Journal of Adaptive Learning Technologies
ISSN **2997-3902** (Online)
Vol. 3, No. 2, Feb 2026,
Available online at: https://scientificbulletin.com/index.php/JALT

Article

The use of Grotesque and Satirical Devices in the Works of Nikolai Gogol

Saidova Olima Botirovna
Asia International University, Assisstent Teacher

Article information:
Manuscript received: 30 December 2025; **Accepted:** 25 January 2026; **Published:** 16 February 2026

Abstract: The peculiar juxtaposition of absurd visuals often with a lucid social commentary in Nikolai Gogol's prose creates an impenetrable satire on the flaws of the 19th century Russian society and man. The article focuses on three important works - "The Nose," "The Overcoat," and "The Government Inspector" - and explains how Gogol uses absurd, grotesque devices, and sharp satire. In this paper grotesque is understood as occurrences in Gogol's fiction that become so strange or distorted that the boundaries between the comic and the evil collapse - times when reality is described in a fantastically distorted or "phantasmagoric" way.

Keywords: Grotesque, Satire, Nikolai Gogol, Russian Literature, Social Critique, The Nose, The Overcoat, The Government Inspector

1. Introduction

Nikolai Gogol (1809–1852)[1] is one of the most important of Russian writers, master of a unique mix of realism, absurdity, and sarcasm. His stories usually contain weird, sometimes grotesque imagery and surreal moments to demonstrate the absurdities and the evils of society. The absurd in Gogol, far from being a fanciful disruption of commercial realism, is "the very source" of it; the stuff of daily life, its tones and tropes, is depicted as naturally conducive to comic distortion and nightmarish non sequitur. Gogol has been observed by critics to be (the grotesque) writer who "builds with (the grotesque) — a world in which the grotesque is the exception, here not even the exception [but] the rule, often the characters and landscapes "to be malformed from the start." Stated differently, the grotesque in Gogol is a constitutive part of, not a detached device in his fictive universe. This gave Gogol the status of a precourser of modern absurdist and surreal literature: "the elements of grotesque, the surreal, and the absurd were impressively avant-found in his work, and very influential on later writers. The ability of Russian literature to respond to Dostoevsky's widely quoted remark that "we all come out of Gogol's Overcoat" is testament to Gogol's influence on the direction of Russian literature.

As used here, grotesque will have a broadly defined meaning, comprising absurd, exaggerated, and outlandish in Gogol's fiction, complicating the boundary between comic and sinister—where reality is rendered in a fantastically distorted order, moments described as phantasmagoric. A nose that was cut off and ended up as a government official walking the streets; a humble overcoat takes to the streets, melds with a ghost to become a ghostly avenger. In sharp contrast, satire, in the context of Gogol, refers to his employment of wit, irony, hyperbole, and absurdity as a means to expose and discredit the hypocrisy and vices of persons and institutions in society. Importantly, Gogol's grotesque mode is almost always satirical, and vice versa. Shami Ghosh, a critic himself,

believes Gogol exhibits the "bizarre mix" of fantasy and naturalism: "We find details realistic, (the) general picture of the world, however, phantasmagoric." What this looks like in practice is that Gogol typically places his stories in real-world places (St. Petersburg bureaucracies, provincial towns) and believable details, only to break with reality with absurd characters or events. The comparison — the norm with the nonsensical — serves to take what we know and help us see it differently and in turn makes blunt Gogol's critique of society. Gogol himself perceived his literary purpose as moral and social; he remarked of The Government Inspector that "In The Government Inspector, I tried to collect everything that was evil in Russia into a single pile." By the means of comic grotesque satire, he aimed to highlight that the evils of bureaucracy, pretense, and cruelty were inherent to his society.

Through grotesqueries and satire in the short stories "The Nose" (1836) and "The Overcoat" (1842) as well as his play The Government Inspector, Gogol explores flaws in the social, political, and human systems. Lastly, we touch on the larger significane of these results, Gogols thematic motives, and the relevance of his grotesque satire. [2]

2. Materials and Methods

The present study is qualitative textual analysis of how Gogol employs the grotesque and satiric elements in the selected works. Performing close readings of the primary texts—in translation—"The Nose," "The Overcoat," and The Government Inspector, we emphasized passages that tended toward out-sized, surreal, or absurd images but also texts that contained direct social criticism. Literary theory on the grotesque and satire undergird our analysis. We draw especially upon Wolfgang Kayser's concept of the grotesque as the alienation of the real world into the strange or surreal. For Gogol this means mundane turns her into absurdity or nightmare but still they reveal a certain truth. We also take inspiration from Mikhail Bakhtin, who asserts that laughter and the carnivalesque reveal and liberate excluded truths within official reality (although Gogol's satire here is less carnival humor and more ice-pick cruel).

More specifically, the analysis moved through individual works considering grotesque representations, such as the anthropomorphized nose found in "The Nose," the spectral presence in "The Overcoat," and the tableau of hyperbolic caricatures in The Government Inspector. We also distinguished satiric devices associating with these grotesque features (like irony, exaggeration, parody, and farcical plotting). And every case, we were taught, could be understood in terms of the historical (the Russian civil service system of ranks, say) and the social (the petty bureaucracy of 19th-century St. Petersburg) — it needed a diagnosis of what social or human failing Gogol is taking aim at. To further develop and deepen our understanding of the novels — and to ensure that we were accurate in cultural references — we consulted secondary sources, including literary criticism and annotations. Scholarly commentary on Gogol's language and symbol, for example, helped to elucidate how absurdist details (e.g., a nose function in "The Nose" donning a State Councillor uniform) carry satirical significance. We then try to distill Gogol's overall strategy in the intersection of grotesque aesthetics and satire by comparing the findings across the three works. In this way, the methods combine a formalist analysis of narrative and style with a thematic analysis, both grounded in evidence from the texts analyzed and tested against textual evidence and critical scholarship. The systematic application of analysis outlined above enables us to reach well-founded conclusions about the grotesque and satirical features available to Gogol in his attack on social and human failings.

3. Results

In one of his most ridiculously ludicrous ideas, Gogol's short story The Nose (1836) introduces us to a collegiate assessor (Major Kovalyov) who wakes up one morning to find his own nose missing from his face and, even worse, living separate from him in St.

Petersburg disguised as a top-ranking official. It is a great setup and immediately creates a grotesque atmosphere — a literally living body part living on its own in society and Gogol plays the whole thing seriously for comedic affect. A floating nose in a gold-braided uniform with a sword is simultaneously absurd and disturbing. It serves as a grotesque exaggeration of social snobbery: Kovalyov is obsessed with rank and social standing, which his nose distorts by wearing a higher rank and shamelessly refusing to recognize its former possessor. As one analysis notes, the nose and its "brazen imposture" is a grotesque caricature of Kovalov's pathetic vanity and how he "skims across the surface of life, deceiving both himself and others." (Interesting is that Kovalyov used to flatter himself by taking a higher title, him calling himself "Major" since he used to seem to voice that he was of a higher rank than he really was. The runaway Nose is just extreme distillation of this imposture.) The result is a sardonic take on Petersburg bureaucracy, its peremptory rank hierarchy, and the identities anchored to it. Kovalyov resents the social humiliation of being a "man without a nose' more than the literal loss of it – he will be unable to make a reasonable appearance in society or woo a woman sans this token of his honour. It is through this absurdist mechanism that Gogol satirizes the shallow nature of a society in which a “triangular piece of flesh” can wield more power than the living man whose flesh it was.

In its absurdity, Gogol’s narrative style in “The Nose” is at once absurd, with nonsensical plots recounted in a straight-faced fashion, and viciously satirical verbal acrobatics, producing a “grotesque social satire” based on intentional irrationality, according to one critic. The story is full of idiomatic puns and deflatations of high language, helping to create a comic feel. For example, the official letters and ads in search of the lost nose parody bureaucratic language, and Kovalyov’s grandiose speech contrasts with the absurdity of his predicament. The climactic confrontation in a cathedral – where Kovalyov faces off against his Nose (now assuming the role of a State Councillor) – is delivered in a surreal deadpan back-and-forth mocking the title-laden silliness of social strutting. Even as the events spiral out into pure absurdity, Gogol keeps it grounded in social commentary. The independent life of the Nose emphasizes just how arbitrary and ephemeral identity and position are. To the nose, its own part eclipses the whole: an appendage endowed with more importance than the person, reflecting a society that values distinction, status, presence above personage." The other interpretation explains that the nose that goes "out walking in full uniform" is not only an absurd image but also a sharp allegory: "not merely a sign of bureaucratic alienation or a satirical gadget—it is an organ dismembered from a body but somehow more powerful…the severed member going on to rule the land." To put it another way: Gogol takes the notion of people being “led by the nose” by their bureaucracy literally: the Nose leads its owner, and society finds this absurdity to be par for the course. This grotesque reversal defies the idea of a unified, dignified self and ridicules Kovalyov's vanity and the the stupidity of a status-obsessed society.

It has long been plugged by critics as a work that mixes fantasy and social commentary. In the 1830s, contemporary readers were baffled by “The Nose”; it ignored the rules of conventional realism and narrative logic. Gogol himself offers no certainty about what the Nose is getting up to — the episode is neither quite a dream, nor quite magic — thus preserving a scholarly sense of “fantastic hesitation” as to the interpretation of the tale. This ambiguity is deliberate: it compels the viewer to embrace the ludicrous as self-evident, mimicking the acceptance of characters, thus exposing the irrationality that lies beneath the paperthin skin of societal structure. In “The Nose” Gogol at the height of his grotesque satire: in the utterly absurd situation lies an ahuman truth—identity, honor—as thoroughly over-civilized constructs bound seem dangerously arbitrary. The Nose is absurd on its own, but by the end — where the Nose bizarrely reattaches and no solution is provided — the reader is left with the impression that perhaps the ordinary world itself is equally absurd and fragile. The fun the story generates is loaded with

piercing wisdom: Gogol has mocked the “nonsense” in the core of Petersburg’s civil life, implying that the line between reality and absurdity might be damn close.

Nicknamed as Gogol's best short story, "The Overcoat" (1842) is known for its unique mix of humor and pathos. The story in question is that of Akaky Akakievich Bashmachkin, an overly modest and destitute civil servant in the St. Petersburg bureaucracy who copies documents for a living. Gogol paints Akaky as a “little man”—he is a comic character at first, from his ludicrous name (a repetitive doublet that also sounds like gibberish) to his single-minded drive to procure a new overcoat to stave off the Russian cold. But as the story unfolds, the tone transitions from light satire to earnest sympathy. After years and years of saving and forgoing life necessities, Akaky finally acquires a gorgeous new overcoat and for a brief, beautiful moment, is elevated above his status in life — his coworkers must notice him and throw him a party. So it is especially tragic when a street thief steals the coat, a sequence Gogol describes in terms of tragedy. Akaky is soon stricken by a fever and dies with a broken heart. But that's not all: in additional macabre twist, a sort of ghost story follows, one where an apparition much like Akaky's walks through the city, stealing overcoats off the backs of passerby – ultimately, divesting a certain politician who had earlier turned away Akaky, and his pleas for assistance, of an outer garment of his own. Gogol often employed the grotesque to heighten his social criticism, and this mix of everyday realism with a supernatural finish is exactly that.

Among these grotesque and satirical devices, one story in particular that stands out is; “The Overcoat.” To begin with, Gogol's portrayal of Akaky is intentionally hyperbolic, but never to an inhuman extent. Akaky is a man who "lived for his duty," an office functionary who endures infinite mockery from colleagues; his tattered old coat; his bald head perpetually dusted by shreds of paper from his work as a copyist make him a ridiculous, tragic figure. He does indeed seem "grotesque and laughable" to those he encounters, and, at times, the reader. Yet by narrating Akaky with a thorough and delicate hand, Gogol elicits sympathy while never stripping Akaky of his humanity. There is something galling about the treatment meted out to Akaky, literary commentators have observed — and Akaky, for all his apparent comic ridiculousness, is never exactly a buffoon; we feel the injustice of how he is treated to the very end. So the story works on two levels: one is that Aakaky is a caricature of meekness, and the absurdity of his life (his rapture at something as mundane as a new coat) is funny; and the other is that Akaky is a representation of the oppressed human person, and we are to feel sorry for him. This is a dualism that defines the satirical quality Gogol uses in "The Overcoat." Gogol in fact mocks and ridicules Akaky into being both ridiculous and pitiable in order to satirize the very kind of inhuman social system that likely abuses such people. An important moment happens when a young office clerk, who has recently started working there, sees the mercyless bullying of Akaky and he feels pity for the man, and he hears Akaky weakly shouting Leave me alone! Why do you insult me?” echoing in his mind. This moment of sympathy in the tale reveals something of the story’s moral background: it lays bare the thoughtless cruelty of bureaucratic society, where a man like Akaky is not acknowledged as a “brother” until after he dies. These passages show the roots of perhaps Gogol's greatest theme, "mankind's inhumanity towards man," which subsequently became a staple of later Russian (and Gogolian-inspired) literature.

The overcoat, then, is both the story's symbol and its instrument of grotesque imagery. More than just an article of clothing, the coat is a symbol of status, of hope, and, eventually, supernatural retribution. As one analysis points out, “the overcoat, for instance, becomes, in the narrative, an object of salvation and damnation – fetish, ghost, and sacrificial totem.” Akaky is initially seeking the coat not only for warmth but also for a kind of "symbolic restoration" of his dignity. Much of the way Gogol refers to the process of getting the coat has a religious zeal – as if Akaky has acquired a sacred item that only temporarily frees him from unsightness. The utter absurdity and injustice of Akaky's

condition come to a zenith when this talisman is forcefully taken from him. Here, however, Gogol adds the humanly grotesque touch of the supernatural: a specter that beats the roofs of the city as he approaches Akaky and accosts passersby for their overcoats, identified as Akaky's ghost. This ghost is an image of black comedy and a manifestation of vengeance. The Important Person – the high official who had brusquely denied Akaky help – is the final victim of the ghost, yielding his luxurious coat in fright at the appearance of the specter. In this absurd conclusion possessing some sort of revenge on Kakaky's behalf Gogol mocks his own process and punishes the fucking official by submitting him to terror and depriving him of anything. The ghost might also be interpreted as Akaky's dawning effort at claiming his humanity and value — ironically only after he has died, and only through a magical transgression of physical reality. This mixing of pathos and the supernatural is a signature feature of Gogol's grotesque method: the story shifts, with a faculty of a fairytale, from social realism to urban legend, with a jolt to the reader and a through-line moral to boot. The Important Person treats the ranks below him with just a touch more humanity after this (the narrator dryly observes) — a satirical jab that perhaps only a jolt of the bizarre (a ghost grabbing his collar) could pierce that bureaucratic wall.

Although satirical in nature, there is a difference in the level of satire between The Nose and The Overcoat, as the satire in The Overcoat is a bit more subtle than in Nikolay Gogol 's earlier short story. Gogol's narrator uses irony and exaggeration to parody the paperwork and other class pretensions. As the story famously announces there's nothing worse than "departments, regiments, courts of justice and … all other branches of public service." Here this blowing-up is a jocular exaggeration that mocks the meanness and thin-skinnedness of red-tapism. The narrator swoops in with a laugher of a parenthesis here (just why are government institutions defined by extreme irritability?); and then dismisses the "dysfunction… and self-importance" prevalent in these offices. In the same vein, Gogol ridicules bureaucratic diction and process: the "Notable man" becomes no more than a name-less (and thus nameless) title, which, in an ironic twist, speaks of the way that titles, like rank, supersede identity. When Akaky tries to plead to this bigwig after his coat is stolen, the meeting is recounted with satirical irony — the big big bureaucrat berates Akaky for a minute breach of etiquette (as if, on his part), while he rages irrationally, illustrating the absurd hypocriticalness of such officials. The object of Gogol's bitter satire here is obvious: the civil service system and its dehumanizing fixation on rank and protocol. The story's climactic closing lines even remark that the Important Person, spooked by the ghost, envisions that "his own ghost, without overcoat" might be walking the streets afterwards — a final ironic note that melts the distinction of who haunts whom, as though to suggest that the true phantom abroad is guilty conscience.

To conclude, "The Overcoat," subtly employs the grotesque in an even more destructive capacity than "The Nose." The grotesque lies in the caricaturish patheticity of Akaky and in the bizarre transformation from a robbed overcoat to a spectral avenger. These elements reinforce Gogol's satirical indictment of social injustice: the laughable elements (Akaky's idiosyncrasies; the absurd ghost) prevent the tale from becoming a dry morality play, while the pathos of Akaky's plight and the shock of the supernatural force the reader to confront the story's moral heart. That little reminder — that there exists a point beyond which every little man is going to lose his cool, and, in the words of the book's marketing copy, societal cruelty can produce wildly unsettling and even hilarious results — is something successive generations have taken to heart through a blend of humor and horror that is uniquely Gogol. Gogol sets a standard here for where the grotesque can mingle with empathy in a new domain, one that clearly inspired generations of her peers and descendants to follow in his footsteps, consider the human cost of bureaucracy and poverty, and channel a spirit that would leave its mark on Russian literature.

From exaggerated characters and comic plot devices to political satire bursting with black humor, this method can be easily seen in Gogol's play The Government Inspector (Revizor, first staged in 1836), a silly farce of bureaucy and corruption. This piece contains no supernatural or impossible event at its core, which is why it's so grotesque compared to the two short stories discussed in the article above; it is like a opulent caricature of human greed and stupidity. This is comic misidentification, of course, the premise of the play: in a small provincial town deep in Imperial Russia, local officialdom hears that a Government Inspector has come incognito to their part of the world to check up on them. THESE OFFICIALS ARE SCUM, FROM GOVERNOR TO JUDGES TO SCHOOL AND HOSPITAL DIRECTORS, BUT THEY ALL PERISH AT THE THOUGHT OF AUDITORS COMING IN. While a stranger named Ivan Khlestakov, a nowhere civil servant from St. Petersburg, is passing through lodging at the inn, they believe that he is the dreaded inspector general. What follows is a classic farce: the authorities cater to Khlestakov, paying him off and showering him with hospitality in a desperate attempt to hush up their sins while Khlestakov (a vain, empty-headed youth and all-around braggart) happily plays along, spinning fantastical tales about his importance. This town is literally hoist by its own petard, their own lies and flattery causing them to fall victim to a much larger lie. Although the plot is based on an anecdote proposed by Pushkin, Gogol turned it into "a satire of the immense bureaucracy" of Nicholas I's Russia. In this one play Gogol, as he put it, attempted to "gather in one heap all-that-was-bad-in-Russia."

There are multiple satirical targets in The Government Inspector. The play, on one level, pokes fun at the capriciousness and bizarre nature of the provincial echelons. In living caricature to all, “All of the officials in the town are corrupt to the core.” There's a corrupt judge who's blatantly taking bribes, you have the hospital director shaking his head saying patients get no treatment, the school principal is a fascist, and the cops are a bunch of violent drunks. Even the governor himself is dubbed "the worst of the worst" – pocketing public money and shaking down local shopkeepers. In its over-the-top portrayals, Gogol renders a fun-house mirror full of rogues that's both hilarious and poignant. It was done so accurately that many of the officials in the audience recognized themselves and were insulted, although the Tsar himself apparently laughed at the play, viewing it as a more general commentary. Modern critics said that Gogol realised this intention by “the mental outlook of the first Russian writer in whose works the realities of the official world were analysed in literature, to be mocked in a hilarious way”. Gogol burst the bubble of the bureaucratic facade by dressing civil servants as clowns on stage. He highlights the ridiculousness of every aspect of their system — none more so than the oft-quoted idea that the “entirety of this vast empire was choked by red tape, … and crushed under a paper over people grindstone.” Gogol's satirical vision possesses an understanding of governmental machinery as not rational, nor as inherently enlightened, but as a grotesque tangle of pointless paperwork and self-serving officials. The idea of bureaucracy as a beast devouring the life around it — a "xanadu of paper" — is a central satirical trope in the drama that manifests in all sorts of comedic ways (the Mayor's office is filled with stacks of unread documents, the Postmaster opens private letters just because he can). These tidbits show that the very bureaucracy is the farcical antagonist of the common folk.

A lot of the humor in the play comes from dramatic irony and farce. Ironically, the audience soon learns (particularly as the play unfolds) that Khlestakov is not an inspector at all, making the fawning manner of the officials deeply comedic. Khlestakov does indeed arrive, bewildered by the unknown officials' fear and hospitality alike, and figures out, quite quickly, how to play the game; he concocts elaborate tall tales regarding the nobility of his character (dinners with ministers, "friends of the Tsar") and the more ludicrous the fabrications, the greater the locals fawn around him. Here, Gogol is able to mock the naiveté and subservience of the officials their fear of bureaucratic tyranny is so enormous that it leaves no room for rational thought. This is the satirical point: a regime based on

rigid hierarchy and terror produces the circling absurdity of the weakness Gogol mocks the local potentates who hound the populace become simpering fools before some alleged greater power. Perhaps the most memorable scene in the play is when the local bureaucrats come in succession to Khlestakov's room and pay him hush money, each one offering apologies for the pathetic state of his office, they are, in essence, confessing their own crimes to a complete stranger. This order (official after official outdoing each other with humiliating subservience) reinforces the play's claim that corruption is both widespread and absurd. When Khlestakov, high with bribes and flattering, reaches the point where he plans to propose to the Governor's daughter and allows himself the thought that he is someone really important, the viewer realizes how many levels of self-deception are at work.

Gogol lays a deeper satirical theme below the roof of this ridiculous plot, one that touches on deception and self-deception. The people of The Government Inspector are not only conning one another; they are also conning themselves, an irony Gogol employs to write about a larger human silliness. Beresford notes that "Gogol used the mistaken-identity plot 'to lay bare a primal condition of disorder in human life,' adding that for Gogol 'deception was at the very center of existence'" The townspeople have an incentive to accept Khlestakov's absurd fictions, because they correspond with their hopes and fears, while Khlestakov, in turn, starts to believe his own fraudulent hype, bathing in a glory he hasn't earned. This way, everyone gets trapped in what Beresford refers to as a "tangle of confusion and deceptions," fooled by "their own fantasies and fairy-tales." It's an observation that elevates this satire from a knavish, Russian official, cookie-cutter critique to a deep look into man's soul: vanity and fear make fools of us all. What is at work here is grotesque but neither supernatural nor a horror vision in style, but rather psychological and social – the entirety of the town's experience collapses into something bordering on a sirens' song of collective delusion, driven by their basest traits In the play's finial scene, an Inspector General knocks at the doors to demand an audience - a moment indeed famously so, that it echoes the line, "The InspectorGeneral is in this very minute here and asks to see you." The comedy bubble is burst at once: the actual inspector arrives now to reveal the facts. Gogol closes this play with an image of the officials frozen in terror and humiliation, this unspoken and shocking status is a powerful image on the stage that makes the satirical core of the play crystal clear. Byeong-Moo allow the audience enjoy the punishment of the sinister officials but send them home to ponder that they participated in the shame of the town themselves. The final stage direction from Gogol — the so-called “mute scene” — serves as a mirror to the audience, colluding all societies based on shameless deceit and sycophancy.

In The Government Inspector, Gogol uses all his satirical weapons: his ever-inflated caricature of a character, the bitter irony of his plot, and the grotesque comedy of the play's growing pandemonium. No one is a hero; no one is simply sane; all are touched by the absurd, from mayor to fluster and even drunken servant Osip (the eternal opportunist) who observes dryly the foolishness of his master. And it is this universal folly that lends the play its barbed, if cynical, bite. The comedy occasionally strays into the territory of dark absurdism —such as when the Mayor frantically attempts to defend his smacking a woman (I didn’t do it… much, he mumbles)—or when Khlestakov, in a speech to himself, absurdly fantasizes about being a real high official. The best moments of a Gogol production simultaneously make you laugh and threaten the spectre of moral chaos, as in Detteadz. To quote a much later commentator, Gogol's Russian bureaucratic world is "a theater of appearances, its bureaucracy a necromantic farce"—the appearance of order is actually ordered illusion. Every shadow of order collapses into a carnival of avarice and terror in The Government Inspector – a grotesque travesty of good ruling. Gogol's satirical core is crystal clear: the ultimate "inspectors" of corruption are not the emperor's courtesans, but laughter and truth. In confronting the audience with the unalloyed masterpiece of the town’s alleged rottenness (to borrow a term even Gogol used himself),

the play does what a classic work of satire is supposed to do: it wields the sword of the humorous against vice and folly.

4. Discussion

From these analyses, one sees that in varied narratives and genres, Gogol utilizes grotesque and satirical elements to negative ramifications of both society and human nature. Be it through the surreal absurdity his runaway nose, or the comical humiliation of corrupt officials, Gogol the artist confronts us (and our viewers) with the grotesque reality coursing beneath the skin. This suggests that nonsense and immorality are not deviations but inherent to the social order – and at its most overtly outrageous we see this with Gogol's work, which deliberates these situations to increasingly ludicrous lengths. In the hands of Gogol, grotesque and satirical become two sides of the same coin, the grotesque imagery serving as a jarring, sometimes unwelcome mirror, with the satire creating the gleaming surface of that mirror. As one commentator perceptively puts it: Gogol's absurd situations are "not a defect, it is a reflection" of the real world; his artistry "teaches us not how to repair the world, but how to view its shatteredness" (Kashnikov 42). As in he does not give direct solutions to the social/moral cancers he represents – instead, he makes us aware of those cancers by expanding on them grotesquely. The reader is amused by the bureaucrat who runs after his own tail or the officers who naively worship a non-entity, but that amusement comes with an implication: judgement. A laugh that loosens the grip of the normal, revealing folly in stark relief. In this sense, Gogol "embodies absurdity four square in dwelling therein turning reality inside out and upside down to reveal its absurd underside." Whether it was noses that walked around on their own, an overcoat that shed its invisible tears, practical jokes, or caricatured towns, each of these grotesque devices radically unhinged the mundane to the point where audiences could no longer accept supposedly rational institutions (the civil service, social class distinctions) at face value. In both his stories and his play, the breakdown of order is funny, even if revealing: as one scholar puts it, there is the “collapse of order” — and the impulse to mourn its loss is thereby both mocked and revealed. Indeed, Gogol himself suggests that the “order” was always a sham, a ruse built on the back of self-delusion and flimsy decorum.

This grotesque satire makes the specific criticism universal; and that is a key outcome of Gogol. Gogol's revelation of human vanity, cruelty, and corruption is rooted in the particular, in Imperial Russian society, and yet echoes beyond his time. As indeed critics of the day saw that Gogol's aims were not just local. For example, in The Government Inspector Gogol ridiculed bribery, ineffectiveness and terror of authority — a theme which made one commenter to declare that the play is “an assault on all types of moral depravity, of which bribery and corruption are merely instances [of]”. Due to this wide-reaching moral compass, "Gogol's play is as relevant to the world of the twentieth century as it was to its own time" and addresses "a perennial evil of civilized societies." This is generally true of Gogol itself. Though social systems may change, Gogol's human vices — pride, greed, pettiness, willful blindness — endure, granting a timelessness to his grotesque satires. Readers from Dostoevsky to the present have found Gogol characters and situations simultaneously laughably recognizable and downright disturbingly familiar. The impact he had on Russian literature was of titanic proportions: Dostoevsky, Tolstoy and Chekhov learned from Gogol a comic grotesque woven in with an earnest social critique. Gogol’s absurd realism would inspire many different kinds of writers, from Franz Kafka to Mikhail Bulgakov (in the magical satire The Master and Margarita).

Gogol was a master of the grotesque, and his style had the added benefit, given the period in which he was writing, of permitting pointed criticism to be veiled in absurdist humour, allowing him to escape certain confines of his time (i.e. the rigorous Tsarist censorship). A bureaucrat would never strike down a direct political attack, but who could object to a tale about the nose of a man? And so, as we have seen, "The Nose" contains a

condemnation of social bourgeoisie more piercing than any blatant critique. While this did not always shield Gogol from controversy—some officials felt him in his sights (Gogol had to defend that the play Revizor was not directed at an individual)—the strategy did protect the survival and dissemination of his works. Gogol is frequently read in this way by both his literary histories and scholarly commentaries, who praise the innovation of this narrative strategy. He defied easy classification by his contemporaries: was he a realist or a fantasist? As in reality, he was one and neither — a proto-absurdist-realism-realism or a life-like grotesque realization-realism bracketed by life -like grotesque-realization-realizations. Indeed, as a late 19-century critic, Vasily Rozanov, pointed out, Gogol's realism, rich with detail, always ultimately succumbs to a "phantasmagoric" vision that undermines any straightforward mimetic interpretation of his work. This has resulted in a wealth of interpretations: psychologists or existentialists read Gogol's ghosts and living noses, socio-political critics do also. Analysis: In every case, the role of these devices is one of irony. The unreal is not a method of escape for Gogol; it is a sharper confrontation of reality. He strips away the soft laws of normal life and forces fundamental realities to rise to the surface, even going as far as to make bigotry a literal specter, lies into a farcical activity, and national pride lashing out in the streets in soldier's uniforms.

5. Conclusion

Overall, the works of Nikolai Gogol illustrate the potential of grotesque imagery and satirical technique when combined into a singular, powerful form of social criticism. It is the grotesquerie of his stories — the bizarre scenarios, the warped personalities, the surreal events — that will sometimes pull us in, sometimes make us laugh, but will always unground us and prepare our minds for the rainstorm of critique that is to follow. Next, we turn to satire, the interpretive lens (Gogol's humor is moral humor directed against hypocrisy and pride; empathy for the downtrodden). That blending of the comics and the tragic is part of what makes Gogol's writing have a lasting human power. Gogol is a genius in demonstrating what one scholar notes: that "absurdity is not the exception, but the rule in human affairs." In this way, through the embrace of the grotesque, through making the absurd an "ontological signature" of his fictional world, Gogol could hold us up to the same cracked mirror reality holds us up to, one that magnifies flaws and warps contours, yet also leads to a clearer rendition of reality. The influence of this method can be seen in countless subsequent examples of satire and absurdist literature. As much as Gogol's readers leave laughing over the comic situations he puts his characters in, they must also leave with an uneasy sense that the joke may be on them: the absurd, satirical tools he makes his art from are a distorted mirror to very real social and psychological imperfections that while crazy in his work, are very common when his work is closed. Via grotesque laughter, Gogol compels acknowledgement of those shortcomings—and with that, grounds his distinction as a seminal master and seer of global literature.

REFERENCES

Ботировна , С. О. . (2024). Склонение Имён Существительных. Miasto Przyszłości, 46, 531–535. Retrieved from https://miastoprzyszlosci.com.pl/index.php/mp/article/view/2895

Саидова Олима Ботировна. (2024). КОНЦЕПТ "ЛЮБВИ" В ЛИРИКЕ АЛЕКСАНДР СЕРГЕЕВИЧА ПУШКИНА. МЕДИЦИНА, ПЕДАГОГИКА И ТЕХНОЛОГИЯ: ТЕОРИЯ И ПРАКТИКА, 2(9), 59–66. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13774212

VERB CONJUGATION IN RUSSIAN LANGUAGE. (2024). MEDICINE, PEDAGOGY AND TECHNOLOGY: THEORY AND PRACTICE, 2(5), 197-206. https://universalpublishings.com/index.php/mpttp/article/view/5627

THE IMAGE OF NATURE IN THE WORK OF A.S. PUSHKIN. (2024). MEDICINE, PEDAGOGY AND TECHNOLOGY: THEORY AND PRACTICE, 2(4), 563-573. https://universalpublishings.com/index.php/mpttp/article/view/5222

Саидова Олима Ботировна. (2024). ЗНАЧЕНИЕ ОТЧИЗНА В ТВОРЧЕСТВЕ МИХАИЛ ЮРЬЕВИЧ ЛЕРМОНТОВА. Miasto Przyszłości, 49, 472–475. Retrieved from https://miastoprzyszlosci.com.pl/index.php/mp/article/view/3919

Саидова, О. (2025). ГЛАВНЫЕ ЧЛЕНЫ ПРЕДЛОЖЕНИЯ И СПОСОБЫ ИХ ВЫРАЖЕНИЯ КОТОРЫЕ СОСТАВЛЯЮТ ОСНОВУ ЛЮБОГО ПРЕДЛОЖЕНИЯ. Modern Science and Research, 4(2), 553–558. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/view/65915

Саидова , О. (2025). ОБРАЗ ПРИРОДЫ В ПОЭЗИИ СЕРГЕЯ ЕСЕНИНА. Modern Science and Research, 4(5), 535–538. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/view/87978

Саидова , О. (2025). СЛОЖНОПОДЧИНЁННЫЕ ПРЕДЛОЖЕНИЯ В РУССКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ КЛАССИФИКАЦИЯ И МЕТОДИЧЕСКИЕ АСПЕКТЫ. Modern Science and Research, 4(4), 644–656. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/view/79285

Fayzullaeva, N. (2025). GRAMMATICAL ECONOMY AS EXPRESSING ECONOMY IN THE SYNTACTIC AND MORPHOLOGICAL STRUCTURE OF A LANGUAGE. Modern Science and Research, 4(2), 567–572. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/view/65917

Fayzullayeva, N., & Kamolova, M. (2025). PHONETICS AS THE STUDY OF THE ACTUAL SPEECH SOUNDS THAT CREATE WORDS IN A LANGUAGE. Modern Science and Research, 4(2), 46–52. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/view/65428

Fayzullayeva , N. (2024). Using animation discourse on the cartoon Kung Fu Panda. Medicine, Pedagogy and Technology: Theory and Practice, 2(9), 18–25. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/mpttp/article/view/59340

Surat, F. N. . (2024). DIALOGUE IN THE ANIMATED SERIES "KUNG FU PANDA. JOURNAL OF EDUCATION, ETHICS AND VALUE, 3(4), 202–205. Retrieved from https://jeev.innovascience.uz/index.php/jeev/article/view/624

Fayzullayeva, N. (2024). FEEL THE FREEDOM IN THE WORKS OF WALT WHITMAN. MODERN SCIENCE AND RESEARCH, 3(3), 330–335. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10814469

Fayzullayeva, N. (2024). WALT WHITMAN WORD ABOUT "A CELEBRATION OF THE HUMAN SPIRIT IN POETRY". MODERN SCIENCE AND RESEARCH, 3(3), 336–341. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10814566

Fayzullayeva, N. (2024). WALT WHITMAN AND HIS POEM ABOUT AMERICA. Modern Science and Research, 3(1), 35–39. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/view/28918

Fayzullayeva, N. (2024). "AMERICAN DREAM" IN WALT WITHMAN'S POEMS. Modern Science and Research, 3(1), 220–224. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/view/27940

Fayzullayeva, N. S. qizi . (2023). Theoretical Views on the Use of the Term "Concept" in Cognitive Linguistics. EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF INNOVATION IN NONFORMAL EDUCATION, 3(5), 27–31. Retrieved from https://www.inovatus.es/index.php/ejine/article/view/1685