubokoe more*) that "keeps its own hidden to such an extent that even for an adult it is a philosophically absorbing subject" (так скрывает свои собственные, что даже для взрослого представляет философически-увлекательный предмет).[81] In this Romantic schema, the work of the geographer and author is to form a bridge "between Nature and the products of Man" (от природы к произведениям человека).[82] Together, geography and history form one body (*odno telo*) not divided by the temporary appearance of

borders and states, and Gogol argues that Cossack history and the geography of the Ukrainian steppes demonstrate a brief but vibrant manifestation of this unity.

In Gogol's history, after the Mongol invasion, the precarious position of the south causes an exodus to Poland, Lithuania and Northern Russia. In the dangerous southern steppe lands that "separated, or rather united" (разделяли или, лучше сказать, соединяли) inimical peoples, nature herself "becomes inventive" (становиться изобретательнитсею) and heats the land to produce "an audacious, passionate nation of character" (смелый, страстный, характерный народ).[83] Gogol defines "this land, which later became known as Ukraine" (Эта земля, получившая после название Украины) by its openness and lack of geographical borders.[84] Spieker notes that Gogol's descriptions of the Dnieper river, its rapids (пороги), whirlpools (водоворот), and flood plains emphasize the liminality of this space and that "the absence of geographical boundaries is equated with the absence of political organization."[85] However, Gogol's Cossacks are depicted as a united political organization; instead, this geographical exposure both unites this heterogeneous miscellany of peoples into the Cossack nation and prevents their political long-term viability. Though Gogol alludes to the eventual union of north and south, his essays focus on the differences brought about by this historical divide. *Arabesques* argues that purpose of Gogol's project of Cossack or Little Russian history is to see the different nations "called by the same name - Rus" (называвшиеся одинаким именем — Русью) who composed "two nations of entirely different characteristics for a time" (составили на время два совершенно различные характера). Gogol claims that the story of how this difference came to be "constitutes the very goal of our history" (составляет цель нашей истории).

Imagining the pre-history of the Cossacks in the Caucasus, Gogol evokes Cherkasy as the first steppe settlement "built by intrepid expatriates whose name tells us that they were native to the Caucasus" (построенный удалыми выходцами, имя которого звучит обитателями Кавказа). As the heterogeneous rabble expands and forms a nation, the union of people and place "performed a miracle" (сделавший чудо) and transformed "a peaceful Slavonic generation into a warlike people known as the Cossacks, a nation which was one of the most remarkable phenomena of European history" (превративший мирные славянские поколения в воинственные, известный под именем козаков, народ, составляющий одно из замечательных явлений европейской истории).[86] The people who inhabit this land are described as rivals to Russia and to Poland, and though temporary, their vitality is reabsorbed back into the geography itself with their death:

> Будь хотя с одной стороны естественная граница из гор или моря — и народ, поселившийся здесь, удержал бы политическое бытие свое, составил бы отдельное государство. Но беззащитная, открытая земля эта была землей опустошений и набегов, местом, где сшибались три враждущие нации, унавожена костями, утучнена кровью.[87]
>
> If there had been, even on one side, a natural border of mountain or sea – then the people who settled here would have held on to their political life and erected a separate government. But without protection, this open land was the land of devastation and raids, a place where three feuding nations collided, enriched with bones, nourished with blood.

Crimea and the Cossack steppe lands, enriched with bone and blood, ultimately provide the means for Russia's civilizational regeneration and the wellspring for Russian national and literary ambitions. Spieker emphasizes the liminal position of the Cossacks and argues that they represent both purity, "an ideal zone of contact between heterogeneous elements" and simultaneously the "impossibility for any synthesis on earth."[88] Within the

framework of the Russian empire, this is to some degree true. However, though they are destined to be a temporary phenomenon, Gogol also represents the Cossack past as an ordered chaos, "a complete nation," and an ideal, though liminal, synthesis of history and geography.

Throughout *Arabesques*, Gogol prefers and focuses on historical periods of youth and vitality over eras of consolidation and stability. Evoking Schlegel and the German Romantics, Gogol praises the Middle Ages as "the flowing together of two lives, the ancient and the new" (слияния двух жизней, древнего мира и нового) and characterizes the era as a time of vibrant, youthful chaos.[89] Gogol argues that the Middle Ages are the heart organ "into which flow and from which all our veins lead" (к которому текут и от которого исходят все жилы).[90] Against the classical understanding, which characterized the Middle Ages as a dry epoch, meaningless, and lacking vitality, Gogol depicts it as an eddy in time: "All the world events, approaching these centuries after long periods of inertia, flow with vigorous speed, as if to an abyss, [as if in a rebellious] maelstrom, and eddying in it, mixed up and reborn, they emerge like new waves" (Все события мира, приближаясь к этим векам, после долгой неподвижности, текут с усиленною быстротою, как в пучину, как в мятежный водоворот, и, закружившись в нем, перемешавшись, переродившись, выходят свежими волнами).[91] Instead of teleological progress from ignorance to enlightenment, Gogol represents time as a reverse current, a swirling whirlpool, and as the flow of blood through a closed system or body.[92] This understanding of history refuses dialectical synthesis, and Spieker notes that: "one of the characteristics of a whirlpool consists in the possibility that it may momentarily speed up and reverse the waters flowing through it

(*vorotit'sia*). This opens up the possibility for contact and mutual affection between elements that would otherwise follow each other in an irreversible sequence." Much like an eddy, historical change is decidedly non-linear in this text, and its illusion of newness is a reconstitution of already existing elements and swirling countercurrents.

Gogol proclaims that these moments of mixture and youthful chaos are far more interesting than "the static era of the enlightened Roman Empire with its government of impotent emperors" (время всесветной Римской империи под правлением ее бессильных императоров). In "On the Teaching of Universal History" (*O prepodavanii vseobshchei istorii*) he writes: "The Romans absorbed everything from the nations they conquered, at first the vices, then the enlightenment. Everything was once again intermixed. Everyone became a Roman, but there was no such thing as a genuine Roman" (Римляне перенимают всё у побежденных народов, сначала пороки, потом просвещение. Всё мешается опять. Все делаются римлянами и ни одного настоящего римлянина!).[93] For the Roman empire, the cultural flowering of the Greek islands and the heterogeneity of the imperial lands form the preconditions of possibility for regeneration. In Gogol's *Arabesques*, the Cossacks are equated with the culture of the Greeks and deemed the prehistory and wellspring for an ideal synthesis of Russian geography, history, and peoples, or a fusion of the heterogeneous elements Russian empire made national by the poetic voice.

Schlegel's understanding of chaos as "a primordial fusion of the original elements of the world" and of the arabesque as a creative, generative genre which gives shape to chaos, is also seen in Ovid's depiction of the origin story of the Roman Empire in his epic "gallery of various literary genres," *Metamorphoses*.[94] In Ovid's Metamorphoses,

Deucalion, the son of Prometheus, and Pyrrah, his wife and cousin, land on Parnassus as the waters of the great flood begin to subside. Deucalion interprets the proclamation of the oracle, and from his interpretive act and out the body of Parnassus itself, the earth begins to regenerate life. While I am not claiming that Ovid serves as a model for Gogol's *Arabesques* or *Taras Bulba*, *Metamorphoses* can help us understand Gogol's vision of world regeneration and chaotic wholeness, which he merges with the Romantic understanding of history and the role of the poet-historian. Like Ovid, who reinterpreted the possibilities of the epic form first defined by Homer and Virgil, Gogol's historical vision and his epic novella *Taras Bulba* give form to the chaos of the primordial past and shape the national future.[95]

The story of Deucalion and Pyrrah begins after the great flood, when only Parnassus, the treasure trove of culture itself, and the two innocents remain among a "pool of swirling water."[96] Deucalion, the son of Prometheus, and Pyrrah, his wife and cousin, are originally united by blood and marriage. Now, their danger unites them, as "all else belongs to the sea." Unlike the Biblical version of the flood, where the future is secured via an orderly filing, two by two, of each species and their eventual reproductive lineage, Ovid's *Metamorphoses* complicates a genetic or genealogical understanding of historical progress. While Deucalion and Pyrrah are connected by blood, their genealogical bond, and marriage, their social bond, the regeneration of the world requires the fecundity of nature herself and the interpretive skill of man.

Fearing his inability to regenerate life, Deucalion recalls his own father, Prometheus, who "breathe[d] new life into molded clay" and whose origins are traced to the Caucasus.[97] They young couple turns to the oracle for help, who tells them to disrobe

and "cast the bones of your mighty mother behind your backs" (1:382). Though initially confused, Deucalion successfully interprets the words of the oracle: "Our mighty mother is Earth. I believe what is meant by her bones / are stones on her body, and these we are bidden to cast behind us.'" (1:389-394). Deucalion's successful interpretive act regenerates the world:

> The stones started to lose their essential hardness, slowly / to soften, and then to assume a new shape… /An outline of human form could be seen, not perfectly clear, like a rough-hewn statue / partially carved from the marble and not yet properly finished. / But still, the part of the stones, which consisted of earth and contained / some moisture was turned into flesh; the solid, inflexible matter / was changed into bones; and the veins of the rock into the veins of blood.[98]

The generative geography and culture of Parnassus links the past and the present, and Deucalian's symbolic act of interpretation on the Greek islands regenerates life, merges geography and history in one body, and makes possible the Roman Empire. Like Deucalion and Pyrrah, in Gogol's *Arabesques*, the Cossacks are unified in their open and dangerous position among the elements and the slowly receding sea and defined by their ability to recirculate existing elements in productive, generative chaos. Gogol merges the Dnieper River and the Black Sea in a mythical image of flood. which links the Cossacks to the Greek islands and the Aegean Sea: "Earlier, the waters of the Dnieper were higher, then it spread out wider and wider and flooded the meadows over an even greater distance. When the waters are beginning to subside, the sight is breathtaking: the elevated areas stand out and resemble countless green islands amid the endless ocean of water" (Прежде во̀ды в Днепре были выше, разливался он шире и далее потоплял луга свои. Когда во̀ды начинают опадать, тогда вид поразителен: все возвышенности выходят и кажутся бесчисленными зелеными островами среди необозримого океана воды). The floodwaters of the Dnieper, the warmth of the Crimean peninsula, and

the fertile Ukrainian lands evoke the mythical model of regeneration dominant in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and further associate Gogol's Ukraine with ancient Greece.

In the essay "On Little Russian Songs" (*O malorossiskikh pesniakh*), Gogol claims that folksongs "are the vibrant, clear, colorful, truthful history of a nation" (народная история, живая, яркая, исполненная красок, истины, обнажающая всю жизнь народа) and addresses his Russian-speaking contemporaries in a time of "striving for originality and a national poetry of our own" (в эти времена стремления к самобытности и собственной народной поэзии).[99] Against the silent and individual remembrance of history, he recommends a turn to the collective voice of the folksong: "Away with meditation and vigil! Man's whole mysterious makeup demands sounds, nothing but sounds" (Тогда прочь дума и бдение! Весь таинственный состав его требует звуков, одних звуков).[100] Translating into Russian folksongs hitherto only heard in Ukraine, Gogol offers himself up as a conduit between the Ukrainian past and the Russian present, marked by "an oblivion of life" (*zabvenie zhizni*).[101] Gogol notes that the Little Russian folk song is an especially evocative tombstone (*nadgrobnyi pamiatnik*) and that, whether they speak of Cossack glory or of the melancholy women left behind, these folk songs all mourn the temporary nature of the Cossack phenomenon: "Be it an expression of anguish over someone's youth being cut short prematurely before it had been enjoyed to the full, or be it a complaint about the exposed position of Little Russia at that time…, its sounds live, burn and tear the soul apart" (Тоска ли это о прерванной юности, которой не дали довеселиться; жалобы ли это на бесприютное положение тогдашней Малороссии..., но звуки ее живут, жгут, раздирают душу). It is Ukraine's geographical openness and the resulting historical temporality that gives these songs such

vitality and perpetual youth; Gogol mourns the passing of the Cossack era, but praises the passion of the resulting verses.

Gogol only uses the word Ukrainian once in this essay, to describe an idyllic unity, a poetic whole, in which the "best songs and voices" (*luchshie pesni i golosa*) echo amongst the rural life and fertile nature of the Ukrainian steppe lands. This unreachable unity is encapsulated in the folk song, now "entirely historical" (*mogut vpolne nazvat'sia istoricheskimi*), "faithful to the moment" (*verny togdashnei minute*), and "permeated by [and breathing] that broad freedom of Cossack life" (Везде проникает их, везде в них дышит эта широкая воля козацкой жизни).[102] Gogol describes the Cossacks as a masculine, non-procreative culture that surrenders the "wife, mother, sister, brothers" (*zheni, mat', sestru, brat'ev*) for the bonds of brotherhood, which are "stronger even than love" (*sil'nee liubvi*). Describing Ukrainian folksongs as "poetry, history, and a father's grave" (и поэзия, и история, и отцовская могила), Gogol emphasizes both the unity and the ephemeral temporality and of the Cossack phenomenon. He imprints this vision of history onto the landscape of these generative Ukrainian steppes: "The Black Sea gleams; the whole wondrous, immeasurable steppe from Taman to the Danube is a wild ocean of flowers swaying with the slightest breath of air; and swans and cranes sink in the infinite blue of the sky; the dying Cossack lies amid this freshness of virginal nature" (Сверкает Черное море; вся чудесная, неизмеримая степь от Тамана до Дуная — дикий океан цветов колышется одним налетом ветра; в беспредельной глубине неба тонут лебеди и журавли; умирающий козак лежит среди этой свежести девственной природы). In the steppes, which reconcile the sky and the sea, geography and history, the past and the future, the dying Cossack fertilizes the virgin soil. Gogol

locates all the trappings of the Romantic nation – dramatic geography, colorful history, and folk poetry – in Ukraine. Yet, he mourns and historicizes these national qualities as relics or tombstones of the past and sees a political fatality in their ephemeral and non-reproductive unity. Gogol's early works *Arabesques and Mirgorod* focus on the Ukrainian past and its regenerative potential, while the second version of *Taras Bulba*, and the changes from first redaction evidence a preoccupation with the renewed debates between Poland and Russia over claim to the Cossacks lands.

The Two Versions of *Taras Bulba* between Poland and Russia

In 1793, after the second partition of Poland and the Russian acquisition of right-bank Ukraine, Vasily Petrov's "Ode on the Integration of Polish Regions into Russia," addressed to Catherine II, celebrates the Slavic unity of Russians, Poles and Ukrainians. The ode celebrates the Dnieper's full liberation and Russia's control of the Black Sea region: "The Dnieper, having heard fate's command, / That however long or remote its channel / From sea to source, he will flow / In the Russian realm" (Услышав Днепр веленье рока, / Дабы, сколь логом ни далек, / Он весь от моря до истока / Во области Российской тек).[103] For Petrov, the annexation of right-bank Ukraine proclaims a glorious future Slavic unity and Russia's role as lead nationality: "Ross will be the body's head" (*Ross budet telesi glavoi*). Poland is assigned the right of primogeniture (*pervorodstva chest'*), but her fate is to be part of Russia. The Poles, who remained restless and unconvinced by the Russian-lead Slavic union, are understood by Kappeler as "the first national movement to shake the Russian empire" and right-bank Ukraine was

vital to the Polish conceptualization of its borders and reach.[104] The Warsaw uprising of 1794, the Polish alliance with Napoleon, and the November uprising of 1830-1 were aimed at the restoration of the Polish state and for some, a Slavic-based unity with a dominant Polish nationality.

The right bank, along with Lithuania and Belarus formed the borderlands (*kresy*) of the imagined Polish homeland prior to the partitions. In the 1830s, Polish leaders debated whether the Polish borderlands were to be included in their national project, which was a state-based restoration of Poland. The Romantic poet, Wincenty Pol, himself from Galicia, emphasized the borderlands in his "The Song of our Land" (1835). For Pol and for others, the Polish imaginary aligned with its 1772 borders and stretched from the Baltic Sea to the Dnieper river estuary at the Black Sea: "From Lithuania as far as to Zaporozhia / I know the entire Poland" (*Z Litwy aż do Zaporoża / Cala Polskę znam*).[105] One group of Polish liberals declared in 1837: "Poland [is] united and undivided [*Polska jedna i nierozdzielna*]. From the Oder to the Dnieper, and from the Baltic to the Black Sea [*po Euxyn od Bałtyku*], these are the borders of its mightiness. Such a Poland will respond with dignity to its calling and fulfill its high mission among the Slavs."[106] This assertion of Polish dominance over the Russia's recent imperial acquisition was understood as direct threat to Russian imperial and national integrity, and Russia responded both politically and culturally.

Gogol's *Arabesques* essays and the first version of *Taras Bulba*, published in 1835 as part of *Mirgorod*, emphasize that the Cossacks form a unified, if ephemeral, nation between Poland, Russia, and the Tatars and Ottomans. Gogol's focus on the independence of the Ukrainian Cossack lands was fully acceptable, even by the standards

of official nationality, because it was limited to the historical past and because the Russian national poet was to serve as the bridge between the present and this past. However, beginning in the 1830s Sergei Uvarov, whose triad of official nationality had both a Romantic and anti-Polish frame of reference, sought to demonstrate Russia's immemorial historical patrimony over its recent imperial acquisitions.[107]

Histories such as Gogol's, which emphasized the pre-Union period of Ukrainian independence, were acceptable. However, this framework also left open the possibility that during the union with Poland-Lithuania all traces of Russianness had been cleared from the Ukrainian borderlands. As Saunders explains, Uvarov "had been engaged in discussions with scholars on the subject since 1834, but declared that he had not yet secured what he was looking for. He admitted that part of the reason lay in 'the novelty of this view of the history of the fatherland."[108] The historian Mikhail Pogodin also took part in the project to demonstrate that the Ukrainian borderlands had been Russian from time immemorial. By the late 1830s, the idea of "provinces returned from Poland" had taken root in the Russian empire, and Pogodin emphasized the geographical reach of the Kyivan inheritance—an idealized map of Iaroslav the Wise and his territorial possessions early in the eleventh century. Bilenky notes that "the geographical shape of Iaroslav's state suspiciously resembled the territorial gains of Russia after the partitions of Poland" and quotes Pogodin: "Yaroslav owned Kiev, Volhynia, Podolia, Galicia, Lithuania, the Baltic Sea coast, Novgorod, Dvina district, Volga district, Northern country … The borders of Yaroslav's domains were the Baltic Sea, present-day Prussia, the Kingdom of Poland, the Carpathians, New Russian steppes, the Volga, the Ural Mountains, etc."[109]

This imaginative historical precedent of Russian rule allowed Pogodin and others to claim the Ukrainian borderlands as native, historical patrimony.

First published in the collection *Mirgorod* in 1835, Gogol's novella *Taras Bulba* also focuses on Cossack history and the Cossack lands. Belinsky, in his review of the first edition of *Taras Bulba* equates Gogol with Homer, the poet of republic Greece and the bardic tradition, and associates the Cossacks with the ancient Greeks.[110] He deems the novella

> an episode from the great epic life of a whole nation/people. If in our time a Homeric epic is possible, then here it is in its highest form, an ideal and a prototype!... If they say that the *Aeneid* reflects the whole of Greek life in her epic period, then […] can we not say the same about *Taras Bulba* in relation to Little Russia of the sixteenth century?
>
> эпизод из великой эпопеи жизни целого народа. Если в наше время возможна гомерическая эпопея, то вот вам ее высочайший образец, идеал и прототип!.. Если говорят, что в «Илиаде» отражается вся жизнь греческая в ее героический период, то разве […] сказать то же самое и о «Тарасе Бульбе» в отношении к Малороссии XVI века?

While Belinsky hints that the present is not the time for epic, he finds Russia's epic history in Gogol's Cossacks and quotes a section describing the Zaporozhian Sech, the main Cossack stronghold on the Dnieper: "The place from whence flows freedom and Cossackdom to all of Ukraine" (Вот откуда разливается воля и козачество на всю Украйну). For Belinsky, Gogol has successfully represented Ukraine and Cossack era in their historical flourishing. Deeming Gogol the successor to Pushkin and emphasizing Gogol's use of the Russian language, Belinsky has no doubts that this narrative history is now part and patrimony of the Russian nation. When, signaled by the 1840 publication of Shevchenko's *Kobzar*, Ukrainian-language publications threatened to reanimate this history outside the Russian national and imperial framework, Belinsky was more

emphatic in arguing that the Ukrainian element of the Russian literary revival was a historical phenomenon only possible in the past.

After moving to Italy in 1837, despite the high praise from Belinsky, Gogol continued to revise *Taras Bulba* from 1839 to 1842. After considerable revision, an expanded and substantially different text was republished as part of Gogol's *Collected Works* in 1842. After the publication of the 1842 version, this later redaction became understood as the more mature, canonical version of the text, and it is this version which has consistently been one of Gogol's most read works.[111] Meanwhile, the first version of *Taras Bulba* has languished in relative obscurity, with critics deeming it an underdeveloped work that unsuccessfully mixes styles.[112] However, the first edition has seen a recent revival of interest in contemporary Ukraine, and renewed critical interest has focused on the changes between the two versions of Gogol's text, the reason for the changes, and whether the second redaction Russifies the Ukrainian Cossacks of the first edition.[113]

While most critics have focused on the issue of Russification, with some arguing that it is a Gogolian tactic to shield himself from criticism over his depiction of Russia in *Dead Souls*, the changes themselves place more emphasis on the relationship between the Cossacks, Russia, and Poland, and the Cossacks remain a historically distinct entity.[114] The second redaction is significantly longer at twelve chapters (the first version has nine) and the main changes focus on the relationship between the Cossack past and the Russian future. The Ukrainian Cossack past is not conflated with Russia; however, the geographical space of the Cossack steppe lands and borderlands are emphasized to be Russian patrimony. Yoon understands the changes between the two texts as a

"transformation of a Ukrainian tale into a Russian novel," and emphasizes that the tales in *Mirgorod* focus on the Ukrainian past (430). Yoon also note that the changes to the epic novella began with the Polish chapters, but frames the relationship between Poland and Russia in terms of an "opposition between the West and Russia" (432). Within the framework of *narodnost'*, Romanticism, and the historical context of the Polish uprising and the Greek war of independence, Gogol's changes emphasize the Russian, not Polish, patrimony of the Cossack lands and further emphasize the poet-historian's role in national-imperial consolidation. While the first version of the novella attempts to focus exclusively on the Ukrainian Cossack past, the revised text connects this history more explicitly to a vision of Russian national regeneration made possible by the fertile Ukrainian geography, the passionate exploits of the historical Cossacks, and the narrative power of the poetic voice.

While the changes are significant, the plot of both versions of the epic novella remains stable. *Taras Bulba* begins as our eponymous hero greets his sons Ostap and Andrii, who have just returned from the seminary in Kiev. To give his sons an education that is more appropriate for their era, Bulba takes them to the Zaporozhian Sech, located on the rapids of the Dnieper River. The Sech is the exclusively male stronghold, the treasury, and the center of the Zaporozhian Cossack community. The peacetime Cossack lifestyle of carnivalesque carousing and drinking soon shifts into military preparation as the Cossacks begin a war with Poland. The main action of the epic novella takes place in Dubno, a city in today's Ukraine, which was then part of Poland-Lithuania. The Cossacks shut off food supplies to the city and lay siege. Andrii, the younger son, defects ranks and joins the Polish because the Polish princess he loves is trapped dying inside the city.

Taras seeks out Andrii during battle and kills him for his betrayal. Meanwhile, the older son Ostap is taken prisoner and sent to Warsaw. Bulba travels to Warsaw and sees Ostap tortured and executed.[115] The orphaned parent joins Hetman Ostranitsa's rebellion against Poland, refuses the peace that is eventually agreed upon, and launches a campaign and pogrom of destruction to avenge his lost legacy. He is eventually caught on the banks of the Dniester River, and as he dies he directs his Cossack troops to safety via the River, where they can escape the Poles and return to the Black Sea.

In the first version of the novella, Taras Bulba is presented as the prototypical Cossack and as a stubborn character "from the half-nomadic east of Europe" (*polukochuiushchem Vostoke Evropy*).[116] Bulba, like all Cossacks, is a product of geography and historical circumstances. The Cossacks are described as the sons of the steppes and the Sech, "this school of war in that Ukraine" (*ietu voennuiu shkolu togdashnei Ukrainy*).[117] They exist at "a time of lawful and unlawful understanding of land, created by a type of contested, unsure ownership, as to whom Ukraine then belonged. The eternal necessity of border defense against three nations of differing characters – all this gave a kind of warlike, broad dimension to her son's feats" (время правого и неправого понятия о землях, сделавшихся каким-то спорным, нерешенным владением, к каким принадлежала тогда Украйна. Вечная необходимость пограничной защиты против трех разнохарактерных наций — всё это придавало какой-то вольный, широкий размер подвигам сынов ее) (2:283). While the Cossacks and Ukraine are equated and culturally distinct from the neighboring Russians, Poles, and Tatars, the question of land is central and their ability to defend their open borders both defines them and hints and the ephemerality of this phenomenon.

While both version emphasize the lack of official borders, the first redaction adds that the steppes are "more ruled, it could be said, by Zaporozhians than others" (хозяевами более других могли считаться запорожцы) (2:333). Emphasizing the freedom of the Cossack lands and the Cossacks themselves, another passage cut from the second redaction identifies the Polish Batory as one of the first Cossack colonels and differentiates the Cossacks from their neighbors, including Russia: "This historical position of Little Russia, which had not yet been united into any system, nor even been brought into renown, facilitated the existence of many completely detached warriors" (Тогдашнее положение Малороссии, еще не сведенное ни в какую систему, даже не приведенное в известность, способствовало существованию многих совершенно отдельных партизанов) (2:284-5). This independence is associated with youth and the desire for an eternal Cossack flourishing is voiced by Bulba himself who mourns the passage of time and sits "wishing, that his whole life could be youth" (желавший бы, чтобы вся жизнь его была молодость) (2:289 and 2:53).

In the 1842 version of the text, Bulba and the Cossacks are now located in the "half-nomadic corner of Europe" (*na polukochuiushchem uglu Evropy*), which is immediately identified as "Southern primordial Russia" (*iuzhnaia pervobytnaia Rossiia*) when it was abandoned by its princes (2:46). In this redaction, it is the already-Russian nature that generates the Ukrainian Cossack phenomenon. The Cossacks appear like an occurrence or phenomenon on land already Russian: "The Cossacks multiplied – that wide, riotous sweep of Russian nature, -- all the rivers, crossings, coastal shallows and preferential places were dotted/sown with Cossacks" (завелось козачество — широкая, разгульная замашка русской природы, — и когда все поречья, перевозы,

прибрежные пологие и льготные места усеялись козаками). The verb *zavestit'* and the neuter noun *kozachestvo* together evoke the unexpected establishment of a semi-wild beast in a domesticated space. The historical subject matter and the Gogolian imperial geography merge in a teleological vision of the Russian dominion over the Black Sea region. The Cossacks are deemed "an extraordinary phenomenon of Russian power" (*neobykovennoe iavlen'e russkoi sily*) and this event is "knocked from the national heart by flaming calamity" (вышибло из народной груди огниво бед). The national heart, the geography of Crimea and Novorossiya, is now clearly demarcated as Russian and the invocation of power alludes to the imperial power that secures these lands. The association between the Cossack past and the Russian present is further developed in another added passage: "It is clear to all from history, how their constant war and restless life saved Europe" (Уже известно всем из истории, как их вечная борьба и беспокойная жизнь спасли Европу). Gogol never actually merges the Cossacks themselves with Russians; instead, he resettles them in his present and on Russian soil.[118]

Both versions of the text describe the beauty of the steppe lands in lengthy, lyrical passages and evoke the Russian present with the mention of Novorossiya, the largely-nomadic, sparsely-populated area of today's southern Ukraine, just secured from the Ottomans in the eighteenth century.: "the whole expanse that constitutes today's Novorossiya, all the way to the Black Sea; it was a green, virginal wilderness" (всё то пространство, которое составляет нынешнюю Новороссию, до самого Черного моря, было зеленою девственною пустынею) (2:295; 2:58). Passing through steppe, gendered female in Russian, Gogol's narrator describes the wind rustling the oceanic expanse of wild grasses: "fresh, seductive, like the waves of the sea" (*svezhii,*

obol'stitel'nyi, kak morskie volny) and the steppe herself as "endless, free, and beautiful" (*beskonechnaia, vol'naia, prekrasnaia*) (2:296; 2:59). While both versions of the text allude to the Russian present, the second redaction merges the temporal space and Cossack history with imperial geography. In a passage only added to the second version of the texts, the Cossack raids are now described extending from the Anatolian shores, to the Crimean steppes, from the Dnieper and its tributaries to Moldavia, Walachia and Turkey. Their exploits take them across "the whole Black Sea" (*vse Chernoe more*) and their victories against the Turks are emphasized (2:93-4). The Black Sea space itself is demonstrated to be cleared for Orthodox settlement by Cossack raids. Emphasizing the virginal nature of the land throughout the novella, Gogol erases the non-Cossack, non-Russian, non-Orthodox, populations and history of the reign and settles the Cossacks as the original Orthodox Slavic inhabitants of lands now returned to the Russian empire. The contact zone shifts from the open and permeable space of the Black Sea to the western border of the newly acquired Right-Bank and the antagonism between the Ukrainian or Little Russian Cossacks and the Russian nation is transferred to the Polish borderlands and the Poles themselves.

As Taras Bulba and his sons approach the Sech, they are enveloped by the Dnieper, which "fanned them with cold waves and spread closer, closer, until it finally covered half the surface of the earth" (Он веял холодными волнами и расстилался ближе, ближе и, наконец, обхватил половину всей поверхности земли) (2:297; 2:60). The location of the Sech is especially poetic, it's described as "the place where the Dnieper, until then penned in by the rapids, finally took its due and roared like the sea, and spilled out at will" (Это было то место Днепра, где он, дотоле спертый порогами,

брал, наконец, свое и шумел, как море, разлившись по воле). After three hours of swimming, the Cossacks arrive at the island Khortitsa, where the Sech was located then, though it often moved "often changing its home" (*chasto peremeniavshaia svoe zhilitse*). In both versions, the Cossacks are diverse in origin and class; in addition to the uneducated and escaped seminary students, the Sech is home to "even those, who know of Horace, Cicero and the Roman republic" (были и те, которые знали, что такое Гораций, Цицерон и римская республика) (2:302; 2:66). They're also deemed a "strange republic, the very need of that age" (Эта странная республика была именно потребность того века). However, while the 1835 version notes that among this group were "many officers from the Polish army" (было много офицеров из польских войск) (2:302), the 1842 version deletes this mention and emphasizes that among the Cossacks were "many of those officers, who would later distinguish themselves in the royal troops" (Тут было много тех офицеров, которые потом отличались в королевских войсках) (2:66). The phrasing implies the Russian imperial frame of reference and again alludes the Gogol's present. When alluding to the Polonized nature of the Cossack elite the first version notes that "a portion of our Hetman took their faith" (и часть гетьманцев приняла их веру) (2:308). The second version decries this fiercely noting "there were also dogs among even us who took their faith" (были тоже собаки и между нашими, уж приняли их веру) (2:77).

The stronghold itself is surrounded by a multicultural settlement "that resemble a large fair and that clothes and feeds the Sech" (которое было похоже на ярмарку и которое одевало и кормило Сечь) (2:299; 2:62). The Sech itself, like the Ukrainian

lands, is described as mother and as a carnivalesque space that performs a ritual rebirth or baptismal to unite its diverse populations. Bakhtin argues that in these spaces

> the primitive notion, which commonly takes shape in norm-setting circles, that some kind of linear forward motion exists is rejected. It turns out that every truly significant step forward is accompanied by a return to the beginning ('primitiveness'), or more exactly to a renewal of the beginning. Only memory, not forgetfulness can go forward. Memory returns to the beginning and renews it. Of course, in this understanding the very terms 'forward' and 'backward' lose their self-contained absoluteness.[119]

Arriving at the Sech, a man forgot his past "and with the fire of a fanatic gave himself up to freedom and camaraderie" (и с жаром фанатика предавался воле и товариществу) (2:301; 2:65). Calling to mind Voltaire's description, the Cossacks are united in their negative identities; they have "neither relatives, nor a corner, nor family, apart from the free sky and the eternal feast of their soul" (не имевших ни родных, ни угла, ни семейства, кроме вольного неба и вечного пира души своей). The Sech is the home of "this crazed carousing, which could not have been born from any other root/source" (ту бешеную веселость, которая не могла бы родиться ни из какого другого источника). It is described as a nest (*gnezdo*) that "spreads freedom and Cossackdom throughout Ukraine" (откуда разливается воля и козачество на всю Украйну) (2:299; 2:62). When Andrii and Ostap arrive, they do indeed forget their past, their "paternal home" (*ottsovskii dom*) and join into the carousing lifestyle described as a "sea of revelry" (*razgul'noe more*) (2:303; 2:67). When the Cossacks leave for their campaigns, their departure from the Sech recalls Andrii and Ostap's departure from their maternal home: "Farewell, our mother!' they said almost in one voice: 'May God protect you from any misery'" *(*„Прощай, наша мать!" сказали все почти в одно слово: „пусть же тебя

хранит бог от всякого несчастья!“) (2:311; 2:82). The Sech, the Cossacks, and the steppes are connected in a close metaphorical kinship and a generative union.

The Threatened National Body: The Polish Temptress and the Russian Sea

In both versions of the novella, the Cossacks fight valiantly against the Poles, and eventually lay siege to the city of Dubno in the western borderlands. After distinguishing himself in battle, Andrii is awakened by the Tatar maid of a Polish beauty he once loved as a schoolboy. In the first version, upon recognizing the maid, Andrii drowns in the emotions released by the memory of the past, “And all that had passed, that was in the depths, that was closed, muffled, suppressed by his present free life, all this rose at once to the surface, having flooded in its turn the present” (и всё минувшее, что было во глубине, что было закрыто, заглушено, подавлено настоящим вольным бытом, всё это всплыло разом на поверхность, потопивши в свою очередь настоящее) (2:314). Andrii, now the walking dead (*vstavshego iz mogily*), follows the maid into a hidden tunnel and into the besieged and starving city of Dubno, which is described as a ghost town of the dead and dying (2:316). Entering the quarters of the Polish beauty, Andrri is “devoured by the flames of passion” (пожирающим пламенем страсти) and her only words, which urge him to rejoin his brotherhood and father, lead Andrii to renounce his familial and earthly ties: “I don’t love them like this: my father, brothers, mother, fatherland, all that exists in the world, -- I give it all up for you, all, forgive me! I am now yours! I’m yours! What else do you want?” (Я не так люблю: отца, брата, мать, отчизну, всё, что ни есть на земле, — всё отдаю за тебя, всё прощай! я теперь ваш!

я твой! чего еще хочешь?) (2:318). The scene is brief, and the text cuts away quickly. In the first version of the text, Taras discovers Andrii's defection almost immediately and the scene detailing Andrii's death occurs within a few paragraphs of his metaphorical death upon choosing the Polish princess over his brotherhood.

The second version of the novella greatly expands the passages between Andrii's metaphorical and physical deaths. The entrance to the tunnel to Dubno is moved outside the Cossack encampment, and Andrii must cross a ravine and stream to reach its entrance. Unlike the first version's brief reunion in the starving city, Andrii's time in Dubno becomes a separate chapter, the plight of the city is detailed at far greater length, and the Polish beauty and her family are foregrounded. In another added scene, the symbolically named Periaslav regiment is routed by the Polish due to drunkenness and the Cossacks fight an additional day of battle before Andrii makes his appearance in battle. Elaborating on the drowning metaphor already present in the first edition, the second version emphasizes the damp nature of the gully, stream, and tunnel that Andrii must cross to get inside the city. After Andrii's impassioned speech offering her his life and possessions, the Polish beauty does not believe his declarations of love, saying "and I know your duty and your covenant: you are called by your father, your brothers, and your fatherland" (и знаю я, какой долг и завет твой: тебя зовут твои отец, товарищи, отчизна) (2:106). Her mild protest leads to Andrii's passionate renouncement of his worldly attachments: "Who said that Ukraine is my fatherland? Who gave me her as a fatherland? A fatherland is that, which our soul seeks, that which is more dear than all else. My fatherland – is you! Here is my fatherland!). In the second version of the

novella, Andrii does not merely succumb and declare himself hers, he lays claim to the Polish body as part of the Cossack patrimony.

In the first edition of the text, shortly after Andrii joins the Polish, he meets his father on the battlefield. Andrii is depicted poorly, he "shivered, like a cowardly coward" (затрепетал […] как подлый трус) and "felt his soul not fully clean" (чувствовавшего свою душу не совсем чистою) (2:321). Hiding behind his Polish troops, he is pursued by Bulba's whose immeasurable rage terrifies the fleeing Polish. Left alone, they face each other. Bulba lays claim to his progeny: "Did you think that I would give away to anyone my own child? No! I gave birth to you, and I will kill you! Stand and don't move, and don't beg God's forgives: for this deed there is no forgiveness on this earth!" („Ты думал, что я отдам кому-нибудь дитя свое? Нет! Я тебя породил, я тебя и убью! Стой и не шевелись, и не проси у господа бога отпущения: за такое дело не прощают на том свете!"). Andrii's sin and Bulba's sin of filicide are both depicted as tragic. Cut down like a stalk of wheat, Andrii dies with the unknown and unheard name of the Polish beauty on his lips. Finding his brother dead, Ostap embraces the body and helps Bulba bury Andrii. Bulba returns to battle immediately, and is about to begin to seek out the Polish beauty to slice her neck, when the news of the Tatar raid arrives.

During the siege of Dubno, the Cossacks hear news that the Tatars have raided their Sech, killed and captured its inhabitants, and stolen their treasure. The Cossacks decide to split up and half the regiments leave to pursue the Tatars. Taras become the new leader or Ataman of those who stay. In the first version of the novel, Taras acknowledges their dire fate, deems it a wedding (*svad'ba*) and a celebration, and gives a rousing speech evoking unity in death and common grave: "so that we all lie together, so

that no one is left alive, so that all, like good comrades, lay side by side in one grave" (чтобы все полегли на месте, чтобы ни один не остался вживе, чтобы все, как добрые товарищи, покотом улеглись в одной могиле) (2:327). The troops indeed rally, and the narrator describes the battlefield as wedding night: "They performed under the whistle of the bullets, as though they were performing to wedding music" (Под свист пуль выступали они, как под свадебную музыку) (2:329). The Cossacks are so synchronized that "their hearts and passions beat as one with the unity of common thought" (сердца их и страсти били в один такт единством всеобщей мысли) and they intimidate the Polish troops who suffer great losses and retreat as though before "a supernatural force" (сверхъестественная какая сила).

In the second version of the text, after the Cossacks are divided in numbers and dejected, Taras meditates on the capacity of the vaguely specific Slavic breed (*poroda*), suggests a different type of unity:

> the Slavic breed, a capacious breed, a breed mighty before others, like the sea before smaller rivers. When times are turbulent, it turns into roar and thunder, hillocks and upturns bulwarks, which impotent rivers could not have raised; if it is windless and quiet, clearer than all the rivers, it spreads its indefinite sparkling surface, for the eternal bliss of the eyes
>
> славянская порода, широкая, могучая порода перед другими, что море перед мелководными реками. Коли время бурно, всё превращается оно в рев и гром, бугря и подымая валы, как не поднять их бессильным рекам; коли же безветренно и тихо, яснее всех рек расстилает оно свою неоглядную склянную поверхность, вечную негу очей. (2:129)

This vaguely pan-Slavic passage argues that the Slavic breed is capacious enough to unite the disparate nationalities of the empire and points to the newly incorporated Black Sea regions of Gogol's imperial geography. Though Bulba invokes the strength of the sea, the Cossacks remain dejected contemplating their bleak future on Polish land: "It will be, it

will be, the whole field with is bushes and roads will be covered with the comrade's white bones, generously washed in their Cossack blood and covered in wrecked carts, split sabers and spears" (Будет, будет всё поле с облогами и дорогами покрыто торчащими их белыми костями, щедро обмывшись козацкою их кровью и покрывшись разбитыми возами, расколотыми саблями и копьями) (2:131).The foreboding ruminations of the Cossacks, differ dramatically from Gogol's narrator, who proclaims the path to regeneration is in the hands of the poet and his "thick, powerful word" (густое, могучее слово). Evoking the bardic bandura player, "prophetic in spirit" (вещий духом), the narrator proclaims that the powerful word of Cossack glory will be "carried far, like a humming copper bell into which a master has plunged a lot of clean, fine silver, so that later in the villages, hovels, tents and everywhere will be spread the fine sound, calling everyone equally to holy prayer" (далеко разносится могучее слово, будучи подобно гудящей колокольной меди, в которую много повергнул мастер дорогого чистого серебра, чтобы далече по городам, лачугам, палатам и весям разносился красный звон, сзывая равно всех на святую молитву) (2:131-2).

The poetic prophecy, the clean fine silver of Cossack glory and the call to Orthodoxy are echoed in the numerous, patriotic last word of many dying Cossacks, which were all added to the 1842 edition. The second version emphasizes the non-Polish roots of the Cossack lands and projects the Russian present all the way back to antiquity. Taras' speech, which successfully rouses his troops, evokes an ancient glory impinged upon by non-Orthodox populations:

> You heard from your fathers and grandfathers, in what honor all held our land: we made ourselves known to the Greeks, and plundered gold from Czargrad, and the towns were opulent, the cathedrals, and princes, the princes were of Russian

> genus/race/kin, our princes, and not Catholic heathens. The infidels took it all, all disappeared.
>
> Вы слышали от отцов и дедов, в какой чести у всех была земля наша: и грекам дала знать себя, и с Царьграда брала червонцы, и города были пышные, и храмы, и князья, князья русского рода, свои князья, а не католические недоверки. Всё взяли бусурманы, всё пропало. (2:133)

Evoking their leaderless and exposed position and orphaned Ukraine, Taras calls upon the power of brotherhood – stronger than any ties of blood. He claims there are no ties more holy than those of brotherhood and claims that unlike the animals, "only man can create kinship of the soul and not just of blood" (породниться родством по душе, а не по крови, может один только человек). Proclaim the unique nature of the brotherhood made possible by the Cossack lands and the Orthodox faith, Taras voices a genealogically and historically impossible unity, yet like the unifying power of the exposed and dangerous steppes, the poetic voice is able to reconcile the pre-national past with the national future.

In the second version of the text, it is well after another full day of successful battle that Bulba meets Andrii on the battle field. Unlike the cowardly, unsure figure in the first version, this Andrii emerges proudly from the city, bedecked in Polish armor and his success in battle leads Taras to cry, "Your own, devil's spawn, you kill your own?" (Своих, чортов сын, своих бьешь) (2:142). Juxtaposed with the multitude of added honorable Cossack deaths, Andrii's rage dissipates as Taras reaches him. The scene of the murder is similar in both versions, but in this second version the Polish troops receive reinforcements, surge in strength, and capture Ostap immediately after Andrii's death. There is not enough time in the second version to bury the Cossack body on Polish soil.

After killing Andrii and witnessing Ostap's torture in Warsaw, Taras returns to the Cossacks and to Ukraine in the conclusion of the novella. In both versions, Taras and the Cossacks appear "on the borders of Ukraine" (*na granitsakh Ukrainy*) and the narrator makes it clear that this is no mere detachment or self-interested brigandage; instead, this assembly is a whole nation (*tselaia natsiia*) rising.[120] In the first version, there are thirty thousand Cossacks clad in blue and yellow caftans. This mention of the blue and yellow caftans and of the Cossacks as "an insulted and oppressed nation" (*оскорбленным угнетенный народ*) is cut from the later version, though the number of troops is increased to one hundred and twenty thousand. In the second version, the narrator's list of Cossack grievances grows to include the Uniate church, the disgrace of Orthodox churches, and "the outrages of foreign lords" (*beschinstva chuzhezemnykh panov*), while the desire for revenge "for their hetmans and colonels treacherously slain" (за вероломные убийства гетьманов своих и полковников) is removed. These changes alter the implied enemy of the Cossacks, which in the first version includes the Russians. The second version identifies Poland as the primary opponent and once again emphasizes the geographical reach of the historic Cossacks and the implied Russian lands: "the Cossacks rose up, from Chigirin, from Pereiaslav, from Baturin, from Glukhov; from the lower Dnieper region, from its upper regions and the islands" (поднялись козаки: от Чигирина, от Переяслава, от Батурина, от Глухова, от низовой стороны днепровской и от всех его верховий и островов).[121] This added symbolic geography blurs the temporal distance between the history of Cossack Hetmanate and the history of Cossack incorporation into the Russian empire.

At first, Taras and his Cossacks form part of a larger rebellion headed by Hetman Ostranitsa, whose goals are listed as the overthrow of the self-government of the Polish magnates, and the expulsion of the Jews, the Uniate church, and the "foreign rabble" (*postoronnego sbroda*).[122] The Cossacks begin fighting the Polish crown and its appointed hetman, Nikolai Potocki, who is derided for having "drowned the larger portion of his regiment in a small river" (перетопил он в небольшой речке лучшую часть своего войска) (2:350; 2:166). Trapped by the Cossacks in the city of Polonne, Potocki promises the restitution of their previous rights and privileges. He is met with disbelief and enlists the aid of the Russian clergy (*russkoe dukhovenstvo*), who finally convince the Cossacks to sign the treaty with the Polish king. In the first version of the novella, this invocation of the Russian clergy alludes to a collusion between the Polish and Russian crowns against the Cossacks. The Cossacks "still feeling the ties that bind them to the king" (еще чувствовавших узы, привязывавшие их к королю) are convinced by the pleas of the clergy (2:350). They resolve to keep Potocki hostage until the treaty is signed and dispatched to all Cossacks.

In the first version, the Orthodox clergy evokes Cossack loyalty to the Polish crown and the treaty is signed by the defeated puppet hetman and the victorious Cossacks. The second version frames the Cossack victory as a reflection of their Orthodoxy, which supersedes their loyalty to the Polish King. The Cossacks are convinced by the power of Orthodoxy itself and by the Russian clergy: "against their own Orthodox church they did not dare, and they respected their clergy" (против своей церкви христианской не посмели, и уважили свое духовенство) (2:167). The Russian clergy deliver the will of God, and the faith of the Orthodox is "created from a single,

solid stone. Visible from everywhere and looking directly into the eyes of the passing waves" (созданная из одного цельного, сплошного камня. Отвсюду видна она и глядит прямо в очи мимобегущим волнам). The Orthodox faith is the bedrock of the Russian imperial sea. In this second version, which emphasizes the later perfidy of Potocki and the Polish, the Cossacks decide to release Potocki, after getting his solemn oath to leave all Orthodox churches in freedom, to forget their old enmity, and to never harm the Cossack ranks (оставить на свободе все христианские церкви, забыть старую вражду и не наносить никакой обиды козацкому воинству).

Bulba is the only leader who remains unconvinced, and both versions include his reaction and prophecy, which foretells the end of the Cossacks under Polish rule:

> You think that you've bought tranquility with this treaty and now you'll live as gentlemen – you'll see that it will not be so! Hetman, they will rip your flesh from your head! They will stuff it with buckwheat chaff, and it will long be seen at the fairs! Yes and you too, gentlemen, it will be the rare head that survives! You will disappear in damp cellars, immured in stone walls, if they don't cook you alive in cauldrons like sheep.
>
> Вы думаете, что купили этим спокойствие и будете теперь пановать — увидите, что не будет сего! Сдерут с твоей головы, гетьман, кожу! набьют ее гречаною половою, и долго будут видеть ее по ярмаркам! Да и у вас, паны, у редкого уцелеет голова! Пропадете вы в сырых погребах, замурованные в каменные стены, если не сварят вас живых в котлах, как баранов!

In the second edition of the text, this prophecy is preceded by an added symbolic passage. Before he utters his horrific vision, Bulba takes out his Turkish sabre made of fine silver, breaks it into two pieces, and throws each piece in a different direction saying: "As the two ends of this broadsword will not be united into one and will not make one sabre, so we too, brothers, will not be reunited in this world" (Как двум концам сего палаша не соединиться в одно и не составить одной сабли, так и нам, товарищи, больше не видаться на этом свете).[123] This added image of the broken sword, suggesting the loss

of honor, glory, and reputation, contrasts starkly with a scene from the first pages of the novella.[124] After the sons first come home from the seminary, Bulba spars with Ostap. The boys' mother voices her disapproval, saying "How can it be that children fight their own/native father?" (Как можно, чтобы дитя било родного отца?) (2:280; 2:43). Refusing her suggestion of domesticity and peace, Bulba berates the boys, telling them to ignore their biological mother and cries "Look at this sword – this sword is your mother" (видите вот эту саблю — вот ваша матерь). The promise of unity in battle on Cossack soil is made impossible by the symbolic break, which symbolizes the fear of the permanent dismemberment of the maternal geography.[125]

Emphasizing the perfidy and treachery of the Poles, Bulba calls on his troops to follow him and rebel against the proposed peace, which he calls a "womanish" (*bab'e*) deal (2:350; 2:167). He tells them that they can accept the false treaty, go home, and waste away in powerless domesticity, or they can search for their fates and fortunes on the battlefields. The domestic sphere is depicted as a dead end, where a Cossack can live only temporarily and ingloriously. The first version emphasizes the domestic sphere's vulnerability to attack and its tedious lack of glory; while his enemy chooses to leave him alone (*pokamest ne priberet vrag*), the Cossack will drink, and his wife will nag, and he'll die in the shade "like a dog" (*kak sobaka*) (2:351). Opposed to this limited and isolated domesticity, Bulba offers his Cossacks glory in battle, where they serve like "faithful knights" (*kak vernym rytsariam*) united in a "familial brotherhood" (*kak brat'iam rodnym*). While the domestic Cossack dies powerless without a trace at the will of his enemies, the Cossack who joins his brotherhood, "lays together on the field" (лечь вместе на поле) and leaves a legacy of eternal glory. The second version cuts this

mention of eternal glory, emphasizes the futility of Bulba's enterprise, and presents a more macabre image of death as the bride: "honest, Cossack death, all on one bed, like a groom and his wife (честной, козацкой смертью, всем на одной постеле, как жених с невестою).[126]

Turning against the proposed peace and the Polish King, unconvinced by the Russian clergy, Bulba leads his detachments in an open and bloody rebellion. In the first version of the text, Cossack leadership is strong and Bulba's Cossacks are united. The text makes it clear that only the stern gaze of the Hetmans and leaders kept the other Cossack regiments from following him. Those who remain, unlike those who left, are shown to be divided, "not looking at one another" (не глядя друг на друга) (2:352). In the second version of the text, though Bulba's ranks grow as other Cossacks cleave from their regiments and join his uprising (к ним перебежало не мало других), the unauthorized and discordant nature of Bulba's rebellion is emphasized (2:168). In the first version, the narrator begins describing Bulba's exploits in Poland by uniting the readership: "But let's return to our history" (Но обратимся к нашей истории) (2:352). The second version distances Bulba's unauthorized rebellion from the text's readership, noting that "Taras roamed all of Poland with his regiment" (Тарас гулял по всей Польше с своим полком) (2:169). Bulba moves from village to village, burning and pillaging without mercy. While claiming, in the first version, that "no brush would dare to depicts these evils" (Никакая кисть не осмелилась бы изобразить всех тех свирепств), the narrator describes innocent women and girls, like lily of the valley (*kak landysh*), being burned inside the churches and their children being speared by the Cossacks and thrown into the flames (2:352). While the narrator seems to mourn these

innocent lives, Taras Bulba watches "with a somehow terrible feeling of pleasure" (каким-то ужасным чувством наслаждения) declaring the events "Ostap's wake" (*pominki po Ostape*). The second version emphasizes the destruction of property, and notes that though they did not move Taras, the pleas of the innocents would have caused "the raw land itself and the steppe grass to wilt with pity for their fates" (самая сырая земля, и степовая трава поникла бы от жалости долу) (2:169). Here nature itself disagrees with Bulba's cruelty, and the second version distances the reader from Bulba's unauthorized and anti-autocratic rampage.

Poland sends Potocki and his men to pursue Bulba, and Bulba's troops are surrounded as they stop to rest in a dilapidated castle perched on the Dniester river's high bank above churning rapids and a dangerous abyss. Refusing the inaction of a siege and starvation, Taras and his Cossacks decide to try to break Polish ranks and find a place that they can leap into the river from its banks. As they are breaking through, Taras abruptly stops and bends to the earth, saying: "stop, brothers! I dropped my pipe" (*stoi, brattsy! Uronil liul'ku*). He reaches down to retrieve it and is "snatched from the rear of the detachment and cut from his own" (схвачен набежавшим с тыла отрядом и отрезан от своих) (2:353). He tries to wrest free, but unlike in his youth, his enemies do not fall to the earth. In the second version of the text, this moment is expanded; dropping his pipe, Taras cries out: "'Stop! My tobacco pipe fell; and I don't want even my pipe to go to the enemy Poles!" And the old Ataman bent down and began to look in the grass for his tobacco pipe, his inseparable companion on the seas and on land, and in his campaigns, and at home. („Стой! выпала люлька с табаком; не хочу, чтобы и люлька досталась вражьим ляхам!" И нагнулся старый атаман и стал отыскивать в траве

свою люльку с табаком, неотлучную сопутницу на морях и на суше, и в походах, и дома) (2:170). Another passage only added to the second version evokes the Polish eagle and a Cossack declares he'll take Bulba's body "even if dead, and return it to Ukraine!" (Хоть неживого, а довезу тебя до Украйны) (2:147). The changes suggest that Taras does not want his Cossack pipe, a symbol of the Cossack body, to contribute to the regeneration of the Polish state.

More than symbolic betrayal of the domestic or feminine, Bulba's pipe, most likely made of bone of clay, represents the ephemeral lifespan of the individual and collective Cossack body.[127] The pipe also calls to mind Kotliarevsky's *Aenied*, where Prometheus steals fire from the gods to light his Cossack pipe and can symbolize Cossack glory itself.[128] The reach of the Cossacks and their exploits in battles and campaigns is marked in the physical evidence of dead bodies and discarded pipes: "For a long time to after, they found in those place discarded Zaporozhian short pipes" (Долго еще после находили в тех местах запорожские коротенькие люльки) (2:334; 2:148). The second redaction elaborates on the associations already evident in the earlier redaction and connects the short Cossack lifespan to the territorial ambitions of the Polish state. While in the first version Taras is surprised that his youth is waning, the second emphasizes that this youth is also being cut short by the influence of Poland, first seducing Andrii, then killing Ostap, then taking the flame of Cossack glory into itself in the dropping of Taras' pipe. Though Taras blames his old age for his inability to throw off his powerful enemies in both versions, the narrator does not stay silent in the second version: "But old age wasn't to blame: strength overpowered strength" (Но не старость была виною: сила одолела силу) (2:170).

In the first version, after he is captured Taras is tied to a felled tree trunk, his hands are nailed down, and he is made visible to his troops below. Ignoring his situation, Bulba focuses on his troops, and shout directions so they can reach the boats he sees are tied to the banks of the Dniester. The Cossacks, separated from the river banks by the Polish on one side and a deep chasm on the other, are saved by the shouts of their dying leader and by their wild horses. Hearing Bulba's call, the Cossack decide to leap over the abyss to reach the river banks: "The Cossacks stopped in the blink of an eye, they raised their whips and whistled, and their Tatar steeds lifted from the ground, soared into the air like snakes and flew over the abyss. Only under one did a horse stumble, but it caught the ground with its hoof and, accustomed to the Crimean slopes, scrambled out with its rider" (Козаки только один миг ока остановились, подняли свои нагайки, свистнули, и татарские их кони, отделившись от земли, распластались в воздухе, как змеи, и перелетели через пропасть. Под одним только конь оступился, но зацепился копытом и, привыкший к крымским стремнинам, выкарабкался с своим седоком).[129] As they board the boats, unaffected by the bullets above, Bulba regains consciousness after a brutal blow. His eyes sparkle with happiness and he delivers his last words: "Remember me another time! Do not worry about my fate! I know my fate: I know that I will be torn apart alive into pieces, and not a piece of my body will be left on this earth […] Yes, make sure to come again next summer, yes have a good adventure" („вспоминайте иной час обо мне! Об участи же моей не заботьтесь! я знаю свою участь: я знаю, что меня заживо разнимут по кускам, и что кусочка моего тела не оставят на земле […] Да глядите, прибывайте на следущее лето опять, да погуляйте, хорошенько!.." While the Taras, his body, and his Ukraine are fated to be

dismembered and incorporated into the surrounding empires, Taras dies with a smile and with a certainty that the Cossacks will rise up again.

They escape as a collective whole, and Taras' prophecy foretells a return. The narrator reinforces Taras's words with a reaffirmation of Cossack bravery and a meditation on the cyclical rising of rivers: "The Dniestr is not a small river; but when the wind blows off the sea, its swell laps at the moon itself. The Cossacks floated under shells and shots, carefully avoided the green islands, successfully straightened their sail, and harmoniously and peacefully rowed and talked about their Ataman" (Не малая река Днестр; а как погонит ветер с моря, то вал дохлестывает до самого месяца. Козаки плыли под пулями и выстрелами, осторожно минали зеленые острова, хорошенько выправляли парус, дружно и мерно ударяли веслами и говорили про своего атамана) (2:355). From the Western boundary of their borderlands, the Cossacks return home. Their rebellion is a naturally occurring phenomenon, like the swell. Their collective union and oral history, embodied in Taras, sustains them on their journey. While he dies, they begin again.

The second version of the novella ends quite differently. The Cossacks are unable to follow Bulba's directions, must jump directly into the Dniester, and two of the Cossacks die in the process. Bulba also awakens to the safely departing Cossacks and calls out to them to remember him and to return the next spring; however, his last words focus on the Orthodox faith and are addressed to the Polish:

> What have you captured, you damned Poles? Do you think there is anything in this world a Cossack would be frightened of? Just wait, the time will come, the time will be, you will understand what Russian Orthodox faith is! Already nations near and far sense it: there rises from the Russian land a Russian tsar, and there will be no power in this world that will not yield to him!

> Что́ взяли, чортовы ляхи? Думаете, есть что-нибудь на свете, чего бы побоялся козак? Постойте же, придет время, будет время, узнаете вы, что такое православная русская вера! Уже и теперь чуют дальние и близкие народы: подымается из русской земли свой царь, и не будет в мире силы, которая бы не покорилась ему! (2:172)

Instead of Cossack unity, this invocation of future Russian strength emphasizes the anti-Polish legacy of the Cossack, the regenerative power of the Ukrainian soil, and the binding force of the Orthodox faith for "nations near and far" (*dal'nie i blizkie narody*). Bulba and the narrator are distracted by the fire lapping at the Cossack's feet and the narrator refocuses by asking: "Will there be found in the world such fire, torments, or force powerful enough to subjugate the Russian spirit?" (Разве найдутся на свете такие огни, муки и такая сила, которая бы пересилила русскую силу). Bulba's body, burned in the pyre, frees the Russian spirit to conquer the world.[130]. Emphasizing Russian Orthodox (as opposed to Polish) patrimony of Cossack lands and Cossack history, Bulba's final words in the second edition continue to connect the fertile exploits of the Ukrainian Cossacks to his Russian present in a mythical mode of regeneration.[131]

Notes

[1.] François Marie Arouet de Voltaire, *Histoire de Charles XII*, in *Oeuvre complètes de Voltaire* 52 vols. (Paris, 1877-85), 16:242-43. Unless otherwise indicated, translations are my own.

[2.] Larry Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994), 92.

[3]Romana Bahrij-Pikulyk counts approximately thirty authors, see "Superheroes, Gentlemen or Pariahs? The Cossacks in Nikolai Gogol's *Taras Bulba* and Panteleimon Kulish's *Black Council*," *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 5.2 (Fall 1980): 30.

[4]See Dan Unguriano, *Plotting History: The Russian Historical Novel in the Imperial Age* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2007), 30 and George G. Grabowicz, "Ukrainian-Russian Literary Relations in the Nineteenth Century: A Formulation of the Problem," in *Ukraine and Russia in their Historical Encounter,"* Eds Peter Potichnyj, Mark Raeff, et. al. (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1992), 233.

[5]Lauren Gray Leighton, "An Introduction," in *Russian Romantic Criticism: An Anthology* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987), ix.

[6]For a detailed biography and overview of Somov as a writer, literary editor, and critic, see John Mersereau Jr., *Orest Somov: Russian Fiction between Romanticism and Realism* (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1989).

[7]Leighton, "Introduction," xv. See also George Luckyj, *Between Gogol' and Shevchenko, Polarity in the Literary Ukraine*: 1798-1847 (Munchen: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1971), 79-80; and Boris Gasparov, "Alienation and Negation: Gogol's View of Ukraine," in *Gogol: Exploring Absence*, ed. Sven Spieker (Bloomington: Slavica, 1999), 114.

[8]Orest Somov, "O Romanticheskoi poezii. Opyt v trekh statiakh" (Sanktpeterburg: Tim Imp Vospitatel'nogo Doma, 1823), 27. I have modernized the orthography. The translations are taken from Lauren Gray Leighton's *Russian Romantic Criticism*, 28. For detailed notes on Somov's essay, its composition and influences, see Leighton, *Russian Romantic Criticism*, 21-45.

[9]Somov, "O Romanticheskoi poezii," 85. Leighton, *Russian Romantic Criticism*, 30.

[10]Somov, "O Romanticheskoi poezii," 91. Leighton, *Russian Romantic Criticism*, 32.

[11]Somov, "O Romanticheskoi poezii," 89. This section is not included in the Leighton translation. Somov's essay echoes Pushkin's 1822 poem "The Captive of the Caucasus," which begins by equating the Caucasus with ancient Greece and deeming it Russia's Parnassus. See Katya Hokanson, "Literary Imperialism, *Narodnost'* and Pushkin's Invention of the Caucasus," *The Russian Review*, 53 (1994): 343-344. Both Somov and Gogol shift the imagined geography of the Russian south from the Caucasus to Crimea and Ukraine. Hokanson connects Gogol's representation of Ukraine to Pushkin's representation of the Caucasus, noting "It was Pushkin's ability to 'authentically represent,' or better, 'authentically present,' the Caucasus that assured him his place in 1822 as Russia's foremost poet" (342).

[12]Somov, "O Romanticheskoi poezii," 86. Leighton, *Russian Romantic Criticism*, 31.

[13]Somov, "O Romanticheskoi poezii," 95-6. Leighton, *Russian Romantic Criticism*, 32-3.

[14]See Andrew Kahn, "Readings of Imperial Rome from Lomonsov to Pushkin," *Slavic Review*, 52(4): 1993, 750

[15]Baehr notes that at least nine Roman histories were translated into Russian between 1762 and 1796. See Stephen L. Baehr, "From History to National Myth: Translatio Imperii in Eighteenth-Century Russia," *Russian Review* 37(1): 1978, 5.

[16]Pushkin's "I built myself a monument not made by human hands" is based on Derzhavin's translation of Horace's ode 2.20, titled "The Swan" (*Lebed*), Horace's ode 3.30, and his "Exegi monumentum." On Pushkin's "Exegi monumentum" and its relationship to Horace's odes, see Katya Hokanon, "Poetry and Politics: The 'Anti-Polish' Poems and 'I built myself a monument not made by human hands" in *Taboo Pushkin: Topics, Texts, Interpretations*, ed. Alyssa Dinega Gillespie (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2012), 299-301 and 309-10. For more on Horace as a Roman imperial poet, see Ellen Oliensis, *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 105.

[17]Hokanson, "Politics and Poetry," 300. Hokanson notes that Pushkin's "words, like Horace's for Rome, lend meaning and shape to those vast spaces controlled by Russia" (310).

[18]Somov, "O romanticheskoi poezii," 102. Emphasis in the original. I have modified the translation from Leighton, *Russian Romantic Criticism*, 33. The phrase in the original, необходимо иметь, is far more ambiguous than the frequently used translation "undeniably possesses," which would be an accurate translation of необходимо имеет. In the original text of the essay иметь is spelled with a *yat*. Somov's text stops short of affirming that Russia possess a national literature.

[19] For an elaboration of Catherine's imperial project, see Andrei Zorin, *By Fables Alone: Literature and State Ideology in Late-Eighteenth – Early-Nineteenth Century Russia*, trans. Marcus C. Levitt (Boston: Ars Rossica, 2014).

[20]See Zorin, *By Fables Alone*, 27-30.

[21]Zorin, *By Fables Alone*, 93. This myth of peaceful transfer fails to mention the role of the Cossacks, who helped secure Crimea and whose Sech, or main stronghold, stood between the imperial center and its newest territory. After returning from Crimea, the Russian army attacked the Cossack Sech in 1775 and dispersed any surviving Zaporozhian Cossacks. Gogol's story "A May Night" in the collection *Evenings on a Farm Near Dikanka*, alludes to this history and Gogol's Cossacks ask Catherine herself: "Of what are the Zaporozhian troops guilty? Of escorting your army through Perekop and helping your generals chop the Crimeans to pieces?" This history is elaborated on and this quote is cited in Edyta Bojanowska, *Nikolai Gogol: Between Ukrainian and Russian Nationalism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), 70-1.

[22]The Dikanka estate belonged to Viktor Kochubey and neighbored Gogol's familial estate. This Kochubey, an interior minister for Alexander I, was a descendant of the loyal Kochubey immortalized in Pushkin's *Poltava*. Bojanowska argues that because Gogol harbored sympathy for Mazepa, his descriptions of Dikanka was meant to provoke Kochubey, see Bojanowska, *Nikolai Gogol*, 41. In Gogol's oeuvre, Mazepa features in "I need to See the Colonel" (*Mne nuzhno videt' polkovnika*), a fragment from his unfinished historical novel *The Hetman* published in *Arabesques*, and also in the unpublished fragment "Mazepa's Meditations," where Mazepa contemplates whether to ally with Sweden's Charles against Peter, see Bojanowska, *Nikolai Gogol,* 158-167.

[23]Ivan Kotliarevsky's reimagining of Vergil's *Aeneid*, his Cossack *Eneida* was the first text written in Ukrainian vernacular. Kotliarevksy's popular parody contributed to the association of the Ukrainian language with humorous subject-matter and a low, in the Classical sense, literary style, for more on this association, see George Grabowicz, "Semantyka kotliarevshchyny," in *Do istorii ukrain'skoi literatury* (Kyiv: Osnovy, 1997), 316-32 and Grabowicz's "Subversion and self-assertion: The role of Kotliarevshchyna in Russian-Ukrainian literary relations," in *Culture, Nation, and Identity: The Ukrainian-Russian Encounter (1600-1945)*, eds. Andreas Kappeler, Zenon E. Kohut, et. al. (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2003), 401-408. Kvitka is considered the father of Ukrainian prose. For more on Kvitka and Hulak-Artemovsky and their relationship to the imperial and Ukrainian literary milieus, see Luckyj, *Between Gogol and Shevchenko*, 43-49.

[24]Petro Hulak-Artemovsky, *Tvory* (Kyiv: Dnipro, 1964), 218-19.

[25]By 1834, ethnic Russians composed less than half of the total imperial population, and regional and imperial allegiances coexisted in the early-nineteenth-century Russian empire, see Andreas Kappeler, *The Russian Empire: A Multiethnic History* (New York: Pearson Education, 2001), 117.

[26]Regarding Ukrainian writers who chose to write in Russian, Olga Andriewsky argues that "it was the ability of these Ukrainian writers to interpret and order – and ultimately tame – the Ukrainian experience so as to make it accessible to a Russian audience that became a key to their literary success," see "The Russian-Ukrainian Discourse and the Failure of the 'Little Russian Solution,' 1782-1917," in *Culture Nation, and Identity,* 184. However, these writers did not necessarily seek to minimize the differences between the Ukrainian Cossack lands and the "strictly-speaking" Russians; instead, Gogol's *Evenings*, *Arabesques*, and *Mirgorod* emphasize Ukrainian difference to argue that the Cossacks formed a unique historical and cultural wellspring or inheritance for the future Russian nation.

[27]On the relationship between the Russian empire, the doctrine of official nationality, and Greece in the early nineteenth century, see Lucien J. Frary*, Russia and the Making of Modern Greek Identity, 1821-1844*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).

[28]Andriewsky, "The Russian Ukrainian Discourse and the Failure of the Little Russian Solution," 185.

[29]For a comparative analysis of the relationship between Russian, Polish, and Ukrainian political and national imaginations in the Romantic era, see Serhiy Bilenky's *Romantic Nationalism in Eastern Europe: Russian, Polish, and Ukrainian Political Imaginations* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012).

[30]On Pushkin's "Anti-Polish" poems, see Hokanson, "Politics and Poetry: The Anti-Polish Poems and 'I built myself a monument not made by human hands,'" in *Taboo Pushkin: Topics, Texts, Interpretations*. Ed. Alyssa W. Dinega (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 2012), 282-317; and Megan Dixon, "Repositioning Pushkin and the Poems of the Polish Uprising," In *Polish Encounters, Russian Identity*, eds. David Ransel and Bozena Shallcross (Bloomington: Indiana University Pres, 2005), 49-72.

[31]In 1829, Mickiewicz had left Russia for exile in Rome and Dresden, and he was unable to participate in the uprising. Before he left, he saw Pushkin at the house of Pogodin and was one of the first to receive a copy of *Poltava.* By this time, Pushkin had begun to translate the foreword to Mickiewicz's *Konarad Wallenrod*, see W. Lednicki, "Bits of Table Talk on Pushkin: One more Polemic of Pushkin and Mickiewicz" *ASEER* 5.1/2 (1946): 100-101.

[32]Adam Mickiewicz, *Konrad Wallenrod and Other Writings of Adam Mickiewicz*. trans. Jewell Parish (Westport.: Greenwood Press, 1975), 8.

[33]Alexander Pushkin, "Klevetnikam Rossii," in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 16 vols. (1937-1959), 3:269-70.

[34]Megan Dixon, "Repositioning Pushkin and the Poems of the Polish Uprising," 62.

[35]Alexander Pushkin, "Borodinskaia Godovshchina," in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 16 vols. (1937-1959), 3:273-74.

[36]See John Mersereau Jr., *Orest Somov*, 35; Serhiy Bilenky's *Romantic Nationalism in Eastern Europe*, 29-31; and Gorge S.N. Luckyj, *Between Gogol' and Shevchenko,* 79-80.

[37]For a more detailed study of the immediate critical response to Gogol's *Evenings on a Farm Near Dikanka*, see D. B. Saunders, "Contemporary Critics of Gogol's *Vechera* and the Debate about Russian *Narodnost'* (1831-32)," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 5.1 (1981), 66-82.

[38]Bojanowska, *Nikolai Gogol*, 81.

[39]*Severnaia pchela*, 1831, no. 219, p. 1.

[40]Bojanowska, *Nikolai Gogol*, 78

[41]Saunders, "Contemporary Critics," 71.

[42] N. I. Nadezhdin, in *Teleskop*, 5 (1831): 558-563; quoted in Bojanowska, *Nikolai Gogol*, 80.

[43]V. G. Belinskii, "*Arabeski* i *Mirgorod*," in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii (PSS)*, 13 vols. (Moskva: Akademia Nauk, 1953-59), I:172-4.

[44] V. G. Belinskii, "O russkoi povesti i povestiakh g. Gogolia," in *PSS* I:306.

[45]While the essay is dated 1832, it was written during 1834 and included in the 1835 publication of *Arabesques.* See Nikolai V. Gogol, "Neskol'ko slov o Pushkine," in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii (PSS)*, 14 vols (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSR, 1937-1952), 8:50. All *Arabesques* translations are taken from Nikolai Gogol, *Arabesques*, trans. Alexander Tulloch (Ann Arbor, Ardis, 1982), 109. Whether Pushkin was a national poet had been hotly debated in the interim. For a detailed overview of Pushkin's canonization as a national poet, see Edyta Bojanowska's "Equivocal Praise and National-Imperial Conundrums: Gogol's 'A Few Words About Pushkin'" *Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue Canadienne des Slavistes* 59:2/3, 2009, 187.

[46]Bojanowska, "Equivocal Praise," 178-79.

[47]Gogol, "Neskol'ko slov o Pushkine," *PSS* 8:52, and Tulloch, *Arabesques* 111.

[48]Gogol, "Neskol'ko slov o Pushkine," *PSS* 8:53, and Tulloch, *Arabesques*, 111.

[49]Gogol, "Neskol'ko slov o Pushkine," *PSS*, 8:53, and Tulloch, *Arabesques*, 112.

[50]See Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities*, 87. For an elaboration of the proponents of and discourse surrounding official nationality, see Cynthia H. Whittaker, *The Origins of Modern Russian Education: An Intellectual Biography of Count Sergei Uvarov, 1786-1855* (DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University Press, 1984) and Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, *Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825-1855* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1959), 124-83.

[51]Zorin, *By Fables Alone*, 339.

[52]This combination of cultural and political elements was not fully successful, and the debate as to whether Russian identity was to be found in the Autocratic state and in the Orthodox Church, or whether it was to be found in the Russian language, history, and peasantry continued, eventually leading to the Slavophile-Westernizer divide. Leighton notes that the popularity of Hegel and Hegelianism in the 1830s formed the intellectual foundations for the future Westernizers. The "Schellingian orientation" in turn developed into the Slavophile philosophy of the *Kruzhok liubomudrov* and the journal *Moskovskii vestnik*. Leighton, *Russian Romantic Criticism*, xii.

[53]For detailed account of Gogol's historical undertaking in this period, see Paul A. Karpuk, "Reconstructing Gogol''s Project to Write a History of Ukraine" *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 51.4(2009): 413-447.

[54]Gogol's first two announcements (January 1834 in *Severnaia Pchela* and February 1834 in *Moskovskii Telegraf*) announce a "History of Little Russian Cossacks," the third announcement (Feb 1834 in *Molva*) proclaims a "History of Little Russia." In the third announcement, Gogol claims that his history will show Little Russia's almost four centuries of independence from Russia (почти четырех веков независимо от России). However, the announcement alludes to a prior unity, after which "this part of Russia became separated" (отделилась эта часть России), and a future union, wherein it "finally merged with Russia forever" (наконец совершенно слилась с Россиею). See, Gogol, "Ob'iavlenie ob izdanii istorii malorossii," *PSS* 9:76.

[55]Belinsky, "O russkoi povesti i povestiakh g. Gogolia," *PSS*, I:307.

[56]Judith Kornblatt, *The Cossack Hero in Russian Literature: A Study in Cultural Mythology* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1992), 76.

[57]See Viktor Shklovskii, *V kotorom rasskazyvaetsia o russkoi proze*, vol. II in *Povesti o proze* (Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literature, 1966), 6. Shklovskii went back to the 1889-1896 Tikhonravov-Shenrok edition of Gogol's collected works to find the complete collection. The Tulloch translation is almost complete, though it does leave out the *Hetman* fragments.

[58]Melissa Frazier, "*Arabesques* Architecture, and Printing," in *Russian Subjects: Empire, Nation, and the Culture of the Golden Age*, eds. Monika Greenleaf and Stephen Moeller-Sally, (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1998), 293.

[59]Frazier, "*Arabesques* Architecture, and Printing," 279. On the relationship between Gogol's *Arabesques* and the arabesque as a literary genre, see also Melissa Frazier, *Frames of the Imagination: Gogol's Arabesques and the Romantic Question of Genre* (New York: Peter Lang, 2000); Joan Nabseth Stevenson, "Literary and Cultural Patterns in Gogol's 'Arabeski,'" PhD Dissertation, Stanford University, 1984; and Susanne Fusso, *Designing Dead Souls: An Anatomy of Disorder in Gogol* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993), 5-19.

[60]Friedrich Schlegel, "Dialogue on Poetry" in *Dialogue on Poetry and Literary Aphorisms*, trans. Ernest Behler and Roman Struc (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1968), 86. See also Hans Eichner, "Friedrich Schlegel's Theory of Romantic Poetry" *PMLA* 71 (1956): 1039.

[61]Ernest Behler, "Introduction" to *Dialogue on Poetry and Literary Aphorisms*, 10-11.

[62]Melissa Frazier, *Frames of the Imagination*, 7.

[63]See Gogol, "Kommentarii," *PSS* 8:746 and Donald Fanger, *The Creation of Nikolai Gogol* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979), 57-58 and 64-65.

[64]Gogol, "Predislovie" PSS 8:7, and Tulloch, *Arabesques*, 23.

[65]Bojanowska, *Nikolai Gogol*, 122.

[66]H. Barry Nisbet, "Herder's Conception of Nationhood and its Influence in Eastern Europe" in *The German Lands and Eastern Europe*, 119. See also Sonia Sikka, *Herder on Humanity and Cultural Difference* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011). Herder's second major work on history, *Ideas on the Philosophy of History* (1784-91), includes his famous chapter on the Slavs in the fourth and final volume.

[67]Frederick C. Beiser, *The German Historicist Tradition* (Oxford, 2011), 158-9. See also Herder, *On World History*, trans. Menus and Palma (1997), 288.

[68]Herder, *On World History*, 291.

[69]See H. Barry Nisbet, "Herder's Conception of Nationhood," 125.

[70]See Sonia Sikka, *Herder on Humanity and Cultural Difference,* 89.

[71]G. W. F. Hegel, *Lectures on the Philosophy of History*, trans. J. Sibree (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1861), 113.

[72] Gogol, "Vzgliad na sostavlenie Malorossii," PSS 8:47-48; Tulloch, *Arabesques*, 106.

[73]Gogol, "Vzgliad na sostavlenie Malorossii," PSS 8:49; and Tulloch, *Arabesques*, 108. Judith Kornblatt notes that Pushkin's *History of Pugachev* serves as a precedent, it also represents the Cossacks as a brotherhood not regenerated by sexual reproduction, see *The Cossack Hero in Russian Literature*, 61. Gogol had praised Pushkin's *History* prior to its publication, see Fanger, *The Creation of Nikolai Gogol*, 55.

[74]See also Judith Kornblatt, *The Cossack Hero in Russian Literature*, 46 and 71, who notes that the Cossacks in Russian literature are characterized by this ability to reconcile paradoxical opposites.

[75]Robert A. Maguire, *Exploring Gogol* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994), 329.

[76]Gogol, "Vzgliad na sostavlenie Malorossii," PSS 8:40; and Tulloch, *Arabesques*, 98.

[77]Gogol, "Vzgliad na sostavlenie Malorossii," *PSS* 8:41; and Tulloch, *Arabesques*, 99.

[78]Gogol, "Vzgliad na sostavlenie Malorossii," *PSS* 8:42; and Tulloch, *Arabesques*, 100.

[79]Gogol, "O prepodavanii vseobshchei istorii," *PSS* 8:26; and Tulloch, *Arabesques*, 42.

[80]Gogol, "Vzgliad na sostavlenie Malorossii," *PSS* 8:28; and Tulloch, *Arabesques*, 43-44.

[81]Gogol, "Mysli o geografii," *PSS* 8:105; and Tulloch, *Arabesques*, 201.

[82]Gogol, "Mysli o geografii," *PSS* 8:103; and Tulloch, *Arabesques*, 98.

[83]Gogol, "Vzgliad na sostavlenie Malorossii," *PSS* 8:42; and Tulloch, *Arabesques*, 101.

[84]Gogol, "Vzgliad na sostavlenie Malorossii," *PSS* 8:45; and Tulloch, *Arabesques*, 103.

[85]Sven Spieker, "The Centrality of the Middle: On the Semantics of the Threshold in Gogol"s 'Arabeski,'" *Slavonic and East European Review* 3 (1995): 456-7.

[86]Gogol, "Vzgliad na sostavlenie Malorossii," *PSS* 8:46; and Tulloch, *Arabesques*, 105.

[87]Gogol, "Vzgliad na sostavlenie Malorossii," *PSS* 8:46, my translation.

[88]Spieker, "The Centrality of the Middle," 454 and 460.

[89]Gogol, "O srednikh vekakh," *PSS* 8:15; and Tulloch, *Arabesques*, 31. Spieker notes that Friedrich Schlegel, in his "Conversations about Poetry," deems the Middle Ages an "intermediary sphere of creation [Bildung], a fruitful chaos towards a new order of things." See "The Centrality of the Middle," 461.

[90]Gogol, "O srednikh vekakh," *PSS* 8:15, Tulloch, *Arabesques*, 30. "*Zhila*" also connotes, like in English, a vein of mineral deposits in the earth. The image connects the human body to physical geography, to life, and the verb *zhit'*.

[91]Gogol, "O srednikh vekakh," PSS 8:14, Tulloch, *Arabesques*, 30. Throughout the Arabesques essays, moisture is associated with the production of meaning and with life and vitality. Aridity and its negative connotation is clear in the phrases "dry and meaningless" (*sukhim i bessmyslennym*) and "lifeless and dry" (*bezzhiznennom i sukhom*).

[92]Spieker connects this to Homer's *Odyssey*, and the whirlpool created by Charybdis and Scylla, who guard the straits. See Spieker, "The Centrality of the Middle" 464.

[93]Gogol, "O prepodavanii vseobshchei istorii," *PSS* 8:32, and Tulloch, *Arabesques*, 48

[94]See G.B. Conte, *Latin Literature: A History*, trans. J Soldow (Baltimore, 1994), 352; Ernest Behler, "Introduction" to *Dialogue on Poetry and Literary Aphorisms*, 10-11.

[95]Griffiths emphasizes that Gogol parallels the trajectory of his *Dead Soul* with Ovid's "constantly mutating" "mythic landscape" of constant change in *Metamorphoses*, noting that "Rus' is as much a telos of Gogol's tale as Rome is of Ovid," see his, *Epic and the Russian Novel*, 71-72. Gogol invokes Ovid's Metamorphoses in his Dead Souls, published two months after his short story "Rome," he notes: "such a transformation will overtake our Prometheus as even Ovid himself could never think of."

[96]Ovid, *Metamorphoses*. Trans. David Raeburn. (London: Penguin, 2004) 1:324.

[97]Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, I: 363-64.

[98]Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, I: 397-409.

[99]Gogol, "O srednikh vekakh," *PSS* 8:90; and Tulloch, *Arabesques*, 186.

[100]Gogol, "O srednikh vekakh," *PSS* 8:95; and Tulloch, *Arabesques*, 191.

[101]Gogol, "O srednikh vekakh," *PSS* 8:96; and Tulloch, *Arabesques*, 193.

[102]Gogol, "O srednikh vekakh," *PSS* 8:91; and Tulloch, *Arabesques*, 187.

[103]Quoted in Zorin, *By Fables Alone*, 146-50.

[104]The Ukrainian national imaginary, which becomes more visible in the 1840s, was first understood as a folk-based, cultural revival. The Poles, who possessed both civilization and political history, were already considered a nation of world-historical importance and the threat was immediately taken seriously, see Andreas Kappeler, *The Russian Empire*, 216.

[105]Quoted in Bilenky, *Romantic Nationalism in Eastern Europe*, 19.

[106]Quoted in Bilenky, *Romantic Nationalism in Eastern Europe*, 22. See this text for numerous textual examples of this Polish geographical imaginary.

[107]Pushkin had also begun writing a history to prove that the Polish had to claim to the Little Russian lands, see Iu. Oksman, "Neosushchestvlennyi zamysel istorii Ukrainy." *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* 58 (1958): 211-212.

[108]David B. Saunders, "Historians and Concepts of Nationality in Early Nineteenth-Century Russia," *The Slavonic and East European Review* 60.1 (1982): 60. See also Stephen Velychenko, *National History as Cultural Process*, (Alberta: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1992), 90-131.

[109]Mikhail Pogodin, *Istoriko-kriticheskie otryvki* (Moskva, 1846), 52. Quoted in Serhiy Belinky, *Romantic Nationalism in Eastern Europe*, 38.

[110]See Frederick T Griffiths and Stanley J. Rabinowitz, *Epic and the Russian Novel from Gogol to Pasternak* (Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2011), 53-55.

[111] For a detailed account the evolving reception of Gogol's texts, see Moeller-Sally, *Gogol's Afterlife: The Evolution of a Classic in Imperial and Soviet Russia* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2002).

[112]See V. V. Gippius' influential study for a canonical version of this view, in *Gogol'* (Leningrad: Mysl', 1924), 72-73. Victor Erlich deems the first version "Cossack jingoism" in his *Gogol* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969), 53.

[113]More recent critics who focus on the changes between the two novels include: Bojanowska, *Nikolai Gogol*, 255-268; Oleh S. Ilnytzkyj, "Is Gogol's 1842 Version of *Taras Bulba* Really 'Russified'?" *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 35-36 (2010-2011): 51-68; Maguire, *Exploring Gogol*, 283; Dan Ungurianu, *Plotting History: The Russian Historical Novel in the Imperial Age* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2007); and Saera Yoon, "Transformation of a Ukrainian Cossack into a Russian Warrior: Gogol's 1842 *Taras Bulba*," *The Slavic and East European Journal* 49.3 (2005): 430-444. Ungurianu calls the changes a softening of "the novel's Ukrainian accent" (83-5). Maguire argues that while the first version identifies the Cossacks with the Asiatic east, the latter version subsumes the very idea of the idea within the body of the Cossack who now represents Russia, albeit an early manifestation (283). And Bojanowska notes that by its very changes, the 1842 edition "achieves an affirmation of the 'greater' Russian nation without having a single ethnically Russian character in it (256). However, despite the addition of over twenty instances of the adjective Russian (*russkii*), Ilynytsky notes that the word *Ukraina* also becomes more frequent. Ilnytsky's argument is unique, and he claims that "rather than backing away from his Ukrainophile positions of the 1830s, as most critics maintain, Gogol actually reinforced them in the 1842 redaction by establishing roots for the Ukrainians in Rus'" (68).

[114] See Carl R. Proffer, *The Simile and Gogol's Dead Souls*, (Paris: Mouton, 1968), 183-200; and Bojanowska, *Nikolai Gogol*, 255, 268.

[115]George S.N. Luckyj, in his *Between Gogol' and Shevchenko*, proposes a fascinating theory for the biographical precursors of Andrii and Ostap, Taras Bulba's two sons. In the *Istoriia Rusov*, Ostap Gogol (Hohol), a sixteenth-century Polonized Cossack colonel is given the title of Hetman by the Polish king "for surrendering to them the fortress of Mohyliv" (89). When petitioning for nobility, Gogol's father had listed Andrei Gogol instead of Ostap Gogol in his petition. Luckyj asks: "Is there not an attempt [in *Taras Bulba*] to rehabilitate the 'traitor' forefather, Colonel Ostap Gogol', who ignominiously surrendered a fortress to the Poles?" (114).

[116]Gogol, *Taras Bul'ba*, *PSS* 2:283. This quote is only present in the first version of the novella. I will cite both versions of the novella when the quoted text appears in both. In this edition of Gogol's collected works, the 1835 version is found under the "drugie redaktsii" section of Volume II and the most easily located text is the second edition.

[117]Gogol, *Taras Bul'ba*, *PSS* 2:285. The text creates a parallel between maternal Ukraine and Taras Bulba's wife, whose sons Andrii and Ostap, either leave her to join the Polish or are tortured and killed. She is described as a figure standing on the threshold (*stoiavshaia u poroga*) and hovering over her children like a steppe gull (*kak stepnaia chaika*).

[118]Ilnytsky notes that "The reason 'Russia' may appear to be the 'place of action' is because the phrase *russkaia zemlia* appears eleven times in 1842 – yet not once in 1835. Nevertheless, even at that frequency the phrase is used *less* often than *Ukraina* and never replaces any occurrence of *Ukraina* in the 1835 edition" (56).

[119]M.M. Bakhtin. "Iskusstvo slov i narodnaia smkhovaia kul'tura (Rable i Gogol')," in (Moskva: Kontekst, 1972). The translation is taken from Henryk Baran in *Semiotics and Structuralism*, 292.

[120]Gogol, "Taras Bul'ba," *PSS* 2:349 and 2:165.

[121]Gogol, "Taras Bul'ba," *PSS* 2:166.

[122]Gogol, "Taras Bul'ba," *PSS* 2:349.

[123]Gogol, "Taras Bul'ba," *PSS* 2:168.

[124] Gabriel Shapiro, "The Emblem and its Reflection in the Works of Nikolai Gogol" connects this scene to the emblem titled "A Broken Sword" (found in *Selected Emblems and Symbols*). The emblem is a visual genre from the baroque popular in eighteenth century Russia that consists of a short description, an image, and a literary citation.

[125]In the 2009,filmed version of *Taras Bulba* by the director Vladimir Bortko, this scene is especially evocative. As Bulba delivers his lines, he stabs the sword into the earth itself. On the debates surrounding the film, which remain relatively faithful to the second version of the text (though as this example demonstrates, the visual imagery places tension on claims to fidelity), see Catharine Theimer Nepomnyashchy, "Re-Visioning the Past: Russian Literary Classics in Film," *World Literature Today* (2011): 55-58 and Ellen Barry, "A Wild Cossack Rides into a Cultural Battle," *New York Times*, April 12, 2009, A6.

[126]See Judith Kornblatt, who argues that "Cossacks do not so much fear or reject women as represent self-sufficient and, most important, self-regenerating individuals […] They repossess the land as they become one with free, barrierless, and 'womanly' space. They thus reconcile male and female qualities within themselves," in *The Cossack Hero in Russian Literature*, 65-66.

[127]See Peace, *The Enigma of Gogol*, 51.

[128] In Shevchenko's "Kavkaz" Prometheus serves as a symbol of oppressed peoples, and Shevchenko sent a copy of the poem to Mickiewicz, whose *Dziady* (Ancestors) influenced its composition. Prometheus was said to have originated in the Caucasus, and Byron's 1816 poem "Prometheus" helped promote the figure as a symbol of rebellions and Romantic progress.

[129]Gogol, "Taras Bul'ba," *PSS* 2:355. This scene is not included in the second redaction, but a version of it is included in the American filmed version of *Taras Bulba* starring Yul Brynner.

[130]Kornblatt connects the violence of birth and rebirth to Dionysus, noting the regenerative model in which "creation is thus inextricably linked to death," *The Cossack Hero in Russian Literature*, 68.

[131]Kornblatt notes that the Cossacks are here depicted as part of a 'new Exodus' and "the Cossacks leap out of history and out of time altogether at the end of *Taras Bulba* (82).

CHAPTER IV

TARAS SHEVCHENKO'S "HAIDAMAKY": LITERARY PARTHENOGENESIS AND THE POLITICS AND POETICS OF NATIONAL REBIRTH

> Yes, each death leaves a little good—its memory—and asks to be looked after. For those who have no friends, the magistrate must supplement them. For law, justice is more sure than all our forgotten tenderness, our tears so quickly dried up. This magistrate is History. And the dead are, to speak like Roman law, those miserable people of whom the magistrate must be concerned. In my career, I have never lost sight of this duty of the historian. I have given too many forgotten deaths the assistance I myself will need. I exhumed them for a second life. . . they now live with neighbors who they feel are their parents, their friends. Thus, a family is formed, a common city between the living and the dead.
> – Jules Michelet, *History of the Nineteenth Century*

Yarema and Oksana: The Unconsummated Marriage

Set amidst a series of eighteenth-century uprisings against Polish rule in right-bank Ukraine, Shevchenko's narrative poem "Haidamaky" tells the story of Yarema, an impoverished orphan who "grew up on the threshold" (*vyris u porohu*).[1] He falls in love with Oksana, who he vows to treat "like a Hetman's wife" (*iak het'manshu*).[2] Yarema joins the *haidamaky* uprising and later discovers that Oksana has been captured by the Polish. After Yarema rescues Oksana, he secures her in Lebedyn, which Shevchenko's footnote tells us is a female monastery near Chyhyryn, the old capital city of the Cossack Hetmanate. Oksana awakens in the nunnery and tells her sad tale: "I'm scared to remember, they have taken / my dewberry with them. / Don't ask, grandmother, what happened to me" (*Boius' zhadat', moia syza, / Uzialy z soboiu. / Ne pytaisia, babusen'ko, Shcho bulo zo mnoiu*) (118). The Poles have killed her father and she alludes to being the

victim of sexual violence. Yet, she declares she stayed alive for Yarema: “He’s an orphan –without me, who/ will welcome him?” (*Vin syrota – khto bez mene / Ioho pryvitaie*) (119). Oksana’s wounded body and maternal love, as well as her association with the soul (*dusha shchyra*) suggests the absent-presence of Ukraine (70). The young orphans are wed in the nunnery, and their marriage is a complex symbol that reflects the possible procreative or genealogical futures for Ukraine.

Before their wedding night, Yarema leaves his young bride (*pokynuv Oksanu*) and returns to his fellow rebels to avoid angering his surrogate father, the *haidamaky* leader Zalizniak (122). Yarema’s wedding reception is spent with Zalizniak in the burning fires of the city of Uman, where the final and largest *haidamaky* uprising occurred simultaneously with the Bar Confederation. In the first edition of the text, Oksana waits for her new husband at the window of her monastic cell:

> Оксані небозі,
> Їй аж нудно, бо Ярема
> Весілля гуляє
> З ножем в руках, на пожарах.
> Вона виглядає
> До півночі, а іноді
> Помолиться Богу,
> Та й спать ляже, одна собі...
> Умер би, їй-богу.
>
> For poor Oksana, / It's almost tiresome, because Yarema / wanders on their wedding day / Among the fires, with a knife in his hands. / She looks out / Until midnight, and on occasion / Prays to God, / And she lies down to sleep, alone herself … / If he died, by God.

Oksana’s lonely figure (*odna sobi*) suggests that Yarema’s loyalty to Zalizniak, which requires leaving or abandoning his domestic union (the word *pokydaty* is ambiguous), could lead to his death before the young lovers can be united.

Shevchenko's "Haidamaky" lingers on the question of paternal Cossack leadership, and each of the *haidamaky* leaders, Zalizniak and Honta, is depicted as both a warrior and a father. Yarema, often referred to as a Cossack (*kozak*), feels amongst "his own" (*svoi*) in the company of the *haidamaky*. He vows his loyalty to the Hetman and *haidamaky* leader, Zalizniak: "Let's go, let's go, Otaman,/ You are my father, brother,/ My only!" (*Khodim, khodim, otamane,/ Bat'ku ty mii, brate,/ Mii iedynyi!*). Their paternal bond is reinforced when Zalizniak himself assigns the orphan the surname Vagabond (*Halaida*). However, Yarema's vow of fidelity to the rebellion is problematic given his love for Oksana. After finding out that the Confederates have captured Oksana, Yarema fears she will forsake him and laments her imagined cultural and sexual infidelity: "She'll forget… and maybe…/ In an overcoat, a real lady,/ And the Pole… oh God, oh God!" (*Zabude … i mozhe … / U Zhupani sama pani, / A liakh … Bozhe, Bozhe!*). During his vengeful carnage with the *haidamaky*, Yarema discovers where Oksana is being held and despite Zalzniak's advice to let Oksana go, Yarema pursues her rescue. As he thinks about Oksana, his memory is interrupted by Zalizniak, who urges him forward: "About Oksana … he gets faint / Remembering Oksana. / And Zalizniak: "Onward, son, / While your fate rises" (*Za Oksanu … Ta i zomliie, / Zhadavshy Oksanu. / A Zalizniak: "Huliai, synu, / Poky dolia vstane!*).

The poem indeed ends before Yarema and Oksana meet again and questions the potential of the *haidamaky* uprisings to generate a fruitful future. Oksana's wounded body and Yarema's split loyalties make it difficult to imagine a united and generative future. Specifically mentioning the destruction of the main Cossack stronghold, the Zaporozhian Sich (*Sich rozruinovaly*), Shevchenko's narrative voice meditates on

Ukraine's inability to reap the rewards of its rich past: "And Ukraine forever, / fell asleep for the ages. / Since that time, the rye grows green / in Ukraine; / No cries are heard, nor cannonry, / Only the wind blows" (*A Ukraina naviky, / Naviky zasnula. / Z toho chasu v Ukraini / Zhyto zeleniie; / Ne chut' plachu, ni harmaty, / Til'ko viter viie*) (137). While Shevchenko depicts the *haidamaky* uprisings, despite its violence, as a time of national action and unity, the poetic voice worries that the current generations have forgotten this history and the bellicose, independent spirit of the past. Castigating the Cossack elites for their inability to generate a viable future, the poetic voice reasserts the power of national poetry to reunite and regenerate the national community.

Shevchenko's narrative poem ends with old *haidamaky* walking along the Dnipro river. Breaking the Ukrainian silence, they sing of Yarema, who is remembered as the Vagabond: "And our Vagabond has a house upon the hill. / Play, Black Sea, / Good, Black Sea / All will be good, / Vagabond" (*A v nashoho Halaidy khata na pomosti. / Hrai, more, / Dobre, more, / Dobre bude, / Halaida*). It is not clear whether Yarema's house on the hill is a shared space with Oksana, a symbolic kurgan or burial mound, a historical legacy, or Shevchenko's poem itself. The l860 publication of "Haidamaky" suggests a hopeful conclusion by changing Oksana's vision of the future from potential death to an anticipated reunion: "She looks out -- / Looks out to see, if he's coming / With the boyars for a visit -- / To move her from her cell / Into a house upon the hill" (*Vona vyhliadaie -- / Vyhliadaie, chy ne ide / Z boiaramy v hosti -- / Perevezty iz kelii / V khatu na pomosti*).[3] The old *haidmaky* and their songs could be said to evidence Oksana's revised and more optimist outlook and the narrator, speaking to both Oksana and his reader, advises: "Do not worry, remain hopeful / And pray to God" (*Ne zhurysia,*

spodivaisia / Ta bohu molysia). However, violent action, while potentially necessary to secure the national future, is also depicted as a destructive and fatal enterprise. The poem questions the ability of history alone to secure a Ukrainian future; instead, both variations emphasize that this violent history requires poetic verse and national memory to generate a viable national community.

Narrative Conception and the National Community

In "The Double Session," Derrida elaborates on the mimetic nature of literary representation and its temporal possibilities.[4] In Derrida's formulation, the hymen is a symbolic medium that signifies in the act of its destruction by authenticating and reifying the past virginity made real in the present. Likewise, literary representation makes more real that which is being represented by making it present in the act of un-forgetting. Derrida quotes Mallarmé to relate the syntactical presence of the hymen to the mime and the text as medium: "between desire and fulfillment, perpetration and remembrance: here anticipating, there recalling, in the future, in the past, *under the false appearance of a present*. That is how the Mime operates, whose act is confined to a perpetual allusion without breaking the ice or the mirror: he thus sets up a medium, a pure medium, of fiction."[5] The act of writing creates a *past present* and a *future present* and imitation serves to fix or make "more true" what is imitated (191). The text itself re-marks the blank page and proclaims its literariness and representative power. The written word validates its truth and creates history, and "the difficulty lies in conceiving that what is

imitated could be still to come with respect to what imitates, that the image can precede the model" (190).

Hymen, the ancient Greek and Roman god of marriage, is an apt metaphor for the creative, generative power of textual representation. The hymen once denoted the institution of marriage and its perforation served to legally validate the marriage contract; thus, it evokes both biological and sociopolitical reproduction.[6] As a symbol of authorial production and mimetic reproduction, the hymen allows Derrida to "lend form to his own written propagation" (308). The feminine symbol of authorial world-genesis gives way to a fantasy of male parthenogenesis. For Derrida, the authorial text has "no origin other than itself," and "it is inseparable from desire (the desire for reappropriation or representation) […] it gives birth to [desire] and nourishes it in the very act of separating from it."[7] While mourning the loss of direct access to the past, the text creates this access in the act of remembrance. Derrida deems the text a "miniscule tomb" able to create "an atmosphere of death and rebirth, an atmosphere both funereal and joyous" (283). Bypassing the female body and its reproductive power, the authorial text and its representative power transcends the short lifespan of the earthly body and the limits of political power.

The syntactical significance of the hymen, which makes "more true" in the present the purity now past, emphasizes the relationship between reproductive and literary continuity and the national imaginary. Benedict Anderson demonstrates that the nation is undeniably both a political and a narrative construct: "In fact, all communities […] are imagined. Communities are to be distinguished, not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined."[8] Appearing at the end of the eighteenth

century amidst the declining legitimacy of dynastic autocracy and religious authority, the nation responds to the human need for continuity.[9] The national community generates emotional attachments akin to kinship and concerns itself "with the links between the dead and the yet unborn, the mystery of re-generation" (11). Anderson finds the "deep horizontal comradeship" of national citizens manifested in cenotaphs, or empty tombs, and in the tomb of the unknown soldier (9). These monuments, erected to honor unidentified or unfound national heroes, symbolize the ephemeral yet powerful connection between the national community and its past and future patriots in an elegiac present. While the body inside is unidentified or missing, like a text, the tomb binds the past and future of the national community in an ephemeral present.

The self-appointed historian of the French revolution, Jules Michelet (1798-1877), sought to resurrect the revolutionary dead and unify them as French nationals. Invoking French revolutionaries imprisoned in the Bastille, Michelet understands their sentence as a fate worse than mere death. Those interred in this symbolic tomb were destined to be forgotten. Hayden White elaborates: "Unlike his eighteenth-century predecessors, Michelet conceived his task as a historian to be that of the custodian of the dead […] serving that justice in which the good are finally liberated from the 'prison' of human forgetfulness by the historian himself."[10] Anderson focuses on Michelet's historical project and its interpretive task to argue that in his framework "the silence of the dead was no obstacle to the exhumation of their deepest desires."[11] For Michelet, the dead are given a second life in narrative history and connected to a "common city," understood as an eternal family: "they now live with neighbors who they feel are their parents, their friends."[12] The national community is bound in timeless kinship by the

historian's magisterial act of remembrance, which reanimates the dead, transcends the divide between the past and the future, and satisfies the desire for continuity.

Existing between narrative and reproductive regeneration, the national community blurs the lines between biological filiation and symbolic affiliation.[13] Its genetic anxieties manifests themselves in a proliferation of symbolic tombs pregnant with "ghostly national imaginings."[14] These symbolic graves are almost universal and Grabowicz argues they represent "the turning to the past to find the collective (or 'national') strength for continued existence, the turning to the dead to insure life, in a word, the vitalization of the future through the past."[15] Indeed, the Romantic era imagined national revival as awakening to "an immense antiquity behind the epochal sleep."[16] For Taras Shevchenko (1814-1861), the *mohyla*, or Cossack burial mound, reanimates a forgotten past while the poet's words regenerate a national community bound by narrative ties. Grabowicz notes that in Shevchenko's poetry, "Cossacks function as a remarkably resonant mediator between the past and the future, between life and death. Like all mythical mediations between opposing categories, they assume a preternatural existence. They are the living-dead."[17] In Shevchenko's poetics, alongside folk traditions and the Ukrainian language, Cossack burial mounds represent national history and community, and his narrative poem "Haidamaky" is especially indebted to the symbolism of the national tomb. Composed in St. Petersburg and printed in 1842, "Haidamaky" is the most critiqued poem in Shevchenko's oeuvre and a powerful factor in Shevchenko's mythological status.[18] This chapter considers the regenerative power of Shevchenko's "Haidamaky" and his representation of the Ukrainian national community between the womb and tomb.

The Poet and the National Body

Taras Shevchenko's autobiographical and melancholic poetry blurs the line between poet and subject and contributes to his mythical status as the embodiment of the Ukrainian nation.[19] Taras Shevchenko was born a serf in right-bank Ukraine in 1814. While trying to become apprenticed to a painter, Shevchenko was taken on as a court servant for the Engelgardt estate in Vilshana. During a trip with the estate owner Engelgardt, he witnessed the November 1830 Polish uprising, in 1832 he began his artistic career as an apprentice to Shiriaev, a well-known St. Petersburg decorator. Shevchenko could not study at the St. Petersburg Academy of Art because he was a serf. However, in St. Petersburg, he made the acquaintance of fellow compatriots such as the artist Ivan Soshenko, the poet Ievhen Hrebinka, who translated Pushkin's *Poltava* into Ukrainian and edited the short-lived almanac *Lastivka* (The Swallow), and Vasyl Ivanovych Hryhorovych (1786-1865), the secretary of the Academy of Fine Arts. After his artistic talents and his story were publicized, Karl Briullov painted the poet Vasiliy Zhukovsky and offered the painting as a lottery prize to the tsar's family. From the proceeds, Taras Shevchenko's freedom was purchased with 2,500 rubles on April 22, 1838, and he entered the Academy that same year. His long narrative poem, "Haidamaky", is dedicated to this day and to Hryhorovych.

Russian imperial culture in the early nineteenth century was receptive to literature focusing on Cossack history and Ukrainian folk themes. This cultural revival was made possible by the influence of the German Romantics and the concomitant interest in vernacular languages and national histories as well as by anti-Polish sentiment after the

1830-1 uprising. The interest in the Ukrainian lands, Cossack history, and folk culture was set against the backdrop of the political absorption of the Cossacks into the Russian empire.[20] Despite their political demise, the early nineteenth century saw the Cossacks revived and reanimated in history and poetry.[21] While poet-historians had a central role, Cossack elites seeking admission into the Russian Empire's noble ranks also mobilized Ukrainian historical research and textual production. In what Koznarsky deems the "historical memory project," the administrative incorporation of the Cossack elite "mobilized Ukrainian gentry to turn into *nolens volens* archeographers and historians, collecting and producing family genealogies, documents, and chronicles to prove their descent from noble families of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.[22] Ukrainian local patriotism and Russian imperial service were not mutually exclusive, and a Little Russian identity was encouraged in the right-bank as a de-Polonizing measure. Within the Little Russian framework, Russia's statehood and a shared Orthodox faith indicated that Ukrainian local identity and the Cossack past were vital components of Russia's imperial and national self.[23]

Serhii Plokhy argues that the *History of the Rus'* (*Istoriia Rusov ili Maloi Rossii*), which had actively circulated for over two decades prior to its publication in 1846, was "an attempt on the part of the descendants of the Cossack officer elite to negotiate the best possible conditions for their incorporation into the empire."[24] This history and those it influenced took an anti-Polish stance and emphasized the Orthodox and Slavic ties between the Cossacks and the Russian Empire. However, it also claimed that the Cossacks formed a unique nation, that they were mistreated by both the Poles and the Russians, and that they were the true heirs to the legacy of Kyivan Rus'.[25] The divide

between the Little Russian mentality, wherein a local Ukrainian patriotism was compatible with a Russian imperial identity and service, and the emerging Ukrainian vision of a national community linked by a shared history, vernacular language, the *volk*, and folk traditions, became clear in the 1840s.[26] Already in 1842, Mykola Markevych's *Istoria Malorossii*, influenced by the *Istoria Rusov*, was criticized by Belinskii for its argument that the Ukrainians were the proper inheritors of Kyivan Rus'.[27] Shevchenko's "Haidamaky", which depicts the seventeenth-century era of right-bank uprisings against the Polish nobility and focuses on the national specificity of its Ukrainian characters, was thematically in line with the literary production of the day; however, Shevchenko's Ukrainian-language poetry also signaled a dramatic shift.

The Russian empire's tolerance for the Ukrainian idea embodied in the Little Russian identity lasted until the late 1840s, when the arrest of Taras Shevchenko and the Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood (1847) signaled a change in the relationship between the empire and the Ukrainian cultural revival. Russia was late to notice the Ukrainian reorientation away from the Cossack Hetmanate, Polonized nobility, and Russian administrative and political center to a populist understanding that based its community in the Orthodox populations of the right bank. For the Russian literary elite, Shevchenko's poetry was disqualified from attaining true national relevance due to his use of the Ukrainian language. However, as much as the content of his poetry, it was his very use of Ukrainian that most boldly challenged the Russian imperial-national framework: "Shevchenko's poetry became the driving force that transformed the Cossack myth, inspired and promoted by the *History of the Rus'*, from a mainly Russian literary and cultural phenomenon into a mainly Ukrainian one."[28] Though the Cossacks and the Cossack lands

were fully incorporated into the Russian empire, Shevchenko's poetry expanded the horizons of Ukrainian national aspirations into the future.

Shevchenko's poetics call to a community of readers beyond geographical boundaries, and his national vision of the Ukrainian national community remains active because his poetry gives form to a shared history that is always in danger of being forgotten. Noting that "poetry is a unique parthenogenesis," Grabowicz argues that Shevchenko's poetics assert the living presence of the past and that this assertion becomes "self-generating." The poet himself "is its necessary cause, and yet the very measure of the poetry's success is the way in which [his poetry] succeeds in transcending him."[29] In Shevchenko's verses, Ukraine itself is always "on the very threshold of resurrection."[30] More than even resurrection, Shevchenko's poetics offer a continuous rebirth, and like Michelet's national historian, his verses "create in their texts a moment in which the boundaries between life and death are temporarily transcended."[31]

Poetic Children and the National Future

Shevchenko's "Haidamaky" is preceded by a lengthy dedication, where the poetic voice describes the stars, the moon, the changing seasons and the unceasing and mysterious cycle of life.[32] Speaking to the moon directly, the poet depicts it as a timeless, boundless entity and as a witness to the past, the present, and the future:

> Як над Вавилоном, над його садами
> І над тим, що буде з нашими синами;
> Ти вічний без краю!.. люблю розмовлять,
> Як з братом, з сестрою, розмовлять з тобою.
> Співать тобі думу, що ти ж нашептав. (49)

> As once upon Babylon, upon its hanging gardens, / And upon that, what will be with our sons; / You shine eternal, limitless!.. I love to converse, / To talk with you, like with a brother, with a sister. / To sing you the *dumy* that you yourself whispered.

The inspired and collaborative relationship between the moon and the poet is familial and generative. The opening lines refer five times to the word *krai* (edge, land), the root word of Ukraine (*Ukraina*). In each instance the root *krai* is negated and refers to endless or edgeless (or landless) phenomena: "all passes and has no end" (*vse mynaie i kraiu nemaie*), "the endless sea" (*more bezkraie*), "[the moon] eternal, limitless" (*vichnyi bez kraiu*), "Like the endless stretch of azure sky, / So too the soul exists with no beginning and no end" (*Iak nebo blakytne, nema iomu kraiu, / Tak dushi pochynu i kraiu nemaie*) (50). These geographically limitless phenomena speak to eternity, and the endless expanse of the poetic soul (the feminine *dusha*) suggests the absent-presence of Ukraine. The Ukrainian nation, despite its lack of state and self-rule, exists in the language and history the poet brings to life and in the generative union between the poet and each new community of readers.

Shevchenko's narrator contemplates interring his poetic stanzas, personified as children, along with himself (*zakhovat' z soboiu*); yet, he resolves to live, declaring: "I am not alone, I am not an orphan" (*Ia ne odynokyi, ia ne syrota*). Shevchenko's readers pause here because the passage distinctly contradicts the poet's famous biography.[33] The poetic voice clarifies:

> Єсть у мене діти, та де їх подіти?
> Заховать з собою? — Гріх, *душа* жива!
> А може, *їй* легше буде на тім світі,
> Як хто прочитає ті сльози-слова […]
> Ні, не заховаю, бо *душа* жива.
> Як небо блакитне, нема йому краю, —
> Так *душі* почину і *краю немає*.

А де *вона* буде? Химерні слова!!
Згадай же хто-небудь *її* на сім світі,
Безславному тяжко сей світ покидать.[34]

I have children, and where to put them? / Bury them alongside myself? — A sin, the soul, she lives! / Perhaps it will be easier for her in that world, / If someone reads these word-tears […] / No, I will not bury them, because the soul is alive. / Like the blue sky, which has no end, / So to the soul has no end and no beginning. / But where is her future? Chimeric words! / Remember her, somebody, in this world, / For the inglorious, it is difficult to leave.

In this passage, the striking repetition of feminine pronouns (*ii, vona*) refer to both the poet's soul (*dusha*) and an eternal Ukraine whose future moves with the horizon. Born from the poet's tears, his verses reconcile masculine and feminine, past and future, and regenerate a national community called upon to remember the "she" (*vona*, the poetic soul and Ukraine) who loves them and sings of their lot in life: "Remember, girls – you must remember!" (*Zhadaite, divchata, - vam treba zhadat'!*).[35] The repetition of these indefinite feminine pronouns merges its subjects into a timeless collective. Alluding again to the cyclical nature of time, the poet puts his children to sleep and tells them to rest while he will "deliberate where to find a ruler" (*pomirkuiu, vatazhka de vziat'*). The poet, who is not himself a political leader, suggests that Ukraine itself is asleep. His stanzas, the poetic children born of tears, are the future community among whom this ruler might be found.

The poet laments his poetic children's small stature and their foolishness, and he contemplates their assuredly cold reception. He sends his verse-sons to Ukraine, so that they will not die on foreign soil (*na chuzhyni*). Ukraine is juxtaposed to St. Petersburg, which is the poet's "here" (*tut*): "There will be a sincere soul/ Who will not let you die" (*Tam naidetsia dusha shchyra, / Ne dast' pohybaty*). The urban milieu is characterized by its "literate, published" (*pys'menni, driukovani*) and snobby elite who question the sun

itself, and the poet scorns their supposed mastery of nature: "One must listen, maybe, indeed/ This isn't how the sun rises" (*Treba slukhat', mozhe, i spravdi/ Ne tak sontse skhodyt'*).[36] The narrative voice imagines the Russian critical reception for his vulnerable Ukrainian verses:

> «Нехай, скажуть, спочивають,
> Поки батько встане
> Та розкаже по-нашому
> Про свої гетьмани.
> А то дурень розказує
> Мертвими словами; […]
> Од козацтва, од гетьманства
> Високі могили,
> Більш нічого не осталось
> Та й ті розривають.
> А він хоче, щоб слухали,
> Як старці співають.
>
> They'll say, let them rest / Until our father rises / And tells us in our language / About our hetmans. / And here the fool tells his story / In dead words […] From Cossackdom, from the Hetmanate, / Tall burial mounds, / Nothing else is left / And even those are plundered. / But he wants us to listen to / how the old sing.

The perspective shifts to the Russian home, where the imagined Russian reader prefers their language and their version of Cossack history. In Shevchenko's poem, the Russian critics claim Ukrainian history as their own and interpret the tall Cossack burial bounds as historical evidence of the Cossack's—and by extension of Ukraine's—demise. This history is deemed irrelevant to the present, exploited as a purely literary phenomenon (the plundered grave), and understood as the echo of a dying generation. Loudly rejecting the anticipated, cold reception of his poetic children, the poet sits alone in his house and revives the history declared dead and buried.[37] As the wind blows inside Shevchenko's narrative hut, "the tall burial mound turns around, and / All the way to the sea, Zaporozhians / cover the wide steppe" (*rozvernulas' / Vysoka mohyla, / Azh do moria*

zaporozhtsi / Step shyrokyi kryly) (52). The poetic voice, the wind, and the rapids of the Dnipro River all sing together as the Cossacks populate both the wide-open steppes and the poet's small hut in St. Petersburg. The poet reinterprets the historical significance of the burial mound, and his song emphasizes the relevance of history and poetry for the national future.

Shevchenko, whose poetic voice and authorial self are now nearly indistinguishable, reanimates the Cossacks, whose leaders and historical statehood reintroduce the masculine or political into the poetic Ukrainian family. The multi-generational Zaporozhian Cossacks dance the *hopak*: "Arms around each other's sides, squatting / Young alongside old. / "Like this, children! Good, children! / One day you'll be lords'" (*Vziavshys' v boky, navprysidky / Parubky z didamy. / "Otak, dity! Dobre, dity!/ Budete panamy*") (54). As he observes, the poet reaffirms his will to live, affirms he is not alone, and connects this living history with the symbolic burial mound: "In my little home the blue sea plays, / The burial mound mourns, the poplar whispers" (*U moii khatyni synie more hraie, / Mohyla sumuie, topolia shumyt'*). Merging with the natural landscape of Ukraine, the burial mound symbolizes the nearly-forgotten past reanimated in the poet's verses.

As the metaphorical morning arrives, the poet, exhausted after a feverish night of Cossack carousing and writing, wonders to whom he should dedicated his poetic children. Again, he laments their youth and inexperience and asks: "Who will lead you / Go before you, / Who will guide you?" (*Khto vatazhkom/ Pide pered vamy? / Khto provede?*) (56). Suggesting Ukraine's present and lack of leadership, the autobiographical poet dedicates his Ukrainian verses to Vasyl Ivanovych Hryhorovych who freed him

from serfdom: “I have a sincere father / (Though not my own) / He’ll advise me what to do with you” (*Iest’ u mene shchyryi bat’ko / (Ridnoho nemaie), / Dast’ vin meni radu z vamy*). Though the path is difficult for “an orphan without a family” (*syrota bez rodu*), the way is made possible by the kind father or benefactor’s sincere soul (*dusha shchyra*) or Ukrainian soul. Cossack lineage (*Kozats’koho rodu*) and the poetic form reanimate the past and create possible futures, and Hryhorovych is especially praised for not forsaking the language of his mother:

> Не одцурався того слова,
> Що мати співала,
> Як малого повивала,
> З малим розмовляла,
> Не одцурався того слова,
> Що про Україну
> Сліпий старець сумуючи
> Співає під тином.
> Любить її, думу правди,
> Козацькую славу,
> Любить її—ходім, сини,
> На раду ласкаву.
>
> He did not shun those words / That mother sang / As she swaddled the baby, / Talked to the child; / He did not shun those words / That about Ukraine / The blind kobzar mournfully / Sang in the shade. / He loves her, the truthful song, / Of Cossack glory / He loves her! Let’s go, my sons / To an affectionate council.

The feminine pronoun reappears and once again calls to mind the absent-presence of Shevchenko's eternal Ukraine. In the cold winter of St. Petersburg, on the threshold of his compatriot’s doorstep (*na tvoim porogu*), Shevchenko brings his poetic children to be blessed on their long journey (*v daleku dorohu*) back to a Ukraine reanimated in poetic verse and a loving (*laskava*) readership.

Belinskii and the Critics: Language and the Ideal Reader

Shevchenko's understanding of national community was legitimated by the German Romantic emphasis on folk cultures and vernacular languages. In the early nineteenth-century "golden age of vernacularizing lexicographers, grammarians, philologists, and litterateurs," figures like Shevchenko were decisive in the formation of national consciousness.[38] While all nations imagine themselves in terms of primordial, natural, or historical roots, Shevchenko's representation of the national family was in line with the Romantics, who understood national development "*genealogically* – as the expression of an historical tradition of serial continuity" (195). Folk culture and the vernacular language were evidence of the nation's historic roots and its genealogical continuity. In the Russian empire, the Petrine reforms and the resulting schism between the language and customs of the commoners and the elites made articulating a common national identity, or *narodnost'*, difficult. The Romantic genealogical framework, which led Shevchenko to Ukraine, was met with resistance in the Russian empire. Shevchenko's dedication responds to anticipated antagonism from his elite, literary Russian critics, represented most forcefully by Vissarion Belinskii (1811-48), who

> inverted the conventional nineteenth-century wisdom about the relationship between a nation and its past. National identity was generally considered to be intrinsic to a people, existing throughout its history, albeit in a state of slumber. The counterpoised images of the illiterate peasant and the educated man were icons of nationalist thought, but it was the peasant, with his traditional lifestyle, who was regarded as the repository of a national identity which had been lost to the educated, Europeanized upper class.[39]

Deeming it the necessary precondition for national development, Belinskii prioritizes the political state and the literate elite over genealogical lineage and folk culture and represents the Hegelian influence on Russian national thought.

In his response to the 1841 publication of the journal *Lastivka* (*The Swallow*), which was edited by Hrebinka and included the first chapter of Shevchenko's "Haidamaky," Belinskii elaborates on the Ukrainian or Little Russian language, Cossack history, and Little Russia's present reality.[40] Belinskii never mentions Shevchenko directly and begins by wondering if there exists a Little Russian language or if it is solely a regional dialect (*oblastnoe narechie*); he wonders if there exists a Little Russian literature, and whether writers from Little Russia should write in "Little Russian" (*po-malorossijski*) (5:176). Answering the first question both yes and no, he claims the language did exist at a time of "Little Russian originality" and does exist today. However, he argues that it only exists today "in monuments to the national poetry of those glorious times (*v pamiatnikakh narodnoj poezii tekh slavnykh vremen*) and that national poetry (*narodnaia poeziia*) does not constitute a literature (5:177). Emphasizing Little Russia's poetic and original character, Belinskii describes her precarious geopolitical position against Catholic Poland and the Muslim Ottomans. He argues that the "Asiatic knighthood, renowned under the name of swashbuckling Cossackdom" (*aziatskoe rytsarstvo, izvestnoe pod imenem udalogo kazachestva*) had failed to produce world-historical hetmans distinguishable from the common Cossack in ideas, training, or language (5:177). In Belinskii's history, Peter's reforms led the Cossack nobility, "in the course of historical necessity" (*po khodu istoricheskoj neobxodimosti*), to accept the Russian language and Russo-European customs. Belinskii claims that Little Russian high

society had outgrown (*pererosla*) the Little Russian language, and he encourages Little Russian writers to follow suit.

Belinskii's understanding of Little Russia's history and future reflects the philosophy of nationhood he elaborates in the 1841 essays "Russia before Peter the Great" and "Essays on National Poetry."[41] Belinskii rejects the notion of organic historical development, and with it he rejects the idea that folk culture and the peasantry embody national identity.[42] Instead, he claims that *narodnost'* is a less developed form of *natsional'nost*, and relegates the Herderian community of *volk* to the prior, immature and pre-political form of social organization. These pre-political peoples, with whom he groups the Cossacks and the Little Russians, are characterized by a "spontaneous, natural, and patriarchal state" (*neposredsvennom, estestvennom, i patriarkhal'nom sostoianii*) (5:1350). Belinskii argues that their concerns are domestic and familial, and this precludes them from entry onto the world stage of history. Citing the example of the Petrine reforms, Belinskii argues that only the educated elites can transform and regenerate the nation.

In "Russia before Peter the Great" Belinskii claims that Peter's adoption of European culture and western advances elevated Russia to world-historical importance. Starkly contrasting with the Slavophile understanding of the Petrine reforms, Belinskii's analysis does not find the ensuing rift between the peasantry and the elite problematic; instead, he understands this as a vital step towards the development of the political nation. Comparing Peter the Great to other world leaders such as Julius Caesar and Napoleon, he clarifies:

> Что он к нам ближе всех других, что мы связаны с ним более родственными, более, так сказать, кровными узами – об этом нет и спора, это истина святая

> и несомненная; но все-таки мы любим и боготворим в Петре не то, что должно или может принадлежать только собственно русскому, но то общее, что может и должно принадлежать всякому человеку, не по праву народному, а по праву природы человеческой. (92)
>
> That he is more dear to us than all others, that we are united with him by more familial, more so to say, blood ties – about this there is no debate, this is the holy truth and indubitable; but all the same, we love and worship in Peter not just what should and may belong only to the Russian proper, but to the universal, or what may and should belong to each human, not by right of nation, but by right of human nature.

Belinskii goes on to argue that mere kinship cannot guarantee entry into the brotherhood of civilization, which is here equated with elevated humanity (*chelovechestvo*). The reproductive ties of blood are not enough to elevate a community to national importance; instead, the mythical strength of a "great man" (the idolized Peter, here literally "the god we create" [*bogotvorim*]) is needed. Yet, these great men can only appear in a nation (*y naroda*) "already belonging to the family of humanity, in the historical sense of the word, or in such a nation, whose destiny of world-reign has been designated for a great man, such as Peter, to introduce into kinship relations with humanity" (*uzhe prinadlezhashchego k semeistvu chelovechestva, v istoricheskom znachenii etogo slova, ili u takogo naroda, kotoryi miroderzhavnymi sud'bami prednaznacheno emu, kak naprimer Petru, vvesti v rodstvennuiu sviaz' s chelovechestvom*). For Belinskii, only certain peoples are destined for a world-historical leader, and he sees no indication that Ukraine will ever have this type of leader and thus, no indication that Ukraine will ever attain the type of nationality necessary to produce an independent nation (and thus a literature worth reviewing).[43]

Belinskii argues that a national literature and a reading public are intimately connected and that the development of one requires the other. He takes great pains to

define the reading public as "a class of society, for whom reading is a type of continuous occupation, a type of necessity" (*klass obshchestva, dlia kotorogo chtenie est' rod postoiannogo zaniatiia, est' nekotorogo roda neobkhodimost'*). Belinskii imagines himself as the ideal reader and reiterates that "the public consists of the highest, most educated strata of society" (*publika sostoit iz vysshikh, obrazovanneishikh sloev obshchestva*) (5:177). Belinskii argues the Little Russian upper classes speak Russian and French, while the rest of the Little Russian people all speak a generalized and Russified peasant language (*krest'ianskoe*). The Little Russian experience is only able to rise above its limited folk milieu in the hands of a genius, and Belinskii emphasizes that Gogol is one such genius (less influential than a great man) who could reach a universal, educated audience, and his choice was to write in Russian. He ends by noting that the Little Russian writer, who must write for the Little Russian audience, is limited to peasant themes, which have already bored (*priskuchilo*).

Belinskii's review of "Haidamaky" evidences this boredom.[44] Referencing his own review of *Lastivka*, he claims that Little Russian poets are solely writing for their own amusement as "it seems they do not have another public" (*drugoj publiki u nikh, kazhetsia, net*) (6:172). He claims Shevchenko's stanzas could not possibly serve the edification the lowest classes because they are "devoid of simplicity in content and form, full of unnecessary adornments and manners" (*lisheny prostoty vymysla i rasskaza, napolneny vychurami i zamashkami*). Belinskii claims Shevchenko's poetry is too adorned and complicated for his readers and calls him a "rural sage-scribe" (*volostnoj mudrets-pisar'*). He cannot imagine that a Ukrainian readership could be sophisticated enough to appreciate Shevchenko's verses and argues that the level of education and skill

required would immediately lead both readers and writers to the Russian language. Literature, in Belinskii's argument, must serve a higher-level function than the folk narratives of the past. The move from *narodnost* to *natsional'nost*, paved by Peter the Great, requires educated readers and the Russian language. Belinskii rejects Shevchenko not only as a Little Russian poet but as a common or peasant poet, and the review ends by noting the poem's crimes against punctuation, and Belinskii claims he had to add commas to the quoted text just to make it legible.[45]

Russian critics focused on language when reviewing "Haidamaky." As Andriewsky notes, for the Russian elite, "the Ukrainian literary revival of the 1830s came to be regarded by many as the last echo of a dying world. Much of the discussion surrounding this revival, in fact, centered on the question of the value and necessity of resuscitating a 'dead' language and culture."[46] Though Belinskii's review was ultimately the most influential, other Russian critics were more positive. The 1842 review in *Literaturnaia gazeta*, mostly likely written by Nekrasov, exemplifies the narrative poem's immediate Russian reception: "If 'Haidamaky' had been written in Russian, then this poema would need to be joined to the ranks of Russia's best poems" (*Esli b 'Haidamaki' byli napsany na russkom iazyke, to ietu poiemu dolzhno bylo prichislit' k chislu luchshikh russkikh poiem*).[47]

Grabowicz notes that at first, Shevchenko's fellow Ukrainians and Little Russians were also unprepared to discuss serious subject matter in Ukrainian.[48] Burachek's Ukrainophile journal *Maiak*, which went out of print in 1845, published a long review by Nikolai Tikhorskii, who defended "Haidamaky" and its language as representative of a national-religious community.[49] Noting that Shevchenko's verses have been met with

great enthusiasm throughout Little Russia, Tikhorskii argues that his Russian readers who cannot understand these "native songs" (*rodnye napevy*) could easily get translation help from a Little Russian (65). Nothing the large numbers of Little Russians in St. Petersburg, Tikhorskii positions himself and his countrymen as vital mediators between Ukraine's rich culture and the imperial literary milieu, and he himself translates some of Shevchenko's verses into Russia prose in the review. Tikhorskii ends his review by switching to Ukrainian himself and asking his fellow countrymen to sing loudly despite the Russian critics so that "good, intelligent Muscovites will begin learning our language" (*dobri, rozumni moskali pochaly uchyt'sia nashemu iazyku*) (79).

"Haidamaky": Between Poland, Russia, and Pan-Slavism

While "Haidamaky" was composed in St. Petersburg between 1839 and 1841, the narrative poem is set in eighteenth-century right-bank Ukraine, which was then part of Poland-Lithuania (until the second partition of Poland in 1793). The *haidamaky* uprisings (1734, 1750, 1768), the last and largest of which is called the *Koliivshchyna*, occurred simultaneously with the Bar Confederation and ended with the massacre and conquest of the city of Uman. Composed of primarily free Cossacks and peasantry, the *haidamaky* were initially aided by Russia's Catherine II, who eventually assisted the Polish crown in crushing the uprising.[50] While the term *Koliivshchyna* is preferred by Ukrainians, the Polish remember the uprising as the *rzez humanska* or the massacre in Uman. In the early nineteenth century, right-bank Ukraine's history was a series of tense negotiations between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the political and cultural assertions of

the Cossack elite. In 1569, the Union of Lublin transferred the right-bank from Lithuania to Poland and the language of the nobility shifted from Church Slavonic to Polish. The Union of Brest in 1596, which created the Uniate Church, furthered the divide between the Orthodox peasantry and the Polonized nobility. The rifts in the Commonwealth grew as the registered (and thus enfranchised) Cossack populations were restricted and the free Cossacks and peasantry went unassimilated. Bohdan Khmelnytsky's alliance with Muscovy in 1648 and the aborted Hadiach Treaty of 1658-9 are understood in Polish historiography as two key moments of Cossack betrayal. These moments also indicate the socio-political rifts of the seventeenth century and the context for the *haidamaky* uprisings.

Shevchenko's "Haidamaky" is set in eighteenth-century Poland during the rule of Stanislaw August Poniatowski (1732-98), the last king of Poland and Catherine II's lover. In Shevchenko's poeticized history, the king's attempt to limit the nobility's veto power leads to the formation of Confederations, or Polish nobles opposed to royal authority. The Confederations persecuted the Ukrainian peasants and Orthodox and provoked the *haidamaky* uprisings. In this narrative, the Ukrainian peasantry and the Cossacks are united and defined against the Polonized Catholic nobility and the wealthy Jewish leaseholders. The Polish nobility are depicted as tyrants and aggressors, and the Jews are represented as greedy collaborators. The *haidamaky* violence, while horrifying and brutal, is portrayed in broad strokes and depersonalized.

Depictions of the *Koliivshchyna* in Ukrainian folklore and literature frame the *haidamaky* uprisings as justified retribution and part of a holy war. In Shevchenko's poem, the Polish nobility refers to Ukrainians as "schismatics" (*skhyzmaty*) or non-

Uniates, the Jewish leaseholders admit to taking Ukrainian wealth and property, and the *haidamaky* are presented as righteous: "Punishment for the Poles and Jews / For the blood and the fires / The *haidmaky* will repay the Poles with hell" (*Liakham, zhidam karu; / Za krov i pozhari / Peklom haidamaky liakham oddadut'*). Individual Polish and Jewish deaths are not described, instead scenes of mass bloodletting are represented undifferentiated and from afar:

> Скрізь по селах шибениці;
> Навішано трупу —
> Тілько старших, а так шляхта —
> Купою на купі;
> На улицях, на розпуттях
> Собаки, ворони
> Їдять шляхту, клюють очі;
> Ніхто не боронить…
> Та й нікому: осталися
> Діти та собаки —
> Жінки навіть з рогачами
> Пішли в гайдамаки. (102)
>
> Throughout the villages, gallows; / Full of hanging corpses – / The elders hang, but the gentry / Lie heaped in piles / In the streets, at the crossroads / Dogs, ravens / Gnawing the gentry, pecking their eyes / Nobody stops them. / As nobody is left for / The children and the dogs – / Even the women with pitchforks / Went with the *haidamaky*.

Even when vulnerable groups, such as the disabled, the old, and the very young are among the dead, the narrative voice ultimately redefines them by their nobility or religion (*Ni dushi zhyvoi / Shliakhets'koi i zhydivs'koi*) and ascribes the *haidamaky* violence to the impersonal hand of death: "Like death, fierce, they do not consider/ age or beauty" (*Iak smert' liuta, ne mynaiut' / Ni lita, ni vrodu*) (108). Against the undifferentiated collectives of religious others and the Polonized, cruel, and greedy gentry, Ukrainian identity is strengthened and defined: "Gathered together: old, young, poor, rich / United" (*Zibralysia; starii, malii, Ubohii, bahatii / Poiednalys'*).

The poetic narrator invites his community of readers to understand this violence as righteous and to pass on this oral history: "Listen, so later you can tell the children / So even the children will know, and tell the grandchildren, / How terribly the Cossacks punished the gentry / Because they did not know how to be good and reign" (*Slukhaite zh, shchob ditiam potim rozkazat', / Shchob i dity znaly, vnukam rozkazaly, / Iak kozaky shliakhtu tiazhko pokaraly / Za te, shcho ne vmila v dobri panuvat'*). Yet, despite the anti-Jewish and anti-Polish violence in the text, Shevchenko's narrative poem has also served as a symbol of Ukrainian and Polish unity. After the 1830-1 uprising, the Uman' Society (Gromada Human), a Polish revolutionary group in exile, understood the massacre at Uman as a painful symbol of fraternal strife and placed blame on autocratic Russia for fomenting discord in the Slavic borderlands.[51] This version of history, in which the Russian and Orthodox nobility are charged with instigating the strife between the Polish and Ukrainian people, natural allies against Russian despotism, found literary form in Michal Czajkowski's *Wernyhora,* an important predecessor to "Haidamaky".[52] Shevchenko directly addresses the ideal of Slavic unity in the after/foreword to "Haidamaky" and the poem "My Friendly Epistle." While the Russian empire later misunderstood Shevchenko's participation in the St. Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood as a manifestation of a pro-Polish, anti-Russian, pan-Slavism, Shevchenko's poetics do not indicate either a pro-Polish or pro-Russian viewpoint.[53]. Instead, Shevchenko focuses on the orphaned Ukrainian national community and the failure of Cossack leadership and bloody rebellion alone to foster a viable future. Rather than fully espousing a form of pan-Slavism, Shevchenko's poetics argue that the idea of Slavic brotherhood is ultimately unfeasible without generative leadership, shared history, and the poetic voice.

In the foreword to "Haidamaky," which is placed after the poem, Shevchenko explains that while a foreword seems superfluous, literate audiences and critics demand such things. Both following and subverting the conventional form, Shevchenko addresses the content of his composition. Arguing that while it is good to listen to the blind *kobzar* sing about the past and about how the Poles and Cossacks fought, he also anticipates the modern reader and their relief that such things are history: "'Thank God that it passed", -- especially if you remember, that we are children of one mother, that we are all Slavs" (*Slava Bohu, shcho mynulo,' – a nadto iak zhadaiesh, shcho my odnoi materi dity, shcho vsi my slav'iane*). The mother is here the contested Ukrainian geography and its poetic history. He notes that though it pains him, he must tell this history, so the sons and grandsons can see that their fathers were wrong. Shevchenko claims that while literary forewords are composed "so that they contain no lies, but also no truths" (*ne bulo i kryvdy, shchob ne bulo i pravdy*), his account of the 1768 *haidamaky* uprising is taken from oral history. While Shevchenko acknowledges that his narrative poem may deviate from the truth in its representation of the hetman leaders Honta and Zalizniak, he excuses himself and links his history not with historical truth, the literate Russian critics, the Polish gentry classes or even the Cossack Hetmans and elite, but with the vernacular oral history of the folk. He quotes his grandfather, who used to say: "When the old tell lies, then I too with them" (*Koly stari liudy breshut', to ii a z nymy*). Honta and Zalizniak's paternal failures may not be historically true, but they are the symbolic link and break between the past and the present.

Shevchenko's 1845 poem "My Friendly Epistle" (*Poslaniie*) was written at the height of Shevchenko's interest in pan-Slavism, during his travels to Ukraine and his

"Three Year" (*try lita*) period.[54] While most epistles address an individual; "this one aspires to reach an entire nation across space and time."[55] Addressing an ideal community of readers "the poet establishes an essential link, a contractual relationship between himself and his addressees […] in an implicit exchange of vows, he asks that (just as he gave his people his Word) they remember him with a soft, kind word in the new, free family – the vision of which is his essential legacy."[56] While alluding to pan-Slavic thought, Shevchenko's "Friendly Epistle" focuses more on the dangers of poor rule. The poetic voice angrily berates the elites for deserting their homeland for foreign languages and milieus. It warns of peasant uprisings that will forsake ideals of Slavic unity for national freedom. Ultimately, Shevchenko's "Epistle" argues that pan-Slavism is a seductive ideology impossible without leadership, and the poetic voice begs the Cossack elite to stop espousing dead ideas and to unite with the national family and the poetic voice in a fruitful, generative union.

Shevchenko addresses his gentry readers, claiming that they are sleeping (*spochyvaiut'*) and that he feels himself alone at the crossroads while those in power "swap their chains and barter with the truth" (Кайданами міняються). Asking them to wake up he implores them: "Look upon that quiet heaven, / Upon your Ukraine, / Fall in love with sincere heart / With the great ruin" (Подивіться на рай тихий. / На свою країну, / Полюбіте щирим серцем / Велику руїну). The poetic address shifts subtly from the nobility to the common readership, telling them: "Throw off your chains, be brothers!" (Розкуйтеся, братайтеся!). Warning his common readers not to seek their fortunes in foreign lands, the voice quickly shifts back to addressing the nobility, who are excoriated for their understanding of brotherhood, which brings "great words and great

power, and nothing else" (Великих слов велику силу, / Та й вільш нічого) to Ukraine while enslaving her people. The poetic voice warns that the theft and disregard of the elites will lead to a bloody uprising and describes an apocalyptic future that at the same time repeats the bloody uprisings of the past: Brother will forsake his brother / And the children their mother. And the clouds of smoke will block / The sun before you, / And you will be cursed forever / By your own sons! (Одцурається брат брата / І дитини мати. / І дим хмарою заступить / Сонце перед вами, / І навики прокленетесь / Своїми синами!) This familial discord is brought about when the elites prioritize foreign knowledge and power over domestic unity.

Mocking those who learn foreign knowledge at the expense of their native history and culture, Shevchenko sketches the reading list of the contemporary elite – from the leaders of the pan-Slavic movement, Jan Kollar, Pavel Jozef Safark, and Vaclav Hanka, to the German Romantics – and glibly suggests that "one day we'll even learn our language, if the Germans teach us" (Колись будем / І по-своєму глаголать, / Як німець покаже). Claiming that the Ukrainian language and people possess a history equal to that of the Romans, he distances the glory of the people and their language from their leadership: "Slaves, sycophants, Moscow's filth, / Warsaw's trash – your Lords, / Illustrious Hetmans" (Раби, подножки, грязь Москви, / Варшавське сміття—ваші пани, / Ясновельможнії гетьмани). Claiming that a revisionist look at history is necessary, Shevhcenko's "Epistle" contrasts the false glory found in foreign lands and distant leadership and instead focuses on the idealized image of the national family. The exhausted and tearful maternal Ukraine laughs with joy, kisses and embraces her children, and blesses them: "The commotion will be forgotten / An age now past, / And

the good glory will revive / The glory of Ukraine" (І забудеться срамотня / Давняя година, / І оживе добра слава, / Слава України).

Critics also find evidence for Shevchenko's pro-Polish or anti-Russian viewpoint in the historical novel *Wernyhora* (Paris 1838, second edition 1842), by Michal Czajkowski, or Sadyk Pasha, a textual predecessor to "Haidamaky" and the only textual precedent to the story of Honta killing his children.[57] Born to a noble family in right-bank Ukraine, Czajkowski (1804-1886) was a prolific Polish writer of Cossack descent.[58] His memoirs, novels, and short stories focus on Cossack themes; the most famous of these are *Cossack Tales* (*Powiesci Kozackie,* 1837) and the novels *The Hetman of Ukraine (Hetman Ukrainy)* and *Wernyhora*. He wrote in both Polish and Russian and has also been considered a part of the 1820s and 1830s Ukrainian School in Polish literature.[59] *Wernyhora* focuses on a romantic love triangle composed of a Polish girl, a Ukrainian Cossack, and the Russian officer to whom she is betrothed. This plot is set against the real historical context of the 1768 uprising. While the romantic triangle is an invention, it serves as a metaphor for Ukrainian and Polish unity. Wernyhora, a Polish nobleman of Ukrainian origin, unites the Poles and Ukrainians against the Russians. Wernyhora's peaceful program is defeated in the Russian-backed uprising. After the capture of Uman, the *haidamaky* rebels are pursued and punished by the Poles, who are now aided by the Russians. While the historical Czajkowski imagined a Cossack Ukraine as the cornerstone of a larger and revived Polish-Lithuanian-Ruthenian Commonwealth, Shevchenko's representation of Honta murdering his children is revealing of a more complex relationship to pans-Slavic loyalties, and Sloan's conclusion is justified: "Shevchenko viewed the Koliivshchyna […] as a moment of national glory, morally

justified in light of the wrongs his people had suffered. On the other hand, he saw it as a monstrous fraternal conflict symbolic of man's seemingly eternal inhumanity to his fellow man."[60]

The Failure of Political Paternity and the Rise of Literary Parthenogenesis

Shevchenko's *haidamaky*, accompanied by the a blind *kobzar* and his songs, are a motley crowd of Cossack officers, Zaporozhian Cossacks, *chumak* salt merchants, and peasantry. Before embarking on their bloody crusade, the crowd is blessed and their knives are consecrated in a mass religious ceremony in the old Cossack capital of Chyhyryn. The poetic litany assures the *haidamaky* that their mission is holy, and Ukraine is embodied as a national mother: "And you, shield Ukraine, / Do not let her, do not let your mother / perish in the executioner's hands" (*A vy Ukrainu khovaite, / Ne daite materi, ne daite / V rukakh u kata propadat'*) (87). Shevchenko elaborates on the Ukrainian family under Polish bondage:

> Козацькі діти; а дівчата!
> Краю козацького краса
> У ляха в'яне, як перш мати,
> І непокритая коса
> Стидом січеться!.. карі очі
> Гаснуть в неволі, розковать
> Козак сестру свою не хоче,
> Сам не соромиться канать
> В ярмі у ляха... Горе! горе! (87-88)
>
> Cossack children, oh Cossack daughters! / The beauty of the Cossack lands / Wilt upon the Polish vine, like before, their mother, / And her exposed braid / Whips in shame! … Hazel eyes / Dim in bondage, the Cossack / He does not want to unchain his sister. / Himself unashamed of the rope, / Under the Polish yoke … Woe! Woe!

The poetic voice mourns Ukraine's exposure and bondage, the national family's abandoned female members, and the Cossack warrior's inaction and service to the Polish kings. The divided family is unviable as its reproductive potential "wilts on the Polish vine," and the Cossack elites are shamed for their indifference.

The Cossacks are chastised for preferring their chains to Ukraine's freedom and the poetic voice begs the masculine crowd to remember their past active glory. "Remember the righteous Hetmans, / Where are their burial mounds? Where lie / the remnants of the glorious Bohdan, / Where stands Ostranytsa's / Grave, even if it's miserable / Where's Nalyvaikov's? Gone!" (Zhadite pravednykh het'maniv, De ikh mohyly? De sezhyt' / Ostanok slavnoho Bohdana, / De Ostranytsyna stoit' / Khoch by ubohaia mohyla? De Nalyvaikova? Nema!). Evoking historical hetman rule, the poetic voice condemns their present ignominy and warns that the burial mounds and history are fading from sight and memory. Shevchenko's poem resurrects the dead in collective memory, as does the ceremony where the *haidamaky* knives are blessed. In an image suggesting the white cloths that were traditionally tied to Cossack burial mounds, after the *haidamaky* pray, their consecrated knives "flash throughout all of Ukraine" (*zablyshchaly / Po vsii Ukraini*). The violence of the *haidamaky* uprisings is purifying, unifying, and historically significant to the nation, but Shevchenko's poem also demonstrates that violence alone cannot be generative.

The lonely burial mound, which symbolizes the history always endangered in the present, is forgotten by the present Cossack generations, who no longer remember their ancestors' graves and are too busy "sowing wheat for the lords" (Panam zhyto siiut').[61] The national unity represented in the *haidamaky* uprisings comes at a high cost and is

potentially ephemeral. Speaking to the Dnipro, the poetic voice evokes a harrowing vision of the failure of both Polish pan-Slavism and Russian imperialism:

> Багато ти, батьку, у море носив
> Козацької крові; ще понесеш, друже.
> Червонив ти синє, та не напоїв;
> А сю ніч уп'ється. Пекельнеє свято
> По всій Україні сю ніч зареве;
> Потече багато, багато-багато
> Шляхетської крові. Козак оживе (94).
>
> You, father river, carried to the Sea / much Cossack blood; you will still, my friend. / You turned red, blue one, and you were not sated; / But this night you will be sated. This hellish holiday / Shall roar across all of Ukraine tonight; / Much, much-much, Polish / blood will flow. The Cossack will come to life.

This terrifying vision of bloody national regeneration is mourned as cyclical, eternal, and ultimately sterile in an elegiac passage: "The Spring did not stop the blood, / Nor humanity's malice. / It's difficult to look; but we'll remember -- / Thus it was in Troy. / And thus, it will be" (*Ne spynyla vesna krovi, / Ni zlosti liuds'koi, / Tiazhko hlianut'; a zhadaiem -- / Tak bulo i v Troi. / Tak i bude*) (124). The failure of both the Cossack elite and the peasant uprisings to generate a united national family becomes the central focus of *Haidamaky's* tragic ending. It becomes the task of the poet to bridge political power and folk community and to reproduce from the inchoate strands a national family history in narrative form.

Shevchenko's *Haidamaky* began with the poetic voice questioning whether to kill himself and his verse children and choosing to live because the soul, whose feminine pronoun evokes Ukraine, lives. The relationship between Ivan Honta and Yarema also calls into question the reproductive future of the young lovers' unconsummated marriage. The poem ends as it began, with the question of filicide and the fragmented Ukrainian family reborn and reunited in narrative form. The story of the *haidamaky* uprisings ends

as two children are brought before Ivan Honta in the city of Uman. They are his children, born to a Polish-Catholic mother, and the crowd demands that Honta kill them, given his holy vow to kill all Catholics. He must demonstrate his loyalty to the sons of his rebellion over his biological children: "My children – Catholics … / So there won't be treason / So there won't be gossip, / Congregation of Lords! / I kneeled, I took the sacred knife / To kill Catholics" (*Moi dity – katolyky… / Shchob ne bulo zrady, / Shchob ne bulo pohovoru, / Panove hromado! / Ia prysiahav, brav sviachenii / Rizat' katolyka*) (126). His Orthodox vows bind him to the *haidamaky* and the sacred knife decides the sacrificial offspring's fate. As he kills his sons, Honta distances himself from the crime, "it is not I who kill" (*ne ia vbyvaiu*). Invoking his sacred oath (*prysiaha*), he hears their last words: "'Daddy…' they chirped, / "Daddy … daddy … we aren't Poles, / We …" and they fell silent" *("Tatu…" bel'kotaly, / "Tatu … tatu … my ne liakhy, / My …" ta i zamovchaly*) (127). Born to a Catholic mother and a Cossack father, Honta's children are sacrificed among the burning fires of Uman.

As the *haidamaky* continue to kill the Polish and Jewish populations in Uman, Honta deems the Poles cannibals (*liudoidy*) and blames them for eating his sons (*Z'ily moikh ditok*) (128). Honta also blames the Catholic school where his children were educated and their mother, the "damned Catholic" (*prokliata katolychka*), who gave them life (127). The school, which calls to mind Michelet's depiction of the Bastille, is described as both a womb and a tomb. The *haidamaky* trap its living-dead inhabitants inside to die, and Honta rages: "You nursed my children! -- / He yells, he rages, -- / You nursed the young, but virtue you did not teach them!" (*Ty poila moikh ditok! -- / Hukaie, liutuie, -- / Ty poila nevelykykh, / Dobru ne navchyla!*) (127-28). Later, as he secretly

buries his children Honta cries out: “Oh, my unhappy fate, / What have you wrought?” *(Dole moia neshchaslyva, Shcho ty narobyla?*) (131). The feminized Polish-Catholic mother and the school that nursed Honta’s children merge with his fortune and his cry, which asks fate what it has wrought (*narobity),* evokes the verb for giving birth or engendering (*narodity*). Honta tries to quench his grief in burning Uman, and tries to hide his shame, his crime against nature, from nature itself: “It’s hard for me to weep! / Righteous stars! / Hide behind the cloud; I did not call you. / I killed my children!... Woe is me, woe! / Where will I huddle? / Thus, Honta shouted” (*Tiazhko meni plakat’! / Pravednii zori! / Skhovaites’ za khmaru, ia vas ne zaimav. / Ia ditei zarizav, hore! Moie hore! / De ia prykhyliusia?’ / Tak Honta krychav*) (128). Unlike most Cossacks in the uprising, who were unregistered or free Cossacks, the historical Ivan Honta was a registered Cossack officer sent to Uman on behalf of Count Potocki to protect the city from the *haidamaky*; he instead turned and joined Zalizniak. Honta’s crime and his insistence that the Polish feminine is to blame, presents the argument that foreign unions are incapable of generating viable future generations. Honta’s initial crime, of being an elite Polonized Cossack blinded to the plight of Ukraine and her daughters, prefigures his later crime, the murder of his Polish sons. Unlike Andrii’s death at the hands of Taras Bulba, Honta’s children are absolved of blame by both their biological and their poetic fathers. The crime is not the Polonized nature of the children, but of the absent leadership and generative failure of the father.

As night falls, the *haidamaky* sit down for their Last Supper and the blind bard sings a folksong evoking village family life. While the festive *haidamaky* feast and sing,

Honta steals away and inters the bodies of his sons in a Cossack grave. Here, the house on the hill is explicitly a grave:

> Синам хату серед степу
> Глибоку будує.
> Та й збудував. Бере синів,
> Кладе в темну хату,
> Аж труситься, ніби чує:
> «Ми не ляхи, тату!»
> Поклав обох їх; із кишені
> Китайку виймає.
> Поціловав мертвих в очі,
> Христить, накриває
> Червоною китайкою
> Голови козачі. (131)
>
> For his sons, a house amidst the steppe / A deep house he builds. / And he built it, he takes his sons, / Places them into the dark house, / Almost trembling, almost hearing: / "We aren't Poles, Daddy!" / He placed them both; and from his pocket / He takes out a silk cloth / He kissed the dead ones on their eyes, / Crosses them, covers them / With the red silk / the Cossack heads.

During this ritualistic internment, Honta's innocent sons, in their sacrificial death, are transformed into full Cossacks and united with Ukraine: "My sons, my sons, / For that Ukraine / Look, you, for her / And I, for her, die. / And who will bury me / In a foreign field?" (*Syny moi, syny moi, / Na tu Ukrainu / Podyvit'sia, vy za nei / I ia za nei hynu. A khto mene pokhovaie / Na chuzhomu poliu?*). Their burial and their grave, more so than their birth, unites them with the Ukrainian community and the narrator refers to them Cossacks after this. The broken family, while unviable on its own, is restored in posterity in the poet's verses. As Honta buries his children in their "deep house" (*v glybokii oseli*) on the hill, he again blames their Catholic mother for the lack of coffins, flowers, and the other symbolic aspects of burial. Yet, Honta understands his failure as well. He asks his Catholic children to pray for his punishment, and knowing that he deserves to be punished for his crimes against nature, Honta forgives them for being Catholic and seems

to admit that his transgressions are not justified by faith alone: "Rest, children, / And pray, ask God / That on this earth / I am punished on your behalf, / For this enormous sin / Ask, my sons, I forgive you, / That you are Catholic" (*Spochyvaite, dity, / Ta blahaite, prosit' Boha, / Nekhai na sim sviti / Mene za vas pokaraie, / Za hrikh sei velykyi / Prosit', syny, ia proshchaiu, / Shcho vy katolyky*) (132).

Shevchenko's epilogue links oral and narrative history to the continual rebirth of the national community. The epilogue transports the reader to Shevchenko's present with his recollection: "An orphan in burlap, I once wandered, / Without a coat, without bread, across that Ukraine. / Where Zalizniak, Honta with sacred knife roamed" (*Syrota v riadnyni, ia kolys' blukav, / Bez svyty, bez khliba, po tii Ukraini, / De Zalizniak, Honta z sviachenym huliav*) (133). The orphaned Shevchenko, Honta's buried children, and Ukrainians as children of the *haidamaky* uprisings, are connected in the poet's recollections. Like Ukrainian nature, the poet's father and grandfather, exemplify a national continuity that exists regardless of political borders:

> По чарці з сосідом випивши тієї…
> Батько діда просить, щоб той розказав
> Про Коліївщину, як колись бувало.
> Як Залізняк, Гонта ляхів покарав.
> Столітнії очі, як зорі, сіяли,
> А слово за словом сміялось, лилось
>
> We'd drink a glass with a neighbor / Father would ask grandfather, to tell us/ Of the Koliivshchyna, and how it once was / His centennial eyes, like the stars, would shine/ And word after word would laugh and pour out.

In *Haidamaky*, the burial mound represents a national history that is in danger of being forgotten, and the poet thanks his grandfather for embodying, entombing, and reminding him of this family history: "Thank you, Grandad, that you interred / In your centennial mind, that Cossack glory. / And I now tell the grandchildren" (*Spasybi, didusiu, shcho ty*

zakhovav / V holovi stolitnii tu slavu kozachu; / Ia ii onukam teper rozkazav) (134). The grandchildren in this stanza are Shevchenko's readers, united by both filial and narrative bonds. The bloody legacy of the *haidamaky* uprisings is not enough to generate a productive future lineage. In Shevchenko's poem, the active battles of Honta and Zalizniak are coupled with their patrimonial failures, and war and glory alone are deemed incapable of reproducing a patrimonial lineage. Instead, the grandfather as a representative of oral history, Shevchenko's vow to remain alive with his children, and the timeless natural fecundity of the Ukrainian lands regenerate a timeless national community embodied in Shevchenko's verses.

The poet returns to the Russian imperial present and apologizes to his readers for his lack of citations and bookish sources. Emboldened, the poetic voice turns his back on his learned critics and declares: "Let them criticize, and I, for now / will return to my own / And I'll lead them up to the edge/land, / I'll lead them there – and I will rest, / And at least in my dreams, I'll look / Upon that Ukraine" (*Nekhai laiut': a ia poky / Do svoikh vernusia / Ta dovedu vzhe do kraiu, / Dovedu – spochynu, / Ta khoch kriz' son podyvliusia / Na tu Ukrainu*). The poet eulogizes the aborted legacy of the *haidamaky* uprisings and the lack of collective historical memory, which he connects to the failure of political patrimony embodied in the dead children and forgotten graves of Honta and Zalizniak.[62] To again emphasize this point, the poem ends with the image of the burial mound and with a fallow field. Remarking on the scattered *haidamaky*, the poem eulogizes the present, inactive community: "Alone, black, amidst the steppes / The burial mound remains. / Sowed the *haidamaky* / Rye in Ukraine, / But they didn't harvest it, -- / What must we do? / There is no truth, it hasn't grown, / Injustice thrives…" (*Odna*

chorna sered stepu / Mohyla ostalas'. / Posiialy haidamaky / V Ukraini zhyto, / Ta ne vony ioho zhaly, -- / Shcho musym robyty? / Nema pravdy, ne vyrosla, / Kryvda povyvaie...) (136). The poem refers to the destruction of the Zaporozhian Sich, and the Dnipro River mourns Ukraine's silence and political inaction: "They've buried our children, / and they tear us apart" (*Pokhovaly ditei nashykh / I nas rozryvaiut'*). Despite Ukraine's political silence, Shevchenko's final stanzas declare that along the banks of the Dnipro River, old *haidamaky* rebels still walk and sing of Yarema, the Vagabond:

> Все замовкло, нехай мовчить,
> На те Божа воля.
> Тілько часом увечері
> Понад Дніпром гаєм
> Ідуть старі гайдамаки,
> Ідучи співають:
> *А в нашого Галайди хата на помості.*
> *Грай, море,*
> *Добре, море,*
> *Добре буде,*
> *Галайда!* (137)
>
> All fell silent, let it be silent. / For this is God's will. / Only sometimes, in the evening / On the banks of the Dnipro river / Walk old *haidamaky*, / They walk and they sing: "And our Vagabond has a house on the hill. / Sing, oh Black Sea! Good, Black Sea! All will be good, Vagabond."

While the wheat and rye grown in Ukraine are harvested by foreign powers, the burial mound symbolizes the potential unifying power of shared oral and narrative history. In *Haidamaky*, Shevchenko calls his Ukrainian vagabonds home, and in the words of Michelet, he exhumes "them for a second life… they now live with neighbors who they feel as their parents, their friends. Thus, a family is formed, a common city between the living and the dead."

Notes

[1]All citations are taken from the first published edition of "Haidamaky" in Oles' Fedoruk, *Pershe vydannia Shevchenkovykh 'Haidamakiv': Istoriia knyzhky* (Kyiv: Krytyka, 2013), 61. Most readers and critics (in Ukraine and internationally) read and reference the last edition of "Haidamaky" published in Shevchenko's lifetime (the 1860 *Kobzar* version). While generally similar, apart from a few key moments, the later version includes Shevchenko's corrections and omits the foreword, the note to subscribers, and the footnotes. As Grabowicz notes in his analysis of the poem and its critical reception, Shevchenko's early critics responded to the first publication and it set the framework for the poem's continuing reception. For more see, George G. Grabowicz, *Shevchenkovi Haidamaky: Poema i Krytyka* (Kyiv: Krytyka, 2013), 12-15. All translations are my own and primarily meant as a guide to the vocabulary and meaning.

[2]Shevchenko, "Haidamaky," 72. Shevchenko's childhood friend and first love was named Oksana, and the name reappears throughout his poetry, see Pavlo Zaitsev, *Zhyttia Tarasa Shevchenka*, trans. George S.N. Luckyj (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), 18.

[3]Taras Shevchenko*, Povne zibrannia tvoriv u shesty tomakh*, (Kyiv: Akademii nauk URSR, 1963), I:129. See this volume, hereafter *PZT* for variations and the 1860 Kobzar version of *Haidamaky*.

[4]Jacques Derrida, "The Double Session," in *Dissemination*, trans. Barbara Johnson, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 173-285.

[5]Stéphane Mallarmé, "Mimique," in *OEuvres complètes* (Paris: Pléiade, 1945), 310; quoted in Derrida, "The Double Session," 175. Emphasis in the original.

[6]See Roberta Weston, "Free Gift or Forced Figure? Derrida's Usage of Hymen in 'The Double Session,'" in *Language and Liberation: Feminism, Philosophy, and Language*, eds. Christina Hendricks and Kelly Oliver (New York: State University of New York Press, 1999), 302-11.

[7]Derrida, "The Double Session," 258. On the appropriation of "woman as metaphor," see Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Displacement and the Discourse of Woman," in *Displacement: Derrida and After*, ed. Mark Krupnick (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1983), 169-95; Teresa de Lauretis, "The Violence of Rhetoric," in *Technologies of Gender: Essays on Theory, Film and Fiction* (London: Macmillan, 1987), 48; and Rosi Braidotti, *Patterns of Dissonance: A Study of Women in Contemporary Philosophy*, trans. Elizabeth Guild (Oxford: Polity, 1991), 140.

[8]Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism,* rev. ed. (New York: Verso, 2006), 6.

[9]National communities developed within imperial state structures, and imperial and national identities could and did coexist in the nineteenth century. For more on the origins of the modern national community, see Anderson, *Imagined Communities*; Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008); Liah Greenfeld, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1992); and Tom Nairn, *The Break-up of Britain* (London: New Left Books, 1977).

[10]Hayden White, *The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), 161.

[11]Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 199.

[12]The original can be found in, Jules Michelet, preface to vol. 2 of *Histoire du XIXe siècle:* 1872-74, in *Oeuvres Complètes*, ed. Paul Viallaneix, (Paris: Flammarion, **year**), XXI: 268.

[13]See Edward Said, "Introduction: Secular Criticism," in *The World, The Text and the Critic* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983), 1-24.

[14]Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 195.

[15]George G. Grabowicz, *The Poet as Mythmaker: A Study of Symbolic Meaning in Taras Shevchenko* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982), 118.

[16]Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 195-6.

[17]Grabowicz, *The Poet as Mythmaker*, 118

[18]On the first edition of Shevchenko's "Haidamaky" and the making of the book, see Fedoruk, *Pershe vydannia Shevchenkovykh 'Haidamakiv,'*, 9-48. On the censorship history of "Haidamaky," see B. Borodin, T.H. *Shevchenko i tsars'ka tsenzura: Doslidzhennia ta dokumenty. 1840-1862 roky* (Kyiv, 1969). For a critical overview and analysis, see Grabowicz, *Shevchenkovi Haidamaky*, 10.

[19]For Shevchenko's biography, see Zaitsev, *Taras Shevchenko: A Life*, trans. George S.N. Luckyj.

[20]After Bohdan Khmelnytsky's 1648 alliance with Muscovy, the Treaty of Andrusovo split the lands of the Hetmanate along the Dnipro River in 1667. The lands east of the river (left-bank Ukraine), which included the Mohyla Academy in Kyiv, the leading religious and academic of the day, were transferred to Muscovy. After Ivan Mazepa's attempt to regain Cossack independence was defeated at the Battle of Poltava in 1709, the left bank was incorporated as the Little Russian Governorate. By the late eighteenth century the Russian empire had grown significantly. Under Catherine II, Russia pursued a course of administrative unification in its southwestern borderlands. Catherine abolished the office of the hetman in 1764, and in 1775, the Zaporozhian Sich was disbanded and destroyed. Crimea was annexed in 1783. The Russian Empire's domain expanded to the region known as Novorossiya or New Russia, just north of the Black Sea. During the second partition of Poland in 1793, the lands west of the Dnipro river (right-bank Ukraine) also came under Russian rule. Known in the Polish context as the "south-eastern borderlands" (*Poludniowo-wschodnie kresy*), these lands had been under Polish rule since the 1569 Union of Lublin.

[21]See George S. N. Luckyj, *Between Gogol and Shevchenko: Polarity in the Literary Ukraine, 1798-1847* (Munchen: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1971) and Andriewsky, "The Russian-Ukrainian Discourse," 185.

[22]Taras Koznarzky, "Izmail Sreznevsky's 'Zaporozhian Antiquity' as Memory Project," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 35(1): Fall 2001, 92.

[23]See Andriewsky, "The Russian-Ukrainian Discourse," 196-7.

[24]Serhii Plokhy, *The Cossack Myth: History and Nationhood in the Age of Empires* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 6. See this text on *The History of the Rus'* (*Istoriia Rusov ili Maloi Rossii. Sochinenie Georgiia Koniskago, Arkhiepiskopa Beloruskago*, Moscow, 1846), its mysterious authorship, and the historical and political contexts of its composition and continued reception.

[25]In addition to serving as a source for Ryleev's *Voinarovsky* and the Decembrists, the *Istoriia Rusov* influenced Pushkin, Gogol, and Shevchenko. Pushkin published notably anti-Polish excerpts from the *History* and Gogol referenced it heavily in his *Taras Bulb*a. However, Shevchenko was the first to read it "as a quest for national liberation." Plokhy, *The Cossack Myth*, 3-4, 56

[26]D. N. Bantysh-Kamenski's (1788-1850) *History of Little Russia* (three editions, 1822, 1830, 1842) was dedicated to Nicholas I. The *Istoriia Rusov* was used as a source for the second edition. It assigned the Dnipro region a leading role in Slavic history and defined the Ukrainians against the Poles and the Jews. While the first edition of Bantysh-Kamenskii's *History* was ignored, the second edition was reviewed by almost all the major journals during the Polish uprising of 1830-1. See Paul Bushkovitch, "The Ukraine in Russian Culture 1790-1860: The Evidence of the Journals," *Jahrbucher fur Geschichte Osteuropas*, 39.3 (1991): 349.

[27]V.G. Belinskii, "Istoriia Malorossii. Nikolaia Markevicha," *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk,1953-59), VII:44-65.

[28]Serhii Plokhy, *The Cossack Myth*, 65.

[29]George G. Grabowicz, "Self-Definition and Decentering: Shevchenko's 'Xiba Samomu Napysat' and the Question of Writing," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 14 no. 3/4 (1990): 332.

[30]Grabowicz, *The Poet as Mythmaker,* 149.

[31]Jurgen Pieters, *Speaking with the Dead: Explorations in Literature and History* (Edinburgh University Press, 2005), 128.

[32]The entire 268-line dedication, which was composed in St. Petersburg after the body of the narrative poem and dated April 7th, 1841, was removed by the censor for the poem's reprinting in the 1860 collection *Kobzar*.

[33]Grabowicz argues that in Shevchenko's poetry, the poet himself becomes mythologized and is "the central protagonist and in a sense, all the major protagonists. The myth, in short, is so deeply internalized and his own experiences so interwoven with it that ultimately the poet and the myth are quite inseparable." See his, *The Poet as Mythmaker*, 148. For more on Shevchenko's authorial personae, see Rory Finnin "Mountains, Masks, Metre, Meaning: Taras Shevchenko's

'Kavkaz,'" *The Slavonic and East European Review* 83, no. 3 (2001): 396-439 and Bohdan Rubchak, "Shevchenko's Profiles and Masks," in *Shevchenko and the Critics 1861-1980* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980), 395-429.

[34]Shevchenko, "Haidamaky," 49-50. I have added the italics for emphasis.

[35]Shevchenko, "Haidamaky," 50. Shevchenko's poetics are uniquely and persistently characterized by female characters and domestic themes. On women and the related thematic of illegitimacy in Shevchenko's poetics see, Grabowicz, *The Poet as Mythmaker*; and on abandoned women and children in Shevchenko's poetry, see George Luckyj, "The Archetype of The Bastard in Shevchenko's Poetry" *SEEJ* 14:3 (Autumn 1970): 277-283.

[36]Shevchenko, "Haidamaky," 51. Chyhyrin, the old Cossack capital (*kolys'-to kozachii*) at the time of Khmelnytsky, is described as a ruin and a coffin (*domovyna*). Chyhyrin was also the answer to the Sts. Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood's call-and-response question asking where the sun rises.

[37]This section clearly responds to Belinskii's critique of the journal *Lastivka*, discussed below. See V.G. Belinskii, "Retsenzii i zametki, mart-maj 1841 g.," *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (Moskva, 1953-59), 5:176-79.

[38] Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 71.

[39]Andrea Rutherford, "Vissarion Belinskii and the Ukrainian National Question," *The Russian Review* 54.4 (October 1995): 504-05.

[40]V.G. Belinskii, "Retsenzii i zametki, mart-maj 1841 g." *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (Moskva, 1953- 59), 5:176-79; *hereafter PSS*.

[41]V.G. Belinskii, "Rossiia do Petra Velikogo" (1841), *PSS,* 5:91-152, and "Stat'i o narodnoi poezii" (1841), *PSS* 5: 289-450.

[42]For more on Belinskii's views on nationality and Ukraine, see Rutherford, "Vissarion Belinskii and the Ukrainian National Question," 500-515; and Andrzej Walicki, *A History of Russian Thought from the Enlightenment to Marxism*, trans. Hilda Andrews-Rusiecka (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1979) 135-44.

[43] See Rutherford, "Vissarion Belinskii and the Ukrainian National Question," 512.

[44]V.G. Belinskii, "'Gaidamaki,' Poema Tarasa Shevchenka" (1842), *PSS* 6: 172. Belinskii's review appeared in May of 1842 in *Notes of the fatherland* (*Otechestvennye zapiskaki*), which he edited.

[45]Belinskii was correct about the lack of editing, and Shevchenko himself bemoaned the mistakes in the 1840-1 edition. See Fedoruk, *Pershe vydannia*, 30-1.

[46]Andriewsky, "The Russian-Ukrainian Discourse," 185.

[47]"'Haidamaki.' Poiema T. Shevchenka," in *Taras Shevchenko v krytytsi*, ed. George G. Grabowicz, vol. I (Kyiv: Krytyka, 2013), 32.

[48]Grabowicz, *Shevchenkovi 'Haidamaky'*, 89. In addition to the Little Russian framework of imperial loyalty, Grabowicz argues that the prevailing and dominant mode of Kotliarevshchyna prevented Ukrainian-language discussions of serious subjects and limited the discourse to vaudeville-burlesque themes and domestic subject matter. Grabowicz understands Tikhorskii's review as a reflection of this mode, see pages 89-94. For more on Kotliarevshchyna, see George G. Grabowicz, "Subversion and self-assertion: The role of *Kotliarevshchyna* in Russian-Ukrainian literary relations," in *Culture, nation, and identity: the Ukrainian Russian encounter, 1600-1945*, eds. Kappeler, Kohut, Sysyn, et. al (Edmonston: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2003), 401-408.

[49]Nikolai Tikhorskii, "Gaidamaki. Poiema T. Shevchenka," in *Taras Shevchenko v krytytsi*, ed. George G. Grabowicz (Kyiv: Krytyka, 2013), 60-79. See also Serhiy Bilenky, *Romantic Nationalism in Eastern Europe: Russian, Polish, and Ukrainian Political Imaginations* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012), 259.

[50]The poem alludes to the initial cooperation of Catherine and Poniatowski, which ultimately aided the rebels fighting the Confederations, noting: "Попід дібровою стоять/ Вози залізної тарані:/ То щедрої гостинець пані. / Уміла що кому давать, Невроку їй, нехай царствує; Нехай не вадить, як не чує!". This also alludes to Russia's long tradition of inflaming Orthodox insurrection in the Polish lands.

[51]See Paul R. Magocsi, *A History of Ukraine: The Land and its Peoples*, rev. ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 314-316.

[52]See Roman Koropeckyj, "A Note on a Note in Taras Shevchenko's 'Haidamaky,'" *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 32/33.2 (2011-2012): 455-467.

[53]Cyril and Methodius were Greek missionaries who are said to have provided the Rus' people with an alphabet and the literary Slavic language in the tenth century. The aims of the short-lived group, to which Mykola Kostomarov (1817-75) and Panteleimon Kulish (1819-97) also belonged, included the abolition of serfdom and the spread of general literacy within an ideological framework influenced by Polish intellectuals, Slavic messianism, Christianity and nationalism. Kostomarov was especially influenced by pan-Slavic ideology and imagined Ukraine as a cornerstone for a Slavic revival. The Brotherhood defined the Ukrainian nation as a nation of commoners linked by language, thus excluding both the Polonized nobility and the Russian critics from their vision of an ideal community.

[54]Shevchenko, *PZT* I:329-335. The full title of the poem is "To my Dead, and Living, and Unborn Countrymen in Ukraine and not in Ukraine, my Friendly Epistle" (*I mertvym, i zhyvym, i nenarozhdennym zemliakam moim v Ukraini i ne v Ukraini moie druzhnieie poslaniie*).

[55]Rory Finnin, "Nationalism and the Lyric, or How Taras Shevchenko Speaks to Compatriots Dead, Living, and Unborn," *The Slavonic and East European Review* 89, no. 1 (2011): 37.

[56]George G. Grabowicz, "Self-Definition and Decentering: Shevchenko's 'Xiba Samomu Napysat'" and the Question of Writing," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 14 no. 3/4 (1990): 333. See Also Finnin, "Nationalism and the Lyric," 30.

[57]Peter Martosa, who financed the first publication of "Haidamaky," claimed in 1863 that much of the details were inspired by Czajkowski's text, see Fedoruk, *Pershe vydannia*, 9. Removed alongside the pan-Slavic afterword for the 1860 republication of Kobzar were twenty-three footnotes that Shevchenko published as part of the first and second editions of "Haidamaky." While Shevchenko does not acknowledge his source, Koropeckyj argues that Shevchenko's notes to "Haidamaky" rely heavily on Czajkowski's *Wernyhora*. For example, the twenty-first note conflates Czajkowski's citation of Pawel Mladanowic's memoirs, which were unpublished at the time of Shevchenko's composition, with another source from Czajkowski, which refers to a poem written by a young witness to the massacre at Uman. Koropeckyj, "A Note on a Note," 458.

Other important literary subtexts include Pushkin's *Poltava* and Gogol's *Taras Bulba*. See Zaitsev, *Zhyttia Tarasa Shevchenka*, 47 and 66. See also Alois Woldan, "Gli *Hajdamaky* di Taras Ševčenko. Il contest Letterario," *Studi Slavistici* XII (2015): 285.

[58]Czajkowski's fascinating biography emphasizes the complex loyalties possible in this era. He took part in the Polish insurrection of 1830 and obtained the rank of lieutenant. When the movement failed, he was forced into exile in Paris where he met Mickiewicz and became a celebrated and well-translated writer. Czajkowski's vision of a Polish-Lithuanian-Ruthenian federation led him to associate with the "Hotel Lambert" group of Polish emigres led by Prince Adam Czartoryski. Czajkowski's anti-Russian, idealized, and Romanticized vision of Ukrainian and Polish unity led him to travel to Istanbul in 1841 on the Prince's behalf with the aim of reducing Russian influence among the Balkan Slavs under Ottoman rule. In 1850 Czajkowski converted to Islam and became a Turkish subject, Mehmed Sadyk Pasha, arguably to avoid deportation to Russia and to allow him to marry again. In 1853, he created a Cossack force to fight against Russia and the Sultan himself is said to have given this Cossack formation a flag once carried by Ivan Mazepa. After his relations with the Poles deteriorated, it was Mickiewicz himself who came to mediate during the Crimean War (1853-56). By 1863, Sadyk Pasha refused to align himself with the uprising Poles and had given up on his vision of a restored Hetmanate free from Russian rule. He chose to return to Kiev in 1872 when the Russian government offered him amnesty, and he converted to Orthodoxy in 1873. Growing increasingly isolated with age, Czajkowski killed himself in January of 1886. For more on Czajkowski see, Ivan L. Rudnytsky, "Michal Czajkowski's Cossack Project During the Crimean War: An Analysis of Ideas" in *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History,* Ed. Peter L. Rudnytsky (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987): 173-186 and Thomas M. Prymak, "The Strange Life of Sadyk Pasha," *Forum: A Ukrainian Review* 50(1982): 28-31.

[59]For more on Czajkowski's *Wernyhora* and other texts which narrate the *haidamaky* uprisings, see Alois Woldan, "Gli *Hajdamaky* di Taras Ševčenko. Il contest Letterario," *Studi Slavistici* XII (2015): 279-294.

[60]David A. Sloane, "The Author's Digressions in Shevchenko's 'Hajdamaky': Their Nature and Function," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 2, no. 3 (1978): 328.

[61]This is a change from the first edition, which simply read "they sowed their wheat" (Zhyto sobi siiut'), see Shevchenko, "Haidamaky," 92. This change emphasizes that the Poles, not the Russians, are the overlords the Cossacks are rebelling against.

[62]Honta, who was eventually tortured and quartered after being turned over to the Poles by the Russians, is not given a burial in the poem: "There is no Honta, no cross / for him, no burial mound, / Violent winds scattered / the ashes of the *haidamaky*" (*Nema Honty, nema iomu / Khresta, ni mohyly, / Buini vitry rozmakhaly / Popil haidamaka*). Zalizniak, who was eventually captured by the Russians and sent to Siberia fares better, but the poem notes that his grave rests on foreign soil and cannot unite his *haidamaky* children: "Buried in foreign soil, / That is his fate. / Sadly, sadly, the *haidamaky* / Zalizniak's steel strength / buried, heaped / a tall burial mound. / Wept, parted / from whence they came" (*V chuzhu zemliu polozhyla, / Taka ioho dolia. / Sumno, sumno haidamaky / Zaliznuiu sylu / Pokhovaly, nasypaly / Bysoku mohylu. / Zaplakaly, roziishlysia / Vidkilia vzialysia*).

CONCLUSION

In the 2012 essay, "Tales Told by Nationalists," Nancy Condee asks, "How is it that 'nationalism,' conventionally signaling *liberation* from hegemonic rule, can come to signal *hegemonic* rule itself?"[1] Writing in the age of nation-states and proposing that in national narratives "discourse trumps semantics," Condee considers the "internal contradiction" where the nationalist can be hegemon, freedom fighter, or both and the distinction between empire-preserving nationalisms (such as Uvarov's concept of Official Nationality) and empire-dismantling nationalisms (such as that of the Decembrists, the Polish uprising of 1830-1, and the nationalisms inspired by Shevchenko's narrative community). Focusing on Russian nationalism, Condee argues that strong nationalism is not necessarily coupled with strong nationhood (or statehood), instead "weak nation formation may easily persist alongside powerful nationalisms" (44). Even for the Russian nation, the nation-state does not form the precondition of possibility for the national imaginary. Within the Russian empire, Russian nationalism is "on the one hand, emancipation from hegemonic [autocratic] culture; on the other, exaltation at a hegemonic victory over the minority culture" (39). The very lack of Russian nationality in the early nineteenth century (in the sense of vernacular-, native-, and folk-based unity between the various segments of society) and the power of Western European cultural frameworks, necessitated that the Russian empire negotiate Russian nationhood against both external influences and internal ruptures. Condee emphasizes that the inherent contradictions of nationalism, "the necessary lapses of empirics" are for narrative scholars the very crux of the issue and that we "happily focus on the disjuncture between the nation's recent history and imagined story: if the former is relatively short, the latter

is as long as its minstrel can insist on its being" (43). The national bard indeed serves as the bond between the past and future, between the poet and the historian, and between the people and the state.

Condee's argument is especially important for understanding Russian nationalism in the imperial, Romantic era, and for understanding the imperial and narrative roots of most national projects. Engaging with Andreas Kappeler, who emphasizes that framing the multi-ethnic empire as a Russian nation-state is untenable, Condee's essay quotes Anderson who emphasizes the "satisfyingly fraudulent" primordial origins of national imaginaries. From the Russian national perspective foregrounded in Pushkin's *Poltava*, Russian imperial triumph over Mazepa and the Cossacks indicates the end of Ukrainian autonomy, the triumph of the Russian autocratic state, and the precondition of possibility for the future Russian nation. Yet, Pushkin's poetic voice mourns the lost possibilities that cede power to this unifying imperial-national narrative and evokes the alternative, oral histories that the state cannot fully control or incorporate. Mazepa's role as both hegemon and freedom fighter is emphasized, and while foregrounding the official imperial narrative of national development, Pushkin's narrative poem lingers not only on the symbolically inviable Ukrainian national family and their aged hetman Mazepa, but also on the failure of the Decembrists. While often speaking from the position of official history, Pushkin's poetics are still able to preserve and emphasize the rich internal disjuncture between the official interpretation of history and its many influences, challengers, and ruptures. Pushkin's narrative poem makes visible the tension inherent in writing a national history and literature within a multi-ethnic empire as it reveals the disjuncture between potential stories and official histories.

The relationship between filiation and affiliation, or the national family and the state, also indicates the central role of the poet, of narrative, and of literary criticism in these political and historical debates. In his "Secular Criticism," Edward Said argues that in the era of high modernism, "the failure of the generative impulse—the failure of the capacity to produce or generate children—is portrayed in such as a way as to stand for a general condition afflicting society and culture together […] the only other alternative seemed to be provided by institutions, associations, and communities whose social existence was not in fact guaranteed by biology but by affiliation."[2] While both Condee's essay and Edward Said's argument about the relationship between filiation and affiliation focus on the twentieth century, these question of viable futures, national communities, and state structures were also theorized actively in the Romantic era. Within the Russian empire, the political failures of Cossack history seemed to indicate that affiliative models were to preserve both the future and the past. For imperial subjects such as Nikolai Gogol and Orest Somov, the end of Cossack history and the inability to genealogically link the Ukrainian Cossacks of the past with the Russian patriots of the present results in a move away from the German Romantic framework of folk communities and toward historical models of regeneration.

Though the German Romantics largely imagined national-historical development as a genealogical, familial, hereditary process, within the Russian empire, the distinct history of the Cossack lands and the generative differences of the Ukrainian borderlands made such a framework impossible. Thus, Gogol merges the idea of generative history and the brief flourishing of the Cossack past with mythical, non-reproductive models of regeneration and sees in the death of the Cossack the future of the Russian nation.

Arguing that mere kinship is not enough and that Cossack history is a cultural repository for the Russian national future, Gogol offers himself as a conduit between the future and the past, which can only be linked by text, not blood. For Gogol, as for Pushkin, the unviability of the Ukrainian family is a forgone conclusion. In the novella *Taras Bulba*, neither the titular character nor his sons survive. Taras and Ostap are killed by the Poles, and Taras himself kills his son Andrii, who had fallen in love with a Polish princess and joined the Poles to fight against his Cossack brothers. The temptation of feminized Poland signals the destruction of the Cossack brotherhood and its incapacity to produce a viable future on its own. Instead, the Cossack past and its brief but vibrant existence, made visible in the texts of the poet-historian, is meant to serve as the cultural wellspring for the future Russian nation.

Unlike both Pushkin and Gogol, who look to the Russian empire to secure a national future, Shevchenko turns away from the imperial state, the Cossack elites, and even the literate critics to argue that forgetting one's national history is more dangerous than losing one's state. Shevchenko's poetics reassert the power of history and the poetic voice to generate a viable national future, with or without a state. Like Gogol, Shevchenko offers himself as a conduit between the national past and the national future. However, unlike Gogol, Shevchenko asserts the living presence of the past and seeks to reanimate the community in danger of being forgotten. Shevchenko's Hetman Honta also kills his Polonized offspring; however, it is the father, not the child, who is castigated for the procreative failure. Secretly burying his innocent children, Honta must face his crime against nature and he must face that he chose potential glory over viable paternity. Shevchenko's stanzas, or his child-tears, argue that amidst the failure of political

paternity, the way forward for the state-less nation is by remembering the Cossack grave, the *mohyla*, or the shared space of remembrance and anticipation.

Pushkin, Gogol, and Shevchenko each reimagine Cossack history, the political or state-based death of the Cossack, and the possibilities of the future nation in their narratives and each "duplicate[s] the closed and tightly knit family structures that secure generational hierarchical relationship to one another" (21). Yet, these texts emphasize the constant incompatibilities and infinite possible futures they generate along the way. In the Romantic era, both Russian and Ukrainian nationalisms spoke to communities without nation-states. This dissertation suggests that the late eighteenth-century incorporation of the former Cossack lands and the resulting obsession with Cossack history in the early nineteenth century is a vital origin story for both Ukrainian and Russian national imaginaries. Moving beyond the confines of the nation-state and of national literatures, this dissertation places Pushkin, Gogol, and Shevchenko back into conversation and analyzes their texts and their era as a space and time in which the teleological dominance of the nation-state could not be taken for granted.

Notes

1. See Nancy Condee, "Tales Told by Nationalists," in *Soviet and Post-Soviet Identities*, eds. Mark Bassin and Catriona Kelly (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

2. Edward Said, "Secular Criticism, in *The World, the Text, and the Critic* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983), 17.

REFERENCES CITED

Altshuller, Mark. *Epokha Valtera Skotta v Rossii: Istoricheskii roman 1830-kh godov*. St. Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 1996.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. New York: Verso, 2006.

Andriewsky, Olga. "The Russian-Ukrainian Discourse and the Failure of the 'Little Russian Solution,' 1782-1917." In *Culture, Nation, and Identity: The Ukrainian-Russian Encounter, 1600-1945*, edited by Andreas Kappeler, Zenon E. Kohut, Frank E. Sysyn, and Mark Von Hagen, 182-214. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2003.

Aronson, M. I. "'Konrad Vallenrod' i 'Poltava.'" In *Vremennik Pushkinskoi komissii*, vol. 2, 43-56. Moscow-Leningrad: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1936-.

Babinski, Hubert F. *The Mazeppa Legend in European Romanticism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1974.

Baehr, Stephen L. "From History to National Myth: Translatio Imperii in Eighteenth-Century Russia." *Russian Review* 37, no. 1 (1978): 1-13.

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. "The Art of the Word and the Culture of Folk Humor: Rabelais and Gogol." In *Semiotics and Structuralism*, edited by Henryk Baran, 284-96. White Plains, NY: International Arts and Sciences Press, 1974.

Barry, Ellen. "A Wild Cossack Rides into a Cultural Battle." *New York Times*, A6. April 12, 2009.

Bassin, Mark. *Imperial Visions Nationalist Imagination and Geographical Expansion in the Russian Far East, 1840-1865*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Beiser, Frederick C. *The German Historicist Tradition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Belinskii, V.G. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*. 13 vols. Moskva: Izd. Akad. nauk SSSR, 1953-1959.

Bhabha, Homi K. *Nation and Narration*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Bilenky, Serhiy. *Romantic Nationalism in Eastern Europe: Russian, Polish, and Ukrainian Political Imaginations*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012.

Binyon, T. J. *Pushkin: A Biography*. London: Harper Collins Publishers, 2002.

Blagoi, D. I. "'Poltava' v tvorshestve Pushkina. Sotsio-literaturnyi analiz." In *Moskovskii Pushkinist*, vol. 2, 5-54. Moscow: Federatsia, 1930.

Bojanowska, Edyta. "Equivocal Praise and National-Imperial Conundrums: Gogol''s 'A Few Words About Pushkin.'" *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 51, no. 2/3 (2009): 177-202.

——. *Nikolai Gogol: Between Ukrainian and Russian Nationalism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Borodin, V. S. *T.H. Shevchenko i tsars'ka tsenzura: Doslidzhennia ta dokumenty 1840-1862 roky*. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1969.

Bortko, Vladimir. *Taras Bulba*. DVD. April 2, 2009. Telekanal Rossiya.

Braidotti, Rosi. *Patterns of Dissonance: A Study of Women in Contemporary Philosophy*. Translated by Elizabeth Guild. Oxford: Polity, 1991.

Burns, Virginia. *Pushkin's 'Poltava': A Literary Structuralist Interpretation*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2005.

Bushkovitch, Paul. "The Ukraine in Russian Culture 1790-1860: The Evidence of the Journals." *Jahrbücher Für Geschichte Osteuropas* 39, no. 3 (1991): 339-63.

Conte, Gian Biagio. *Latin Literature: A History*. Translated by Joseph B. Solodow. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.

Debreczeny, Paul. "Narrative Voices in Pushkin's *Poltava*." *Russian Literature* 24, no. 3 (1988): 319-48.

———. "The Reception of Pushkin's Poetic Works in the 1820s: A Study of the Critic's Role." *Slavic Review* 28, no. 3 (1969): 394-415.

Derrida, Jacques. "The Double Session." In *Dissemination*, 173-285. Translated by Barbara Johnson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.

Dixon, Megan. "Repositioning Pushkin and the Poems of the Polish Uprising." In *Polish Encounters, Russian Identity*, edited by David L. Ransel and Bozena Shallcross, 49-72. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005.

Dixon, Simon. "Pushkin and History." In *The Cambridge Companion to Pushkin*, edited

by Andrew Kahn, 118-129. Oxford: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Doak, Connor. "Poltava at 300: Re-Reading Byron's *Mazeppa* and Pushkin's *Poltava* in the Post-Soviet Era." *Australian Slavonic & East European Studies* 24, nos. 1-2 (2010): 83-101.

Eichner, Hans. "Friedrich Schlegel's Theory of Romantic Poetry" *PMLA* 71, no. 5 (December 1956): 1018-41.

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

Evdokimova, Svetlana. *Pushkin's Historical Imagination*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.

Fanger, Donald. *The Creation of Nikolai Gogol*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Fedoruk, Oles'. *Pershe vydannia Shevchenkovykh 'Haidamakiv': Istoriia knyzhky*. 2 vols. Kyiv: Krytyka, 2013.

Finnin, Rory. "Nationalism and the Lyric, or How Taras Shevchenko Speaks to Compatriots Dead, Living, and Unborn." *Slavonic and East European Review* 89, no. 1 (2011): 29-55.

Fleishman, Lazar. "Poezia kak proza: narrator v Pushkinskoi 'Poltave.'" In *Analysieren als Deuten. Wolf Schmid zum 60. Geburstag*, edited by Lazar Fleishman, Christine Golz and Aage A. Hansen-Love, 229-336. Hamburg: Hamburg University Press, 2004.

Frary, Lucien J. *Russia and the Making of Modern Greek Identity, 1821-1844*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Frazier, Melissa. "*Arabesques*, Architecture, and Printing." In *Russian Subjects: Empire, Nation, and the Culture of the Golden Age*, edited by Monika Greenleaf and Stephen Moeller-Sally, 277-296. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1998.

———. *Frames of the Imagination: Gogol's* Arabesques *and the Romantic Question of Genre*. New York: Peter Lang, 2000.

Fusso, Susanne. *Designing Dead Souls: An Anatomy of Disorder in Gogol.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993.

Gasparov, Boris. "Alienation and Negation: Gogol's View of Ukraine." In *Gogol: Exploring Absence: Negativity in 19th Century Russian Literature*, edited by Sven Spieker, 113-23. Bloomington: Slavica, 1999.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. 2nd ed. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008.

Gippius, V. V. *Gogol*. Translated by Robert A. Maguire. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1981.

Glaser, Amelia M., ed. *Stories of Khmelnytsky: Competing Literary Legacies of the 1648 Ukrainian Cossack Uprising.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2016.

Gogol, N. V. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii.* 14 vols. Moscow: Izd. Akad. nauk SSSR, 1937-1952.

———. *Arabesques*. Translated by Alexander Tulloch. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1982.

Grabowicz, George G. "Between History and Myth: Perceptions of the Cossack Past in Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian Romantic Literature." In *American Contributions to the Ninth International Congress of Slavists*, edited by Paul Debreczeny, vol. 2, 173-88. Kiev: Slavica, September 1983.

———. "The History and Myth of Cossack Ukraine in Polish and Russian Romantic Literature," PhD diss., Harvard University, 1975.

———. *The Poet as Mythmaker: A Study of Symbolic Meaning in Taras Shevchenko*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.

———. "Self-Definition and Decentering: Shevchenko's 'Xiba Samomu Napysat' and the Question of Writing." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 14, no. 3/4 (1990): 313-42.

———. "Semantyka kotliarevshchyny." In *Do istorii ukrain'skoi literatury: doslidzhennia esei, polemika*, 316-32. Kyiv: Krytyka, 2003.

———. *Shevchenkovi Haidamaky: Poema i krytyka*. Kyiv: Krytyka, 2013.

———. "Subversion and Self-Assertion: The Role of *Kotliarevshchyna* in Russian-Ukrainian literary relations." In *Culture, Nation, and Identity: The Ukrainian-Russian Encounter, 1600-1945*, edited by Andreas Kappeler, Zenon E. Kohut, Frank E. Sysyn, and Mark Von Hagen, 401-08. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2003.

———. "Ukrainian-Russian Literary Relations in the Nineteenth Century: A Formulation of the Problem." In *Ukraine and Russia in their Historical Encounter*, edited by Peter Potichnyj, Mark Raeff, Jaroslaw Pelenski and Gleb Zekulin, 214-44. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1992.

Grabowicz, George G., Stepan Zaharkin, and Oles' Fedoruk eds. *Taras Shevchenko v krytytsi*. Kyiv: Krytyka, 2013.

Greenfeld, Liah. *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*. Cambridge: Harvard University

Press, 1992.

Greenleaf, Monika and Stephen Moeller-Sally, eds. *Russian Subjects: Empire, Nation, and the Culture of the Golden Age*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1998.

Griffiths, Frederick T. and Stanley J. Rabinowitz. *Epic and the Russian Novel from Gogol to Pasternak*. Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2011.

Hegel, G. W. F. *Lectures on the Philosophy of History*. Translated by John Sibree. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1861.

Herder, Johann Gottfried. *On World History: An Anthology*. Edited by Hans Adler and Ernest A. Menze. Armonk, N. Y.: M. E. Sharpe, 1997.

Hokanson, Katya. "Literary Imperialism, *Narodnost'* and Pushkin's Invention of the Caucasus." *The Russian Review* 53, no. 3 (1994): 336-352.

———. "Politics and Poetry: The 'Anti-Polish' Poems and 'I built myself a monument not made by human hands.'" In *Taboo Pushkin: Topics, Texts, Interpretations*, edited by Alyssa Dinega Gillespie, 282-317. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2012.

———. *Writing at Russia's Border*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.

Hulak-Artemovsky, Petro. *Tvory*. Kyiv: Dnipro, 1964.

Hunt, Lynn. *The Family Romance of the French Revolution*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Ilnytzkyj, Oleh S. "Is Gogol's 1842 Version of *Taras Bulba* Really 'Russified'?" *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 35-36 (2010-2011): 51-68.

Izmailov, N. V. "Pushkin v rabote nad *Poltavoi*." In *Ocherki tvorchestva Pushkina*, 5-124. Leningrad: Nauka, 1975.

Kahn, Andrew. "Readings of Imperial Rome from Lomonsov to Pushkin." *Slavic Review* 52, no. 4 (Winter 1993): 745-68.

Kappeler, Andreas. *The Russian Empire: A Multiethnic History*. Translated by Alfred Clayton. New York: Pearson Education Limited, 2001.

Karamzin, N. M. "O liubvi k otechestvu i narodnoi gordosti." In *Izbrannye sochineniia*, vol. 2, 280-87. Moscow: Khudozh. literatura, 1964.

Karpuk, Paul A. "Reconstructing Gogol"s Project to Write a History of Ukraine."

Canadian Slavonic Papers 51, no. 4 (December 2009): 413-47.

Kireevskii, I.V. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v dvukh tomakh*, vol. 2. Moscow: Moskovskii Universitet, 1911.

Knut, Andreas Grimstad. “No Sissy Stuff!: The En-gendering Significance of Polishness in Gogol’s ‘Taras Bulba.’” *New Zealand Slavonic Journal* 36 (January 2002): 115-127.

Kohut, Zenon E. “The Development of a Little Russian Identity and Ukrainian Nationbuilding.” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 10, no. 3/4 (1986): 559-76.

Kornblatt, Judith Deutsch. *The Cossack Hero in Russian Literature: A Study in Cultural Mythology*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1992.

———. "Gogol' and the Muses of *Mirgorod*." *Slavic Review*. 50, no. 2 (1991): 309-16.

Koropeckyj, Roman. “A Note on a Note in Taras Shevchenko’s ‘Haidamaky.’” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 32-33, no. 2 (2011): 455-467.

Koznarsky, Taras. “Izmail Sreznevsky’s Zaporozhian Antiquity as a Memory Project.” *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 35, no. 1 (Fall 2001): 92-100.

———. "Obsessions with Mazepa." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 31, no. 1/4 (2009-2010): 569-615.

de Lauretis, Teresa. “The Violence of Rhetoric.” In *Technologies of Gender: Essays on Theory, Film and Fiction*, 1-30. London: Macmillan, 1987.

Lednicki, Waclaw. “Bits of ‘Table Talk’ on Pushkin: One More Polemic of Pushkin with Mickiewicz.” *American Slavic and East European Review* 5, no. 1/2 (May 1946): 93-110.

Leighton, Lauren Gray, ed. *Russian Romantic Criticism: An Anthology*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1987.

Lotman, Iu. M. *Pushkin: Biografiia pisatelia*. Edited by Boris Fedorovich Egorov. St. Petersburg: Iskusstvo-SPB, 1995.

Luckyj, George S. N. “The Archetype of The Bastard in Shevchenko’s Poetry.” *Slavic and East European Journal* 14, no. 3 (Autumn 1970): 277-283.

———. *Between Gogol’ and Shevchenko: Polarity in the Literary Ukraine, 1798-1847*. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1971.

Maguire, Robert A. *Exploring Gogol*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994.

Mainardi, Patricia. *Husbands, Wives, and Lovers: Marriage and its Discontents in Nineteenth-Century France*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

Maxwell, Alexander. "National Endogamy and Double Standards: Sexuality and Nationalism in East-Central Europe during the 19th Century." *Journal of Social History* 41, no. 2 (Winter 2007): 413-33.

Mersereau, John. *Orest Somov: Russian Fiction between Romanticism and Realism*. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1989.

Michelet, Jules. *Histoire du XIXe siècle: 1872-1874*. Vol. 21 of *Œuvres Complètes*. Edited by Paul Viallaneix. Paris: Flammarion, 1798-1874.

Mickiewicz, Adam. *Konrad Wallenrod and Other Writings of Adam Mickiewicz*. Translated by Jewell Parish. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1975.

Moeller-Sally, Stephen. *Gogol's Afterlife: The Evolution of a Classic in Imperial and Soviet Russia*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2002.

Nairn, Tom. *The Break-up of Britain*. London: New Left Books, 1977.

Nalyvaiko, Dmytro. "Mazepa v evropeiskii literature XIX st.: Istoriia ta mif." *Slovo i chas* no. 8/9 (2002): 3-17 and 39-48.

Nepomnyashchy, Catharine Theimer. "Re-Visioning the Past: Russian Literary Classics in Film." *World Literature Today* 85, no. 6 (2011): 55-58.

Nisbet, H. Barry. "Herder's Conception of Nationhood and its Influence in Eastern Europe." In *The German Lands and Eastern Europe*: *Essays on the History of their Social, Cultural and Political Relations*, edited by Roger Bartlett and Karen Schonwalder, 115-35. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.

Oksman, Iu. G. "Iz razyskanii o Pushkine. Neosuschestvlennyii zamysel istorii Ukrainy." *Literaturnoe Nasledstvo*, 58: 211-12. Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1952.

Oliensis, Ellen. *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Translated by David Raeburn. London: Penguin, 2004.

Peace, Richard. *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.

Pieters, Jürgen. *Speaking with the Dead: Explorations in Literature and History*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005.

Plokhy, Serhii. *The Cossack Myth: History and Nationhood in the Age of Empires*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

———, ed. *Poltava 1709: The Battle and the Myth*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012.

———. "Ukraine or Little Russia? Revisiting an Early Nineteenth-Century Debate," *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 48, no. 3/4 (2006): 335-53.

Pogodin, M. P. "Pismo o russkikh romanakh." In *Severnaia lira na 1827 god*, edited by T. M. Gol'ts and A. L. Grishunin, 133-40. Moscow: Izd-vo Nauka, 1984.

Polevoi, K. "O Sochineniiakh Pushkina." In *Russkaia kriticheskaia literatura o proizvedeniiakh A.S. Pushkina: Khronologicheskij sbornik kritikobibliograficheskikh statei*, edited by V. A. Zelinskii, vol. 2, 146-7. Moscow, 1887-99.

Pollard, Lisa. *Nurturing the Nation: The Family Politics of Modernizing, Colonizing, and Liberating Egypt, 1805-1923*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

Proffer, Carl R. *The Simile and Gogol's Dead Souls*. Paris: Mouton, 1968.

Proskurin, Oleg. "Pushkin and Politics." In *The Cambridge Companion to Pushkin*, edited by Andrew Kahn, 105-117. Oxford: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Prymak, Thomas M. "The Strange Life of Sadyk Pasha." *Forum: A Ukrainian Review* 50 (Spring 1982): 28-31.

Pushkin, A. S. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*. 16 vols. Leningrad: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1937-1959.

———. *Poltava*. In *Pushkin: Collected Narrative and Lyrical Poetry*, translated by Walter Arndt. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1984.

Ram, Harsha. *The Imperial Sublime: A Russian Poetics of Empire*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2003.

Riasanovsky, Nicholas V. *A Parting of Ways: Government and the Educated Public in Russia, 1801-1855*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.

———. *Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825-1855*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959.

Rubchak, Bohdan. “Shevchenko’s Profiles and Masks: Ironic Roles of the Self in *Kobzar*.” In *Shevchenko and the Critics, 1861-1980*, edited by George S. N. Luckyj, 395-429. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980.

Rudnytsky, Ivan L. “Michal Czajkowski’s Cossack Project During the Crimean War: An Analysis of Ideas.” In *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History,* edited by Peter L. Rudnytsky, 173-86. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987.

Rutherford, Andrea. “Vissarion Belinskii and the Ukrainian National Question.” *The Russian Review* 54, no. 4 (October 1995): 500-15.

Said, Edward. “Introduction: Secular Criticism.” In *The World, The Text and the Critic*, 1-24. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983.

Saunders, David. “Contemporary Critics of Gogol’s *Vechera* and the Debate about Russian *Narodnost’* (1831-32).” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 5, no. 1 (1981): 66-82.

———. *The Ukrainian Impact on Russian Culture, 1750-1850*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1985.

Schlegel, Friedrich. *Dialogue on Poetry and Literary Aphorisms*. Translated and edited by Ernst Behler and Roman Struc. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1968.

Shapiro, Gavriel. "The Emblem and Its Reflection in the Works of Nikolai Gogol." *Comparative Literature* 42, no. 3 (Summer 1990): 208-26.

Shevchenko, Taras. *Povne zibrannia tvoriv*. Edited by K. Hudzij, 6 vols. Kyiv: Akademii nauk URSR, 1963-64.

Shil’der, N.K. *Imperator Nikolai Pervyi: ego zhizn’ i tsarstvovanie,* vol. 1. St. Petersburg: Izdanie A. S. Suvorina, 1903.

Shklovskii, Viktor. *Povesti o proze*, vol. 2. Moscow: Khudozh. literatura, 1966.

Sikka, Sonia. *Herder on Humanity and Cultural Difference: Enlightened Relativism.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Sipovskii, V. “Pushkin i Ryleev.” *Pushkin i ego sovremenniki* 1, no. 3, 68-88 (St. Petersburg: Akademiia nauk, 1906.

Sloane, David A. “The Author’s Digressions in Shevchenko’s ‘Hajdamaky’: Their Nature and Function.” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 2, no. 3 (1978): 310-33.

Sommer, Doris. *Foundational Fictions: The National Romances of Latin America*.

Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.

Somov, Orest. *Romanticheskoi poezii v trekh statiakh.* St. Petersburg: Tim Imp Vospitatel'nogo Doma, 1823.

Spieker, Sven. "The Centrality of the Middle: On the Semantics of the Threshold in Gogol"s *Arabeski*." *Slavonic and East European Review* 73, no. 3 (1995): 449-69.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Displacement and the Discourse of Woman." In *Displacement: Derrida and After*, edited by Mark Krupnick, 169-95. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1983.

Stevenson, Joan Nabseth. "Literary and Cultural Patterns in Gogol's 'Arabeski.'" PhD diss., Stanford University, 1984.

Steiner, Lina. "'My Most Mature Poèma': Pushkin's *Poltava* and the Irony of Russian National Culture." *Comparative Literature* 61, no. 2 (2009): 97-127.

Tomashevskii, B. V. *Pushkin.* 2 vols. Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1956-61.

Ungurianu, Dan. "Fact and Fiction in the Romantic Historical Novel." *Russian Review* 57, no. 3 (1998): 380-393.

———. *Plotting History: The Russian Historical Novel in the Imperial Age*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2007.

Velychenko, Stephen. *National History as Cultural Process: A Survey of the Interpretations of Ukraine's Past in Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian Historical Writing from the Earliest Times to 1914*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1992.

Voltaire, François Marie Arouet. *Histoire de Charles XII*. In *Oeuvre complètes de Voltaire*, vol. 16. Paris: Garnier frères, 1877-85.

———. *History of Charles XII King of Sweden*. Translated by Winifred Todhunter. London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1925.

Wachtel, Andrew. *An Obsession with History: Russian Writers Confront the Past*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994.

Walicki, Andrzej. *A History of Russian Thought from the Enlightenment to Marxism*. Translated by Hilda Andrews-Rusiecka. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1979.

Weston, Roberta. "Free Gift or Forced Figure? Derrida's Usage of Hymen in 'The

Double Session.'" In *Language and Liberation: Feminism, Philosophy, and Language*, edited by Christina Hendricks and Kelly Oliver, 302-11. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999.

White, Hayden V. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-century Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

Whittaker, Cynthia H. *The Origins of Modern Russian Education: An Intellectual Biography of Count Sergei Uvarov, 1786-1855*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1984.

Woldan, Alois. "Gli *Hajdamaky* di Taras Shevchenko. Il contesto letterario." *Studi Slavistici* XII (2015): 279-94.

Woolf, Larry. *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994.

Wortman, Richard S. "National Narratives in the Representation of Nineteenth-Century Russian Monarchy." In *Extending the Borders of Russian History: Essays in Honor of Alfred J. Rieber*, edited by Marsha Siefert, 51-66. New York: Central European University Press, 2003.

Yoon, Saera. "Transformation of a Ukrainian Cossack into a Russian Warrior: Gogol's 1842 *Taras Bulba*." *Slavic and East European Journal* 49, no. 3 (Fall 2005): 430-44.

Zaitsev, Pavlo. *Taras Shevchenko: A Life*. Translated by George S. N. Luckyj. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.

Zorin, Andrei. *By Fables Alone: Literature and State Ideology in Late-Eighteenth- Early-Nineteenth Century Russia*. Translated by Marcus C. Levitt. Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2014.