


LITERATURE AND IDEOLOGY: RECEPTION OF ANDREY STOLTS IN VARIOUS DISCOURSES (NOVEL «OBLMOV» BY I.A. GONCHAROV)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24115/S2446-622020206Extra-B598p.100-105>

Almaz Ildarovich Zakirovⁱ 

Rinat Ferganovich Bekmetovⁱⁱ 

Ilsever Ramiⁱⁱⁱ 

Ildar Shaikhenurovich Yunusov^{iv} 

ABSTRACT

The article examines the evolution of the perception of the image of Andrei Stolz, the hero of the novel by I.A. Goncharov's "Oblomov", in various ideological discourses of Russia and the West from the moment of the publication of the work to the present time. The figure of Andrei Stolz in various research practices evolves into a kind of mythologeme and ideologeme that helps explain many trends in modern life. This dynamics in the assessment of the hero is characterized by a vector of movement from complete rejection of Andrei Stolz (a non-Russian character of the novel, "alien", because he is German by ethnicity and Lutheran by religion, despite the fact that his mother is Russian) to instructions the fact that this particular hero is one of the most demanded personalities - not just carriers of the author's conceptual ideas, who believed that the "crossing" of Russian soulfulness and German practicality should create the "correct" type of human nature in Russia, but also exponents new era.

Keywords: Literature. Ideology. Discourse. I.A. Goncharov. Oblomov.

LITERATURA E IDEOLOGIA: RECEPÇÃO DE ANDREY STOLTS EM VÁRIOS DISCURSOS (NOVEL «OBLMOV» DE I.A. GONCHAROV)

LITERATURA E IDEOLOGIA: RECEPCIÓN DE ANDREY STOLTS EM VÁRIOS DISCURSOS (NOVELA «OBLMOV» DE I.A. GONCHAROV)

RESUMO

O artigo examina a evolução da percepção da imagem de Andrei Stolz, o herói do romance de I.A. O "Oblomov" de Goncharov, em vários discursos ideológicos da Rússia e do Ocidente, desde o momento da publicação da obra até a atualidade. A figura de Andrei Stolz em várias práticas de pesquisa evolui para uma espécie de mitologeme e ideologeme que ajuda a explicar muitas tendências da vida moderna. Essa dinâmica na avaliação do herói é caracterizada por um vetor de movimento a partir da rejeição total de Andrei Stolz (personagem não russo do romance, "estrangeiro", por ser alemão por etnia e luterano por religião, apesar de sua mãe é russa) para instruir o fato de que este herói em particular é uma das personalidades mais exigidas - não apenas portadores das ideias conceituais do autor, que acreditava que o "cruzamento" da alma russa com a praticidade alemã deveria criar o tipo "correto" da natureza humana na Rússia, mas também expoentes da nova era.

Palavras-chave: Literatura. Ideologia. Discurso. I.A. Goncharov. Oblomov.

RESUMEN

El artículo examina la evolución de la percepción de la imagen de Andrei Stolz, el héroe de la novela de I.A. El "Oblomov" de Goncharov, en varios discursos ideológicos de Rusia y Occidente desde el momento de la publicación de la obra hasta la actualidad. La figura de Andrei Stolz en diversas prácticas de investigación evoluciona hacia una especie de mitologema e ideologema que ayuda a explicar muchas tendencias de la vida moderna. Esta dinámica en la valoración del héroe se caracteriza por un vector de movimiento desde el rechazo total de Andrei Stolz (personaje no ruso de la novela, "alien", por ser alemán por etnia y luterano por religión, a pesar de que su madre es rusa) a las instrucciones del hecho de que este héroe en particular es una de las personalidades más demandadas, no solo los portadores de las ideas conceptuales del autor, que creía que el "cruce" de la conmovición rusa y la practicidad alemana debería crear el tipo "correcto" de la naturaleza humana en Rusia, sino también exponentes de la nueva era.

Palabras-clave: Literatura. Ideología. Discurso. I.A. Goncharov. Oblomov.

INTRODUCTION

At the turn of the 1980s and 1990s, in the Russian cultural space, a common place was the idea that only literature of the Soviet period was ideologized, and before and after socialist realism, Russian language was, as it were, outside of ideology. The call to de-ideologize literature was certainly perceived as the only true and progressive one. Objective, highly artistic literature was presented only that literature that would be free from any manifestation of ideological preferences. And this appeal was addressed not only to literature, but also to literary studies and, in general, to the humanities. At that time, it seemed that humanities research can be considered truly scientific only when it is free from ideology.

However, the past three decades have shown that this is not entirely true. Now, perhaps, the opposite thesis is an axiom: the humanities cannot exist outside of ideological discourses. Could postcolonial discourse not be ideologized? Only the use of one term "minority literatures" (literatures written in the language of an ethnic minority) immediately fills any scientific and philological text with quite specific ideological meanings.

Obviously, ideology can be represented in various discourses. There is a dominant official ideology of states of an authoritarian type. These include the Marxist ideology in Soviet Russia, Islamic ideology in the non-secular states of the Muslim world. For example, a kind of quintessence of the complete ideologization of the literature of socialist realism was the principle of partisanship, which was understood as "a certain socio-historical, social, class tendency of a work of art, a conscious or unconscious ideological orientation of literary creativity" (BRIEF LITERARY ENCYCLOPEDIA, 1968, p. 608). But there is also literature that expresses unofficial ideologies: political, social, class, religious, national, social, cultural.

Since the beginning of the 21st century, the problem of correlating ideology and fiction has attracted the attention of many researchers. So, in the book of V.A. Pesotsky "Fiction: a socio-philosophical analysis" investigated the dynamics of the interaction of fiction and ideology. The author identifies various ideological functions of fiction: the expression of certain ideologies, ideological influence, the possibility of ideological identification (PESOTSKY, 2008). In the article by D.V. Rodichkin "Ideology and Literature in the Spiritual Sphere of Society" shows the evolution of the interaction of ideology and literature from ancient times to the present (RODICHKIN, 2017). In the article by O.E. Osovsky "Ideology and ideological myths in the space of XX century literature" examines the problem of the relationship between literature and ideology, the mechanisms of functioning of ideological myths in the literary space of the XX - early XXI centuries (OSOVSKY, 2011). In 2016, a collection of articles "Literature and Ideology. Twentieth century" with many interesting works (LITERATURE AND IDEOLOGY. TWENTIETH CENTURY, 2016).

It is characteristic that most of the reviewed publications on the correlation of literature and ideology are devoted to Russian and foreign literatures of the XX-XXI centuries. However, ideology was presented in various forms in the classical Russian literature of the 19th century.

In the light of various ideological discourses, the figure of Andrei Stolz from the novel by I.A. Goncharova "Oblomov".

The novelty of this article lies in the fact that the image of Andrei Stolz is considered as a kind of ideologeme in various ideological discourses of the 19th and 21st centuries.

METHODS

The methodological basis of the article is a synthesis of traditional approaches that have stood the test of time (historical-literary, system-typological, comparative-historical) with the involvement of relatively new research practices (receptive aesthetics). The methodological principles of the listed areas are used depending on the specific material and tasks (AFANASYEVA, KRYLOV, GOVORUHINA, 2018; BEKMETOV et al. 2019; BEKMETOV, 2015; NIGMATULLINA, 2017).

We also point out that the article takes into account the results of Western studies that used methodological developments that are close to us see: Ehre (1973); Seeley (1976); Mondry (1991); Russell (2003); Walker (2013); Gorelik (2015); "Goncharov's Oblomov" (1998); Andrews (1988); Hansen Löve (1990) Wigzell (1996); Lounsbery (2011); Belyanin (2000); Testa (1994).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The main novel by I.A. Goncharova attracts attention, first of all, by the correlation of two opposite natures in the novel - Ilya Oblomov and Andrei Stolz. Their fundamental opposition, for all the commonality noted by some critics, was determined by the difference in lifestyles, life philosophies, although they were known since ancient times (vanity - contemplation), but understood by readers and critics in the context of the difference in ethnic characters actualized by the author, more precisely, the presence of an additional "German element" in the figure of Andrei Stolz. The introduction to the novel world as the main character or one of the leading characters of a foreigner almost always means, among other things, a certain reproach of the nation to which the author and his main readers belong.

It was the presence of this German element that became the subject of ideological controversy about this image.

I.A. Goncharov, as you know, was a "Westernizing practitioner." And this position found its expression, both in the novel and in the author's comments to it. In the article *Better Late Than Never*, the artist admitted that he was often reproached, why did I introduce him (Stolz) into the novel? Why did I put a German, and not a Russian, in opposition to Oblomov? " And then he gave such an explanation: "I could answer this, that, depicting laziness and apathy in all its breadth and inveterateness, as a spontaneous Russian trait, and only this is me, exposing the Russian next to it as an example of energy, knowledge, labor, in general, any strength, would fall into some contradiction with himself, that is, with his task - to depict stagnation, sleep, immobility. I would dilute the integrity of one side of the Russian character that I have chosen for the novel" .

Here, as you can see, the writer motivated the introduction of a foreigner into the novel with special ideological and artistic tasks. Further I.A. Goncharov says that under the ideological pressure of the Slavophiles, due to their rejection of Ilya Oblomov and especially Andrei Stolz, he was forced to recognize the introduction of a German into the novel as a mistake. But "meanwhile, it seems, against my will, there was actually no mistake here, if we take into account the role that the German element and the Germans have played and are still playing in Russian life. Until now, they are our teachers, professors, mechanics, engineers, technicians in all parts. The best and richest branches of industry, trade and other enterprises are in their hands ... This, of course, is annoying, but true ... " At the same time, I.A. Goncharov was clearly aware of what he was doing, introducing the German into the novel already in 1859. In a letter to Il Lkhovsky dated May 20, 1859, we read: "Of course, when the fever subsides, they will begin to swear, especially in Moscow, although the first two parts were passionately greeted there. But Slavophiles live there, and Stolz is a German" (GONCHAROV,1980, p. 273).

It cannot be said that the image of Andrei Stolz evoked an unambiguously negative assessment in Russian criticism, although her opinion was almost unanimous in defining his artistic merit. With rare exceptions, everyone agreed that this was an artistic failure of I.A. Goncharova.

But there were many reviews in which Andrei Stolz was understood as a positive character opposed to Oblomovism, even to a certain extent as a kind of high ideal in the author's intention, and in this interpretation he was generally positively assessed.

Democratically inclined D.I. was one of the first to speak positively about Andrei Stolz. Pisarev: "Stolz is quite European in development and outlook on life; this is the type of the future, which is now rare, but to which the modern movement of ideas, which has revealed itself with such force in our society, leads" (PISAREV,1959, p. 10-11). And almost 30 years after the journal publication of the novel *Oblomov*, V. Ostrogorsky admitted the correctness of I.A. Goncharov, stating that, indeed, "how many Stolts appeared in Russia already under Russian names!" (OSTROGORSKIY,1888, p. 159). A.I. Nelenov wrote in the *Russian Review* that I.A. Goncharov sympathizes with Andrei Stolz "not as a clever manufacturer and businessman making money, but as a person of energy and movement" (NEZELENOV,1891, p. 559).

However, much more numerous and expressive assessments went to Andrei Stolz from the camp that does not accept him.

O.N. Dobrolyubov in his famous article, having presented a number of claims to Andrei Stolz, concludes: "he is not the person who can, in a language understandable to the Russian soul, tell us this almighty word "forward!" (DOBROLYUBOV,1991, p. 65). In the same year, A.P. Grigoryev spoke quite sharply about Andrei Stolz in the *Svetochnik* magazine. Milyukov: "In this antipathetic nature, under the guise of education and humanity, aspirations for reforms and progress, everything that is so contrary to our Russian character and outlook on life is hidden. It was in these Stolz that the foundations of oppression lay hidden so hard on our society" (MILYUKOV,1991, p. 138). I.F. Annensky, connecting the artistic pallor of the image of Andrei Stolz with the fact that the writer did not put his

soul into him: "Certainly, the poetical truth of Goncharov did not see the ideal in these people" (ANNENSKY,1991, p. 228).

As you can see, in pre-revolutionary criticism there are a variety of interpretations images of Andrei Stolz, mainly due to the ideological direction of the magazine or the ideological views of the author of the article.

In the twentieth century, we can also observe various approaches to the figure of the Gon-Charov hero.

In Soviet times, in the well-known monograph by A.G. Zeitlin did not accept the bourgeois essence of Andrei Stolz (TSEITLIN,1950, p. 179-180). M.V. Otradin considers it possible to talk about "Shtoltsevism", which in the moral sense is no better than "Oblomovism" (OTRADIN,1979, p. 441). This is the conclusion that V.A. Kotelnikov: "All Stoltsev's progress is a movement in a circle that does not lead to new historical paths. Such, undoubtedly, Oblomov's interpretation is received by Stolz in the novel, despite the other, perhaps, the initial intentions of Goncharov" (KOTELNIKOV,1993, p. 127).

There are works where the qualities of Andrei Stolz are viewed as positive. This is typical of Western literary scholars. Thus, the German researcher P. Tirgen unambiguously defines the hero as a "positive type" and sees in him drawn by I.A. Goncharov a prototype for Russia (TIRGEN,1997, p. 24).

In Russian literary criticism, researchers assess Andrei Stolts as "an indisputably positive character" in the understanding of I.A. Goncharov. In the article by N.P. Popova. "New stolts are appearing in Russia ...: about the mythological-logem of the hero in modern journalism", the demand for the image of Andrei Stolz in the ideological discourses of the XXI century is revealed: "The analyzed fragments of modern discourse have shown that not only the anthroponym of Ob-lomov, but also the name another hero of the novel, Stolz, went beyond the limits of fiction. The features of the semantization of the anthroponym Stolz by the contemporaries made it possible to identify three semantic profiles of the name in question: "inner Stolz" - to denote certain personality traits, "positive Stolz" and "negative Stolz" - to comprehend, designate and evaluate the ongoing socio-political change. The semantic profiles of the anthroponym Stolz can be considered as part of the processes of formation and formulation of the hero's mythologeme. The semantics of the anthroponyms Stolz and Oblomov turned out to be involved in the processes of understanding the ongoing changes in modern society" (POPOVA,2010, p. 141). And another contemporary author, P. Paramonov, in his article "The Bummer of the Stolz Epoch" through the mythology of Andrei Stolz characterizes the bourgeois nature of modernity: "The Stolz Era, so brilliantly described by Goncharov, is ending. She will fight with all her might, resist, fight, but she is finished. Time begins to demand a new utopia. Neither the modern state, nor the modern church, nor the "golden calf" are able to give a person a new dream. A completely new understanding of reality should emerge and, apparently, this understanding is much closer to Oblomov's worldview than Stol-ts" (<http://tztver.ru/articles/detail/177>).

SUMMARY

It is easy to see that in the nineteenth, twentieth and twenty-first centuries the image of Andrei Stolz evoked diametrically opposite judgments.

It is clear that the assessments of critics, literary critics, and publicists were conditioned by both socio-political and personal factors. However, this should not be surprising. It is natural. In comprehending and understanding the image of Andrei Stolz, various ideological discourses clash: the author, and the motley pre-revolutionary criticism, and domestic and Western literary criticism of the 20th century, and political scientists and publicists of the 21st century.

CONCLUSIONS

It should be borne in mind that these assessments are present simultaneously, providing a lively dialogue, a lively struggle of ideas, for without ideology in human society there can be no true life. Another thing is that one cannot put up with the situation when the force preaching this or that ideology suppresses all other ideologies and their carriers by administrative and repressive measures.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive of Kazan Federal University.

REFERENCES

- AFANASYEVA, M.; KRYLOV, V.; GOVORUHINA, Y. Genre synthesis in Andrei Bely's reviews. *Ad Alta: Journal of interdisciplinary research*, vol. 8, is. 1, p. 159-161, 2018.
- ANDREWS, L. The Spatial Imagery of Oblomovism. *Neophilologus*, vol. 71, n. 3, p. 321-334, 1988.
- ANNENSKY, I. *Goncharov and his Oblomov*. Roman Goncharova "Oblomov" in Russian criticism, L.: Publishing house of Leningrad State University, p. 150-173, 1991.
- BEKMETOV, R. About the 'Buddhist view' on Russian literature. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 6, n. 3, May, Supplement 3, p. 9-17, 2015.
- BEKMETOV, R.; RAMI, I.; YUNUSOV, I.; BOLDYREVA, O. 'West - East' opposition in Russian literature and philosophy of 1830-1850s: search for civilizational identity. *Revista Genero & Direita*, vol. 8, is. 7, p. 400-410, 2019.
- BEKMETOV, R.; TZAN, SH.; RAD, E.; YUNUSOVA, F. Modeling function of metaplot about prodigal son. *Revista Turismo: Estudos & Práticas (UERN)*, Caderno Suplementar 02, p. 1-7, 2019.
- BELIANIN, V. Russian literature: a psychological view. *VI World Congress for Central and East European Studies: Abstracts*, 29 July - 3 August 2000, Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, pp. 55-56, 2000.
- BRIEF LITERARY ENCYCLOPEDIA, vol. V, M.: Soviet encyclopedia, stb. 608-611, 1968.
- DOBROLYUBOV, N. "What is Oblomovism?". Roman Goncharova "Oblomov" in Russian criticism, Leningrad: LSU Publishing House, p. 45-86, 1991.
- EHRE, M. *Oblomov and his Creator: Life and Art of Ivan Goncharov*. Prince-ton: Princeton University Press, 292 p., 1973.
- GONCHAROV, I. *Collected works: in 8 volumes*, v. VIII, Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literatura, 546 p., 1980.
- GONCHAROV'S OBLOMOV. Ed. by G. Diment, Northwestern University Press, 200 p., 1998.
- GORELIK, M. *An Entirely Different World: Russian Visitor to the Cape (1797-1870)*. Cape Town: Van Riebeeck Society, 162 p., 2015.
- HANSEN LÖVE, K. *The structure of space in I. A. Gončarov's 'Oblomov'*. Russian Literature, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 175-210, 1990.
- KOTELNIKOV, V. *Ivan Aleksandrovich Goncharov*. Moscow: Education, 190 p., 1993.
- LITERATURE AND IDEOLOGY. TWENTIETH CENTURY. Moscow: MAKS Press, 400 p., 2016.
- LOUNSBERY, A. The world on the back of a fish: Mobility, immobility, and eco-nomics in 'Oblomov', *Russian review Syracuse* (N.Y.), vol. 70, n. 1, pp. 43-46, 2011.
- MILYUKOV, A. *Russian apathy and German activity ('Oblomov', novel by Mr. Goncharov)*. Roman Goncharova "Oblomov" in Russian criticism, L.: Publishing house of Leningrad State University, p. 120-148, 1991.
- MONDRY, H. A semiotic interpretation of national typology: the English, the Boers and... the Russians (Ivan Goncharov's 'Frigate Pallas'), *Literator* 12, n. 1, p. 71-81, 1991.
- NEZELENOV, A. A. Ivan Aleksandrovich Goncharov. *Russian Review*, vol. V, n. 10, p. 552-584, 1891.
- NIGMATULLINA, Y.; PASHKUROV, A.; RAZZHIVIN, A.; DULALAEVA, I. Binary and trinitarian thought dialogue in the focus of pre-romantic melancholy problem. *European Journal of Science and Theology*, vol. 13, n. 3, p. 137-147, 2017.
- OSOVSKY, O. Ideology and ideological myths in the space of XX century literatur. *Bulletin of the Tatar State Humanitarian Pedagogical University*, n. 2 (24), p. 215-219, 2011.

OSTROGORSKIY, V. *Studies on Russian Writers*. Moscow: Elementary School E.N. Tikhomirova, 187 p., 1888.

OTRADIN, M. *Roman I.A. Goncharova 'Oblomov' "*, I. *Goncharov, "Oblomov"*, L.: Publishing house of Leningrad State University, p. 435–446, 1979.

PARAMONOV, P. *The Stolz Era Bummer,*" <http://tztver.ru/articles/detail/177>.

PESOTSKY, V. *Fiction: socio-philosophical analysis*. Moscow: Publishing house of MGOU, 388 p., 2008.

PISAREV, D. *Works: in 4 volumes*, vol. I, Moscow: GIHL, 467 p., 1959.

POPOVA, N. *New stoltzy appear in Russia...: about the mythologeme of the hero in modern journalism. Political linguistics*, n. 1 (31), p. 135–142, 2010.

RODICHKIN, D. *Ideology and Literature in the Spiritual Sphere of Society. Vestnik Tver State University*, n. 2, p. 77–85, 2017.

RUSSELL, B. *Russia and Western Civilization: Cultural and Historical Encounters*. New York: M.E. Sharpe, 392 p., 2003.

SEELEY, F. *Oblomov. The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 54, n. 3, p. 335–354, 1976.

TESTA, C. *Goncharov's 'Oblomov': Fragmentation, Selfmarginalization. Cockroaches," Canadian – American Slavic Studies*, vol. 28, n.4, p. 399–418, 1994.

TIRGEN, P. *Oblomov as a man-fragment. Russian Literature*, no. 3, p. 18–33, 1997.

TSEITLIN, A. *I.A. Goncharov*. Moscow: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 491 p., 1950.

WALKER, J. *Neither Burgher nor Barin: An Imagological and Intercultural Reading of Andrey Stoltz in Ivan Goncharov's Oblomov (1859). Slověne*, n. 2. p. 5–30, 2013.

WIGZELL, F. *Reading the Future: Women and Fortune-telling in Russia (1770–1840)*. Gender and Russian Literature, ed. by R. Marsh, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 75–91, 1996.

ⁱHead of the Center for Career Guidance and Interaction with Employers of the Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, KFU. E-mail: almaz82@inbox.ru. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9181-2570>.

ⁱⁱDoctor of Philology, Head of the REC Center for the Study of Leo Tolstoy Heritage, Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication. Kazan Federal University. E-mail: bekmetov@list.ru. ID Scopus: 56646553000. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5430-3523>.

ⁱⁱⁱPh.D. in Philology, Lecturer at the Department of Russian Language and Translation at Istanbul University Okan. E-mail: ilsiyar.rameeva@okan.edu.tr. ID Scopus: 5393680112. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4322-7478>.

^{iv}Doctor of Philology, Professor at the Department of Philology of the Birk Branch of the Bashkir State University. E-mail: ildar_yun@rambler.ru. ID Scopus: 57211911028, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6442-3921>.

Received: 20 Oct.2020

Approved: 01 Dec.2020