

## **AvtobiografiЯ**

Journal on Life Writing and the Representation of the Self in Russian Culture

### **Director**

Ulisse Spinnato Vega

### **Editors**

Claudia Criveller (University of Padua, [claudia.criveller@unipd.it](mailto:claudia.criveller@unipd.it))

Andrea Gullotta (University of Palermo, [andrea.gullotta@unipa.it](mailto:andrea.gullotta@unipa.it))

### **Advisory Board**

Marina Balina (Illinois Wesleyan University)

Rodolphe Baudin (Paris-Sorbonne University)

Catherine Depretto (Paris-Sorbonne University)

Evgeny Dobrenko (Ca' Foscari University of Venice)

Lazar Fleishman (Stanford University)

Stefano Garzonio (University of Pisa)

Olga Hasty (Princeton University)

Polly Jones (University of Oxford)

Ilya Kukulkin (Amherst Center for Russian Culture, Amherst College)

Damiano Rebecchini (State University of Milan)

Daniela Rizzi (Ca' Foscari University of Venice)

Stephanie Sandler (Harvard University)

Leona Toker (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem)

Yury Zaretskiy (National Research University – Higher School of Economics, Moscow)

### **Editorial Board**

Stefano Aloe (University of Verona – Editor of the Section “Papers”, [stefano.aloe@univr.it](mailto:stefano.aloe@univr.it))

Daniele Artoni (University of Verona)

Giulia De Florio (University of Parma – Editor of the Section “Materials and Discussions”, [giulia.deflorio@unipr.it](mailto:giulia.deflorio@unipr.it))

Patrizia Deotto (University of Trieste)

Sara Dickinson (University of Genoa)

Giuseppina Giuliano (University of Salerno)

Simone Guagnelli (University of Bari)

Tatiana Kuzovkina (University of Tallinn – Editor of the Section “Materials and Discussions”, [tatjana.kuzovkina@tlu.ee](mailto:tatjana.kuzovkina@tlu.ee))

Francesca Lazzarin (University of Udine)

Claudia Oliveri (University of Catania)  
Bartosz Osiewicz (Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań – Editor of the  
Section “Reviews”, [osiebar@amu.edu.pl](mailto:osiebar@amu.edu.pl))  
James Rann (University of Glasgow)  
Kirill Rogov (University of Bologna)  
Tatiana Saburova (Indiana University, Bloomington)  
Alexandra Smith (University of Edinburgh)  
Josephine von Zitzewitz (Independent Scholar, UK)

### **Managing Editors**

Martina Morabito (University of Padua)  
Chiara Rampazzo (University of Pisa)

Website: [www.avtobiografija.com](http://www.avtobiografija.com)  
Contact: [info@avtobiografija.com](mailto:info@avtobiografija.com)  
Facebook page: <https://www.facebook.com/Avtobiografi%Do%AF-1492404737730803/?fref=ts>  
© 2024 AvtobiografiЯ  
Design and Layout: Adriano Pavan, Samuele Saorin  
Social Media Manager: Attilio Russo  
Cover: Filippo Comuzzi

ISSN: 2281-6992

Università di Padova  
Dipartimento di Studi Linguistici e Letterari  
Via Elisabetta Vendramini 13  
35137 Padova

Registrazione del Tribunale di Padova 23-04-2013, n. 2326 Registro della  
Stampa, Variazione: Tribunale di Padova 27-10-2014, n. 3197 Registro  
della Stampa.

# **AvtobiografiЯ**

*Autobiography of Socialist Trauma– Part 1*

*n. 13/2024*



# **Avtobiografija**

2024, Number 13

*Autobiography of Socialist Trauma – Part 1*

## **Table of Contents**

### **Introduction**

*Claudia Criveller, Andrea Gullotta* 5

### **Special issue**

Introduction: Autobiography of Socialist Trauma  
*Andrea Gullotta* 9

Autobiographies and Soviet Trauma: Ol'ga Adamova-Sliozberg's Case. Preliminary Remarks  
*Simone Guagnelli* 15

The Repressed Body in the Existential Experiences of  
Vasil' Stus  
*Natalia Lebedyntseva* 45

Memoirs of Trauma Halfway Between History and  
Literature: Dragoslav Mihajlović  
*Rosanna Morabito* 67

## Papers

“With Ukraine in the Heart”: From the History of  
Ukrainian Autobiography in the Nineteenth and Early  
Twentieth Centuries

*Tetiana Cherkashyna* 87

Memoria e finzione tra continuità, interruzioni e cesure:  
il (macro)testo-vita nel ciclo pseudoautobiografico  
Legenda o samom sebe di A.M. Remizov

*Maria Teresa Badolati* 119

## Materials and Discussions

Истина это источник. Иван Вырыпаев о себе, своем  
искусстве и имманентной любви

*Giulia De Florio* 141

## Reviews

Wasil Bykau. 2023. Długa droga do domu (Wrocław –  
Wojnowice: KEW)

*Bartosz Osiewicz* 161

Анатолий Панченко (под ред.). 2022. “Ах, скорее бы  
мир!” Письма прапорщика Д. И. Шишакина. 1914–1918  
гг. (Новосибирск: Сибирское отделение Российской  
академии наук, Государственная публичная научно-  
техническая библиотека)

*Jaroslav Golubinov* 167

**Authors** 173



*Autobiography of Socialist Trauma - Part 1*



© Lisa Gaye Crawshaw



Claudia Criveller, Andrea Gullotta

## Introduction to the 13<sup>th</sup> issue of *AvtobiografiЯ*

The thirteenth issue of the journal *AvtobiografiЯ* is devoted to the memory of trauma and its literary expressions within the genres of autobiography, memoir, and autobiographical fiction, offering in this special issue a broad perspective on the evolution of these literary forms in Russian, Serbian, and Ukrainian literatures. The contributions published here explore the dynamics of traumatic memory, conditions of alienation and repression, as well as the modes of transmission and autobiographical representation in contexts of political and cultural oppression. Some features characterizing the examined works are also observable in distinct texts analysed in the 'Papers' section, which focuses on the autobiography genre in Ukrainian literature from the late nineteenth to early twentieth centuries, and on the genre of self-reinvention and myth-making developed in Russian Modernism, particularly in the work of Aleksei Remizov.

A central concept linking these studies is that of 'internal emigration', introduced by Natalia Lebedyntseva. While reconstructing the system of repres-

sion in Ukraine, Lebedyntseva frames this concept as a form of alienation experienced under ostracism, detention, psychiatric isolation, and exile. This form of inward emigration enables individuals to preserve their identity and neutralize external pressures by creating an alternative dimension separated from social reality. Her reflections on the memory process in conditions of social exclusion are built upon the biography of the poet Vasyl' Stus, who spent many years imprisoned. Lebedyntseva highlights how Stus's memory is marked by a pronounced physical and emotional component, linked to bodily perceptions such as odours and pain, contrasting it with a state of 'non-memory' entailing identity loss and non-existence. This condition manifests both in Stus's detention and in exile, the latter also experienced firsthand and constituting a further form of alienation. She argues that incarceration can be understood as an extreme form of 'internal emigration', where soul and body detach from the subject in a psychological dissociation from the surrounding world.

The renunciation of Soviet citizenship and acceptance of exile are interpreted as extreme acts of 'self-immolation', 'self-exile', and 'self-destruction'. In this context, traditional autobiographical narrative and autofiction appear insufficient for representing such painful modes of self-narration, where exile and self-renunciation become founding principles of self-aware existence. The distance from one's existential space, the sensory and emotional absence, lead to a 'wasteland' state of non-existence and sleep are recurring motifs in Stus's work. This notion of distance is revisited in an interview with the playwright Ivan Vyrypaev, conducted by Giulia De Florio for the 'Materials' section, which guides readers through the issue. Vyrypaev stresses that the distance between subject and object, including the distance from the creative process, is not only common—as Lebedyntseva suggests—but essential for achieving awareness, now threatened by forms of unconscious 'liberalism' and transformations induced by artificial intelligence. Lebedyntseva further develops the category of 'memories', understood as processes of emotional self-representation that function as an 'assembly point',

a contact territory bridging past and present, where the memory object is artistically transfigured through the subject's perception. This approach again resonates with Vyrypaev's distinction between source and object, observing how the memory process generates literary creation. Rosanna Morabito's article examines the concentration camp experience in the former Yugoslavia, focusing on the Goli Otok camp and the Serbian writer Dragoslav Mihailović. Morabito demonstrates how traumatic memory acquires a peculiar nature in the absence of consolidated verbal memory, often dissociated and fragmented: sensations experienced during trauma fail to form a coherent narrative and entail temporal and sometimes spatial distance. Mihailović's works often take the form of hybrid narratives where autobiography and historical testimony—typically transmitted orally by former internees and transcribed many years later—overlap. Writing thus becomes a space of denunciation, memory preservation, and trauma reprocessing, offering partial relief and assuming high ethical value. Simone Guagnelli also investigates traumatic memory, focusing on the memorialistic work of Ol'ga Adamova-Sliozberg, an amateur author whose produc-

tion is characterized by the oral genesis of the material and its initial dissemination in samizdat. Guagnelli conducts a philological analysis of different manuscript versions and linguistic choices, tracing the ongoing writing and transformation process in which multiple genres, registers, and narrative levels coexist with precise technique. Tetiana Cherkashyna reconstructs the evolution of autobiography in Ukrainian literature from the late nineteenth century through the early 1920s, with special attention to the period of Ukrainization coinciding with Ukraine's inclusion in the USSR. Although the autobiographical genre developed from classical models and Western influences (Rousseau, Goethe), it became closely linked to the country's major political and nationalist movements during this time. Cherkashyna discusses authors such as Panteleimon Kulish, Mykola Kostomarov, Hanna Barvinok, and Mykhailo Drahomanov, whose autobiographical work in exile integrates the personal dimension with historical and sociopolitical contexts. For entire generations of Ukrainian authors, autobiography assumed a testimonial role, documenting society, civic ideals, and social engagement as evidence of their time.

A different study is presented by Maria Teresa Badolati on Aleksei Remizov. His vast autobiographical corpus is also situated within the space of emigration and similarly, as in Stus's case, comprises hybrid forms—including tales, novels, poems in prose and verse, legends, essays, autobiographies, and dramas—unified by a strong autobiographical imprint. According to Badolati, Remizov's early twentieth-century experimental works surpass widely spread contemporary forms like autofiction, offering unique approaches to myth-making of the self, which Vyrypaev describes as 'unique'. In his interview with Giulia De Florio, Vyrypaev highlights key concepts such as 'structure' and 'word' in his dramaturgical art. He argues that autobiography transcends plot linearity and attains truth through thematic harmony and language, which eternalizes what is fragmentary and ephemeral. This perspective engages directly with reflections on trauma and memory, underscoring language's decisive role in reworking and fixing traumatic autobiographical experiences. In summary, this issue investigates the processes of formation and representation of traumatic memory in autobiographical and memorialistic forms, showing how memory—under conditions

of alienation, exile, and repression—becomes a field of artistic elaboration and identity construction. The dynamics of dissociation, inner exile, and self-renunciation emerge as recurrent and complex elements in these narratives, contributing to

a redefinition of autobiographical writing within extreme historical and political contexts.

**Special issue**



Andrea Gullotta

## Introduction: Autobiography of Socialist Trauma

Introduction to the special cluster Autobiography of Socialist Trauma - Part 1

In his essay ‘My life, several of my lives’ Varlam Shalamov writes:

Стиху надо было отдать судьбу и собственную кровь. Надо писать о своем и по-своему. (Shalamov 2013: 307)<sup>1</sup>

Other than providing an extraordinarily precise insight into Shalamov’s own relationship with his writing, this sentence serves as a monumental slogan for the literature generated by traumatic conditions. Shalamov, a budding poet in his youth, had gone through the ‘meat grinder’: arrested in 1929, he spent a total of 18 years in the Soviet concentration camps, from the Western camps in the Vishera region, to the years spent in atrocious conditions in the Eastern Kolyma, an experience that would eventually define him as a writer and shape his relationship with the word, as explained in the quoted sentence and in several

other essays, written by Shalamov to describe his poetics and make sense of his creative process. His direct experience of repression influenced his literary output not only under a thematic point of view, but also for what concerns his style: both his poems and especially his prose texts were directly impacted by trauma. As preliminary research has shown, his use of repetitions, silences/omissions and switching of tenses – as well as many other stylistic features – can be linked to some of the most typical problems encountered by patients who suffer from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (Gullotta 2021). However, Shalamov was not aware of this condition: his essays devoted to his writing process seem to be the attempt of a writer to understand his writing process in view of the sudden re-emergence of traumatic flashbacks and the physical reactions Shalamov had:

Каждый рассказ, каждая фраза его предварительно прокричана в пустой комнате – я всегда гово-

---

<sup>1</sup> ‘I had to give my destiny and my own blood to poetry. You must write about yourself and in your own way’. Translations in this article are my own – A.G.

рю сам с собой, когда пишу. Кричу, угрожаю, плачу. И слез мне не остановить. Только после, кончая рассказ или часть рассказа, я утираю слезы. (Shalamov 1998: 382)<sup>2</sup>

In addition to this specific aspect – which is shared by other traumatised authors, see for instance the switching of tenses in Primo Levi's *Se questo è un uomo* (Roggia 2018) – the writings of authors who spent a term in the Gulag were influenced by the peculiar nature of Soviet repressions. While (apart from exceptions) the victims of the Holocaust, the Apartheid or other traumatic historical events were repressed because of their belonging to ethnic or political groups opposed to or repressed by state power, the victims of Soviet repression were hit because of their belonging to categories which were identified as enemies by the state regardless of their actions but were unclear to the victims: if we exclude the relatively rare cases of people

---

<sup>2</sup> 'Each tale, each of its sentence is initially shouted out in an empty room – when I write, I always talk to myself. I shout, I threaten, I cry. And I can't stop the tears. Only later, when the tale or part of it is written, I wipe my tears away'.

who were actively fighting against the Revolution and/or the Soviet power (White army officers, Socialist revolutionaries, Trotskyists in their fight against Stalinists in the early stages of the fight for power between the two leaders – indeed, Shalamov was one of them), people were arrested without any clear reason. Railway workers, scholars of Eastern cultures, engineers, foreigners etc. were repressed for reasons unbeknownst to them: while the path of dehumanisation they would undergo was overall similar to that of people repressed in other historical contexts, victims of Soviet repression usually would not have the possibility to rely on their identity (Jewishness, blackness, belonging to political movements and so on) to face the extreme conditions in which they were forced to live.<sup>3</sup> Detached from their environment and relations, humiliated and often tortured or subjected to violence, sent to remote areas

---

<sup>3</sup> There are, of course, exceptions, such as the representatives of political factions opposed to the Bolsheviks like the Socialist revolutionaries – see, in this regard, Olitskaia 1971 – or the members of national communities, such as the Ukrainian women who organised a series of counter-practices of survival based on their national cultural background, as studied by Oksana Kis (Kis 2022).

where they would need to readapt to a completely new reality made of abuses and violences, the victims of Soviet repression would often need to readapt to life, a new life where all their references were annihilated and where they would often live under the rule of *homo homini lupus*, and were therefore often forced to reconstruct their own self in view of the context. When, during detention or after surviving the camps, they tried to describe what happened to them in their memoirs, tales, poems etc., they would need to address a series of common challenges, such as that of negotiating their personal stories (and therefore the image they wanted to keep of themselves in their writing) with the unspeakable (or speakable) experiences they had lived. The very nature of Soviet repression was decisive in shaping their texts: recreating a self on paper after it was destroyed by the authorities and their representatives for no clear reason was a typical trait of all the writings of repressed people. This created a variety of outputs with shared narrative, stylistic and aesthetic choices, which characterise the writing of trauma in the Soviet context. This is why, when considering the shared features of a large number of text which form the vast

corpus of literary texts composed by authors who underwent repression in the Soviet Union, we can speak of a specific 'autobiography of Soviet trauma'.

While it is not possible in this introduction to explain in detail the peculiarities of the 'autobiography of Soviet trauma', it is relevant to underline that such dynamics were at play not only in the Soviet Union. As described by many researches (see for instance Pucci 2020), during or after WWII the countries who eventually formed the so-called Soviet bloc (both those who were included in the Warsaw Pact, and those who aligned to the Non-Aligned Movement) either sent their officials to the USSR to shape their repressive organs, or were formed *in situ* by Soviet officials after the end of the war. This led to the creation of similar repressive systems in the Socialist countries which were based on the Soviet model. While obviously each country with time developed their own repressive systems and had different degrees of intensity of repression, the ideological matrix which informed state repression and some concrete repressive practices were the same in all the socialist countries, from Tito's Yugoslavia to Ceausescu's Romania and so on.

The project *Literature of Socialist Trauma: Mapping and Researching the Lost Page of European Literature* aims to study the literary texts generated by these repressive contexts in the Socialist countries. The aim is to understand whether there is a hidden, transnational and multilingual literary genre in European national literatures based on shared features in literary texts composed in repressive contexts but written in different languages in the former Socialist countries of Central and Eastern Europe. A first set of outputs has highlighted promising lines of research, such as the stylistic and compositional similarity identified between oral poems composed in Yugoslavian and Soviet camps by Hungarian, Russian and Serbian authors (Papp 2024, Dušanić 2024). This special cluster, and the second part which will be published in the 2025 issue, follows up on the first outputs and focuses specifically on issues related to life writing, trying to tackle them from particular angles: Simone Guagnelli's article proposes an innovative philological study of Olga Adamova-Sliozberg's *Put'* [Path] which aims to understand if behind what seem to be delib-

erate authorial choices – as seen in the text's variants – can be indeed identified as aspects related to representational issues of trauma. Natalia Lebedyntseva chooses to work on another terrain, that of the repressed body, analysed in the numerous hypostases proposed by Vasil' Stus in his poetry of trauma. Rosanna Morabito works on Dragoslav Mihailović's memoirs of Goli Otok through the prism of trauma studies, and in particular through Van der Kolk's groundbreaking work on the representation of trauma. This way, these authors – and those whose work will be published in the following issue – move the first steps towards the study of the 'autobiography of Socialist trauma' in European literature.

The research presented in this article was conducted within the framework of the PRIN 2022 PNRR project "Literature of Socialist Trauma:

Mapping and Researching the Lost Page of European Literature (LOST)", ID: P2022Z45X8, CUP: B53D23029360001, Principal Investigator: Andrea Gullotta (University of Palermo). The project was funded by the Italian Ministry of Education, Universities, and Research (MIUR) under the 2022 PRIN PNRR Call for Proposals, Directorial Decree No. 1409 of September 14, 2022. Simone Guagnelli and Rosanna Morabito's articles were translated from Italian into English using the project's funds.

## Bibliography

Dušanić 2024: Dušanić, Dunja. 2024. 'The poetry of Goli Otok', *Kwartalnik Neofilologiczny*, 4 (71), 594-612

Kis 2022: Kis, Oksana. 2022. *Survival as Victory: Ukrainian Women in the Gulag* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)

Gullotta 2021: Gullotta, Andrea. 2021. 'More than a Cat: Reflections on Shalamov's and Solzhenitsyn's Writings through the Perspective of Trauma Studies' in *The Gulag in Writings of Solzhenitsyn and Shalamov: Memory, History, Testimony*, ed. by Fabian Heffermehl and Irina Karlsohn (Leiden: Brill), 70-96

Olitskaia 1971: Olitskaia, Ekaterina. 1971. *Moi vospominaniia* (Frankfurt am Main: Posev)

Papp 2024: Papp, Judit. 2024. 'Hungarian folklore and poetry in the Soviet labor camps', *Kwartalnik Neofilologiczny*, 4 (71), 613-27

Pucci 2020: Pucci, Molly. 2020. *Security Empire: The Secret Police in Communist Eastern Europe* (New Haven: Yale University Press)

Roggia 2018: Roggia, Carlo Enrico. 2018. 'L'indefinito presente: tempo e tempi verbali in *Se questo è un uomo*' in *Le forme dell'analisi testuale: sette letture novecentesche*, ed. by Pietro Benzoni and Dirk Vanden Berghe (Firenze: Franco Cesati), 23-45

Shalamov 1998: Shalamov, Varlam. 1998. *Sobranie sochinenii v 4-kh tomakh, IV: Chetvertaia Vologda, Vishera. Antiroman, Esse. Pis'ma.* (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literature-Vagrius)

Shalamov 2013: Shalamov, Varlam. 2013. *Sobranie sochinenii v 6-i tomakh, IV: Avtobiograficheskaia proza.* (Moscow: Knizhnyi klub kino-veg)

Simone Guagnelli

## Auto-Biographies and Soviet Trauma: The Case of Ol'ga Adamova-Sliozberg. Preliminary Remarks

The present article proposes a first reconstruction of the complex editorial path of Ol'ga Adamova-Sliozberg's memoirs *Put'* [Path]. The ultimate goal of the research is to provide a coherent analytical rendering of the genesis and textual dynamics of the work and to understand whether some authorial and editorial choices may be seen as traces of trauma. Bearing in mind the perspective of trauma – considered here as a potentially useful interpretative key in cases where textual or structural clues can be detected – it is possible to read the cultural documents linked to the memory of Soviet repression also in terms of their linguistic and compositional signals. Thus, the philological work on the texts by authors who underwent repression may help to get a clearer understanding of the relation between trauma and representation in autobiographical works.

In the immense production of memoirs related to personal experience within the repressive Soviet system, the auto / biographical legacy of Ol'ga Adamova-Sliozberg (1902-91)<sup>1</sup> is particularly important from both a cultural and an academic point of view in regards to the analysis of the impact of trauma on literary writing, as it presents a whole range of potentially relevant characteristics, which were indicated several years ago as

being specific of the genre to which it belongs:

The memoirs of the Gulag are an unusual corpus of writings, due to the combination of the autobiographical element, the urgency of the testimony and the effect of the trauma on the narrative: another distinguishing feature is the influence of the clandestine circulation of these texts on the style, which one hopes will be thoroughly investigated (Gullotta 2011: 241).

Having trained as an economist and not destined to become a literary writer, Adamova-

---

<sup>1</sup> A series of contributions of a merely biographical or purely introductory nature have been dedicated to Adamova-Sliozberg – whose testimony is a direct source of historical-literary reconstructions (Solženitsyn 2001, Applebaum 2017) – in Russia and Italy (KorzHAVIN 1993, Magnanini 2004, Fici 2013, Chudakova 2015; Sicari 2019, 2021).

Sliozberg left a relatively circumscribed legacy, both in terms of genre and volume, the whole being reduced, essentially, to memoirs written over a long period of time (*Put'*) [Path], with the first written work dating between 1946 and 1958 (Vilenskii 2001: 253). This text, which began to circulate in samizdat from at least 1956, has been published since 1989 in journals, anthologies or as a book in its own right, in partial, supplemented or 'complete' editions that are not without interesting textual differences, some of which will be assessed in this article (Adamova-Sliozberg 1989, 1993, 2002, 2009, 2012, 2015, 2019; Vilenskii 1989, 2004).<sup>2</sup>

*Put'* is also the title of a small collection of poems 'written' by Adamova-Sliozberg 'in her head' over the course of the twenty or so years of her confinement within the 'zone' (Adamova-Sliozberg 1992, 2001, 2006; Vilenskii 2005, Panikarov et al.

2010, Deriabina et al. 2023) and also partially included within the memoirs which share the same title.

Subsequently, at a time coinciding with the twilight of her existence, the author worked on writing further short memoiristic portraits, dedicated to single members or moments of her family, which were often included as an appendix to the book editions of *Put'* under the comprehensive title of *Rasskazy o moei sem'e* [Tales about my family].

To complete the data of Adamova-Sliozberg's biographical journey, *Put'* (which inevitably focused on the author's fate and, more importantly, on the collective fate of fellow Soviet citizens, and particularly women, between 1935 and 1956) is joined by the author's participation in at least two documentaries dedicated to the collective oral reconstruction of the experience of detention in the Soviet Union (Goldovskaia 1988),<sup>3</sup> and by the

<sup>2</sup> The success of the text, which also inspired theatrical performances (Nepachareva 2004), is illustrated by its translation into several languages: as part of Vilenskii's anthology, in French (Adamova-Sliozberg et al. 1997), English (Vilensky 1999), German (Adamova-Sliozberg 2009), Czech (Babka et al. 2009) and Polish (Wileński 2011); as a book in its own right, in Italian (Adamova-Sliozberg 2003) and English (Adamova-Sliozberg 2011).

<sup>3</sup> The website of Memorial Italia (<https://www.memorial-italia.it/luogo-dogne-luce-muto/>) shows a link to a documentary which can be found on YouTube (<https://youtu.be/8SEOmBeZRWw> [accessed 19 December 2024]), which – as stated there – was curated by Memorial and directed by Daria Chubova. Entitled *...luogo d'ogne luce muto*, it is divided into three episodes ('La collettiviz-

testimony of her relatives, particularly her children Aleksandr Zakgeim and El'ga Silina (Zakgeim 1992, Zakgeim *et al.* 2006, Krugovych 2016, Silina 2020) and great-grandson Fëdor Katasonov (Ivanushkina 2016, Fedor 2018, Gordeeva 2021, Kornii 2022).<sup>4</sup>

---

zazione e la fame 1932-1933'; 'La costruzione del canale Stalin 1932-1937'; '1937'). Adamova-Sliozberg appears in the closing minutes of the third episode (1:49:13 to 1:49:50), recounting 'the episode of the mirror', seen for the first time after four years of confinement, in which she sees her mother's reflection. This anecdote had already been told, albeit in different words, in both Goldovskaia's documentary and in *Put'*.

<sup>4</sup> A defence expert in the deeply controversial and highly unjust trial against Iurii Dmitriev, Katasonov – who spoke at the trial in his capacity as paediatrician – clearly explained how he sees a strong link between the preservation of the memory of the Gulag experienced by his great-grandmother and the authoritarian deviations and political persecution that characterise Russia today: 'В моей бабушкиной книжке есть её подруга по тюрьме Женя Быховская, которая пропадает в какой-то момент, ничего не известно, что с ней стало дальше, и Дмитриев нашёл её в списках. Она расстреляна была в Сандармохе в Соловецком этапе. Поэтому в каком-то смысле Дмитриев связан и со мной, и с моей семьёй, и с нашим преданием. Я не знал, честно говоря, ничего про него до тех пор, пока не началось это дело, и мне позвонил Юра Самодуров, дядюшка мой, и сказал, что в деле ищут экспертов педиатров, которые могут прокомментировать' [In my grand-

This contribution takes the form of a preliminary investigation aimed at probing the possible existence of an implicit traumatic dimension in the writing of Adamova-Sliozberg and, in view of a more articulate and systematic analysis of the phenomenon, it proposes firstly to reconstruct and arrange the complex editorial path – and stratification – revealed by *Put'*, in the conviction that this is a critical step, necessary to achieve a coherent analytical rendering of the genesis and textual dynamics of the work. Bearing in mind the perspective of trauma – not considered here as certain, but as a potentially useful interpretative key in cases where textual or structural clues (such as editorial discontinuities, recurring ellipses, marked stylistic variations or anomalies in the construction of the discourse) can

---

mother's book there is her prison friend Zhenia Bykhovskaia, who disappears at some point; nothing is known about what happened to her afterward, and Dmitriev found her on the lists. She was shot in Sandarmokh, part of the 'Solovki transport'. Therefore, in a way, Dmitriev is connected to me, my family, and our history. Honestly, I didn't know anything about him until this case started, and my uncle, Iura Samodurov, called me and said that the case was looking for pediatric experts who could provide commentary] (Gordeeva 2021). On Sandarmokh and the persecutory court case of Iurii Dmitriev, see Flige 2022.

be detected – it is possible to read the cultural documents linked to the memory of Soviet repression also in terms of their linguistic and compositional signals. Six aspects of particular relevance are identified in the case of the study of Adamova-Sliozberg's written production, all of which are present or can be traced from the text and its context of production: 1) the biography of the author and her family, before, during and after repression; 2) the places and periods of detention, with the corresponding disciplinary conditions; 3) the circumstances and initial aims of the drafting of the writing; 4) the period and the methods actually used for writing; 5) the forms of circulation and reception of the text, from the samizdat versions to the printed editions; 6) the presence of postmemory (Hirsch 2012), understood as transgenerational transmission of trauma.

All these aspects are recognisable in the case in hand, but they will not be treated uniformly: the analysis proposed here focuses particularly on the editorial path and linguistic dynamics of the text. The twofold philological task undertaken here is, on one hand, to investigate certain aspects of the author's gestation and drafting of her memoirs over the years, and, on the

other, to reconstruct the main biographical stages as they emerge from the various forms of self-portrayal that she elaborated. To simplify the identification of printed and archival materials relating to *Put'*, which are useful for biographical reconstruction and the argumentation of textual differences, a table with an indication of the published sources and of the typescripts preserved in the Fund 202 (opis' 1) of the Moscow branch of Memorial is proposed here, with a single corresponding abbreviation:<sup>5</sup>

- DRN: first partial printed edition published in *Druzhba Narodov* (Adamova-Sliozberg 1989).<sup>6</sup>
- VIL-1: first complete printed edition published in the first edition of the anthology edited by Semen Vilenskii, *Dodnes' tiagoteet* [It Still Anguishes Me]; there are 38 chapters plus a

---

<sup>5</sup> The table is limited to materials often cited in this article. For an even more complete reference, please see the final bibliography.

<sup>6</sup> A fragment of *Put'*, entitled 'Iz perezhitogo' [From Lived Experience], was published in *Zvezda* (Adamova-Sliozberg 1990). According to an unpublished typescript by Adamova-Sliozberg's daughter (Silina 2019: 99), whom I thank for sending it to me, individual chapters of the text also have appeared in issue 5 (1990) of *Raduga* and issue 9 (2011) of *Niva*.

short biographical-introductory text by the author dating back to 1988 (Vilenskii 1989).

- VOZ-1: first book edition, edited by the publisher Vozvrashchenie; it consists of 41 chapters (the chapter 'Skelet v shkafu' [A Skeleton in the Closet], found in all other complete printed editions, is missing) plus an introductory text. It is also the first edition that mentions the *Rasskazy o moei sem'e* in the appendix, with seven depictions of family members of anecdotes (*Son* is missing) (Adamova-Sliozberg, 1993);<sup>7</sup>
- VOZ-2: second book edition, edited by the publisher Vozvrashchenie (Adamova-Sliozberg 2002).
- VIL-2: second edition of VIL-1 (Vilenskii 2004).<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> It is also available online on the [vgulage.name](https://vgulage.name) platform (<https://vgulage.name/books/adamova-sliozberg-o-l-put-2/>).

<sup>8</sup> The text is identical to that of VIL-1: 'Первый том «Доднесь тяготееет» выходит вторым изданием. Вносить какие-либо изменения в тексты уже ушедших авторов – а таких абсолютное большинство – мы не посчитали возможным' [The first volume of *Dodnes' tiagoteet* is being released as a second edition. We did not consider it possible to make any changes to the texts of authors who have already passed away – and such are the overwhelming majority] (Vilenskii 2004: 6). The textual references in this contribution are taken from this second edition, availa-

- VOZ-5: fifth book edition, edited by the publisher Vozvrashchenie (Adamova-Sliozberg 2015).
- AST: sixth book edition, edited by the publisher AST (Adamova-Sliozberg 2019).
- DELO-1: 191 typewritten pages containing 36 pieces, plus an introductory text (Delo 1).
- DELO-2: 223 typewritten pages containing 43 pieces, plus an introductory text and two appendices: 'Nadezhda Vasil'evna Grankina' and 'Vstrecha s drugom iunosti' (Delo 2).
- DELO-3: 189 typewritten pages containing 36 pieces, plus an introductory text and two appendices: 'Igor' Adrianovich Khorin' and an untitled text dated 1966 (Delo 3).
- DELO-4: 237 typewritten pages containing 43 pieces, plus an introductory text (Delo 4).
- DELO-5: 227 typewritten pages containing 42 pieces, plus an introductory text (Delo 5).

## Writing And Editing

---

ble online at [imwerden.de](https://imwerden.de/pdf/dodnes_tyagoteet_tom1_2004_ocr.pdf) ([https://imwerden.de/pdf/dodnes\\_tyagoteet\\_tom1\\_2004\\_ocr.pdf](https://imwerden.de/pdf/dodnes_tyagoteet_tom1_2004_ocr.pdf)). An anthological and partial version of the text has also been published on other occasions (Adamova-Sliozberg 1990, Vilenskii 2001).

With regard to the time of genesis and composition of *Put'*, the elements available are sufficient to shed light on some facts. Adamova-Sliozberg began planning her memoirs during the Kazan' period, between the early summer of 1938 and the spring of 1939, but had already started to mentally compose poems in the meantime, some of which would become part of her memoirs. From this point of view, Adamova-Sliozberg's written testimony is situated at the level of 'text 0, a draft elaborated by the subconscious before being written down, a sort of pre-text conceived in the very moment in which the subject experiences the reality that will become the subject of their writing' (Pieralli 2013: 225).

As several later accounts show, Adamova-Sliozberg had begun writing her memoirs (conceptually planned, as she recalls in her book, already at the time of her confinement in Kazan') between 1946 and 1949, after the first release from the camp. Fearing a second arrest, Adamova-Sliozberg had hidden the pages containing the text inside bottles buried in the grounds of her family dacha, but when she returned from the camps for good, the exact location of the hiding place could not be identified, resulting in the permanent loss of

the first draft of the initial chapters of *Put'*, later rewritten from the author's memory. No complete written confirmation of this circumstance by the author herself actually seems to exist, only the account passed on by her family.<sup>9</sup> The author men-

---

<sup>9</sup> 'Начиная с 1946 года, в те три года до ссылки, которые она нелегально прожила в Москве под гнетом непрекращающейся угрозы ареста, она начала писать. Это было без преувеличения смертельно опасно, и мама тайно зарывала написанное в землю на даче. Но сейчас, в 1955 году, зарытые бутылки с листками найти не удалось. Она начала сначала' [She began to write in 1946, during those three years before her exile, which she spent illegally in Moscow under the constant threat of arrest. To write was literally life-threatening, therefore my mother secretly buried what she wrote in the ground at the dacha. But in 1955 the buried bottles with the sheets could not be found. She started again from the beginning] (Zakgeim *et al.* 2006: 59); 'Первый вариант книги она сделала еще в 1946—1949 годах, когда вырвалась с Колымы. Писать о лагерях было большой смелостью, поскольку при освобождении давали подписку о неразглашении, и в любой момент маму могли арестовать повторно. Рукописи мы помещали в бутылки и закапывали на даче. Когда мама вернулась через пять лет после второго ареста, мы ничего не нашли. Но она очень легко все восстановила и дописывала книгу еще 36 лет, до конца жизни' [She made the first version of the book back in 1946–1949, when she escaped from Kolyma. Writing about the camps required great courage, because upon release one had to sign a

tions the concealment of the text in her introduction to VII-2, but makes no reference to the loss of the first originals: 'Отсюда мои записки, начатые еще в 1946 году, не раз зарытые в землю в бутылках и снова вырытые, продолженные в эпоху застоя без надежды увидеть их напечатанными' [Here are my notes, begun back in 1946, repeatedly buried in bottles in the ground and dug up again, continued during the era of Stagnation without any hope of seeing them printed] (Vilenskii 2004: 11). The same consideration can be made with regard to a text from 1990 ('Мне 88 лет' [I am 88 years old], DELO-6: f. 11)<sup>10</sup> in which Adamova-Sliozberg speaks about the beginning of the process of writing the text.

---

secrecy pledge, therefore my mother could have been arrested again at any moment. We placed the manuscripts in bottles and buried them at the dacha. When my mother returned five years after her second arrest, we found nothing. But she very easily restored everything and continued writing the book for another 36 years, until the end of her life] (Silina 2020: 33). This reconstruction has been passed down and preserved through the generations to her great-grandson Fedor Katasonov (Fedor 2018).

<sup>10</sup> The text, originally titled 'Materinskoe gore' [The Grief of a Mother], would later be published in the *Rasskazy o moei sem'e* series under the title 'Deti' [Children].

She mentions the bottles, but makes no reference to no longer being able to locate them and having to rewrite the first chapters from scratch.<sup>11</sup>

Adamova-Sliozberg resumed writing in Karaganda (1954-55), but we do not know exactly what she wrote and until what point she continued her writing

---

<sup>11</sup> 'Я очень рада, что написала о пережитом под живым впечатлением, начав писать еще в 1946 году, освободившись после первого ареста, отсидев в тюрьмах и лагерях восемь лет и проведя два года без права выезда на Колыме. Писала я ночами, дрожа от страха — ведь при освобождении с нас брали подписку о неразглашении. *Утром засовывала написанное в бутылку, запечатывала сургучом и закапывала в землю*' [I am very glad that I wrote about my experiences while they were still vivid, having started writing back in 1946, after being released from my first arrest, having spent eight years in prisons and camps, and two years in Kolyma without the right to leave. I wrote at night, trembling with fear — after all, upon our release we had to sign a pledge of secrecy. *In the morning, I would put what I had written into a bottle, seal it with wax, and bury it in the ground*] (the sentence in italics was deleted when the text was published; DELO-6: f. 11). The purpose of the reconstruction here is not to cast doubt on the truth of the account by Adamova-Sliozberg's relatives, but to emphasise the author's decision not to reveal this episode – far from marginal with regard to the genesis of her writing, at least of the first part of her memoirs – in texts or paratexts attributable to her.

(the only thing we are certain of, as we shall see later, is the composition of the chapter 'Liza'). The second writing period was witnessed by Korzhavin, also in Karaganda at that time 'в некоторой полуссылке' [In some sort of half-exile] ('Мемуары Ольги Львовны Адамовой-Слиозберг я читал одним из первых, по мере их написания' [I was among the first to read the memoirs of Olga Lvovna Adamova-Sliozberg, as they were written]), who confirms that he distributed the text – which had, by then, become to all intents and purposes a samizdat text – in his intellectual circles: 'в 50-е — 60-е годы, я показывал эти мемуары многим профессиональным литераторам' [In the 1950s and 1960s I showed these memoirs to many professional writers] (Korzhavin 1993: 3). Most certainly in 1963 (therefore, in the wake of the publication of *Odin den' Ivana Denisovicha* [One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich], 1962) the 'manuscript' was delivered to the editorial department of the publisher Sovetskii pisatel' (Adamova-Sliozberg 2022: 277) and was reviewed, probably for internal use, positively by Frida Vigdorova (18 November 1963) and the editor-in-chief of the publisher Fedor Koluntsev (27 July 1964). By this time, the

Khrushchevian thaw was coming to an end, and the publication of the text was postponed.

A first, albeit partial, printed version of *Put'* appeared in 1989 in *Druzhba Narodov*. VIL-1, the first 'complete' version (the only one published while the author was still alive) appeared that same year, as the première text of the first edition (published by Sovetskii pisatel') of the anthology *Dodnes' tiagoteet*, edited by Vilenskii. *Vozvrashchenie* published five editions of the book between 1993 and 2015. In 2019, the text was published as a book by Ast. All of the book editions are divided into 42 chapters, with the exception of the first, VOZ-1, which, for reasons unknown to me, lacks the chapter 'Skelet v shkafu' (also included in VIL-1). From 2009 onwards, the editing of the text began to offer the tripartition of the memoirs, maintaining this format until 2019 (1. from the eve of the first arrest to the transfer to Magadan; 2. the entire experience at Kolyma; 3. from the first return to rehabilitation).

Bearing in mind the differences between the various editions, not only in structure but also in content – and particularly between VIL-1, VIL-2 and VOZ-1, VOZ-2, VOZ-5, as will be discussed here – it would be helpful to understand which text should

be considered as the author's final version, especially for the purpose of identifying the linguistic traits that reveal a possible trauma, to be explored in future contributions. It is definitely VII-1, published when Adamova-Sliozberg was still alive. The textual differences and additions in the posthumous book editions are, however, so significant and substantial that they must also be attributed to the drafting process and the will of the author herself, although it is not always clear when they were actually written. We are aware that, at least until mid-July 1991, the author was struggling with the writing of *Rasskazy o moei sem'e*. Certainly, and this is also confirmed by her family, Adamova-Sliozberg rethought and reworked her literary testament until the latter years of her life:

мама увидела опубликованной большую часть написанного и в конце жизни подготовила к печати полную книгу своих воспоминаний [...] До самого конца жизни мама продолжала работать над готовящейся к отдельному изданию книгой. Последние главы написаны в середине июля 1991 года. Через месяц мама с энтузиаз-

мом восприняла крах ГКЧП. А в декабре ее не стало [Mum saw most of what she had written published, and at the end of her life prepared for publication a complete version of her memoirs [...] Until the very end of her life, mum continued to work on the book, which was being prepared for publication as a separate book. The final chapters were written in mid-July 1991. A month later, mum enthusiastically welcomed the collapse of the State Emergency Committee. And in December passed away] (Zakgeim et al. 2006: 59, 61).

A further question concerns the possible differences between the samizdat version, which circulated in the late 1950s and 1960s, and at least VII-1. In my opinion, the samizdat drafts preserved by Memorial – which, according to their description, date back to the late 1980s – already allow some assumptions to be drawn from the paratextual elements produced in the 1960s. I refer both to the two reviews 'for internal use' written for the publisher *Sovetskii pisatel'*, and to the first of two letters written by Solzhenitsyn

to Adamova-Sliozberg on 27 December 1967 (VOZ-2: 280-81). Quite apart from the flattering assessment of the work as a whole, both reviews insist that the author, in view of the printed publication, should have ‘уничтожить хронологический разрыв, заполнить пустоту между главой “Скелет в шкафу” и заключительным куском (1949-й год)’ [eliminated the chronological gap and filled the void between the chapter ‘Skelet v shkafu’ and the final bit (1949)], a sentence which we find extremely interesting and which Vigdorova follows up with an equally valuable completion: ‘Читатель вправе знать, как героиня “Пути” вернулась домой, как сложилась ее жизнь после второго ареста’ [The reader has the right to know how the protagonist of *Put’* returned home and how her life turned out after her second arrest]. This would seem to mean that, until 1964, from the point of view of the narrative, the work stopped at 1949, the second arrest. The indication of the year in brackets in the quotation also refers directly to the chapter entitled ‘1949 god. Kamera No. 105 v Butyrskoi tiur’mе’ [1949. Room n. 105 in the Butyrka Prison], with the title remaining the same for DRN and VIL-1 but then becoming absent, re-

placed by the chapter ‘Povtorny arest’ [Repeated Arrest] (followed by seven other chapters) and narratively developing almost twice the content of the previous version.

Solzhenitsyn’s letter dated 1967 offers us further insights into the editorial process. His reading was particularly attentive and interested in view of his ongoing work on *The Gulag Archipelago*. In addition to his praise of the author, there is a whole series of comments, suggestions, contradictions, clarifications and requests. This series of data enriches our ability to compare the structure of the proto-samizdat edition to the versions printed from the late 1980s onwards. For example, the sentence ‘В Сузда-ле по Вашим датам Вы пробыли 1, а не 2 месяца (10 мая - нач. июня)’ [According to the dates you wrote, you spent 1 month in Suzdal’, not 2 months (May 10 - early June)] tells us that, in the samizdat version in Solzhenitsyn’s possession, the beginning of June is indicated as the *ad quem* termination of the experience in Suzdal’, while in all the versions printed in Russia (including DRN), the date is stated as being 10 July 1939.<sup>12</sup> All

<sup>12</sup> Archival sources and, strangely enough, even translations, partially diverge on this point. The correct ‘10 July’ is found in three versions (DELO-1: f.

the chapters that Solzhenitsyn mentions by title and praises are in the first two parts of the post-humous tripartition (e.g. ‘Basia’ [Basia], ‘Nenavist’ [Envy], ‘Altunin i otlichnaia velikolepnaia ‘Zoloto’ [Altunin and the Amazing Fantastic ‘Zoloto’]). The requests by the author of *The Gulag Archipelago* include the following: ‘Моя личная просьба: если можно — расшифруйте мне такие фамилии: Мария Вартанян, Лиза Цветкова, Женя Соболев (и Петров), Мотья “Эдисончик”’ [I have a personal request: if possible, decipher the following names for me: Maria Vartanian, Liza Tsvetkova, Zhenia Sobol’ (and Petrov), Motia-‘Edisonchik’], which is interesting because only Motia-

---

73, DELO-4: f. 79, DELO-5: f. 79), while in the other two we find ‘10 June’ (DELO-2: f. 74, DELO-3: f. 68). As regards the translations, the French (Adamova-Sliozberg *et al.* 1997: 71) and Italian (Adamova-Sliozberg 2003: 83) versions state June, while the German translation (2009) correctly states July. The French translator, who only had VIL-1 at her disposal, completely omitted the chapter ‘Ania Bublik’ (not only the chapter is absent, the narration is interrupted in the place where the chapter should be and resumes, incoherently, afterwards), while the Italian translator mentions in the introduction (Adamova-Sliozberg 2003: X) that their base version ‘is that of 1989, with some integrations from later editions’, up to VOZ-2.

‘Edisonchik’ and Liza Tsvetkova appear in the various printed editions. Indeed, and this fact is preserved in the author’s typescripts, in the early samizdat versions Adamova-Sliozberg had hidden many of the characters’ real names behind pseudonyms. In this specific case, these are all central figures in the first chapters, relating to the Lubianka and Butyrka prisons. Vartanian (actually Varganian: DELO-2, DELO-3) is Daniĕlian (actually Danielian for DELO-1 – which, however, as usual, corrects the previous Varganian in pen – DELO-4 and DELO-5); Sobol’ (again in DELO-2 and DELO-3, which, however, present a note in the margin certifying the true identity and year of birth as 1898) is Gol’tsman (DELO-1 again presents the correction in pen, while DELO-4 and DELO-5 already state the correct wording); the writer Petrov, Gol’tsman’s husband, is actually Ivan Filipchenko (again DELO-1 makes a correction in pen, DELO-2 and DELO-3 refer to the authentic name in a footnote; DELO-4 and DELO-5 already reveal the real identity). Solzhenitsyn evidently reads an anti-graph of DELO-2 and DELO-3, a version not yet corrected in the margin.

## Rationalised Chronology of 'The Way of the Cross'

Born in Samara, on the River Volga, on 1 August 1902 into a family of Jewish tailors, Adamova-Sliozberg always considered herself alien to any religious sentiment: 'Я — еврейка. Я — человек русской культуры. [...] Еврейского языка не знаю. Религиозность мне чужда' [I am Jewish. I am a person of Russian culture. [...] I do not speak Hebrew. Religiosity is alien to me] (Adamova-Sliozberg 1993: 227). Her mother, Nadezhda Il'inichna (Shneider), a key point of reference for Ol'ga during her worst years, was born in Moscow; her father, Lev Aronovich, born in Smolensk, moved to Moscow at the age of 13. El'ga Silina recalls that:

Мамины предки имели право жить вне черты оседлости и поселились сначала в Москве, но после покушения на царя, в котором участвовал еврей, из Москвы изгнали всех евреев. Так семья Слиозберг оказалась в Самаре, где в 1902 году и родилась моя мама Ольга Львовна [My mother's ancestors had the right to live outside the Pale of Settlement and initially

settled in Moscow, but after the assassination attempt on the Tsar, in which a Jew participated, all Jews were expelled from Moscow. So the Sliozberg family ended up in Samara, where my mother, Olga L'vovna, was born in 1902] (Silina 2020: 28).

From childhood, Adamova-Sliozberg knew about the horrors of the anti-Semitic pogroms of the time of Nicholas II from the stories told by her grandfather Aron. This feeling of fear intensified in 1913 with the Beilis trial: 'Одно из самых страшных впечатлений, повлиявших на мою детскую душу, было "дело Бейлиса"' [One of the most terrible impressions that influenced my soul when I was a child the was 'Beilis affair'] (Adamova-Sliozberg 1993: 254). After finishing school, in 1919 she moved to Moscow, where she attended university and graduated with a degree in Economics. In Moscow she met Iudel' Ruvimovich Zakgeim (neither Iudel' nor Adamova-Sliozberg ever joined the Communist Party) whom she married in 1928 (Vilenskii 2004: 10). Iudel' was born in Vitebsk in 1898 to a very religious family where 'говорили только по-

еврейски' [spoke only Hebrew] (Adamova-Sliozberg 1993: 233).<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> 'Отец был атеистом, но интересовался различными религиями и хорошо в них разбирался, и еще во время обучения его пригласили читать лекции по истории религий' [My father was an atheist, but he was interested in various religions and was well versed in them, and was invited to give lectures on the history of religions already at the time when he was a student] (Silina 2020: 28). Adamova-Sliozberg dedicated one of the sketches in *Rasskazy o moei sem'e* to her first husband's family, focusing particularly on the figure of his father ('Мой свекор Рувим Евсеевич Закгейм был молчаливый еврей, погруженный в священные книги' [My father-in-law, Ruvim Evseevich Zakgeim, was a silent Jew, immersed in sacred books], Adamova-Sliozberg 1993: 251). To prevent his son from attending school on Saturdays, Ruvim Evseevich initially denied Iudel' the chance of enrolling in a Russian institute, until a teacher, realising the boy's talents, convinced his father to do so. Iudel' found Russian hard, especially written Russian. His wife writes: 'Я впоследствии нашла его гимназический табель. По всем предметам 5, по русскому — 2 или 3. Однако года за два он овладел русским языком' [I later found his high school report card. He got 5s in all subjects, but a 2 or 3 in Russian. However, in about two years he had mastered the Russian language] (Adamova-Sliozberg 1993: 233). Their daughter also mentions this aspect: 'Когда выехал из черты оседлости, русского он не знал. Но папа был очень способным, довольно быстро выучил язык и в 1922 году поступил в Академию коммунистического воспитания им. Н. К. Крупской' [When he left the Pale of Settlement, he

In 1925, Iudel' began teaching Notions of political science at the Faculty of Biology at Moscow University and, in around 1931, took the chair of Dialectics of nature, despite not yet having the necessary academic qualification, which he would only acquire in 1935 thanks partly to the help from Adamova-Sliozberg in writing his doctoral dissertation (Adamova-Sliozberg 1993: 234-35; Silina 2020: 229). Passionate about medicine, from 1925 Zakgeim organised a study group on the history of medicine, attended by various doctors and academics (Adamova-Sliozberg 1993: 237). The group would continue to meet with some regularity for about ten years, until Iudel' (along with most of its members) was arrested on 10 March 1936, charged with being part of an organisation preparing an assassination attempt on Stalin.<sup>14</sup> At the time

---

did not know Russian. But Dad was very bright, he learned the language fairly quickly, and in 1922 he entered the Academy of Communist Education 'N.K. Krupskaja' (Silina 2020: 28).

<sup>14</sup> 'Его обвинили в том, что он троцкист-террорист, участвующий в заговоре против Сталина. У них в университете действовал своего рода кружок, где обсуждали политическую ситуацию в стране. Туда входили не только студенты, но и преподаватели' [He was accused of being a Trotskyist terrorist involved in a conspiracy against Stalin. There was a sort of circle

of Zakgeim's arrest, Adamova-Sliozberg was employed at the General Directorate of the leather industry. On 27 April 1936, Adamova-Sliozberg too was arrested, charged with conspiracy against the life of Kaganovich. As her daughter recalls: 'В обвинительном заключении у мамы было написано: "Могла слышать антисоветские разговоры и не донесла", а также что она участвовала в заговоре об убийстве Кагановича' [In my mum's indictment was written: 'She could have overheard anti-Soviet conversations and did not report them', and also that she participated in a conspiracy to assassinate Kaganovich] (Silina 2020: 31). This marked the beginning of the family's long struggle to prevent Adamova-Sliozberg and Iudel's children from being placed in an orphanage as 'children of enemies of the people', and to have custody given, as would indeed happen, first to their grandmother Nadezhda, and later to their aunt Elena.<sup>15</sup> Iudel's agony

---

at the university where they discussed the political situation in the country. It included not only students but also faculty members] (Silina 2020: 29).

<sup>15</sup> All this is told by Adamova-Sliozberg in *Rasskazy o moei sem'e*, particularly in the chapters 'Bor'ba rodnykh za moikh detei' [My Parents' Fight for My Children] and 'Elena L'vovna Sliozberg' (Adamova-Sliozberg 1993: 238-45).

lasted only a few months: while the family received the fateful notification of a sentence of '10 years without the right to correspondence', he was actually shot in Moscow as early as 4 October 1936.

The beginning of Adamova-Sliozberg's way of the cross ('Nachalo krestnogo puti' [The Beginning of the Way of the Cross] is the title of the second chapter of her memoirs) winds through stations whose names and dates (sometimes even times of arrival and departure) are almost always indicated in *Put'* with absolute precision. On the day of her arrest, Adamova-Sliozberg was taken to Lubyanka prison, where she was interrogated three times during her four-month stay, always for sev-

---

Elena, a doctor, was her older sister; her son Vadim, the Dima remembered by Adamova-Sliozberg, is the father of Iurii Samodurov, one of the founders of Memorial (1989) and director of the Sakharov Centre from 1996 to 2008. Samodurov himself recounts his link to Adamova-Sliozberg in a documentary on the history and persecution of Memorial, highlighting how this experience influenced his later choices in the field of dissent (Gol'dentsvaig 2021). Adamova-Sliozberg's Moscow household also included the second of her sisters, Paulina, a singer, married to Vladimir Arkad'evich Tronin. Her younger brother, Mikhail L'vovich, a physicist, was living at the time in Leningrad (Pamiat' n.d.).

eral hours, without ever admitting her guilt. In August 1936, she was transferred to Butyrka prison in Moscow, to cell number 105, where she remained for three months. The trial was scheduled for 15 November, at Lubianka, and lasted about 15 minutes. In the end, Adamova-Sliozberg was sentenced to eight years' imprisonment in strict solitary confinement and a further four years' disqualification from political rights. After two days spent at Lubianka prison, her journey to the Solovki islands began. The train journey and the crossing of the White Sea on a steamer named SLON took four days.

Regarding the date of the next leg of the transfer to Kazan' prison ('В июне 1938 года нас повезли в Казань') [In June 1938 we were taken to Kazan'], the information is only included in VIL-1 and VIL-2 (Vilenskii 2004: 47). The reference is at the end of the 'Solovki' chapter and the transition to the chapter entitled 'Kazanskaia t'urma' [The Prison in Kazan']. If we compare VIL-1 (the first printed version that can be considered sufficiently complete and the only one that is not posthumous) with the book editions, we can see that the former has an additional intermediate chapter ('Ania Bublik'), which is structurally absent

in the book editions, but interpolated in the 'Solovki' chapter, the difference being that, in VOZ-1, the narration is placed at the end of the chapter, whereas in the others, e.g. VOZ-2, VOZ-5 and AST, it is situated within it. These are structurally different versions: this is confirmed by a further chronological fact, dating back to the spring of 1938, when the author-protagonist learns from two prisoners that 'женская тюрьма на Соловках ликвидируется, и всех заключенных перевозят на материк. То же ожидало и нас' [the women's prison on Solovki is being closed and all the prisoners are being transported to the mainland. The same destiny awaited us]. The next sentence ('Я мысленно оглядела полтора года, прожитые на Соловках') [I mentally looked back over the year and a half that I spent on Solovki] is in fact included in VIL-1 and VOZ-1 but – again – absent in VOZ-2, VOZ-5 and AST, which close the chapter with the sentence I quoted, followed by the chapter on Kazan' prison. This creates a clear break, a gap, both chronologically and descriptively (an unusual element in Adamova-Sliozberg's very detailed account), between the two stages. From this point of view, VIL-1 ends the chapter, before the sen-

tence concerning the move to Kazan' 'in June 1938', with the poem 'Bespokoinaia belaia noch' [A Restless White Night] written in two quatrains, which become three in VOZ-1, followed by the episode concerning 'Ania Bublik' (which, as mentioned, forms the next chapter in VIL-1).<sup>16</sup> The poem is also found in VOZ-2, VOZ-5 and AST, but with four quatrains, and is placed in the first third of the 'Solovki' chapter, immediately after the reflection, almost identically present in the various versions, during sleepless nights,

---

<sup>16</sup> Of the first five *dela* (the most complete) in Memorial's archives of Adamova-Sliozberg, only in one case (DELO-1: f. 55) is there an indication of the date of transfer to Kazan', recorded, however, at the beginning of the chapter 'Kazanskaia t'iurma' together with the poem (including the title, 'Bessonitsa' [Insomnia]) in six quatrains. In particular, only three (DELO-2, DELO-4, DELO-5) contain the chapter 'Ania Bublik' and only two others (DELO-4, DELO-5) mention the poem 'Bespokoinaia belaia noch' (in both cases in six quatrains). 'Bessonitsa', 'mentally composed' at Solovki in 1937, is found in the book of poems (Adamova-Sliozberg 1992: 14-15) in six quatrains, but with a first verse that is slightly different from all the editions of the memoirs ("Solovetskaia belaia noch"). Compared to the booklet of poetry, the quatrains in VIL-1 are the first and the fourth, with VOZ-1 containing the first, fourth and sixth, and VOZ-2, VOZ-5 and AST containing the first, fourth, fifth and sixth.

on how 'можно управлять мыслями: одни пускать, другие гнать. Можно не вспоминать, не жалеть, не терзаться чувством вины перед собой, перед мужем, перед матерью за то, что *недоделала что-то*, кого-то обидела, мало любила, мало жалела. Можно... Но очень трудно' [you can control your thoughts: let some in, drive others away. You can stop remembering, stop regretting, stop being tormented by guilt towards yourself, towards your husband, towards your mother *for not having finished something*, for having offended someone, for not having loved enough, for not having pitied enough. You can... But it's very difficult].<sup>17</sup> All this suggests that,

---

<sup>17</sup> The italics in the sentence are my own: they indicate a verb that is missing in VIL-1, only appearing from VOZ-1. In addition to the sentence quoted by me in the text, VIL-1 and VOZ-3 include, with respect to VOZ-2, VOZ-5 and AST: 'После *такой* ночи я вставала, как избитая, и входила в норму только после часа гимнастики перед открытым окном' [After *such* a night, I would wake up feeling beaten and only get back to normal after an hour of gymnastics in front of an open window] (the italics are my own). In all the archival editions, both the verb and the following sentence are present, but in one case (DELO-1: f. 48) the verb is deleted, while *takoi* is added in pen; the latter is absent in two versions of the text (DELO-2: f. 50, DELO-3: f. 45) but found in the remaining ones (DELO-4: f. 51, DE-

from VOZ-2 onwards, there was also a substantial editorial intervention in the structure of the work, while the differences between VIL-1 and VOZ-1 might still have been partly introduced by Adamova-Sliozberg or accepted by her.

Returning to the chronology of the ordeal, according to what can be reconstructed from the author's text, Adamova-Sliozberg spent just over ten months in Kazan' prison. She began her transfer by train, with other female prisoners, to Vladimir prison on 10 May 1939, arriving the following day, to be immediately taken on an open truck to Suzdal' prison. She spent two months there and, on

---

LO-5: f. 51). It should be noted that, immediately after the arrest in 1936, the dominant thought that had plagued the author like a sense of guilt had been precisely the idea of having left something unfinished ('Что-то я не доделала') [not having finished something] and being incapable of precisely defining the missing action ('Нет, не то... Что-то еще я не сделала...') [No, not that... I have not done something yet], immediately after leaving and walking out of the house (corresponding to the threshold between a before and an after, which is typical of a trauma: 'Всё. Отрезана жизнь. Я одна против огромной машины, страшной, злой машины, которая хочет меня уничтожить') [That's it. Life is cut off. I'm alone against a huge machine, a terrible, evil machine that wants to destroy me].

10 July 1939, the final transfer to Kolyma began for her and her group (first on a closed truck and then, after a night spent back at Vladimir prison, on a *teplushka* to the 'east'). On 14 August 1939<sup>18</sup> the prisoners arrived at the sorting centre in Vladivostok,<sup>19</sup> ending up at the

---

<sup>18</sup> 16 August, according to VIL-1 and VIL-4 (Vilenskii 2004: 64). Archive findings present: '14 August' (DELO-4: f. 84, DELO-5: f. 84), '14 July' (DELO-2: f. 78, DELO-3: f. 73); the first (DELO-1: f. 79), which is presumably the antigraph of VIL-1, corrects the previous '14 July' to '16 August' in ink.

<sup>19</sup> The author, who also mentions a day's stopover spent 'в Свердловске или в Иркутске' [in Sverdlovsk or in Irkutsk], not only indicates the dates of the beginning and end of the transfer (10 July to 14 August 1939), but also establishes the duration of the journey as 34 days. Regardless of the accuracy or otherwise of the calculations (in the following chapter the author speaks, for example, of four years spent in prison at the time of her arrival in Vladivostok, an indication that is understandably conventional and vague, considering that three years and 109 days had passed since her arrest on 27 April 1936), it is worth pointing out here that the precision with which the author wishes to indicate the number of days, sometimes hours, and the exact transcription of dates and times of certain key events, deserves a separate debate in the assessment of the symptoms of trauma; these are all indicative not so much of how memory works, but of the use of memory made by Adamova-Sliozberg during the years of repression, probably with a view to the later drafting of her text.

women's labour camp in El'gen (Dal'stroi). Adamova-Sliozberg was released on 27 April 1944 (exactly eight years after her arrest), but with the obligation of perpetual confinement at Kolyma.

Meanwhile, Adamova-Sliozberg 'learned of her husband's shooting and found the support of a good man, Nikolai Adamov [...] who was also confined after finishing serving his sentence' (Fici 2013: 65). The chapter, of the same name, dedicated to Adamov, is among those that, in terms of structure and content, present an overall difference between VIL-1 on one hand and VOZ-1, VOZ-2, VOZ-5 and AST on the other. In short, in VIL-1, the chapter on Adamov is preceded by the chapter 'Verochka' (which is that immediately after in the book editions) and in a greatly abridged version.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Adamov, the son of a miner from Donbass, a refined intellectual – as Adamova-Sliozberg describes him – had graduated in veterinary medicine in 1927 and was arrested in 1935 for speaking out against Stalin, serving a five-year sentence (from 1937) in Magadan, at the terrible 'Serpentinka' prison camp. Having served his sentence, Adamov worked in Iagodnoe, in the Magadan region, at a freight depot (of which he became the manager), where Adamova-Sliozberg also found employment as a bookkeeper soon after her release.

In VIL-1, the narration of the events of this specific period is substantially interrupted here (with the author going on to inform us that, after living with Adamov for two years, 'В 1946 году благодаря хлопотам моих родных мне разрешили уехать с Колымы' [In 1946, thanks to the efforts of my relatives, I was allowed to leave Kolyma], Vilen'skii 2004: 106), while it is particularly detailed in VOZ-1, VOZ-2, VOZ-5 and AST, but without specifying the dates and places that had characterised the first part of the narrative. Adamov is then transferred to Burkhala ('в 60 километрах от Ягодного') [60 kilometres away from Iagodnoe], while Adamova-Sliozberg begins teaching Russian literature courses ('Больше всего на свете я люблю русскую литературу' [I love Russian literature more than anything in the world], Adamova-Sliozberg 1993: 227)<sup>21</sup> at a school for adults in Iagodnoe attended by employees of the NKVD ('Я даже не подозревала, что в

---

<sup>21</sup> A love of reading and of Russian literature in general is present throughout the book, forming one of its main threads. As her daughter would state years later: 'Мама очень любила литературу, не могла жить без книг' [Mum loved literature very much. she couldn't live without books] (Silina 2020: 32).

России взрослые люди могут быть такими неграмотными') [I didn't even suspect that adults in Russia could be so illiterate]. In 1944, he is forced to leave Iagodnoe for having spoken in class about the interest of the 'Germans' Marx and Engels in Russian literature. Adamov and Adamova-Sliozberg then decide to get married and moved to Burkhala together.

Meanwhile, in Moscow, Adamova-Sliozberg's brother Mikhail mobilises his connections to promote his sister's return. She travels to Magadan to get close to Nikishov, director of the Dal'stroi of Kolyma. The arduous journey proves fruitless and Adamova-Sliozberg has to turn back. Later, however, she manages to obtain permission from Nikishov to go to Moscow for a fortnight, after which she is to 'уехать куда-нибудь километров за 200–250 от Москвы' [go somewhere 200–250 kilometres from Moscow]. She leaves Kolyma at the beginning of July 1946,<sup>22</sup> setting out on a journey

---

<sup>22</sup> 'В начале июля 1946 года я выехала с Колымы' [At the beginning of July 1946, I left Kolyma] are the opening words of the chapter 'Vozvrashchenie' [The Return] in VOZ-1, VOZ-2, VOZ-5 and AST, but no precise date is given in VIL-1 (which indicates a more vague 'В 1946 году благодаря хлопотам моих родных мне разрешили уехать с Колымы' [In 1946, thanks to the efforts

---

of my relatives, I was allowed to leave Kolyma] at the end of the previous chapter, Vilenskii 2004: 106). In this respect, it is interesting that all the typescripts kept in the archives mention the precise date of '31 August' (DELO-1: f. 140 – but with a pencilled correction changing the month to 'June' – DELO-2: f. 160, DELO-3: 132, DELO-4: f. 167, DELO-5: f. 161). Further on in the same chapter, it is interesting to note that, in the sentence 'После дачи мы переехали в город, в квартиру на Петровке, где я до замужества прожила шестнадцать лет' [After the dacha, we moved to the city, to an apartment on Petrovka, where I lived for sixteen years before getting married] (Adamova-Sliozberg 2019: 221), the part written by me in italics, has been changed to 'до ареста' [before arrest] in VIL-1 (Vilenskii 2004: 109), in VOZ-1 it is missing ('где я прожила шестнадцать лет' [where I lived for sixteen years]; Adamova-Sliozberg 1993: 168) and only from VOZ-2 onwards does it assume its final and correct form (Adamova-Sliozberg 2002). If we turn our attention to the author's typescripts, the matter becomes more complicated, because while in two cases we have the simplified sentence ('где я прожила шестнадцать лет' [where I lived 16 years]; DELO-4: f. 172, DELO-5: f. 166), yet another variant is found in the other three ('где я прожила с семнадцати лет и до ареста, т.е. шестнадцать лет' [where I lived from when I was 17 to the moment of my arrest, a total of 16 years]: DELO-1: ff. 142-14, but included in the next chapter, 'Nikolai Vasil'evich Adamov'; DELO-2: f. 164, DELO-3: f. 136). Considering that the house on Petrovka, where she had lived until her marriage, was her parents' house – and definitely not the one where she had lived from the age of 17 until her arrest, which took place in the house where

that will last a month; Sliozberg's indications turn out to be exact: 'шесть дней паромом, девятнадцать дней поездом, да еще ждали пять дней в порту Находка, пока сформируют эшелон' [six days by ship, *nineteen* days by train, and then we waited *five* days in the port of Nakhodka for the train to be formed] (the italics are my own). On 6 August, she is in Moscow; from there she travels to the family dacha in Zagorianka (30 kilometres north-east of Moscow) to meet her mother and children. Despite being banned from staying in Moscow, she spends three years practically living at her parents' house at 26 Petrovka Street: 'Самое удивительное, что я прожила в Москве на Петровке три года и на меня никто не донес, хотя о моем существовании знали десятки людей. Все эти три года я жила в непрерывном страхе' [The most amazing thing is that I lived in Moscow on Petrovka for three years and no one reported

---

she and her husband lived on Novaia Bozhedomka Street (Pamiat' n.d.), now Dostoevskii Street (Shmukler 2017) –, it almost seems as if the memory of the past before the trauma has become blurred, as if the author struggles to distinguish the phases, the life lived in her parents' house and the one with her first husband where they were both arrested.

me, even though dozens of people knew about my presence there. I lived in constant fear for all those three years].

Adamova-Sliozberg was arrested a second time on 29 August 1949 as a 'repeat offender'<sup>23</sup> and was taken to Malaia Lubianka prison. At the end of October she was transferred again to cell number 105 at Butyrka prison, the same cell where she had been imprisoned after the first arrest. Her deportation began in mid-December, on a *Stolypin* wagon, to Kazakhstan, stopping in Kuibyshev for about a month. From there, 'в ранних сумерках январского дня' [in the early twilight of a January day], on a freight wagon, at a temperature of minus 30, the female prisoners spent 16 days travelling to Karaganda ('Ехали до Караганды мы шестнадцать дней') [It took us sixteen days to get to Karaganda]. Chapter 'V ssylke' [In Exile], covering the deportation to Karaganda, presents very different wording from VIL-1 and VOZ-1, VOZ-2, VOZ-5 and AST, but with important details

---

<sup>23</sup> Shortly before, she had also been joined in Moscow by Nikolai, an element that is omitted from almost all the typescripts. While, in VIL-1, the purchase of the tickets to leave Moscow on 30 August 1949 is still attributed to Adamova-Sliozberg, in VOZ-1 it is already attributed to Adamov.

and dates from a biographical point of view and as regards the rendering of memory through writing, which can be found in both accounts. The narrative presented in VIL-1 is particularly brief, but provides, for instance, the date of Nikolai Adamov's arrival in Karaganda, indicating it as April 1949 ('В апреле 1949 года ко мне в Караганду приехал мой муж Николай Васильевич Адамов' [In April 1949 my husband Nikolai Vasilevich Adamov came to visit me in Karaganda], Vilenskii 2004: 123). This date is highly unlikely because, according to the timeline that she herself, as we have seen, reported for this journey, she would have arrived in Karaganda no earlier than January-February 1950; indeed, VOZ-1, VOZ-2, VOZ-5 and AST make no mention of the date of Adamov's arrival. They do, however, preserve the memory of the fact that 'Летом на каникулы к нам приезжали мои дети' [My children came to visit us during the summer holidays], something which is not present in VIL-1.<sup>24</sup> Similarly, we know from the book editions of

---

<sup>24</sup> The element does not seem to be present even in the typescripts preserved by Memorial. It can be assumed that Adamov arrived in Karaganda in April 1950 and that Adamova-Sliozberg's children visited in the summer of the same year.

her life in Karaganda, of her employment as a seamstress ('ведь всё же я дочь портных') [after all, I am the daughter of tailors] and of her close friendship with Ėmka Mandel' (Naum Korzhavin), Aleksandr Esenin-Vol'pin, Valeriia Gerlin (who had shared a cell with Adamova-Sliozberg at Butyrka prison in 1949) and Iurii Aikhenval'd.<sup>25</sup> Nikolai Adamov was arrested again on 29 April 1951. At the end of 1954<sup>26</sup> (in the meantime, of course, the busi-

---

<sup>25</sup> See the recollections of Adamova-Sliozberg's children in this regard (Zakgeim et al. 2006: 59-60) and an article devoted to Esenin-Vol'pin's Karaganda period (Gross 2022: 1337-38).

<sup>26</sup> The information is present only in VIL-1, VIL-4 and in all the *dela* in the archive. The *dela* do not, however, indicate Dzhezkazgan as the destination, but Moscow ('Наконец, в конце 1954 года с меня тоже сняли ссылку, и я поехала хлопотать в Москву') [Finally, at the end of 1954, my exile was also lifted, and I went to Moscow to petition]. Another difference between VIL-1, VIL-4 and the *dela* on one hand and VOZ-1, VOZ-2, VOZ-5 and AST on the other is that, in the former, the information is placed at the beginning of the chapter 'Reabilitatsiia', while, in the latter, it is in the chapter entitled 'Nikolai Adamov. Konets puti'. DELO-1, as usual, is particularly interesting because it always presents corrections in ink, made by the author herself, after Vilenskii's revision. In this case, first the clarification is made (in italics in the quotation) that 'в начале 1955 я поехала хлопотать в Москву' [At the beginning of

ness with the doctors had broken out and Stalin had died, all these events being detailed in the various editions of *Put'*) she is released from her sentence of perpetual confinement and leaves for Dzhezkazgan, and the prison camp where Adamov is being held. Three years of imprisonment have left him very old and he has become ill with tuberculosis. Adamova-Sliozberg spends a week with him and obtains permission to take him to Karaganda.

It is at this point in the narrative that VOZ-1, VOZ-2, VOZ-5 and AST offer, as opposed to VIL-1, an important element regarding the stages of the writing of Adamova-Sliozberg's memoirs, that 'В этот период в Караганде я вновь начала писать свои воспоминания, прерванные вторым арестом' [During this period in Karaganda, I resumed writing my memoirs, interrupted by the second arrest] (Adamova-Sliozberg 1993: 219). In particular, the author says that she finished the chapter 'Liza' there, narrating the period of her imprisonment in Kazan' (between June 1938 and 10 May

1939) and that she read it to Adamov (Adamova-Sliozberg 1993: 282).

In 1955, Adamova-Sliozberg leaves for Moscow and Adamov travels to Voronezh, both to obtain rehabilitation. Adamov subsequently visits Adamova-Sliozberg in Moscow several times, but without ever managing to actually fit into his wife's circle and family ('в нашей семье он не мог найти себя. Он был чужой в моей среде и остро чувствовал это' [He couldn't find himself in our family. He was a stranger in my environment and felt it acutely], Adamova-Sliozberg 1993: 220). They decide to live separately, writing and meeting from time to time, until Adamova-Sliozberg receives the news of Adamov's death in 1964 (Adamov n.d.).

Adamova-Sliozberg was finally rehabilitated on 6 June 1956; twenty years and forty-one days after her arrest on 27 April 1936, as she herself writes. She died in Moscow on 9 December 1991 (16 days before the end of the USSR), while still working on her memoirs.<sup>27</sup>

---

1955, I went to Moscow to petition] and then both statements are deleted, leaving simply 'Наконец, в конце 1954 года с меня тоже сняли ссылку' [Finally, at the end of 1954, my exile was also lifted] (DELO-1: f. 186).

---

<sup>27</sup> *Rasskazy o moei sem'e* contains precise elements in this sense: 'Первого августа 1991 года мне должно исполниться восемьдесят девять лет. Это будет через две недели' [I'm supposed to be 89 on August 1, 1991. That's in two

## Conclusions

The investigation carried out in the present study has offered a first systematic reconnaissance of the process of writing, transmission and transformation of Ol'ga Adamova-Sliozberg's collection of memoirs, in the conviction that the comparison between typescript (*samizdat*) and printed versions, starting from the complex editorial stratification of the work, is a necessary prerequisite for a philological analysis that can lead to a symptomatic identification and reading of trauma in writing.

The editorial variants, which are evident from this first comparison between typescripts and printed texts, reveal a work in constant evolution, in which testimonial impulse and documentary intention intersect with conscious narrative and compositional choices that cannot be dismissed as purely 'spontaneous' or 'non-literary'. On the contrary, we find elements that invite us to consider *Put'* as a hybrid textual object, in which the author – despite having no literary training – demonstrates a growing awareness of the testimonial and documentary value

---

*weeks*] (Adamova-Sliozberg 2015: 257; the italics in the quote are my own).

of her writing, so much so that she picks up the material again, corrects it, rewrites and expands it until just a few months before her death.

The polyphonic nature of the collection – understood as the coexistence of different genres, registers and testimonial levels – reflects the complexity of Adamova-Sliozberg's memoirs, which consist of a network of texts and paratexts, direct and indirect voices, poetic fragments and biographical reconstructions, published and archival materials. This structure is not the product of a narrative construction planned according to standard literary models, but the stratified outcome of an expressive need that evolves over time. The body of material, constantly expanded and revised, bears witness not only to a stubborn desire to remember and to make others remember, but also to an arduous path of re-processing trauma, which is sedimented in the very form of the text. In this perspective, *Put'* should be read not only as a memory of survival, but as a field of linguistic and narrative investigation, the analysis of which requires attentive comparative and historically situated reading.

In this context, it is essential to bear in mind that all book editions of the work are posthu-

mous, and that their variants – while probably based on materials drafted or approved by the author – require caution in attributing conclusive authority to a single edition. Indeed, the only complete version published in Adamova-Sliozberg’s lifetime is VII-1, which is an indispensable point of reference, especially in the light of the unpublished samizdat drafts, the complete comparison of which represents a further step to be taken to fully identify the telltale scriptural signs of the possible trauma experienced by the author.

The research presented in this article was conducted within the framework of the PRIN 2022 PNRR project “Literature of Socialist Trauma: Mapping and Researching the Lost Page of European Literature (LOST)”, ID: P2022Z45X8, CUP: B53D23029360001, Principal Investigator: Andrea Gullotta (University of Palermo). The project was funded by the Italian Ministry of Education, Universities, and Research (MIUR) under the 2022 PRIN PNRR Call for Proposals, Directorial Decree No. 1409 of September 14, 2022.

## Bibliography

Adamov, n.d.: 'Adamov Nikolai Vasil'evich'. n.d. [https://ru.openlist.wiki/Адамов\\_Николай\\_Васильевич\\_\(1902\)](https://ru.openlist.wiki/Адамов_Николай_Васильевич_(1902)) [accessed 19 December 2024].

Adamova-Sliozberg, n.d.: 'Adamova-Sliozberg Ol'ga L'vovna'. n.d., <https://vgulage.name/authors/adamova-sliozberg-olga-lvovna/> [accessed 19 dicembre 2024].

Adamova-Sliozberg 1989: Adamova-Sliozberg, Ol'ga. 1989. 'Put', *Druzhba Narodov*, 7: 60-104.

Adamova-Sliozberg 1990: Adamova-Sliozberg, Ol'ga. 1990. 'Iz perezhitogo', *Zvezda*, 7: 131-41.

Adamova-Sliozberg 1992: Adamova-Sliozberg, Ol'ga. 1992. *Put'* [stikhi] (Moskva: Vozvrashchenie).

Adamova-Sliozberg, 1993: Adamova-Sliozberg, Ol'ga. 1993. *Put'* (Moskva: Vozvrashchenie).

Adamova-Sliozberg *et al.* 1997: Adamova-Sliozberg, Ol'ga. 1997. 'Le Long Chemin', in *L'aujourd'hui blessé* (Lagrasse: Éditions Verdier), 13-160.

Adamova-Sliozberg 2001: Adamova-Sliozberg, Ol'ga. 2001. 'Den' rozhdeniia; My idem iz Bani; V étape; Pesnia; Zavist', in *Gody besko-nechnye mgnovennye...: stikhi uznits gulaga*, ed. by Zaiara Veselaia (Moskva: Vozvrashchenie), 13-18.

Adamova-Sliozberg 2002: Adamova-Sliozberg, Ol'ga. 2002. *Put'* (Moskva: Vozvrashchenie).

Adamova-Sliozberg 2003: Adamova-Sliozberg, Ol'ga. 2003. *Il mio cammino 1936-1956. Giorno dopo giorno, il drammatico racconto in prima persona di una donna internata nei gulag staliniani*, (Firenze: Le Lettere).

Adamova-Sliozberg 2006: Adamova-Sliozberg, Ol'ga. 2006. 'Iz knigi *Put'*', in "*V Belom more krasnyi SLON...*": *vospominaniia uznikov Solovetskogo lageria osobogo naznacheniiia i literatura o nem*, ed. by Maiia Babicheva (Moskva: Pashkov dom), 35-46.

Adamova-Sliozberg 2009: Adamova-Sliozberg, Ol'ga. 2009. *Put'* (Moskva: Vozvrashchenie).

Adamova-Sliozberg 2011: Adamova-Sliozberg, Olga. 2011. *My Journey: How One Woman Survived Stalin's Gulag* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press).

Adamova-Sliozberg 2012: Adamova-Sliozberg, Ol'ga. 2012. *Put'* (Moskva: Vozvrashchenie).

Adamova-Sliozberg 2015: Adamova-Sliozberg, Ol'ga. 2015. *Put'* (Moskva: Vozvrashchenie).

Adamova-Sliozberg 2019: Adamova-Sliozberg, Ol'ga. 2019. *Put'* (Moskva: Ast).

Adamowa-Sliosberg 2009: Adamowa-Sliosberg, Olga. 2009. *Mein Weg*, in *Weggersperrt. Frauen im Gulag*, ed. by Nina Kasmn (Karl Dietz Verlag: Berlin), 11-117.

Applebaum 2017: Applebaum, Anne. 2017. *Gulag. Storia dei campi di concentramento sovietici* (Mondadori: Milano).

Babka *et al.* 2009: Babka, Lukáš and Bzonková, Radka (ed. by). 2009. *Jen jeden osud. Antologie sovětské lágrové prózy* (Praha: Academia).

Chudakova 2015: Chudakova, Marietta. 2015. 'Svidetel'stvo o prestuplenii i zalog nadezhdy', in Ol'ga Adamova-Sliozberg, *Put'*, (Moskva: Vozvrashchenie), 5-12.

Deriabina *et al.* 2023: Deriabina, Evgeniia and Ani Petrs-Bartsumian (ed. by). 2023. *Uznitsy gulaga: poeziia kak forma soprotivleniia* (no publisher, no place of publication).

Fici 2013: Fici, Francesca. 2013. 'Olga Adamova-Sliozberg. Per non dimenticare', *DEP. Deportate, esuli, profughe*, 22: 62-68.

Fedor 2018: 'Fëdor Katasonov rasskazyvaet o knige Ol'gi Adamovoi-Sliozber *Put'*'. 2018. <https://youtu.be/jqbsgyiniwo> [accessed 19 December 2024].

Flige 2022 Flige, Irina. 2022. *Il caso Sandarmoch. La Russia e la persecuzione della memoria* (Bari: Stilo).

Garskova *et al.* 2019: Garskova, Irina and Simonzhenkova, Ekaterina. 2019. 'O formalizovannoi metodike analiza kompleksov memuar-nykh istochnikov', *Istoricheskaiia informatika*, 1: 169-88.

Gol'dentsvaig 2021: Gol'dentsvaig, Konstantin. 2021. *Zachistka pamiati. Dokumetal'nyi fil'm* (Russia: Dozhd' tvrain).

Goldovskaia 1988: Goldovskaia, Marina. 1988. *Vlast' Solovetskaia. Svidetel'stva i dokumenty. Dokumetal'nyi fil'm* (Moskva: Mosfil'm).

Gordeeva 2021: Gordeeva, Katerina. 2021. "Fëdor Katasonov: 'Nakazaniia Bespolezny. Voobshche'", <https://www.youtube.com/watch?V=hriwnah-F24> [accessed 19 December 2024].

Gross 2022: Gross, Andrei. 2022. 'Ssylka v Karagandu v 1950-1953 gg: sluchai Aleksandra Esenina-Vol'pina', *Historia provinciae – zhurnal regional'noi istorii*, VI, 4: 1323-65.

Gullotta 2011: Gullotta, Andrea. 2011. 'Il samizdat e il tema della repressione sovietica: una ricostruzione storica tra criticità e punti di domanda', *eSamizdat*, VIII (2010-2011): 239-46.

Hignett *et al.* 2018: Hignett, Kelly, Ilic, Melanie, Leinarte, Dalia and Corin Snitar (ed. by). 2018. *Woman's Experience of Repression in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe* (New York: Routledge).

Hirsch 2012: Hirsch, Marianne. 2012. *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture After the Holocaust* (New York: Columbia University Press).

Hutton 2015: Hutton, Marcelline. 2015. *Resilient Russian Women in the 1920s and 1930s* (Lincoln: Zea books, University of Nebraska).

Igrunov 2005: Igrunov, Viacheslav. 2005. 'Adamova-Sliozberg Ol'ga L'vovna (1902-1991)', in *Antologija samizdata. Nepodtsenzurnaia literatura v SSSR, 1950-e – 1980-e*, ed. by Viacheslav Igrunov, I, 1 (Moskva: Mezhdunarodnyi institut gumanitarno-politicheskikh issledovanii), 387.

Ivanushkina 2016: Ivanushkina, Polina. 2016. 'Delo vracha Katasonova', <https://takiedela.ru/2019/04/delo-vracha-katasonova/> [accessed 19 December 2024].

Jurgenson 2016: Jurgenson, Ljuba. 2016. 'La testimonianza letteraria come fonte storica: il caso della letteratura dei gulag', *LEA - Lingue e letterature d'Oriente e d'Occidente*, 5: 267-83.

Korni 2022: 'Korni voini – v tom, chto u nas priniato bit' detei'. 2022. <https://holod.media/2022/04/23/katasonov/> [accessed 22 August 2024].

Korzhavin 1993: Korzhavin, Naum. 1993. 'S chelovecheskoi tochki zreniia', in Ol'ga Adamova-Sliozberg, *Put'*, (Moskva: Vozvrashchenie), 3-4.

Krugovych 2016: Krugovych, Taisiia. 2016. 'Ee sviataia obiazannost' napisat', chto s neiu bylo', Film, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d03gIM8CrCg> (Moskva: Studiia vizual'noi antropologii Muzeia istorii GULAGa) [accessed 19 December 2024].

Magnanini 2004: Magnanini, Emilia. 2004. 'Olga Adamova-Sliozberg, Il mio cammino', recensione, *DEP. Deportate, esuli, profughe*, 1: 173-76.

Magnanini 2005: Magnanini, Emilia. 2005. 'Abbi fiducia nell'alba, non nel dolore'. L'esperienza della deportazione nelle memorie delle recluse nei campi sovietici', *DEP. Deportate, esuli, profughe*, 2: 37-54.

Martini 2002: Martini, Mauro. 2002. 'Il gulag e la letteratura: storia di un genere mancato', *Gulag. Il sistema dei lager in URSS*, ed. by Marcello Flores and Francesca Gori (Milano: Mazzotta): 85-93.

Nepachareva 2004: Nepachareva, Ol'ga. 2004. *Dorogi, kotorye my ne vybirali*, Theatre play, <https://youtu.be/WGyfvo6Y8j4> [accessed 19 December 2024].

Pamiat', n.d.: 'Pamiat' Kolymy. Sait Ivana Panikarova. Èl'gen'. n.d. <https://pamyat-kolymy.ucoz.ru/1/9.htm> [accessed 19 December 2024].

Panikarov *et al.* 2010: Panikarov, Ivan and Anatolii Suzdal'tsev (ed. by). 2010. *Polius liutosti: stikhi uznikov stalinskikh kolymskikh lagerei* (Magadan: Novaia politografiia).

Pieralli 2013: Pieralli, Claudia. 2013. "La lirica nella 'zona': poesia femminile nei gulag staliniani e nelle carceri", in *Linee di confine. Separazioni e processi di integrazione nello spazio culturale slavo*, ed. by Alberti, Alberto and Giovanna Moracci (Firenze: UP), 221-46.

Saltyk 2012: Saltyk, Galina. 2012. 'Vospominaniia byvshikh uznikov ispravitel'no-trudovykh lagerei SSSR kak istoricheskikh istochnik', *Uchenye zapiski. Èlektronny nauchnyj zhurnal Kurskogo goudarstvennogo universiteta*, IV (24): 16-20.

Shcherbakova 2003: Shcherbakova, Irina. 2003. 'Remembering the Gulag. Memoirs and Oral Testimonies by Former Inmates', in *Reflections on the Gulag*, ed. by Dundovich, Elena, Gori, Francesca and Emanuela Guercetti (Milano: Feltrinelli), 187-207.

Shcherbakova 2004: Shcherbakova, Irina. 2004. 'Pamiat' gulaga. Opyt issledovaniia memuaristiki i ustnykh svidetel'stv byvshikh uznikov', in *Vek pamiati, pamiat' veka. Opyt obrashcheniia s proshlym v XX stoletii: Sb. Statej*, ed. by Narskii, Igor', Nagornaia, Oksana and Iuliia Khmelevskaia (Cheliabinsk: Kamennyi poias), 168-86.

Sicari 2019: Sicari, Ilaria. 2019. 'Put' (Il cammino)', in *Alle due sponde della cortina di ferro. Le culture del dissenso e la definizione dell'identità europea nel secondo Novecento tra Italia, Francia e URSS (1956-1991)*, ed. by Claudia Pieralli, Teresa Spignoli, Federico Iocca, Giuseppina Larocca and Giovanna Lo Monaco (Firenze: goware), 285-87.

Sicari 2021: Sicari, Ilaria. 2021. 'Put' (O. Adamova-Sliozberg)', in *Voci libere in URSS. Letteratura, pensiero, arti indipendenti in Unione Sovietica e gli echi in Occidente (1953-1991)*, ed. by Pieralli, Claudia and Marco Sabbatini (Firenze: UP), [vocilibereurss.fupress.net](http://vocilibereurss.fupress.net) [accessed 19 December 2024].

Silina 2019: Silina [Zakgeim], Èl'ga. 2019. *Memuary* [unpublished].

Silina 2020: Silina, Èl'ga. 2020. "Kogda bratu bylo 10 let, on napisal mame pis'mo na Kolymu: 'Kogda uzh konchitsia tvoia prokliataia komandirovka?'" , *Psikhologiiia zaboty. Opyt raboty sotsial'no-volonterskogo Muzeia istorii gulaga* (Moskva: Fond Pamiati), 28-40.

Shmukler 2017: Shmukler, Evgenii. 2017. 'Poslednii adres Iudelia Rubimovicha Zakgeima', <https://www.poslednyadres.ru/video/video139.htm> [accessed 19 December 2024].

Solženicyu 2001: Solženicyu, Aleksandr. 2001. *Arcipelago Gulag*, II t. (Milano: Mondadori).

Toker 2000: Toker, Leona. 2000. *Return from Archipelago. Narratives of Gulag Survivors* (Bloomington: Indiana UP).

Vilenskii 1989: Vilenskii, Semën (ed. by). 1989. *Dodnes' tiagoteet. Zapiski vashei sovremennitsy* (Moskva: Sovetskii pisatel'), 6-123.

Vilenskii 2001: Vilenskii, Semën (ed. by). 2001. *Est' vsiudu svet...: Chelovek v totalitarnom obshchestve: Khrestomatiiia dlia starsheklassnikov* (Moskva: Vozvrashchenie), 215-53.

Vilenskii 2004: Vilenskii, Semën (ed. by). 2004. *Dodnes' tiagoteet. Zapiski vashei sovremennitsy*, second edition (Moskva: Vozvrashchenie), 9-131.

Vilenskii 2005: Vilenskii, Semën (ed. by). 2005. *Poeziia uznikov gulaga: Antologiiia* (Moskva: Materik), 104-09.

Vilensky 1999: Vilensky, Simeon (ed. by). 1999. *Till My Tale is Told: Women's Memoirs of the Gulag* (Bloomington: Indiana UP), 1-86.

Wileński 2011: Wileński, Siemion (ed. by). 2011. *Historie kobiet z Gułagu. Dusza wciąż boli* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN).

Zakgeim 1992: Zakgeim, Aleksandr. 1992. 'Ob avtore', in Adamova-Sliozberg, Ol'ga. 1992. *Put' [stikhi]* (Moskva: Vozvrashchenie), 3-4.

Zakgeim et al. 2006: Zakgeim, Aleksandr and Èl'ga Silina. 2006. 'Adamova-Sliozberg Ol'ga L'vovna', *Klinicheskii gerontologiiia*, XII (7): 59-61.

Zakgeim, n.d.: 'Zakgeim Iudel' Ruvimovich'. n.d. [https://ru.openlist.wiki/Закгейм\\_Юдель\\_Рувимович\\_\(1898\)](https://ru.openlist.wiki/Закгейм_Юдель_Рувимович_(1898)) [accessed 19 December 2024].

## ARCHIVES

Fond 202. Adamova-Sliozberg Ol'ga L'vovna (1902–1991), Moskva, Memorial

Opis' 1. *Memuary O.L. Adamovoi-Sliozberg*

Delo 1: Adamova-Sliozberg, Ol'ga, Memuary O. Adamovoi-Sliozberg *Put'*. Redaktsiia posle prosmotra S. Vilenskim. Mashinopis' s avtorskoi pravkoi. Konets 1980-kh, Moskva, Memorial, f. 202, op. 1, delo 1.

Delo 2: Adamova-Sliozberg, Ol'ga, Memuary O. Adamovoi-Sliozberg *Put'*. Èkzempliar, vozvrashchennyi iz zhurnala "Zvezda" v 1989 g., Moskva, Memorial, f. 202, op. 1, delo 2.

Delo 3: Adamova-Sliozberg, Ol'ga, Memuary O. Adamovoi-Sliozberg *Put'*. Mashinopis'. Konets 1980-kh, Moskva, Memorial, f. 202, op. 1, delo 3.

Delo 4: Adamova-Sliozberg, Ol'ga, Memuary O. Adamovoi-Sliozberg *Put'*. Novelly. 2-i èkzempliar. Konets 1980-kh, Moskva, Memorial, f. 202, op. 1, delo 4.

Delo 5: Adamova-Sliozberg, Ol'ga, Memuary O. Adamovoi-Sliozberg *Put'*. Novelly (nepolnye). 4-j èkzempliar, Konets 1980-kh, Moskva, Memorial, f. 202, op. 1, delo 5.

Delo 6: Adamova-Sliozberg, Ol'ga, Otdel'nye chernoviki memuarov O. Adamovoi-Sliozberg, Moskva, Memorial, f. 202, op. 1, delo 6.

Delo 7: Adamova-Sliozberg, Ol'ga, Stikhi O. Adamovoi-Sliozberg, Moskva, Memorial, f. 202, op. 1, delo 7.

Natalia Lebedyntseva

## The Repressed Body in the Existential Experiences of Vasyl' Stus

The article explores the discourse of corporeality in the poetic works of Vasyl' Stus. In situations of constant external control (prison, exile, special regime camp), the existential conflict characteristic of Stus's artistic worldview intensifies. The themes of internal rupture between body and spirit become more pronounced. The poet conceptualizes the soul and body not as identical to the subject; they are separated from 'themselves' and transcend the boundaries of the integrated, transcendent 'I'. As a result, the physical world in which the artist exists becomes a space of non-presence. Instead, the motif of sleep as a memory-dream is activated, returning to the dreamer sensations stored in the emotional memory of the body. This conscious 'inward journey' becomes a form of 'internal emigration', allowing the poet to exist in conditions intolerable for such existence: outside his physical body, yet within the mental body's force field.

The issue of the artist's existence under a repressive political system has been explored in a wide range of studies. Scholars have examined various aspects of this problem, from the direct experience of imprisonment (in concentration camps, prisons, reservations, etc.), as addressed in the works of K. Caruth (Caruth 1996), O. Solzhenitsyn, P. Potter (Potter 2016), D. Gailienė, and many others (Gailienė 2005), to the broader understanding of any political system as a practice of coercion (e.g., M. Foucault's *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, H. Arendt's *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, *People in Dark Times*, and K. Jaspers' *Philosophical Autobiog-*

*raphy*). Despite a significant body of work, however, the topic of individual resistance and subordination under the Soviet totalitarian regime remains relevant and requires further exploration. This article focuses on the specific experience of conscious, consistent opposition to Soviet totalitarian practices during the period of the 'sixties' (1960s – 1970s), particularly as reflected in the poetic work of one of Ukraine's most prominent dissidents, Vasyl' Stus. Ukrainian culture developed in conditions of total repression for most of the 20th century (from the 1930s to the 1980s). However, while the Stalinist purges primarily focused on the physi-

cal elimination of potential dissidents ('enemies of the people'), Brezhnev's rule was marked by greater psychological pressure and specific disciplinary practices aimed at breaking the will and dignity of individuals. As Mykhailo Osadchy put it: 'The cruelty we experienced was not like under Stalin, when it was physical, such as being forced to pull wheelbarrows day and night. The repressions of the Brezhnev era were characterized by psychological abuse. Everything was aimed at destroying the human psyche in a more sophisticated way' (Pidgirnyi 2002: 44).<sup>1</sup>

Such observations are found not only in the memoirs of Mykhailo Osadchy, a prominent Ukrainian dissident writer who served two sentences in Soviet labour camps, but also in the testimonies of many other Soviet political prisoners of that time. According to O. Gomilko, 'the destruction of the human "I" self, of the personality as a form of human existence, that is one of the main tasks of a totalitarian regime and a prerequisite for its development' (Gomilko 2001: 208). Furthermore, a comparatively 'softer' form of repression, which was introduced and in-

tensified gradually (in Ukrainian literary discourse, a process referred to as the 'tightening the screws'), gave individuals time to decide on their civic stance and behavioural strategy. Many artists, for example, chose to accept censorship restrictions and work within the ideological framework set by the regime.

This had its advantages in material terms – the opportunity to receive housing, state awards, to publish work in state publishing houses, etc. At the same time, there were a few nonconformists who did not want to put up with the violation of human rights or restrictions on freedom of speech and conscience and who expressed their views openly, and their fate was often tragic. Unable to leave the country, these artists tried to resist the totalitarian system from within: 'we reacted to this totalitarian evil ... we resisted ... it was the only opportunity to preserve our moral and psychological bearings (*struktura*). Because you have to react to evil' (Semen Gluzman, Pidgirnyi 2002: 209). In response, the system alienated dissenters, deprived them of social guarantees and professional prospects, arrested and punished them, thus turning the most active 'dissidents' into outsiders, 'prisoners of conscience' and, in fact, 'internal emigrants'.

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, all translations in this article are my own – N. L.

The very concept of 'internal emigration' in modern humanities is primarily related to the experience of intellectuals living under authoritarian or, more often, totalitarian systems (Pylypushko 2018b). According to most scholars, the phenomenon of 'internal emigration' occurs when neither emigration outside the country nor full-scale integration into society (or a specific community) is possible due to socio-cultural conditions created and strictly regulated by a political authority. In such a situation, persons are forced to psychologically distance themselves from the dominant ideology and official social structures, avoiding open confrontation and adopting a position of 'non-involvement' in state politics. In doing so, they adapt to the circumstances of reality while simultaneously distancing themselves from them (Tsymbol 2012: 200–10). According to B. Pylypushko, such a 'special form of escapism [...] provokes reflection through art, strengthens the creative aspect of individuation, and can serve as a means of post-traumatic therapy' (Pylypushko 2018a: 11).

There is also a broader understanding of 'internal emigration' (Litinskaia 2012) as a conscious physical or psychological departure from society that does not

necessarily result from authoritarian or repressive pressure, but can stem from a voluntary distancing from any social identity due to its rejection. Thus, the term 'internal emigrant' can be applied to those who 'are concerned with preserving their own freedom, immersed in introspection, declare abstract humanism, and generally cease communication with the outside world', and whose position is defined by 'political confrontation with any state system' (Kaufman 1983) and by psychological dissociation ('mental dissociation') from their country or environment (Gildea *et al.* 2013: 198).

From this perspective, interpreting 'internal emigration' as one's conscious separation within a specific political system or community allows it to be seen as a form of individual resistance to external pressure – a more or less active protest against the unacceptable realities of life. Such an interpretation aligns the phenomenon of 'internal emigration' with dissidence, while also highlighting its fundamentally different trajectory: if the goal of the dissident movement is the open demonstration of disagreement with the authorities and with official ideology, a direct protest aimed at changing the situation (*status quo*), the 'internal emigrant' moves in the

opposite direction – whether from outside or from within the situation – seeking to create his or her own autonomous space of relative psychological (and, if possible, physical) security. At the same time, ‘internal emigrant’ can adopt various forms of rejection, ranging from ignoring reality to completely neutralizing it, which sometimes leads to self-destruction (for example, through deviant or provocative behaviour). As with ordinary emigration, however, the nostalgic motif of the lost homeland plays an important role in the worldview of these persons – all of them effectively ‘outsiders’ – and is transformed in their imaginations into a symbolic ‘espace sans lieu’ or ‘space without a place’ (Althusser 1974: 87). Not only those who seek to isolate themselves from the influence of state institutions, but also the most active dissidents, whom the state itself begins to isolate within its own territory, may find themselves in a situation of alienation. Under conditions of ostracism, imprisonment, solitary confinement, psychiatric detention, exile, or other forms of being subject to total control, one is forced to ‘emigrate’ within the self, creating a separate, alternative dimension to preserve one’s identity and, as much as possible, neutralize ex-

ternal pressure. The bodily mode plays a significant role in this process. After all, even if the ‘punitive systems’ of modern society, according to M. Foucault, ‘do not make use of violent or bloody punishments, even when they use “lenient” methods involving confinement or correction, it is always the body which is at issue – the body and its forces, their utility and their docility, their distribution and their submission’ (Foucault 1995: 25).

Obviously, any form of emigration shapes a specific worldview, through which exiles position themselves in an alien or hostile physical space, significantly affecting their bodily experience of worldly existence. In a situation of ‘internal emigration’, however, which does not necessarily involve territorial movement, bodily sensations and somatic reactions can take on a distinctive symptomatic character, reflecting the individual’s psychological state of alienation and separation from an undesirable reality.

In poetic discourse, the problem of emigration as a forced and therefore traumatic form of alienation is represented through direct emotional experiences that are primarily connected with motifs of memory/forgetting, loneli-

ness/seclusion, existence/non-existence, one's/another's (hostile) world, and one's/collective identity. These motifs are clearly marked through bodily correlates, creating particular metaphors for the artist's creative world. The experience of 'internal emigration' interpreted through bodily symbolism is particularly compelling in the poetic work of Vasyl' Stus, one of the most renowned Ukrainian dissident writers of the second half of the 20th century.

The story of Vasyl' Stus's wanderings and his steadfast, conscious opposition to the repressive Soviet system begins on September 4, 1965. On that day, during the premiere of Sergei Parajanov's film *Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors*, Stus supported Ivan Dzyuba's protest against the first wave of political arrests targeting members of the young Ukrainian intelligentsia.<sup>2</sup> A few days later, he was expelled from the graduate school of the Taras Shevchenko Institute of Literature of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR (now the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine) for 'systematic viola-

---

<sup>2</sup> For more information about this event see: <https://uinp.gov.ua/istorychnyy-kalendar/veresen/4/1965-premyera-filmu-tini-zabutyh-predkiv>, <https://portalhistoryua.com/event/prot-est-na-premyeri-tinej-zabutyh-predkiv/>

tions of the norms of behaviour for graduate students and employees of scientific institutions'. For several years, Stus was denied the opportunity to work as a writer and had to take on various odd jobs: at a historical archive, stoking a furnace, in a mine, on the railway, etc. In January 1972, like many other Ukrainian artists, Stus was arrested on charges of 'anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda'; he was sentenced to five years in a concentration camp in Mordovia and three years of exile in Kolyma.

This sentence only strengthened the artist's conviction of the need to resist the totalitarian system: 'The more torture and abuse I endure, the greater my resistance against the system of the abuse of man and his elementary rights, and against my own slavery' (Stus 2008: 381). While in prison, he initiated the formation of the 'Society for the Perpetuation of the Ukrainian Language', about which, according to Mykhaylo Osadchy, he wrote a statement in 1977 that was secretly distributed among prisoners and passed on to Andrei Sakharov (Pidgirnyi 2002: 43). In 1978, Vasyl' Stus officially renounced Soviet citizenship. Despite the risk of further punishment, he decided to join the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, es-

tablished in 1976, and did so immediately after returning from exile at the end of 1979.

As a result, in October 1980, Vasyl' Stus was arrested again as a 'recidivist'. He perceived the second sentence – 10 years of imprisonment in special regime camps and 5 years of exile – as an inevitable consequence of maintaining a conscious civic stance under Soviet totalitarianism, and continued to protest. He declared a hunger strike, demanded proper working and living conditions for prisoners, and more. This stricter regime of imprisonment, the lack of opportunity to correspond with his family, a de facto ban on his wife's visits, the absence of communication altogether (for a year, Vasyl' Stus was kept in solitary confinement, not allowed to speak during walks, and had books and personal notes taken away), poor nutrition, and systematic punishment through isolation in a cold cell without warm clothing made the writer more hot-tempered, anxious, and irritable. These hardships did not break his will, however. Even when anticipating the end – once again punished with solitary confinement for reading a book in his cell while leaning on the upper bunk – Stus declared a dry hunger strike in protest.

According to his friends, throughout this time, the poet continued to write poems, compiled a collection of free verse entitled *Bird of the Soul* (which was unfortunately confiscated by the guards and is now considered lost), and in his final years, worked on translations of Rilke's elegies from German. To a large extent, such work served as a form of escapism for the Stus, a means of spiritual self-preservation in the absurd reality of captivity. As Yevhen Sverstyuk notes, 'The extent of his renunciation in the camp in recent years was simply terrible... It reminds me of Rilke's Orpheus and Eurydice, when Eurydice walked away, all filled with death' (Pidgirnyi 2002: 298). A certain symbolism can also be found in the date of Stus's death on September 4, 1985 – exactly 20 years after his protest speech at the premiere of Parajanov's film at the 'Ukraine' cinema.

Unfortunately, Stus's status as one of the most famous Ukrainian dissidents, who consistently opposed the repressive Soviet system, somewhat overshadows his own poetic creativity. This issue of his literary reception has been repeatedly addressed, particularly by Dmytro Stus (Stus 2008: 3–4), Yurii Sherekh (Sherekh 1986: 57), Marko

Pavlyshyn (Pavlyshyn 1997: 159–60, 172), and others, all of whom emphasize the need to ‘overcome stereotypes in the perception of Vasyl’ Stus’ (Polishchuk 2011: 48) and to uncover the universal cultural meanings of his work. This article proposes a discursive analysis of the bodily dimension of Stus’s worldview, as reflected in his poems, allowing for a departure from established approaches to his work and revealing the deeper personal foundations of his experience of complex existential situations. These foundations shape the poet’s unique style and, to some extent, express his philosophy of being.

The human body retains a lasting memory of all its experiences – physical, emotional, mental, existential, and so on. In verbal expression, these memories are often invoked through association with physical sensations and states (such as smells, sounds, tastes, sensations of touch, pain, nausea, pleasure, or numbness), as well as through bodily symbolism itself. Moreover, as numerous studies have shown, ‘the body’s memory stores much more information than consciousness’ (Fuks 2007). Most often, recurring images related to the body are interpreted as ‘somatic markers’ through

which consciousness shapes its being in the world.

In Vasyl’ Stus’s poetry, several bodily correlates can be distinguished: screams, pain, blood, throats, hands (palms), veins, hearts, eyes, and faces. Among these, the image of the throat holds the most complex symbolism, being associated with breathing, the voice, blood (haemorrhage), the pulse, and even the beginning of existence (‘And I float not with the current, / but against it – as if into the throat / of spilled screams. As if returning / to an ancient birth’<sup>3</sup>). The throat symbolizes both relentless, real life (‘and the son runs, / as blood runs from the throat!’<sup>4</sup>), and a way of speaking, of expressing oneself creatively (‘And the poems go, and go, and go, / like blood from the throat’<sup>5</sup>).

The central existential theme (and leitmotif) of the artist’s entire creative output is pain, which can take on both negative connotations (black, hellish, suffering) and positive ones (young,

---

<sup>3</sup> ‘Дорога самовтечі, невідвладна...’ (‘The path of self-escape, uncontrollable...’, Stus 2003: 167).

<sup>4</sup> ‘Наснилося, з розлуки наверхлося...’ (‘I dreamed, a bizarre dream of separation...’, Stus 2003: 254).

<sup>5</sup> ‘Вік би не бачити й не чуть...’ (‘I would not see for ages, nor would I even hear...’, Stus 2003: 139).

ardent, wilful), as it emerges as the core principle of human existence:

ти в цьому світі – лиш  
кавалок муки,  
отерплий і розріджений,  
мов ртуть.<sup>6</sup> (Stus 2003: 57)

For Stus, pain seems to be a desired sensation and a signifier of conscious life. It serves as both a necessary prerequisite for and a dominant element in the concept of ‘deathexistence’/ ‘lifedeath’ (‘It Was Not Destined to Hide from Fate’) found in his worldview. A living soul, even if lost in the ‘between-the-worlds’, in the space of ‘alien existence’, reveals itself – and thus, must endure pain:

розпечена, аж біла з  
самоболю,  
як цятка пекла,  
лаконічний крик  
усесвіту, маленький  
шротик сонця,  
зчужілий і заблуканий у  
тілі.<sup>7</sup> (Stus 2003: 97)

<sup>6</sup> You are but a figment of suffering in this world, / lukewarm and liquefied like mercury.

<sup>7</sup> [R]ed-hot, white with self-pain, / like a speck of hell, a laconic cry / of the universe, a small speck of sun, / alienated and lost in the body.

What is unexpected in this context is the way the lyrical subject’s conscious self relates to his physical body, which rises above the ‘I’ in its essential existence and into which the subject still needs to mature. Pain, it turns out, is not so much a physical experience as a metaphysical one – it signifies life, but is separate from the body, which symbolizes ontological integrity and full inclusion in the organic flow of being:

Ти, народившись,  
виголів лишень,  
а не приріс до тіла. Не  
дійшов  
своєї плоті.<sup>8</sup> (Stus 2003:  
97)

For Vasyl’ Stus, ‘growing into’ one’s own flesh is a painful process of self-improvement, the ability to renounce the self, to let go of one’s ego, in order to achieve the true fulfilment of being – an absolute, sensual fusion with the world in all its fullness. After all, only the ultimate existential experience, the moment of being in union with the world through pain, offers the opportunity to accept one’s existence and imbue it with meaning:

<sup>8</sup> You, having been born, only became naked, / and did not grow into the body. You did not reach / your flesh.

Ти тут. Ти тільки тут. Ти тут. Ти тут –  
на цілий світ! І  
поєдинчим болем  
обперся об натужні  
крони сосон.  
А стогін їхній, вічністю  
пропахлий,  
вивищує покари до  
покор.<sup>9</sup> (Stus 2003: 49)

Here, humility is understood as the awareness and acceptance of one's own fate, one's existential choice, in which pain is not suffering (*punishment*), but the manifestation of a living force, the deep ontological meaning of the world's existence.

Another important aspect of Stus's concept of being is 'ardour' – a passion that should fill every moment of a person's life and, in fact, makes one truly alive. This passion manifests itself either as a love frenzy, in which one can 'lose one's limit to oneself', or as a frenzy of life itself – a struggle, competition, or arbitrary act through which one can mature into and fulfil oneself. In any context or situa-

<sup>9</sup> You are here. You are only here. You are here. You are here – / for the whole world! And with a single pain, / lean against the mighty crowns of the pine trees. / Their groans, fragrant with eternity, / raise punishments to humiliations.

tion, for the poet, this frenzy is always a moment of maximum emotional 'burning' – from the well-known 'be livid, soul, be livid, and do not weep' (ярій, душе, ярій, а не ридай) to the later 'the soul flees your body, / making a hole in the body while rushing out' (Stus 2003: 284). Frenzy, rampage, pure anger, ardent pain – are states of the highest 'test', of accomplished self-conscious being in its fullest existential sense.

At the same time, the poet envisions the conscious course of life as a return to the beginnings of the world, a remembrance of what has already occurred and must find its completion – or realization – through death. Thus, Stus actualizes the concept of memory as the recognition, remembrance, and consciousness of a person's existence in the world:

Давно забуто, що є жити  
і що є світ і що є ти.  
У власне тіло увійти  
дано лише  
несамовитим.<sup>10</sup> (Stus  
2003: 119)

<sup>10</sup> 'To live' has lost the meaning it once had:

the notions of 'the world' and 'you' have  
perished.  
The right to enter one's own flesh, so  
cherished,  
is granted only to the restless mad

In other words, the maximal manifestation of a living (*frenzied*) life is not just memory, but the memory of the body – as the most enduring and true essence of existence, its quintessence. At the same time, this full, passionate bodily existence is a sign of its passing, because ‘manifestations are self-destructions’, and only a petrified, solid form ‘knows self-preservation’ (Stus 2003: 47).

All memories that appear in the poetic world of Vasyl’ Stus are linked to bodily sensations. At the same time, when the body is remembered as an object (for example, the body of a beloved), visual images prevail:

І разом з тобою ми  
заходимося визбирувати  
роздратовані уста, очі,  
пам’яті,  
погляди, губи, плечі,  
розшукаємо все – до  
найменшого панігтя,  
щоб, затиснена в себе, як  
в кулачок,  
ти ставала цільною й  
неушкодженою,  
реставрована для мого  
охриплого

---

(‘This Pain Is Like the Wine of Dying Throes’, trans. by Alan Zhukovski).

горлового шепоту  
щастя.<sup>11</sup> (Stus 2003: 51)

In the above quote, the list of body parts that are significant for the restoration of identity include a category of ‘memories’ that are shared by both the subject and the object of these memories. Remembering oneself and one’s own feelings serves as a kind of ‘assembly point’, a territory of contact that connects a person to the present moment, transforming ‘eyes’ into ‘gaze’ and ‘irritated lips’ into ‘lips’. Nonetheless, this transformation occurs not only through the subject, with his active, visually fixed action (*restoration*), but also for his sake, for his ‘whisper of happiness’.

The subject’s body primarily records touch, sound (such as, for example, a ‘hoarse throaty whisper’, which combines these two sensations), and smell, especially smell, because it is through scent (in scent) that the most lasting emotional memory is preserved. In Stus’s poetry, everything connected with im-

---

<sup>11</sup> And together with you we start collecting / irritated lips, eyes, memories, / looks, lips, shoulders, / we will find everything – down to the smallest detail, / so that, squeezed into yourself, as in a fist, / you become whole and unharmed, / restored for my hoarse / throaty whisper of happiness.

portant, significant experiences has a smell: red apples, earth, human blood, sunflowers, bees, and tears all share the same scent of childhood (in the poem 'Streams'); the 'sad palms' and 'bitter lips' of his wife have their own scent; and even the poems themselves 'smell of rue, which / is already half-forgotten, / and they smell of mint' (Stus 2003: 139).

The poet's memory (if not of childhood or erotic lyrics) is primarily painful: memories are like knives, the feeling of the earth 'like a painful dream', the image of the beloved like 'a speck of my pain'. It is precisely this pain that sustains / manifests a person in the world, making him or her conscious. To feel pain, to be aware of it, and to accept it is to live one's own life as a true, tangible physical existence. Only a living (and conscious, self-aware) body is capable of feeling pain. Similarly, memory must hurt in order to remain live matter, to remain the 'mental body' of the personality.

The opposite state, the state of non-memory or oblivion, means the loss of identity and inhabiting a space of non-existence, a detachment from the general flow of being:

Ріка життя уже тече повз мене.

І жди-не-жди, і скільки не чекай –

та оббігає течія шалена  
забуту гору і забутий  
гай.<sup>12</sup> (Stus 2003: 341)

In Vasyl' Stus's life, such a space of non-existence becomes real starting from January 12, 1972, the moment of his imprisonment. In the poem 'Already then, when diving into the forest', the poet interprets memories of the final days before his arrest as disturbing signs of an approaching disaster, manifested through physical sensations of a freezing body (*the cold hands, a numb heart, stiff arteries*) and perceptions of surrounding space (*gloomy drawn-out lanterns, unsettling stillness*). All moments of living contact with the world are perceived as threatened:

яким вйнуло холодом на мене  
в цій вичужлій вітчині,  
отут,  
де край мені здавався  
серцем серця,

---

<sup>12</sup> The river of life is already flowing past me. / And wait-don't wait, and no matter how long you wait – / And the wild current runs around / the forgotten mountain and the forgotten grove.

а стогін крові – обрїй  
знакував!<sup>13</sup> (Stus  
1986: 292)

It is as if the process of psychological alienation from the world to which the subject can no longer belong begins even before the actual isolation. As the author later realizes, this painful feeling of alienation from everything that constituted the essence of his existence (*the heart of the heart*) turned out to be a final farewell – not only to the most significant landmarks of Vasyl' Stus's life but, in fact, also to himself:

Я непомітно перейшов  
межу  
самого себе. І лежу на  
споді  
вітчизни, пам'яті, жаги,  
свободи,  
не знаючи, що Богові  
скажу  
за цю міграцію душі та  
тіла.<sup>14</sup> (Stus 2008: 194)

<sup>13</sup> How cold it blew upon me / in this alienated homeland, here, / where the land seemed to me the heart of the heart, / and a wail of blood marked the horizon!

<sup>14</sup> I have imperceptibly crossed the border / of myself. And I lie at the bottom / of homeland, memory, longing, freedom, / not knowing what to say to God / or this migration of soul and body.

In this text, dated March 1972 (almost two months after the arrest), the soul and body are perceived by the poet as distinct from the subject; they are separated from 'themselves' and lose their meaning: they move (migrate) beyond the boundaries of the transcendent, integral 'I' and find themselves 'at the bottom', in the space of non-presence.

As psychological research proves, such experiences lead to 'a splitting of "being within oneself" [in which a] person perceives his [or her] own body as something foreign, alien' (Yazvinska 2013: 10–11). This specific detachment from one's own bodily sensations and emotions, provoked by an unacceptable situation of external coercion and violence, can be interpreted through the lens of 'internal emigration', and in its extreme forms, borders on escapism. Moreover, the entirety of Stus's behaviour in prison and exile demonstrates his conscious and consistent rejection of the Soviet political system as 'a system of the abuse of man and his elementary rights' (Stus 2008: 381). The most eloquent gestures of this rejection are his actual renunciation of Soviet citizenship and, in a certain sense, his symbolic renunciation of real life. Stus wrote a statement about renouncing citizenship twice,

and in the second, dated October 18, 1978, emphasized: 'Having Soviet citizenship is an impossible thing for me. Being a Soviet citizen means being a slave. I do not accept such a role' (Stus 2008: 381). His symbolic renunciation of life can be seen, in particular, in his hunger strikes (including the final one, declared by the poet to be 'to the end'), acts of protest with which Stus reacted to manifestations of injustice, both in relation to himself and to other political prisoners. For him, this was almost the only way to preserve himself, his own consciousness and his personal human dignity. Sherekh defined such an uncompromising position as Stus's creation of the 'psychological complex of a kamikaze with a high and final life mission' (Sherekh 1986: 28).

In the context of the 'big zone', as the Soviet Union was ironically called by its citizens, real imprisonment paradoxically gave a person greater freedom of thought and self-expression. Political prisoners of the Soviet system felt freer internally, because they no longer had to pretend and seek compromises with their own conscience: 'We came from this double-minded world. They have already removed this skin of falsehood that we all had' (Semen Gluzman, Pidgirnyi

2002: 208). Vasyl' Stus's son explained this phenomenon as well, reporting that his father 'wrote from the zone that he felt very good. He was good there because he felt free there. Ultimately, it seems to me that freedom was the main indicator of happiness for him, simply being free of barriers. We are under a cap here, you can't say anything [if you want to] get into an institute or university, you have to make some kind of compromise... And there he could afford to say what he thought. He is in prison for this' (Dmytro Stus, Pidgirnyi 2002: 135).

The idea of finding oneself through self-denial – whether voluntary or in the context of total control and coercion – the arbitrary rejection of real life for the sake of a true, authentic life ('sudden self-immolation and eternal / conversion to the body' (Stus 1986: 400), becomes the leading concept, the fundamental principle of self-conscious existence in the works of Stus during his period of exile. The poet constantly emphasizes the arbitrariness of his choice: *self-immolation*, *self-exile*, *self-destruction*, *self-torture* appeal simultaneously both to the loneliness and to the selfhood (і до самотності, і до самоці) of this deadly confrontation with the system:

... В космічній стужі  
 відігриває нас лише  
 вогонь  
 від самоспалення...<sup>15</sup>  
 (Stus 2003: 375)

The direct bodily sensations that define the artist's physical existence gradually shift into memories of the past or individual moments of 'relived' experience in the present (such as meetings with relatives, dreams, visions, or fragments of the landscape that evoke memories of home).

In Stus's work, the body is not merely a part of the living world: it is directly integrated into the organic natural space of being. The loss of this space leads to the loss of the ability to fully experience the world through the body, in fact, it marks a loss of life in its existential sense. The poet's bodily detachment from his physical location is marked by somatic signs of cold and blindness, as well as a dramatic shift in spatial coordinates. A prison cell or place of exile becomes an artificial space divided into squares (*a square heart in a square circle, a square sun, a square step*), or an anti-space perceived as an endless, colourless wasteland (*empty sand, a*

<sup>15</sup> ... In the space frost, / only the fire of self-combustion warms us.

*dead desert, barren and black all around*). The soft, fluid lines of the natural world, rich with sounds and smells, are replaced by the harsh geometry of sharp angles:

... Квадратура  
 таємних бід і ромби  
 самоти,  
 і прямокутники старих  
 напастей,  
 і лінії спадні усевпокори,  
 і вертикальний  
 понадзірний щем.<sup>16</sup> (Stus  
 1986: 200)

The poet's body reacts to the harsh new conditions of existence by blocking sensations of blindness (*blind fingers, blind soul, half-blind spirit*) and flashes of 'deaf-mute pain'. Not only the human body, but the entire world becomes cold, blind, and deaf ('the blind veil of the sky'; 'the mercury of the prison twilight, blind, like a scar'; 'deaf-mute water'; 'the blinding sky – blinds with deaths!'). This mutual alienation leads to the catastrophic destruction of the foundations of existence, which, in turn, causes the subject, who becomes aware of the inevitabil-

<sup>16</sup> ... The squares / of secret troubles and the rhombuses of solitude, / the rectangles of old misfortunes, / and the lines descending of all humility, / and the vertical, unobservable ache.

ity of this catastrophe, an almost physical pain: 'A mirror/ of the broken heavens with shards of radiance / hurts a longing gaze' (Stus 1986: 200).

Thus, the body seems to 'switch off' from the real, present reality for the author, and to focus all sensations on memories of the past and projections of a possible, but lost, future. The space of the lyrical subject's physical presence is marked as 'groundless', 'boundless', and 'shoreless'. It becomes an empty territory of death, a cold wasteland, a non-existence, where the 'black-black raven', the harbinger of the apocalypse, outlines 'Mesolithic circles, like holes in the universe' (Stus 2008: 167–68).

A sky without earth, like a soul without a body, that is, without a boundary that gives form and meaning to the vital potential of the spirit, deprives existence of validity and support. This motif closely aligns with the problem of groundlessness, which Sherekh described as a state of internal emigration for 'fugitives within countries' (Sherekh 1998: 390). For Stus, as the previous analysis has shown, rootedness is a vitally necessary feeling of existential involvement in the world, of physical presence in it – not only an organic connection with the living matter of the world (natural environment, na-

tive land, etc.), but also a literal rootedness in one's own material essence, in the body. A soul that loses the ability to hear its 'roots', that is, its connection with the body, loses its landmarks for purposeful movement and, therefore, its development ('We gladly leave our own nests', Stus 2008: 185).

At the same time, the angelic spirit, 'pinned with sharp spears / to its own body – the likeness of the cross', loses 'the right of self-evasion, / of self-exceeding extreme limits' (Stus 2003: 146). In this poem, which begins with the line 'You, angel, are thrown into hell' and is dated January 31, 1972 (the third week after his arrest), the semantic field of the 'body', which encompasses its own physical needs and limitations, also includes 'beloved ones, friends, hopes', 'pitiful loneliness', and 'a night filled with alienation'. That is, an attachment to one's physical existence, a dependence on everything that emotionally connects a person to the world, becomes an additional punishment and a sacrificial trap for the rebellious spirit.

The poet's body itself is transformed into a 'vertical coffin', in which a 'disoriented, deaf soul' is imprisoned:

Затиснутій минулим і  
майбутнім,  
тобі ані знайтись, ні  
загубитись –  
ти мого тіла яро-чорна  
тінь.<sup>17</sup> (Stus 2008: 185)

Between the past and the future, instead of the present, the soul finds itself 'suspended'. Without a body (only a painful, fiery-black shadow), trapped between memories and vain hopes, in the alienated space of non-life, the soul is torn not only from its own living flesh, but also from the subject itself ('you fly at a distance from me, you beckon'). The splitting of the personality into a dead (mortified) body, a disoriented soul, and a reflective 'I' leads to the total collapse of the world, in which impossible combinations include not only 'soul with body, joy with sorrow', but also the ontological primaries of being: 'life with death' and 'heaven with earth'. In contrast to the notion of physical death as the freezing of space and disembodiment, the motif of sleep emerges as a memory-dream that returns to the dreamer lost bodily sensations and, therefore, returns himself. More precisely, it is the

<sup>17</sup> Trapped between the past and the future, / you can neither be found nor lost – / you are the fiery black shadow of my body.

return of his own reflection in  
the water:

І ось воно: відбитком по  
воді  
Враз попливло сумне  
твоє обличчя  
[...]  
Тепер себе – пізнаєш по  
біді?  
По сивій голові – тепер  
пізнаєш?<sup>18</sup> (Stus 2003: 153)

Recognizing himself in the flowing image on the water (which diverges into *red streaks*) evokes in the poet's memory a similar situation from the past, when 'desired fate was met – eye to eye' (жадана стрілась доля – вічі в вічі) sharpening the awareness of a lost, un-lived life and unfulfilled hopes: 'Not in yourself, you return from yourself'.

The boundary between what happened before and what can happen in the future appears in Stus's artistic world as a liminal space, where emotional memory, recorded in bodily sensations, intertwines with imaginary visions and dreams to creating another phantom (or symbolic) dimension of being:

<sup>18</sup> And here it is: like a footprint on the water / Suddenly, your sad face floats... / Now you will recognize yourself by your misfortune? / By your gray head - now you will recognize yourself?

Тримайся бо потойбік.  
Ти – за гранню,  
де видиво гойдається  
святе.  
Там – Україна. За межею.  
Там,  
лівіше серця.<sup>19</sup> (Stus 2008:  
251)

Through sheer willpower, the subject consciously transforms himself into an emigrant who carries his homeland close to his heart. It exists beyond the confines of present reality and is there, *beyond*, where the artist seeks to be. The image of his native land pains him, yet it is revived in that pain, becoming physically tangible and, therefore, embodied, real. As Sherekh noted of this peculiarity of Vasyl' Stus's writing, 'Dreams in the life of an exiled prisoner are part of his biography, and in his poetry, they serve as a gateway to another reality' (Sherekh 1986: 34).

Certain motifs characteristic of the state of 'internal emigration' appear in poems that Vasyl' Stus wrote long before his imprisonment, however, at the time when the pressure of the repressive system was just beginning

---

<sup>19</sup> Stay on the other side. You are beyond, / where the holy vision sways. / There is Ukraine. Beyond the border. There, / to the left of the heart.

to intensify. According to the poet's recollections, this occurred sometime after 1962<sup>20</sup>. In the poem 'On a Sleepless Night', dated 1964, the concept of emigration itself emerges as an anxious premonition of alienation, an identity crisis, a threat to existence:

Емігрантом. Їй-богу.  
Ліжко.  
І на ковдрі – од вікон –  
грати.  
І подушка моя  
скуйовджена,  
і скуйовджена голова.<sup>21</sup>  
(Stus 2003: 41)

Here, the image of the emigrant's bed becomes a metaphor for the broader issue of (not) finding one's place in the world (*my pillow is tousled*), which is directly tied to the search for one's identity (a *tousled head*). The state of restlessness and uncertainty, of being lost in the suddenly alienated space of a night room in the middle of 'fading Kyiv', leads, both in this work and more generally in the poetry of the 'Winter Trees' period (1970) to existential themes

---

<sup>20</sup> See the letter to his wife dated 16.05.1981 (Stus 2008: 405).

<sup>21</sup> An emigrant. Oh my God. A bed. / And on the blanket - from the windows - bars. / My pillow is tousled, / and my head is tousled.

of loneliness, anxiety, the meaning of existence, and death.

In the artistic conception that Vasyl' Stus developed in his *The Vanishing Blossom* (1971), dedicated to the work of Volodymyr Svidzinsky, the problem of existence, of conscious being, is interpreted as a both universal and purely artistic spiritual collision: 'A person who has felt his own orphanhood and vulnerability in the world has become hardened under the hungry sky [...] And then he runs away – from the world and from himself' (Stus 2008: 362–363). For such a person, art becomes a form of 'surrender to the difficulties of existence', replacing real life with the cult of suffering: 'Making us unused to life, art teaches death' (Відучуючи нас жити, мистецтво навчає смерті). In this tragic perspective, the artist is likened to a spiritual kamikaze, as Sherekh wrote, he is doomed: 'A bee, releasing its sting, dies. So does the artist' (Stus 2008: 357). According to this concept, any poet is a priori an outsider-suicide who rejects 'normal existence' in favor of 'the lost and unattainable'. He 'searches for himself in that expanse through which he, always contrary to reality, defines the space of his individuality. But, searching for himself, he also

loses what he has' (Stus 2008: 356).

The problems of the fatal disconnection between the biological, sensual, and intellectual revolutionary principles, of creativity as inevitable alienation from the world, and of the general catastrophic nature of worldly existence, as outlined in *The Vanishing Blossom*, form most of the foundation upon which the 'internal emigrant' code is built. This code guided Stus throughout his life. External totalitarian pressure only strengthened and deepened this guiding principle. In fact, persons drive themselves into an existential trap: 'With horror, we realized that all the rivers of history flow backwards. [...] we become victims of our history, our actions, victims of ourselves' (Stus 2008: 364).

The same motif of reverse movement (against the flow of time, 'from the mouth to the sources') is pervasive in the poetic discourse of Vasyl' Stus. The future is opaque ('I peer into tomorrow – darkness and dark darkness'), and the present is entirely composed of fragments of the past ('All life is like a look / into the past age. Over the shoulder'). That is, the present is merely an imitation of real life in the here and now (Stus 2003: 124). Returning to the ori-

gins of existence, to the time 'even before birth', can 'reset' the situation, rendering past life inactive, because 'you are dead / in a dead world' (Stus 2008: 107). In conditions of imprisonment, these complex temporal layers acquire new meanings. According to Filip Zimbardo, it is crucial to maintain a temporal perspective in a situation of total control or severe social pressure, relying on one's own past (remember who you are), and considering the future consequences of one's actions in order not to lose oneself in the 'eternal present' and to reduce its influence. Zimbardo argues that 'when the past and the future unite to restrain the extremes of the present, that situation loses power' (Zimbardo 2014: 179). In Stus's poetic reception, the prospect of the future seems to be impossible in principle, and so it is shifted to the past, thereby making time into a circle ('the future is all in the past'), but leaving it outside the present. For the writer, this reflexive 'movement into oneself' (Sherekh 1986: 33) becomes a counterbalance and, perhaps, a form of salvation from destructive reality, a means of self-preservation:

Ми нібито обернені  
свічаддя –

Єдиновласну       душу  
світливо.<sup>22</sup> (Stus 1986:  
140)

Indeed, for Vasyl' Stus, bodily involvement in life is a direct connection to the specific physical space of existence. Thus, the loss of this organic space leads to the loss of the very possibility of bodily experiencing life: 'Your soul has collapsed here, / your chest has become half empty' (Stus 2003: 189). As a result, the poet constructs a phantom existence, one that resides in memories and dreams:

Верни до мене, пам'яте  
моя!  
Нехай на серце ляже  
ваготою  
моя земля з рахманною  
журбою  
...  
Нехай Дніпра уроча  
течія  
бодай у сні, у маячні  
струмує.<sup>23</sup> (Stus 2003: 201)

His life is concentrated in the spaces of memory, as a recollection and reconstruction of the

<sup>22</sup> We are like candles turned upside down – / we illuminate our own souls.

<sup>23</sup> Return to me, my memory! / Let my land lie heavy on my heart / with quiet sorrow / [...] / Let the charming current of the Dnieper / at least flow in a dream, in a delusion.

past, which is understood by him as a movement backward – not only to the times of youth and childhood but much further – to the dreams ‘with which you began / even before birth’ (Stus 2003: 162).

This is a conditional existence within the conditional space of ‘self-sleep’, where the poet dreams of himself, where ‘self-passing-by is your lot’ (самопроминання – твій приділ) (Stus 2003: 167). The discovery of one’s own integrity becomes a permanent immersion in memories, because all the future has already happened (or was about to happen) in the past (‘and I remember everything – as if I were alive’ (Stus 2003: 242). This new existence represents a form of ‘internal emigration’, allowing the poet to exist under conditions of imprisonment that are intolerable

for physical existence: outside the boundaries of one’s own body, yet within the force field of the mental body. Thus, through the memory of the body (and more profoundly, the memory of the lost world: ‘The forgotten sky / hurts like an amputated hand’, Stus 2003: 162), the phantom somatics of unrealized or repressed existence are brought to life in Vasyl’ Stus’s poems.

The research presented in this article was conducted within the framework of the PRIN 2022 PNRR project “Literature of Socialist Trauma: Mapping and Researching the Lost Page of European Literature (LOST)”, ID: P2022Z45X8, CUP: B53D23029360001, Principal Investigator: Andrea Gullotta (University of Palermo). The project was funded by the Italian Ministry of Education, Universities, and Research (MIUR) under the 2022 PRIN PNRR Call for Proposals, Directorial Decree No. 1409 of September 14, 2022.

## Bibliography

Althusser 1974: Althusser, Louis. 1974. *Montesquieu. La politique et l'histoire* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France)

Caruth 1996: Caruth, Cathy. *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative and History* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press)

Foucault 1995: Foucault, Michel. 1995. *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*, transl. from the French by Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage Books [A Division of Random House])

Fuks 2007: Fuks, Tomas. 2007. "Nauki o zhizni" i zhiznennyi mir', *Topos*, 2 (16): 5–21

<[https://en.ehu.lt/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Topos-2007-2\\_51ee9dc60c912.pdf](https://en.ehu.lt/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Topos-2007-2_51ee9dc60c912.pdf)> [accessed 23 March 2025]

Gailienė 2005: Gailienė, Danutė (ed.). 2005. *The Psychology of Extreme Traumatization: The Aftermath of Political Repression*. (Genocide and Resistance Research Center of Lithuania. Akreta, Vilnius)

Gildea et al. 2013: Gildea, Robert, James Mark, and Anette Warring (eds). 2013. *Europe's 1968: Voices in Revolt* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Gomilko 2001: Gomilko, Olha. 2001. *Metafizyka tilesnosti: kontsept tila u filozofskomu diskursi* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka)

Kaufman 1983: Kaufman, Liia. 1983. *Tvorchestvo pisatelei antifashistov v Germanii v gody natsizma. Problematika. Poetika. Avtoréf. dissertatsii* (Moskva)

<<https://dissertation.com.ua/node/1117162>> [accessed 23 March 2025]

Litinskaia 2012: Litinskaia, Dzhinna. 2012. 'Tipy sovremennogo eskapizma i fenomen ekzistentsialnogo eskapizma', *Yaroslavskii pedagogicheskii vestnik*, № 1 (T. I): 308–11

Pavlyshyn 1997: Pavlyshyn, Marko. 1997. 'Kvadratura kruha: prolegomeny do otsinky Vasylya Stusa', in *Kanon ta ikonostas: Literaturno-krytychni statti* (Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo 'Chas'), 157–74

Pidgirnyi 2002: Pidgirnyi, Bohdan (ed. by). 2002. *Netsenzurnyi Stus. Knyha u 2-kh chastynakh* (Ternopil: Pidruchnyky i posibnyky), chastyna 1

Polishchuk 2011: Polishchuk, Yaroslav. 2011. 'Tvorchist Vasylya Stusa v heokulturnomu konteksti...', *Ucrainistica*, 9: 48–59

Potter 2016: Potter, Pamela M. 2016. *Art of Suppression: Confronting the Nazi Past in Histories of the Visual and Performing Arts* (California: University of California Press)

Pylypushko 2018a: Pylypushko, Bohdan. 2018a. *Vnutrishnia emihratsiia myttsia v umovakh totalitarnoi diisnosti (na prykladi dosvidu Oleksandra Aksinina)*. Avtoref. dysertatsii (Kyiv)

<<http://elib.nakkim.edu.ua/handle/123456789/3276>> [accessed 23 March 2025]

Pylypushko 2018b: ——. 2018b. 'Stanovlennya fenomeny "vnutrishnoii emihratsii" u zakhidnomu naukovomu dyskursi'. *Art-prostir*, 3: 19–24. <<https://doi.org/10.28925/2519-4135.4.2018.3.4>> [accessed 23 March 2025]

Sherekh 1986: Sherekh, Yurii. 1986. 'Trunok i trutyzna. Pro "Palimpsesty" Vasylia Stusa', in *Stus V. Palimpsesty. Virshi 1971–1979 rokiv*, ed. by Nadiia Svitlychna (New York: Suchasnist), 17–58

Sherekh 1998: Sherekh, Yurii. 1998. 'Zustrichi z Zakhodom', in *Porohy i zaporizhzhia. Literatura. Mystetstvo. Ideolohii*, u 3 t. (Kharkiv: Folio), 1: 390–423

Stus 1986: Stus, Vasyl'. 1986. *Palimpsesty. Virshi 1971–1979 rokiv*, ed. by Nadiia Svitlychna (New York: Suchasnist)

Stus 2003: Stus, Vasyl'. 2003. *Palimpsest* (Kyiv: Fakt)

Stus 2008: Stus, Vasyl'. 2008. *Taborovyi zoshyt*, ed. by Dmytro Stus (Kyiv: Fakt)

Tsymbal 2012: Tsymbal, Tetiana. 2012. *Fenomen emihratsii: dosvid filosofskoi refleksii* (Kyiv, Kryvyi Rih: Vydavnychy dim)

Yazvinska 2013: Yazvinska, Olena. 2013. *Teoriia i praktyka fenomeny tilesnosti v psykholohii*. Avtoreferat dysertatsii (Kyiv)

Zimbardo 2014: Zimbardo, Filip. 2014. *Effekt Lutsifera. Pochemu khoroshie liudi prevrashchaiutsia v zlodeev* (Moskva: Alpina non-fikshn) <[http://loveread.ec/read\\_book.php?id=45825&p=179](http://loveread.ec/read_book.php?id=45825&p=179)> [accessed 23 March 2025]

Rosanna Morabito

## Memoirs of Trauma Halfway between History and Literature: Dragoslav Mihailović

Dragoslav Mihailović's experience in a concentration camp only appears in his literary works in 1990, with the publication of the first volume of *Goli otok*, a collection of testimonies from former inmates of the camp on the Adriatic Island. The autobiographical introduction to the first volume of *Goli otok* written by Mihailović differs from the documentary approach of the volume, enabling an analysis of the relationship between literary writing and the processing of trauma.

Dragoslav Mihailović was forced to live in the Goli otok concentration camp when he was 19 years old. Only about a quarter of a century later did he begin writing his documentary works and memoirs, for which he can now be considered 'najupornijim proučavaocem golootočke traume' ('the most tenacious scholar of the Goli otok trauma', Đurišić Bečanović 2022: 55).

Dealing with memoirs dedicated to an extremely traumatic experience, both for those directly impacted and for the society involved, makes it necessary to consider the particular ways in which trauma influences the individual, and not only the individual: 'nobody wants to remember trauma. In that regard society is no different from the victims themselves' (Van der Kolk 2014: 195).

The autobiographical discourse about trauma is different from other types of autobiographical discourses, due to the specific psychophysical conditions generated by the extreme experience. Neuroscience explains 'the difference between "narrative memory" – the stories people tell about trauma – and the traumatic memory itself' (Van der Kolk 2014: 180). By its very nature, the latter is very different from the memories that form our autobiographical narrative: since the 'lack of verbal memory is central in trauma' (Van der Kolk 2014: 182), 'traumatic memories are fundamentally different from the stories we tell about the past. They are dissociated: The different sensations that entered the brain at the time of the trauma are not properly assembled into a story, a piece of autobiography' (Van

der Kolk 2014: 195). The term *dissociation* is used here 'to describe the splitting off and isolation of memory imprints' (Van der Kolk 2014: 181) of trauma, which cannot be integrated into the current narrative of life on the basis of which the individual distinguishes past and present. These two forms of memory are linked to different, separate parts of the brain, which Van der Kolk calls the 'rational brain' (including the language area and consequently narrative memory), and the 'emotional brain', which triggers uncontrollable reactions at a physical level. Therefore, 'trauma is much more than a story about something that happened long ago. The emotions and physical sensations that were imprinted during the trauma are experienced not as memories but as disruptive physical reactions in the present' (Van der Kolk 2014: 205).

### 1. The Historical Context

Yugoslavia under Tito was internationally famous as the country of socialism with a human face. Nevertheless, it was no stranger to the Stalinist policies of persecuting dissidents.

The most systematic repressive practices, with the creation of

what was a small universe of concentration camps, are linked to the country's expulsion from Cominform (*Informbiro* in Serbian and Croatian, which led to the supporters of its policy being called *ibeovci*) in 1948, following the breakdown of political relations between Tito and Stalin (Banac 1988; Jambrešić Kirin 2007; Previšić 2019, 2020). From an international point of view, Tito's refusal to submit to Cominform exposed the country to the risk of a military reaction from the colossus of the East, and at the same time turned Yugoslavia into a useful pawn for the Western powers in the struggle against Soviet Communism. Internally, the break with the USSR unleashed a fierce struggle between the internal fractions of the Yugoslav Communist Party, with the swift elimination of a considerable part of the communist cadres, who were replaced by a massive influx of new members. It was also necessary to uproot the cult of Stalin, which had been widespread in the population until then, and replace it with the cult of Tito.

Official documents identify 55,663 *ibeovci*, of whom 15,737 were arrested, but it should not be forgotten that the documents were partly destroyed (to what extent?), especially after the fall

of Aleksandar Ranković (Previšić 2020: 256). Ranković, a Serb, was the number two in the Party and the all-powerful head of the secret service from 1944 until 1966, when it emerged that he had been spying on Tito himself.

In fact, his removal marked the second major internal purge within the Party, after that of 1948 (the third one took place in 1971–72 following the so-called Croatian Spring).

The place of detention that was most notorious for its unspeakable torture was Goli otok (Barren Island), a system of camps on the small Croatian island between the coast and the island of Rab, run by the federal secret service for internal affairs, the UDBA, which, according to Previšić's data, imprisoned around 13,000 people.

Goli otok is an island on the Adriatic coast of Croatia, measuring approximately 4.5 square kilometers. Geologically speaking, it is made entirely of rock and has no natural water source. This, together with its harsh climate, has caused it to remain uninhabited. The internees of the camps, with rudimentary and unsuitable tools, were forced to build several stone and wooden buildings on the island, along with a few pathways, and

planted some, albeit sparse, vegetation.<sup>1</sup>

The 'Goli otok system' existed from July 1949 to 1956, with four labour camps for *ibeovci* political prisoners,<sup>2</sup> alleged supporters of the 1948 Resolution and of the USSR (for men, women, military personnel and for 'diehards'),<sup>3</sup> and was then reorganised for common criminals and placed under the control of the Croatian Republican UDBA (the prison was decommissioned in 1988). The prisoners in the various camps never came into contact with each other.

The particularity of the system was that it was run by the prisoners themselves and this method was adopted shortly after the opening of the first camp on the island.<sup>4</sup> In theory, the police

---

<sup>1</sup> The creation of the few green areas that still exist today was also a form of torture, as the prisoners had to protect the little seedlings with their bodies for hours in order for them to take root.

<sup>2</sup> The camps of Sveti Grgur, Ugljan and Ramski rit were run in the same way.

<sup>3</sup> Women were mainly interned on the small island of Sveti Grgur (St. Gregory, in which the same methods were used and the same activities performed as Goli otok).

<sup>4</sup> This began with the arrival of the so-called *Bosanci* (Bosnians), a large group of 'prisoners' from the central prison in Sarajevo, some of whom were common criminals (apparently, also ex-SS and Chetniks) and former UDBA agents,

had a merely supervisory function, while all activities, including torture and abuse, were left to the prisoners, who were divided into categories according to their level of docility and readiness to abjure their 'misguided' political convictions and expose other cominformists (whether real or not).

The camps were also productive, and the work there focused mainly on the exploitation of the island's stone, but also on processing wood from the Croatian coast and, as time went by, on a variety of craft activities. Thanks to the brutal exploitation of the prisoners, the international trade in raw materials and products from the island was highly lucrative for the UDBA.

In theory, the system was supposed to politically re-educate the prisoners; in practice, however, the sort of self-management carried out there, intended to dehumanise the prisoners and turn them into docile tools in the hands of the secret service. 'Re-education'

---

trained and/or with an inclination to perform all sorts of violence. They mingled with the common prisoners and took on the management of the camp's various activities, supervising the 're-education' of the prison population from a privileged position through slave labor, beatings and both physical and psychological torture, with the aim of breaking down all possible resistance.

was only achieved when the prisoner 'reviewed his position' (usually under torture) and agreed to 'complete the report', the statement (given in the pre-trial prison after arrest, again under torture). This meant joining the UDBA's information network, exposing other alleged *ibeovci*, often without any grounds, and participating in the beatings of other prisoners, in order to escape the violence and terror. It should be noted that, according to many former prisoners, the so-called 'investigators' were undercover agents, sometimes criminals, often sadists. The essence of self-managed concentration camps, a sort of hybrid of Nazi, Stalinist and Yugoslav monarchist prison methods, consisted in making prisoners the torturers of their fellow inmates through a variety of practices, turning them into 'informers' (the so called *revirdirci*), i.e. people who had realised the seriousness of their betrayal of the Party, had reformed and agreed to work against the enemies of the state through violence and informing. In order to regain their freedom after their re-education, prisoners had to sign a statement that committed them to never reveal the existence of the camp and to collaborate with the secret services in the future. After leaving the

camp, along with all the difficulties caused by the impossibility of finding suitable employment and the destruction of their families during their absence, thanks to the persuasive and dissuasive action of the secret police, former prisoners remained under surveillance for years and years. The world of concentration camps extended far beyond the island: there were prisons and labour camps in the various republics, where political prisoners were treated appallingly. The most notorious prisons for the detention of so-called cominformists included those of Ramski Rit, Glavnjača (Belgrade, Serbia), Stara Gradiška (Croatia, formerly the site of a concentration camp during the Ante Pavelić regime), Zabela (Požarevac prison, central Serbia), Stolac (BiH, Herzegovina), Ugljan (an island opposite Zadar), Bileća (BiH, Republika Srpska, eastern Herzegovina).

The regime's repression of dissidents and 'disobedients' continued even after the camps were closed (Antić 2016; Gruenwald 1987; Cvetković 2019).

The truth about the labour and re-education camps was carefully concealed from the population by the authorities, also partly thanks to the mandatory silence of the ex-deportees, although there were in any case se-

cret rumors of their existence. As argued by Đurišić Bečanović (Đurišić Bečanović 2022: 54–55), for decades, the authorities made Goli otok a 'ne-činjenica' ('non-reality') and forbade semi-otization by preventing it from being discussed. Meanwhile, the break with Stalin provided Tito with great advantages in international politics, as much in terms of financial support from the West, the United States and the International Monetary Fund above all (Ceh 2015), as in terms of political credibility, which made it possible for Tito to lead the creation of the Non-Aligned countries Movement.

After 1980, the year of Tito's death, it became possible to speak more freely about the most controversial topic in the history of socialist Yugoslavia, Goli otok, and literary accounts of former prisoners, memoirs and works on the subject began to be published.<sup>5</sup> Pseudo-historical and other types of

---

<sup>5</sup> On literary accounts before the 1980s, see Kadić 1978; Gruenwald 1987. A number of films on the subject were also released in the early 1980s. These were followed by several documentaries, starting with *Goli život* (Bare existence) shot by Danilo Kiš in Israel with director Aleksandar Mandić and aired as a series in 1990, which showed the Yugoslav general public the horror of Goli otok through the accounts of two former prisoners (Beganović 2006).

texts also appeared, often with the intention of justifying what had taken place, but for a long time there was a lack of in-depth scientific studies, partly due to the prolonged closure of the UDBA archives. In short, 'zaboravljanje golotočke traume bilo je dugoročno i relativno uspešno sprovedena strategija socijalističkog režima' ('forgetting the trauma of Goli otok was a long-term and relatively effective strategy of the socialist regime', Đurišić Bečanović 2022: 56).

Many more works on the subject of Goli otok were produced in the 1990s, along with numerous articles in magazines and newspapers (Moscarda Oblak 2007: 74). However, the great interest in Goli otok that spread throughout Yugoslavia in the 1980s was short-lived. The period during which the subject became public knowledge explains the rapid decline of the general public's attention from the 1990s onwards. The country fell apart in a decade, with new wars and the creation of new concentration camps, as well as new national states, which led to the reshaping of the collective memory of the communities involved.

In the countries that succeeded Yugoslavia, the communist victims of the communists were no

longer of interest, especially because they could not be integrated into the nationalist public discourses prevailing at the time. This was due to the fact that the persecution of dissidents was not ethnically based, since in theory it was founded on ideological issues. In actual fact, it was founded on internal struggles at the top of the Party and the paranoia generated in the powerful leadership group by the clash with Cominform.

The Croatian island as an important place of remembrance for various national communities has long been the subject of debate, but it has not yet been 'memorialised',<sup>6</sup> or institutionalized as such (Badescu 2019).

## 2. Dragoslav Mihailović

Dragoslav Mihailović was born in 1930 in Ćuprija, in the Morava River region of central Serbia, a place that often features in his works with its cultural and linguistic connotations. During his

---

<sup>6</sup> Associations of prisoners, their relatives and supporters of remembrance demand that the island be turned into a memorial. In Croatia, it is important to mention the Goli otok 'Ante Zemljarić' association and the Documenta center for confrontation with the past (Centar za suočavanje s prošlošću Documenta). Similar associations are also present in other former Yugoslav republics (Badescu 2019: 391–94).

high school years, he was a member of the Communist Youth League of Yugoslavia, a youth branch of the Communist Party, until its dissolution at the end of 1948, when he applied to join the Party. In 1950, after finishing high school, he was arrested as an *ibeovac* – without any real proof – in his hometown Čuprija. He was subsequently transferred to other prisons (Kragujevac, Ada Ciganlija), ending up in the Goli otok ‘re-education’ camp, where he spent 15 months, until the end of spring 1952. Following his release, he endured financial difficulties for a long time and was unable to find suitable and stable employment due to his past. He began publishing short stories in 1958, and literary fame arrived in 1967 with his first collection, *Frede, laku noć*, which won an award in the same year.<sup>7</sup> He then published his first novel, *Kad su cvetale tikve*, the first literary work in Yugoslavia that alluded to the repression against the *ibeovci* without, however, mentioning either them or the island, which immediately be-

---

<sup>7</sup> According to the author, the prize was awarded due to a kind of misunderstanding, facilitated by the brief relaxation of police control following the deposition of Ranković, as the jury did not apparently know about his past at Goli otok (quoted in Hodel 2021: 16–17).

came a cult book. However, the play based on the book in 1969 was so explicit that it irked the Party’s top leadership. It was pulled from the stage after five performances, albeit without explicit official censorship, confirming the preventive effectiveness of the police’s deterrence measures against citizens, who were led to punish themselves to avoid incurring the reaction of the authorities (Perić 2012: 95). Following this event, which deeply disturbed cultured society, the book also disappeared from the bookshops and was therefore effectively banned, for nine years.

From 1971 Mihailović devoted his time to his literary activities, and received numerous prestigious prizes and awards for his books, screenplays and collections of short stories over the years. He was still controlled by the secret service however, until 1990, and was only rehabilitated in 2006. In the early 1990s he was one of the founders of several Serbian associations that exposed and studied the repression perpetrated by Tito’s regime. He died in 2023 (Ninić 2017: 10–12).

2.1 Mihailović was a ‘paradigmatic’ figure of Serbian narrative

neorealism from the 1960s.<sup>8</sup> His literary works (mainly novels and short stories, but also dramas) often contain a significant autobiographical element. This ‘latentni autobiografizam’ (‘latent autobiographism’, Pantić 2009: 21), was due both to the frequent and distinct setting of his narratives in his home region, with its linguistic and cultural characteristics, and to the repetition of themes and motifs. Critics have repeatedly observed how, in his long literary career, the writer often returned to settings, character types and themes, even developing his short prose into novels, and the same applies to his theatrical works.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> ‘Lični ton ispovesti i iluzija govorenija nametnuli su se kao nova paradigma’ (‘The personal tone of the confession and the illusion of the spoken word have imposed themselves as a new paradigm’, Jerkov 1991: 121). Jerkov (Jerkov 1991) is very critical of the narrative of this new realist wave in Serbian literature and also as part of Mihailović’s work. Miroslav Pantić (Pantić 2009: 23) has a different opinion, but equally describes Mihailović as a ‘paradigmatic figure’.

<sup>9</sup> ‘Skoro svaki njegov roman nalazi analogiju u nekom aspektu njegovih kraćih prozanih djela. Isti je slučaj kad je reč i o dramskom opusu’ (‘Almost every one of his novels finds analogies with his shorter prose in some aspects. The same also applies to his dramatic work’, Perić 2013: 705).

Allusions to imprisonment and internment had already appeared in his earliest works, but only in the 1990s was there a substantial change with respect to his previous fiction (Ilić 2012). His experience in the concentration camp became an explicit and central theme, while his literary writing began to be considered as ‘documentary prose’ (auto-fiction, *fictio documentaria* or ‘Goli otok prose’) which fixed his personal memories of his camp life in literature.

The theme of the camp had actually been part of Mihailović’s work for a long time, and in 1978 he began secretly contacting former prisoners and tape-recording ‘conversations’ with them.<sup>10</sup> It was only in 1990 that he published the first volume of a large collection of witness accounts, which was to grow to five volumes and around 2,600 pages, *Goli otok* (I, Mihailović 1990; II, Mihailović 1995; III, Mihailović 1995; IV Mihailović 2011; V, Mihailović 2012).

---

<sup>10</sup> Mihailović says that, for 25 years, he thought he was not up to the task of tackling a subject that would require Dostoevskii’s skills. This was until the death, in 1978, of a former prisoner, considered to be a kind of living memory of the reality of Goli otok, which prompted him to start collecting the accounts of the victims (Mihailović 2016: 13–19).

After his first step in documentary writing, with the first volume of *Goli otok*, Mihailović's personal experiences of the concentration camp, as well as those of other former prisoners, appeared clearly in Mihailović's fiction with the collection of short stories *Lov na stenice* of 1993, which was followed by other literary works on the subject of Goli otok. The fate of the victims, but also the fates of their persecutors – equally tragic in their own way – remained central to his literary production.

The *Lov na stenice* collection is a hybrid work which combines autobiographical and historical testimonies in nine short stories linked by the main first-person narrator, who participates in or witnesses the events narrated, and by the space and time of the repression against real or presumed *ibeovci*, including pre-trial prisons, labour camps and the widespread practice of torture (Aćimović 2018: 87–111; Kecojević 2021). The book includes parts of the memories of Mihailović and his fellow prisoners, and all the characters, both victims and persecutors, appear with their real names, which emphasizes the testimo-

nial value of the work (Jeremić 2007).<sup>11</sup>

The actualization of the individual and collective trauma of the 1950s, using the tools of oral history, preceded and accompanied the literary transfiguration of the traumatic reality that continued throughout the last narrative phase of Mihailović's production.<sup>12</sup>

In his process of elaborating his trauma, documentary evidence and historiographic research turned out to be necessary, and expressing his traumatic experience (and his fellow prisoners' personal experience) in a literary form was also necessary (Ilić 2012: 73). Writing was no longer simply a place for condemning and preserving the memory of what those who endured the suffering *cannot* forget and what society *must not* forget, but also a place where the tormenting memory of trauma is reprocessed, which may provide at least partial relief. Mihailović's literary narrative was now essentially autobiographical, a sort of

---

<sup>11</sup> It is worth noting the negative opinion of the work expressed by Jerkov (Jerkov 1994).

<sup>12</sup> On the relationship between documentary and strictly literary (fictional) writing in Mihailović's oeuvre, see Aćimović, who argues there is no clear dividing line between the two, due to the presence of the same creative processes in both (Aćimović 2009).

‘fikcionalizacija jastva’ (‘self-fictionalisation’, Zlatar Violić 2009: 40) which returned the powerless victims, narrator and characters, performativity in the narration.<sup>13</sup> Narrating crime means reporting and condemning, ‘ja koji iskazuje, promatra i sudi onom ja u iskazanom’ (‘the narrating self observes and judges the narrated self’, Lerider 2009: 131).

*Goli otok* is a hybrid work, ranging from journalism to non-fiction literature and memoirs, but above all it is a documentary work, a collection of witness accounts compiled with the methods of oral history (Portelli 2014), accompanied by Mihailović’s historiographic or journalistic texts (introductions, long notes) and numerous other documents (letters, lists of victims and witnesses, etc.). In the notes, especially, and in the introduction to the individual accounts, Mihailović painstakingly reconstructs the infernal trajectory of the repression of the Yugoslav regime. The author studied historiographic sources and collected all sorts of data over several decades, attempting to penetrate its intricate sociological, cultural-historical and polit-

<sup>13</sup> ‘Autobiografsko govorno lice postaje performativni subjekt’ (‘The autobiographical narrator becomes the performative subject’, Smit 2009: 99).

ical-historical aspects. For Mihailović, as well as for his interlocutors, the recovery of the traumatic memory of the concentration camp after decades of silence has a strong testimonial ethical value as a report against a regime and an era, in defense of the victims. Such an action takes responsibility for them as well as for the culture of the community they belong to (Zlatar Violić 2009: 42), and functions as a reminder for future generations. As Mihailović himself points out (Mihailović 2018: 184) at the end of a particularly intimate and rich ‘conversation’ full of Mihailović’s observations and memories between the author and his friend Fedor Pifat (the first to agree to record a witness account), the mnemonic and narrative recovery of the trauma for them, as participants and victims, also serves as ‘neku vrstu izlječenja’ (‘a kind of healing’).

### 3. Memory, Trauma, Memories

In order to highlight the relationship between the memory of trauma and literary writing, I am going to examine the introductory text to the first volume of *Goli Otok* entitled *Kruna na zločinoj glavi* (*The Crown on the*

*Head of Crime*, Mihailović 2016: 5–46), and in particular the first and last sections,<sup>14</sup> which differ dramatically from the rest of the text in terms of form and content, as well as from the author's subsequent literary writings dedicated to the theme of the camp. The first part of this book (Mihailović 2016: 5–13) is neither documentary nor journalistic; it is an autobiographical memoir, narrated in a literary style and can be defined as a 'literary expression of a dreamlike memory'. Various themes are touched upon in the text, starting with how, 25 years later, in 1978, the author decided to collect the witness accounts, and on what criteria he based his choice of interlocutors (high moral standing and sincerity, extensive experience and knowledge of the subject, and, finally, good expressive skill). Many of the former prisoners he contacted refused to cooperate, because they were unable or unwilling to speak difficult truths about events 'izvan humanističke istorije sveta' ('outside the humanistic history of the world', Mihailović 2016: 20). The readers of the book are also

---

<sup>14</sup> The book is divided thematically into several parts separated by spacing. Ilić (Ilić 2012: 72) highlights its 'čista literarna forma' ('pure literary form'), without however analyzing it.

characterized in a certain sense: 'ovo nije knjiga za ljude koji rigidno drže do svog visokog mišljenja o ljudskoj vrsti' ('it is not a book for people who are rigidly attached to their high opinion of the human race', Mihailović 2016: 20). Many pages are dedicated to the criticism of official historiography on the subject, many to historical events and Yugoslavia's relations with Eastern European countries from 1948 onwards. The West is also criticized, since it supported Tito's Yugoslavia economically for its own political interests, because it was anti-Soviet, without taking into consideration the real lack of democracy in the regime. Moreover, there are reports about the national composition of the population of prisoners and numbers concerning the various types of repression, data that are not and cannot be confirmed by documents. The last part of the text (Mihailović 2016: 44–46) abandons the journalistic-historical tone once more, without, however, qualifying as a memoir, and, together with the first part, forms a 'literary' frame that offers many insights into literature as an expression of trauma.

**3.1.** 'Muči me jedan san, za koji znam da nije san' ('I am tormented by a dream that I know

is not a dream’): this is the opening sentence of *The Crown on the Head of Crime*. It is a memory that is not recognised as such, a memory that is rejected but cannot be eliminated and is always lurking in the shadows, as is common in traumatic memory. It is almost completely forgotten (Mihailović 2016: 13), and the narrator reconstructs it with his narrative memory, rationalizing it (with expressions like ‘mora biti’, ‘nije moglo biti’, ‘it must have been’ or ‘it couldn’t have been’), but which fails to emerge fully from emotional memory. It is the memory of the island seen from the sea, from the boat taking a large group of former prisoners back to the mainland after they have served their sentences and completed their ‘re-education’.

The autobiographical subject does not remember the exact circumstances of his release and the journey back to life ‘outside’, and some elements are also absent from the memories of many other former prisoners:

*Zašto se polaska sa Golog toliko slabo sjećam?*  
(Mihailović 2016: 5).

*Koliko nas je tu? [na brodu] Pripremajući ovu knjigu, to pitanje sam postavio, sigurno, više hiljada puta i valjda ni-*

*jedanput nisam dobio odrešit odgovor* (Mihailović 2016: 9).

*(Why do I remember so little about leaving the island?*

*How many of us are there? [on the ship] While I was putting this book together, I must have asked this question several thousand times and probably not once did I receive a straight answer. Mihailović 2016: 5–9)*

The feelings that accompanied that journey are forgotten too: ‘Da li sam se prema onima koji ostaju možda osećao pomalo i kriv?’ (‘did I perhaps feel a certain amount of guilt about those left behind?’; Mihailović 2016: 5). In the memory, the place was ‘potpuno nestvarno. Onog časa kad se odmaknem od njega, znao sam, više neću verovati da je takvo mesto zemaljska kuga uopšte mogla poroditi. A on je ipak ostajao upravo tamo’ (‘completely unreal. The moment I left it, I knew I would never again be able to believe that such a place could have been generated by the terrestrial globe. And yet it was still right there’, Mihailović 2016: 5).

Some memories of people and events that took place on the island delay the description of a

crucial scene. In the crowded boat that slowly sails along the coast, no singing (frequent and compulsory on the island) can be heard and the atmosphere is heavy. Everyone is burdened by having been obliged to sign a pledge to become an informer for the UDBA, everyone has a shattered life behind them and a totally uncertain future, no one feels joy about their return to freedom. The narrator is also convinced that he will soon be sent back to the island.

He feels isolated and stares blankly into space. Until he catches sight of something: 'I onda sam to ugledao' ('And then I saw it', Mihailović 2016: 9, all italics in the quotations are mine, R.M.).

A dazzling white scree is described as swaying slightly (a projection of the boat's movement) and 'haotičan kao da je skrkan odnekud s neba' ('chaotic as if it had fallen from somewhere in the sky', Mihailović 2016: 10). Once past the rock, a 'work brigade' appears on the shoreline, which the narrator knows can consist of anywhere from a few dozen to a couple of hundred people spread out along three or four hundred meters. He wonders if they can see them, although he knows with certainty that they can. For the first time, the narrator looks

from the outside at the world he had been a part of just a few hours before and the impression it makes on him is totally alienating.

The group of people on the island looks 'na pomalo neobičnu vojsku' ('like a rather odd army', Mihailović 2016: 10). Due to their ragged, torn greyish clothing, the men look greyish too. They are scorched by the sun, unshaven, dirty, their faces perhaps marred by something else, they look like 'nepoznate dvonožne prašnjave bube' ('unknown two-legged dusty insects'), skinny, with long arms and legs, 'štrkljasti i neskladni' ('lanky and discordant'), 'rade u paničnom uzbuđenju' ('working in convulsive agitation'), 'pokretima koji su odsečni, kratki, brzi, kao drveni' ('with sharp, short, quick, almost wooden' movements). No one is standing still, except for those who are pick-axing the stone; the others, in pairs, are picking up huge boulders and carrying them, hurrying all over the place, as if driven by 'mitraljeski rafali' ('machine-gun fire', Mihailović 2016: 11), then running back to pick up another boulder. It is 'kao u nemoj pozorišnoj predstavi' ('as a silent theatrical performance', Mihailović 2016: 12). The narrator watches, completely estranged (dissociated), although it is

something he knows very well: 'Tek usredsređeniji, primećujem da i u trčanju s teretom ima nesklada' ('*only when I concentrate more*, do I notice that, in the running with the boulder, there is *discordance*' (Mihailović 2016: 12). Some slip, sometimes the person at the front of the pair is pushed by the one at the back or pulled by others with a kind of halter. This continuous and discordant motion along the whole line looks like a 'skakutav, iskrivljen balet' ('ungainly, jumping ballet', Mihailović 2016: 12). There are moments when the running stops, as if someone is refusing to work. The narrator knows that this is not possible, that no one would voluntarily refuse, and yet, totally disassociated, he asks himself: 'Pitaju li se oni to: šta je sad opet?' ('Are they wondering what is happening again?', Mihailović 2016: 12). Then everyone stops, drops their load and goes to where the interruption happened, until the person who caused it disappears from view, while the men gathered around him agitate their hands and feet. It is a beating. Meanwhile, on the other side they scurry around even more furiously, as if – according to the narrator – the others want to distinguish themselves from those who have thoughtlessly caused the interruption.

'Dva-tri minuta brod se vuče kraj tog prikazanja; ali i kad ga mimoide, ja se kao omađijan osvrćem za njim, i za sve to vreme otuda ne dođe ni jedan jedini glas' ('For two or three minutes the ship slowly advances alongside that *vision*; but even when it has sailed past it, I turn to look at it as though bewitched, and *all this time not a single sound can be heard*', Mihailović 2016: 12). At times, the subject has the impression that he can see gaping mouths, faces which have actually become purple from screaming, but 'ne, ništa od toga. Ona su sasvim bezoblična i mrtvački ozbiljna i deluju kao da im glasno izražavanje osećanja, prosto, ne priliči' ('no, there is none of this. The faces are completely *expressionless and deadly serious*, giving the impression that *expressing emotions out loud is simply not appropriate for them*', Mihailović 2016: 12).

As the boat sails away, that frenzied performance of wooden puppets remains completely silent in the distance, and silence reigns on the ship as well.

That silent scene, watched from outside in slow motion and with an absolute sense of extraneousness, clearly expresses his dissociation from his emotional memory.

This sort of 'dreamlike memory' contrasts with the flat, realistic style of the narrative memoirs that appear in the writer's literary works. The silence of the distant gaze, emphasized repeatedly, is in stark contrast with the memories of many survivors who talked about the infernal din of shrieks, beatings, moans, chants and slogans that accompanied their existence at Goli otok.

Despite the enormous amount of documentary material published, the theme of Goli otok remains constant in Mihailović's literary writing, as if due to some sort of obsessive compulsion. We know that trauma remains indelibly etched upon the victims, but also that 'Telling the story is important; without stories, memory becomes frozen; and without memory you cannot imagine how things can be different' (Van der Kolk 2014: 220).

3.2. 'Potekao iz politike, zločin Golog otoka se samo politikom ne može objasniti' ('Triggered by politics, the crime of Goli otok cannot only be explained by politics'): this is the incipit of the last part of the text examined, which delimits the literary 'frame' of *The Crown on the Head of Crime* (Mihailović 2016: 44).

Here the Mihailović's gaze extends to the anthropological and

ethnological dimension of Goli otok and its memory. From the very first stories whispered by survivors to a few trusted individuals, the Goli otok phenomenon turned into the subject of an underground popular narrative, and quickly became part of the cultural heritage of the peoples of Yugoslavia. A secret story yet known to all which, changing through oral transmission, spread unstoppably, like a kind of popular belief, encouraged, rather than obliterated, by forty years of complete official denial.

As with all stories of extreme trauma, 'užas koji je vejao iz onog šapata bijo je do te mere nestvaran' ('the horror that emanated from that whisper was so unreal', Mihailović 2016: 45) that it could only resemble ghost stories.

Istina o tom užasu bila je toliko fantazmagorična da je svako izdvojeno, određeno kazivanje o njemu ispadalo pomalo lažno. Istina o neuhvatljivom može biti jako neistinita. (The *truth about this horror* was so *unreal* that every single story about it was inherently a bit untrue. The *truth about what is inconceivable* can be really *untrue*, Mihailović 2016:

45). Bol, patnja i užas na Golom otoku bili su toliko nestvarni da ih dobro može iskazati jedino potpuno slobodna imaginacija narodnog predanja. Pristupajući radu na ovoj knjizi kao svedok, žrtva i učesnik, i tražeći kao saradnike druge svedoke, žrtve i učesnike, znao sam da ćemo svi zajedno, a ponajpre ja, biti nedostojini istine o kojoj želimo da govorimo. [...]  
Zato mislim da se prava istina o Golom otoku nalazi u legendi o njemu. [...] Tek tamo, negde u udaljenoj, mračnoj visini, nalazi se mračna, žalobna istina o nama

(The pain, suffering and horror at Goli otok were so unreal that they can only be properly expressed by the completely unfettered imagination of folk tradition.

As I set to work on this book as a witness, victim and participant, and sought out other witnesses, victims and participants as contributors, I knew that all of us together, myself first and foremost, would be unworthy

of the truth we wanted to speak about. [...] That is why I think *the real truth* about Goli otok is to be found in the *legend* about it. [...] Only there, somewhere in the far dark heights, lies *the dark mournful truth* about us, Mihailović 2016: 45-46).

Those who study trauma, record the immense difficulty patients have in talking about a reality that is unacceptable, unbelievable, unreal: 'the essence of trauma is that it is overwhelming, unbelievable, and unbearable' (Van der Kolk 2014: 196). For much of his life, through his narrative, documentary and journalistic writing, Mihailović countered the unspeakable essence of evil (historical, political and anthropological) that dominated the experience of Goli otok as a whole, with its premises and consequences, which aimed to erase the individual and his humanity. The unspeakability of trauma is what Mihailović translates as 'unreality' and entrusts to legend.

The research presented in this article was conducted within the framework of the PRIN 2022 PNRR project “Literature of Socialist Trauma: Mapping and Researching the Lost Page of European Literature (LOST)”, ID: P2022Z45X8, CUP: B53D23029360001, Principal Investigator: Andrea Gullotta (University of Palermo). The project was funded by the Italian Ministry of Education, Universities, and Research (MIUR) under the 2022 PRIN PNRR Call for Proposals, Directorial Decree No. 1409 of September 14, 2022. The present article was translated into English from Italian using the project's funds.

## Bibliography

Aćimović 2009: Aćimović, Mileta Ivkov. 2009. ‘Istorija, biografija i priča. O ličnom i narativnom identitetu u nefikcionalnoj prozi Dragoslava Mihailovića’ in *O delu Dragoslava Mihailovića*, ed. by Dejan Ajdačić and Zoran Momčilović, (Vranje: Učiteljski fakultet, Centar za izdavačku delatnost), 32–38

Aćimović 2018: Aćimović, Mileta Ivkov. 2018. *Proza Dragoslava Mihailovića, doktorska disertacija* (Beograd: University of Belgrade)

<<https://uvidok.rcub.bg.ac.rs/bitstream/handle/123456789/2650/Doktorat.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y>> [accessed: 16 April 2024]

Antić 2016: Antić, Ana. 2016. ‘The Pedagogy of Workers’ Self-Management: Terror, Therapy, and Reform Communism in Yugoslavia after the Tito-Stalin Split’, *Journal of Social History*, 1(50): 179–203

Badescu 2019: Badescu, Gruia. 2019. ‘Entangled Islands of Memory: Actors and Circulations of Site Memorialisation Practice Between the Latin American Southern Cone and Central and Eastern Europe’, *Global Society*, 33(3): 382–99

<<https://doi.org/10.1080/13600826.2019.1598946>> [accessed: 24 March 2024].

Banac 1988: Banac, Ivo. 1988. *With Stalin against Tito: Cominformist Splits in Yugoslav Communism* (Ithaca, N.Y., and London: Cornell University Press)

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591/j.ctv75d52q> [accessed: 18 July 2024].

Beganović 2006: Beganović, Davor. 2006. 'Jugoslavenska varijanta stal'inizma: Goli otok i Goli život', *Zbornik Matice srpske za književnost i jezik*, 2(54): 115–37

Ceh 2015: Ceh, Nick. 2015. 'Under the iron heel of western financial institutions: the collapse of communist Yugoslavia', *The Saber and Scroll Journal*, 1(4): 71–88

Cvetković 2019: Cvetković, Srđan. 2019. 'Delovanje 'unutrašnjeg neprijatelja' u Srbiji 1968–1975', *Istorija 20. veka*, 2(37): 239–56 <https://istorija20veka.rs/activity-of-inner-enemies-in-serbia-1968-1975/> [accessed: 19 March 2024].

Durišić-Bečanović 2022: Đurišić-Bečanović, Tatjana. 2022. 'Zaboravljanje traume – Goli otok u jugoslovenskoj semiosferi', *Kultura Słowian. Rocznik Komisji Kultury Słowian Pau*, XVIII: 53–65

Gruenwald 1987: Gruenwald, Oskar. 1987. 'Yugoslav Camp Literature: Rediscovering the Ghost of a Nation's Past- Present-Future', *Slavic Review*, 3–4(46): 513–28 <<https://www.jstor.org/stable/2498101>> [accessed: 10 July 2024]

Hodel 2021: Hodel, Robert. 2021. 'Politički konteksti stvaralaštva Dragoslava Mihailovića' in *Književno stvaralaštvo Dragoslava Mihailovića, Naučni skup Književno stvaralaštvo Dragoslava Mihailovića*, ed. by Emir Kusturica (Višegrad: Andrićev institute), 11–27

Ilić 2012: Ilić, Branko. 2012. 'Narativni model dokumentarne proze Dragoslava Mihailovića', *Uzdanica*, 2(IX): 65–77

Jambrešić Kirin 2007: Jambrešić Kirin, Renata. 2007. 'Šalje tito svoje na ljetovanje!: ženska trauma i arhipelag Goli', *Treća*, 1(IX): 9–38

Jeremić 2007: Jeremić, Ljubiša. 2007. 'Prizivanje priče iz istorije u *Lov na stenice*' in: Jeremić, Ljubiša, *O srpskim piscima* (Beograd: Srpska književna zadruga), 192–97

Jerkov 1991: Jerkov, Aleksandar. 1991. *Od modernizma do post-moderne. Pripovedač i poetika, priča i smrt*, (Priština – Dečje novine, Gornji Milanovac: Jedinstvo)

Jerkov 1994: Jerkov, Aleksandar. 1991. *Stenice i istine* [prikaz knjige], *Borba*, 20. januar, III

Kadić 1978: Kadić, Ante. 1978. 'The Stalin-Tito Conflict as Reflected in Literature', *Slavic Review*, 1(37): 91–106

Kecojević 2021: Kecojević, Milica. 2021. "'Lov na stenice" kao oblik pripovednog venca' in *Književno stvaralaštvo Dragoslava Mihailovića, Naučni skup Književno stvaralaštvo Dragoslava Mihailovića*, ed. by Emir Kusturica (Višegrad: Andrićev institute), 125–50

Lerider 2009: Lerider, Žak [Le Rider, Jacques] (2009), 'Pamćenje i zaboravljanje – Sigmund Frojd i "izlečenje kroz pisanje"', *Polja*, LIV(459): 119–32 <<https://polja.rs/2009/459-2/>> [accessed: 30 April 2024]

Moscarda Oblak 2007: Moscarda Oblak, Orietta. 2007. Le memorie contrapposte di Goli Otok-Isola Calva, *Quaderni*, 1(XVIII): 69–101.

Mihailović 2016: Mihailović, Dragoslav. 2016. *Goli otok I* (Beograd: Službeni glasnik)

Mihailović 2018: Mihailović, Dragoslav. 2018. *Goli otok IV* (Beograd: Službeni glasnik)

Ninić 2017: Ninić, Marina. 2017. *Bibliografija radova akademika Dragoslava Mihailovića u čast osamdeset pet godina života* (Beograd: SANU)

Pantić 2009: Pantić, Mihajlo. 2009. 'Pripovetke Dragoslava Mihailovića. Slike iz turobnog doba', in *O delu Dragoslava Mihailovića*, ed. by Dejan Ajdačić and Zoran Momčilović, (Vranje: Učiteljski fakultet, Centar za izdavačku delatnost), 20–25

Perić 2012: Perić, Jelena. 2012. 'Politička pozadina drame Kad su cvetale tikve Dragoslava Mihailovića' in *Ćorovićeви susreti (22–25.9.2011). Srpska proza danas. Književno djelo Dragoslava Mihailovića. Naučni skup Hercegovina pod austrougarskom okupacijom od 1878. do 1918. godine*, ed. by Nikola Asanović (Beograd: SPKD Prosvjeta, Bileća–Gacko, Fond Svetozar i Vladimir Ćorović), 92–99

Perić 2013: Perić, Jelena. 2013. 'Skupljač današnjeg političkog pozorišta', *Letopis Matice srpske*, 189, 5(491): 705–12.

Portelli 2010: Portelli, Alessandro. 2010. *Un lavoro di relazioni: osservazioni sulla storia orale*, [www.aisoitalia.org](http://www.aisoitalia.org), n. 1, gennaio <https://www.aisoitalia.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/Alessandro-Portelli-Storia-orale-un-lavoro-di-relazione.pdf> [accessed 19 May 2024].

Previsić 2019: Previsić, Martin. 2019. *Povijest Golog otoka* (Zagreb: Fraktura)

Previsić 2020: Previsić, Martin. 2020. 'Izvorima protiv kontroverzi – slučaj Golog otoka' in *Arhivska građa u teoriji i praksi*, ed. by Srđan Cvetković (Beograd: Arhivističko društvo Srbije), 251–65

Smit 2009: Smit, Sidoni [Smith, Sidonie], 2009. 'Performativnost, autobiografska praksa, otpor', *Polja*, LIV(459): 99–106 <<https://polja.rs/2009/459-2/>> [accessed: 30 April 2024].

Van Der Kolk 2014: Van Der Kolk, Bessel. 2014. *The Body Keeps the Score* (New York: Viking Press)

Zlatar Violić 2009: Zlatar Violić, Andrea. 2009. 'Autobiografija: teorijski izazovi', *Polja*, LIV(459): 36-43  
<https://polja.rs/2009/459-2/> [accessed 30 April 2024].

# Papers



Tetiana Cherkashyna

## “With Ukraine in the Heart”: From the History of Ukrainian Autobiography in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries

This article is devoted to the study of the history of Ukrainian autobiography. The object of analysis is Ukrainian autobiographies of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, written by well-known Ukrainian writers, ethnographers, and public and cultural figures of that time who contributed to the formation and affirmation of Ukrainian statehood. The article examines the autobiographies of Volodymyr Antonovych, Dmytro Bahalii, Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, Mykhailo Drahomanov, Sofiia Rusova, Yevhen Chykalenko, and other well-known Ukrainians who had a clearly defined view of life and were active members of *hromadas* (Ukrainian intelligentsia societies) and of the scholarly and political societies of the time and who were, for this reason, often persecuted by the state. The autobiographies analysed here were among the first examples of classical Ukrainian autobiography to comprehensively reveal the life and creative path of the autobiographers. These texts were structured according to a classical scheme: family history, the birth of the author, the specifics of their family upbringing, school, and university education, their professional and social activities. At the same time, they also contained blocks typical of the description of a person's life at that time related to the social and academic activities of the authors which centred on the Ukrainian national cause. Often, Ukrainian autobiographies of this period functioned as apologias. An important element of these texts was to leave a 'living testimony' to the autobiographer's life, the lives of the people around them, the moods and interests that prevailed in the society of the time, and the socially significant events that the autobiographer witnessed or participated in.

The Ukrainian autobiographical tradition dates back to the twelfth century, with the appearance of the *Tale* [Povchannia] of Volodymyr Monomakh, which was then joined by syncretic texts by Vasyl' Zagozovs'kyi, Matvii Strykovs'kyi, Vasyl' Hryhorovych-Bars'kyi and others – all texts in which one

can trace the interweaving of autobiographical, historical, didactic and other types of literature.<sup>1</sup> Ukrainian autobiography of the twelfth to eighteenth centuries was not yet systematic and mostly consisted of individual autobiographical or autobio-

---

<sup>1</sup> See Shevchuk 2008.

graphical elements, which, like autobiography of that period globally, lacked the complex critical and self-reflective analysis of the autobiographers' lives typical of classical autobiographies of later periods, after the appearance of Rousseau's *Confessions* [Les Confessions, 1782] and Goethe's *Truth and Poetry* [Dichtung und Wahrheit, 1811].<sup>2</sup>

The basic rules and norms of Ukrainian autobiography were developed in the second half of the nineteenth century, during a period of the strengthening of the Ukrainophile, nationally oriented movement when the 'most prominent Ukrainians' of the era began to write and publish long, comprehensive autobiographies that exhibit elements characteristic of such texts such as extensive factuality, a chronological structure, retrospectivity, double perspective (contrasting then and now), an interest in psychology, self-analysis, and self-reflexivity.<sup>3</sup> The emergence of

classical autobiographies in Ukrainian literature written under the influence of the aforementioned standard examples of this genre can be related in the first instance to the significant shifts then underway in the political, social, and intellectual life of the country. In the second half of the nineteenth century, nationalist ideas gained considerably in strength in Ukraine (which was under the yoke of the Russian Empire, of which it was then a part) as the movement for the establishment of a national identity, which had begun several decades earlier after the Polish uprising of 1830, entered a new phase. The first Ukrainian autobiographers (including Panteleimon Kulish, Mykola Kostomarov, and Hanna Barvinok) were founders of and active members in the first political organisation of the Ukrainian national movement, the Brotherhood of Cyril and Methodius, which was banned by the Russian tsarist government in 1847 because its goal was to liberate Ukrainians from tsarist rule and create a common Slavic

---

<sup>2</sup> In this article, when analysing the theory and history of global autobiography, I rely on the theory of the French researcher of autobiographical writing Philippe Lejeune (Lejeune 1971, 1975, 2004, 2005).

<sup>3</sup> This is the expression used in by George Luckyj in his 1989 anthology *About Themselves* [Sami pro sebe, 1989] to refer to consciously active Ukrainian public, literary, scientific, and political figures of the turn of the nineteenth

---

and twentieth centuries who stood at the origins of the Ukrainian national movement of that time and were active in the development of Ukrainian statehood in the early twentieth century.

federation centred in Kyiv.<sup>4</sup> Experts in the history of Ukraine, especially of the Cossack era, did a great deal of educational work, including through their scholarly, journalistic, and literary texts, to prove that Ukrainians are a separate nation, distinct from Russian, Polish, and other Slavic nations and emphasising Ukraine's long-standing democratic traditions. It was during this period of the Ukrainian national movement that Kulish and Kostomarov wrote their autobiographies.

In the middle of the nineteenth century so-called *hromadas*, non-governmental educational organizations began to operate in various cities in Ukraine organising community schools that promoted Ukrainian language and Ukrainian culture and history.<sup>5</sup> Almost all authors of autobiographies in Ukrainian in

---

<sup>4</sup> Panteleimon Kulish (1819-1897) was a Ukrainian writer, folklorist, ethnographer, linguist, critic, editor, translator, active public figure, and member of the Ukrainian national movement. Mykola Kostomarov (1817-1885) was a prominent Ukrainian historian, ethnographer, ethnopsychologist, writer, university professor, and active public figure. Hanna Barvinok (real name Oleksandra Bilozers'ka-Kulish, 1828-1911) was a Ukrainian writer, folklorist, active public figure, member of the feminist movement, and the wife of Panteleimon Kulish.

<sup>5</sup> See Pobirchenko 2000.

this period were active figures in these communities (Mykhailo Drahomanov, Volodymyr Antonovych, Olena Pchilka, Sofiia Rusova, Yevhen Chykalenko, Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, and others). With the accession of Alexander II to the throne in the early 1860s, political life in the Russian Empire became more liberal. Alexander II carried out a number of reforms, including of the military, the judiciary, and the *zemstvo* (local government). One of the most important of these reforms was the abolition of serfdom. People who had been members of secret organisations and movements in the 1830s and 1850s and who had been imprisoned returned from exile. The reforms were inconsistent, however, and any sign of national movements on the part of non-Russian peoples within Russian Empire (primarily Poles and Ukrainians) was brutally suppressed. In 1863, the Valuev Circular was issued, banning any publications in the Ukrainian language. The Ems Ukaz of Alexander II in 1876 constituted in effect a complete ban on everything Ukrainian – language, culture, the printing of works in Ukrainian and about Ukraine, its history, culture, and traditions – and instituted repressions against Ukrainians using any language. This ban provoked re-

sistance from politically conscious Ukrainians. Some of the older civic activists went into exile. Young Ukrainians, dissatisfied with the passivity of older civic activists, began to join Russian socio-political organisations and participate in revolutionary movements aimed at overthrowing the tsarist government. Many young Ukrainians joined the illegal organisation *Land and Liberty* [Zemlia i volia] and, after that split in 1879, became members of the secret revolutionary organisation *People's Liberty* [Narodna volia].<sup>6</sup> Drahomanov, one of the leading figures in the Ukrainian national movement of the time, was dismissed from his position as a professor at Kyiv University and forced to leave Ukraine and settle abroad. In exile, he wrote his autobiography. Drahomanov advocated cosmopolitanism and Ukraine's entry into a single European space as part of a broad federation that would include Russia. While his writings were banned in the Russian Empire, which included a large part of Ukraine, they later became widespread in the western lands of Ukraine, which were ruled by the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Some of the leaders of the Ukrainian national

movement of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century moved there from lands controlled by the Russian Empire, including the historian Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, who later became the head of the Ukrainian People's Republic established in 1917 and centred in Kyiv. It was on these lands that an active political, social, and intellectual Ukrainian life developed at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and it was here that the chronicles of the 'prominent Ukrainians' of the time continued to be published. These were mostly older public figures whose children (such as Sofiia Rusova) were active public figures of the younger generation and participated in secret revolutionary organisations. These autobiographers (in particular, Oleksandr Barvyns'kyi) were members of local societies of the time that were engaged in the study and promotion of Ukrainian history, language, literature, and culture – the Prosvita and the Shevchenko Scientific Society.<sup>7</sup>

The next surge in Ukrainian autobiography occurred in the late 1920s, during the short period of Ukrainianisation after a significant part of Ukraine had been

<sup>6</sup> See Sarbei 1994, Yanyshyn 2008 for more on these topics.

<sup>7</sup> See Sarbei 1994, Naumov 2006, Yanyshyn 2008, Procyk 2019 and others.

absorbed into the USSR as the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, in the wake of the unsuccessful attempt to create a separate state with Kyiv as its capital, the Ukrainian People's Republic. At this time, a significant number of the former leaders of the Ukrainian national movement found themselves in exile, primarily in what was then Czechoslovakia. Later, however, some of them, including Hrushevs'kyi, returned to Soviet Ukraine and became involved in the development of Ukrainian historical, linguistic, and literary studies there. In this same period, specialist periodicals were created to publish research into the history, language, literature, and culture of Ukraine from different periods of its historical development. Hrushevs'kyi launched the publication *In One Hundred Years* [Za sto lit, 1927-1930], which published materials on the social and literary life of Ukraine in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. At his request, 'prominent Ukrainians' of the time (including Sofiia Rusova, Vasyli' Chahovets', and Liudmyla Myshchenko) wrote autobiographies for this publication. In this same period, both Hrushevs'kyi and another prominent pro-Ukrainian historian, Dmytro Bahalii, celebrated major anniversaries and used these

occasions to write their autobiographies. Given that these works were published in Soviet Ukraine, the authors cautiously avoid describing their lives during the last decade, ending their stories at the moment when a Ukrainian state independent of other countries is still in preparation. As such, historical events in Ukraine in 1917-1921 did not feature in autobiographical accounts until public figures of subsequent generations came to write their memoirs, mostly in exile. It was abroad that prominent political figures such as Serhii Yefremov, Volodymyr Vynnychenko and others published diaries as well as autobiographies and memoirs.

With their comprehensive description of their own lives in the context of the socio-political and intellectual life of their country, Kulish, Kostomarov, Barvyns'kyi, Chykalenko, Rusova and Hrushevs'kyi had laid the foundations of classical Ukrainian autobiography. The next phase in the evolution of Ukrainian autobiography would not begin until a century later, at the end of the twentieth and beginning of the twenty-first century, when readers were once more able to access foundational texts through anthologies and

new editions.<sup>8</sup> The same period saw the publication of major autobiographies by Ukrainian public and cultural figures, such as Mykola Rudenko, Ivan Dziuba, Iryna Zhylenko, and others.<sup>9</sup> The first Ukrainian classical autobiographies have still not been studied in detail. The first brief overview was given by George Luckyj in his preface to the anthology *About Themselves* (Luckyj 1989). In a brief excursion into the history of Ukrainian memoir literature, some texts were mentioned by the authoritative Ukrainian researcher of nonfiction writing, Oleksandr Halych (1991, 2001, 2008). Mariia

---

<sup>8</sup> In 1981, Hrushevs'kyi's autobiography was republished abroad (Vynar 1981); in 1989, George Luckyj published the anthology *About Themselves* (Luckyj 1989) in New York, in which he collected excerpts from autobiographies of prominent Ukrainian public figures of the nineteenth century. In 1990 the full text of Kostomarov's autobiography was republished in Kyiv (Kostomarov 1990). The first edition had been published in the late nineteenth century with some fragments removed due to censorship; in 2001, the autobiography of Kulish's wife Hanna Barvinok was reprinted in Kyiv (Barvinok 2001), and four years later Kulish's autobiography was reprinted in Kyiv (Kulish 2005); in 2002, the full text of Bahalii's autobiography was reprinted in Kharkiv (Bahalii 2002); in 2004, the full text of Rusova's memoirs was reprinted in Kyiv (Rusova 2004).

<sup>9</sup> See Dziuba 2008, 2013, Rudenko 2013, Zhylenko 2011 and others.

Fedun' (2010) has produced a literary analysis of individual autobiographical texts written by western Ukrainian autobiographers at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Valeriia Pustovit has examined the epistolary heritage of the authors under study through the prism of nation-building (Pustovit 2008). However, the overwhelming majority of contemporary researchers into the history of Ukrainian autobiographical literature address texts from later periods, studying mostly contemporary autobiographical texts without referring to the original sources of the Ukrainian autobiographical tradition. Given how little attention has been given to texts from the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries, the purpose of our article is to provide a structural and typological analysis of the first Ukrainian autobiographies of the classical type – the texts that laid the foundations of Ukrainian autobiographical writing.

The texts studied in this article are the classic autobiographies of prominent Ukrainian public figures Kulish (2005), Hanna Barvinok (2001), Kostomarov (1990), Barvyns'kyi (1989), Nechui-Levyts'kyi (1989), Drachomanov (1989), Chykalenko (2011), Antonovych (1989),

Rusova (2004), Myshchenko (1929), Hrushevs'kyi (1926), and Bahalii (1927, 2002), all written in the second half of the nineteenth and first decades of the twentieth century. The particular focus of the analysis is a consideration of the structural and typological characteristics of these first classical autobiographies of the Ukrainian tradition, the identification of their main structural and typological blocks, and the specifics of the construction of the image of the self they construct.

Autobiographical texts of every historical era have their own peculiarities, and Ukrainian autobiography of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is no exception, as is evidenced in texts of various structural and typological models. One group consisted of classical comprehensive autobiographies that recounted the author's life and creative path in its entirety. They were constructed according to the classical biographical scheme with the following principal thematic blocks: family history; information about the author's parents; birth and childhood of the protagonist; peculiarities of upbringing; home, school, and education at the gymnasium and then university; professional and social activities; personal and everyday

life and so on. At the same time, they also contained sections particularly characteristic of life in nineteenth-century Ukraine, such as: participation in the formation and running of *hromadas* and the political and scientific societies of the time; references to arrests, imprisonment, and exile related to these activities; information about traveling around Ukraine to collect ethnographic, archaeological, folklore and other material, for cultural and educational purpose; trips to European countries to for further academic training etc. The autobiographies of this group were created mainly in the crucial years of the authors' lives and usually in adulthood. They served as a kind of summary of their scientific, pedagogical, social and political, cultural and educational, literary, and literary-critical activities.

Among the authors of this type of Ukrainian autobiography were Mykhailo Drahomanov, Mykola Kostomarov, and Panteleimon Kulish, who were all active participants in the social, political, and cultural life of nineteenth-century Ukraine, and who could thus not avoid describing their own political, ideological, and spiritual beliefs in their autobiographies. It is, therefore, not surprising that

these works are mostly apologetic and confessional in nature and, in addition to providing basic biographical information, contain detailed explanations of the personal beliefs that the authors expressed in their academic and literary critical publications, and explanations of the motivations behind their actions in certain controversial situations.

Kulish's autobiography *My Life* [Moie zhyttia] was written in August 1867, when the author was in government service in Warsaw. This was a difficult period in Kulish's life, since, on the one hand, in his capacity as tsarist official he participated in the suppression of the Polish national liberation movement, and, on the other hand, he was under constant surveillance by the Russian government, which saw him as unreliable because of his close ties to Ukrainian and Galician *hromadas*. Consequently, the autobiography had to serve as a kind of apologia for the author, justify his sometimes controversial activities. This text was written in Ukrainian and was intended mainly for the Ukrainian reader, with whom the author constantly emphasises a close connection in the pages of the work, stressing that 'his father was of an old Cossack family' (Kulish 2005: 96) and

that 'Kulish's mother was a simple person' (Kulish 2005: 98), who 'knew how to speak only Ukrainian, and what she had in her head, she took it all not from books, but from the living folk speech' (Kulish 2005: 99).<sup>10</sup> The author tried to convey to Ukrainian readers as accurately as possible his experiences of the misunderstandings that occasionally arose between him and the Ukrainian *hromadas* of Kyiv, Lviv, and St Petersburg. However, the work was written in the third person, which helped the author to distance himself from his own text and emphasize the greater objectivity of the narrative. Kulish does not always succeed in this because of the high emotional tone of the narrative and his numerous digressions, remarks, and instances of self-reflection. Kulish's autobiography was first published in 1868 in nine issues of the Lviv weekly *Pravda*, a year after it was written, while the writer was still in Warsaw, and, as Shokalo notes in a note to the 2005 reprint (Kulish 2005: 95), the work was submitted for publication by Bilozers'kyi, a friend of Kulish.

Drahomanov had a somewhat similar motivation for writing

---

<sup>10</sup> Here and throughout, translations of the autobiographical texts from Ukrainian and Russian are my own.

his own life story, as he turned to writing an autobiographical note while in exile.<sup>11</sup> The main text of the autobiography was written in 1883 in Geneva, where the author had settled in 1876 because of the risk of arrest and because he was prohibited from living in Ukraine. In 1889, the text was supplemented with information about Drahomanov's public and literary critical activities in the period 1883-1889. However, the work was first published only in 1896, after the author's death.<sup>12</sup> Just like Kulish before him, Drahomanov was persecuted for his active civic position. As Luckyj notes in the preface to *About Themselves*, 'He was an internationalist and cosmopolitan. In addition to the obstacles of the tsarist government and misunderstanding among his countrymen, he tried to build the "political culture" of the nation' (Luckyj 1989: 11). His ideas were not always supported

---

<sup>11</sup> Mykhailo Drahomanov (1841-1895) was a Ukrainian historian, philosopher, publicist, university professor, literary critic, folklorist, active public figure and member of the Ukrainian national movement, advocate of political autonomy and socialist. He was the brother of the writer and active public figure Olena Pchilka (Ol'ha Drahomanova-Kosach) and uncle of the famous Ukrainian writer Lesia Ukrainka (Larysa Kosach-Kvitka).

<sup>12</sup> This refers to Pavlyk 1896.

by the Ukrainian community, so even in exile far from Ukraine, Drahomanov was forced to engage in polemics with his opponents and provide extended comments on his political, scientific, literary and critical articles in his autobiography, giving his own account of his own social and cultural activities. As Drahomanov admits at the end of the main part of his autobiography:

Throughout my life I have had to argue with many people – with different parties at the same time. Not a week passes without me encountering an arrow directed against me from the national camp: Moscow, Polish, German, conservative as well as revolutionary; I also get hit from the Ukrainophiles (mostly Galician ones) [...]. Before starting a polemic with any group or even an individual, I almost always sought gentle means of repair and took up a printed polemic only when I came across 'mauvaise foi' (bad faith) and insincerity from my opponent. I engage in polemics only as long as I think it is necessary to clarify my opponent's opinion and mine.

After that, I shut up and endure everything without response, especially personal attacks on me. (Drahomanov 1989: 136)

As Luckyj aptly puts it, Drahomanov's autobiography is, first and foremost, 'an account of an outstanding political figure and thinker', since 'it contains few personal details and is devoted to work and ideology' (Luckyj 1989: 12).

Unlike the works of Kulish and Drahomanov, Kostomarov's autobiography is not confessional or apologetic. It was written in Russian. Kostomarov describes his own life in a balanced and reasonable manner, focusing on his academic, pedagogical, archaeological, ethnographic, and critical activities. As such, his autobiography is mainly focused on professional and social matters. Kostomarov worked on his autobiography in the last years of his life. Due to health problems, he was unable to write the text himself and dictated it to his wife Alina Leontiivna in the summer of 1875. In the summers of 1876 and 1877, after travelling to Valaam and Narva, the text was added to, and until 1881 Kostomarov personally edited the text, making certain corrections. The autobiography is well structured, contains fifteen

chapters, and covers a significant period of the author's life – sixty years, ending with the events of 1877. We can conclude from a note by Kostomarov's wife in the final chapter (Kostomarov 1990: 637) that the work remained unfinished, as Kostomarov planned to continue the text and at the same time to change some of the chapters that had already been written, in particular the unfinished title of that final chapter, chapter XV, 'Classes and Trips. Illness. Bereavement. Rest...'. Like Drahomanov's autobiographical notes, Kostomarov's autobiography was first published after the author's death. In 1890, Kostomarov's *Autobiography* [Avtobiografiia] was published in the journal *Literary Heritage* [Literaturnoe nasledie] in abbreviated form (without the sections 'IV. Arrest, Imprisonment, Exile', 'VIII. Student Unrest. Closure of the University', and 'IX. St. Petersburg University in the Early 1860s') and with plentiful notes. In 1910 and 1917, Chapters IV, VIII, and IX, which were not published in the previous edition for reasons of censorship, were first published in Moscow in 1922.

An important role in the autobiographies of the nineteenth century was assigned to the Ukrainian studies of the authors, which

is why, when providing information about their own genealogy, these authors repeatedly focus the readers' attention on their Ukrainian, mostly Cossack, roots. Even Kostomarov, who begins his *Autobiography* by saying that 'the family nickname I bear belongs to the old Great Russian families of nobles or children of the boyars' (Kostomarov 1989: 57) and goes on to describe how his grandfather Petr Kostomarov joined Bohdan Khmelnyts'kyi and was promoted to the rank of Cossack (Kostomarov 1990: 11-12). Kulish, whose father 'was of an old Cossack family' (Kulish 2005: 96), and Drahomanov, who notes at the beginning of his autobiography that 'my father and mother belonged to the petty gentry, descended from the Ukrainian Cossack officers' (Drahomanov 1989: 115), also find Cossack roots in their family.

Nineteenth-century Ukrainian autobiographies are primarily histories of the formation and development of an individual, so considerable attention is paid to accounts of upbringing in the family home and to education. As a rule, the protagonists of these works received similar educations. For example, Kulish's upbringing was handled by his mother because 'the son was hiding from his father, and the

father did not care about his son' (Kulish 2005: 98), while Kostomarov and Drahomanov's upbringing and education were more the concern of their fathers. As Kostomarov recalls, 'My childhood until the age of ten was spent in my father's house without any tutors, watched over by my father himself. After reading *Emile* by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, my father applied the rules he had read to the upbringing of his only son [...]. Constantly forcing me to read, he began to inspire me from my tender years with a Voltairean lack of belief' (Kostomarov 1990: 60). Drahomanov's father was also involved in his son's education: 'I adopted a love of reading and a kind of politics from my father from an early age, and at his urging, while still a student at the Hadiach district school (1849-1853), I read almost all the interesting books from his library – mostly travel and historical works (including Karamzin's *History of the Russian State* [Istoriia gosudarstva rosiiskogo] twice)' (Drahomanov 1989: 115), for which the son was later very grateful to him: 'I must thank my father from the bottom of my heart for developing intellectual interests in me and there was no moral discord or conflict

between us.' (Drahomanov 1989: 116).

Later, the autobiographers studied at local district schools, colleges, or gymnasiums, and then became students of the historical and philological faculties of Kharkiv or Kyiv universities.<sup>13</sup> Almost all autobiographers of the time mention that 'the science at the school was dry, dead, and abstract' (Nechui-Levyts'kyi 1989: 233). The subjects taught were mainly Greek, Latin, German, and French, mathematics, geography, history, and literature. As Nechui-Levyts'kyi recalls, 'most of the lectures were in Latin and Greek. We were forced to learn everything by heart, word for word' (Nechui-Levytskyi 1989: 233).<sup>14</sup> University education was not much different.

After graduating from university, these nineteenth-century autobiographers were actively engaged in scientific, pedagogical, socio-political, cultural, educational, literary, and literary critical work. In his autobiography, Kulish recalls how he taught in Kyiv and Luts'k, and eventually,

due to financial problems, became more involved in literary and publishing activities, which brought better income. Due to great need, he also agreed to government service, which did not bring him much pleasure. Kostomarov and Drahomanov began their professional careers as teachers in gymnasiums in Rivne and Kyiv, and later, after defending their dissertations, moved on to teaching at universities, which they would go on to describe in detail in their autobiographies.

Their professional, cultural, and educational activities involved numerous trips to Ukraine and European countries, and thus the description of these trips becomes an integral part of their autobiographies. Kostomarov describes his trips in the most detailed way, devoting several chapters of his autobiography to them. From the pages of Kostomarov's *Autobiography*, a vivid palette of the life of Ukrainian and European cities of the time, their customs, everyday problems, ordinary residents and the most famous people with whom the author met, are described.

The autogeography of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century writers is quite extensive, as most of them actively travelled to study or explore the

<sup>13</sup> Today these are V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University and Taras Shevchenko Kyiv National University.

<sup>14</sup> Ivan Nechui-Levyts'kyi (real name Ivan Levyts'kyi, 1838-1918) was a Ukrainian writer, ethnographer, folklorist, educator, and public figure.

world around them. The reader of their autobiographical works is presented with a wide panorama of European and Ukrainian cities of the time including: Berlin, Heidelberg, Vienna, Zurich, Warsaw, Poznan, and Kyiv in the autobiography of the cosmopolitan Drahomanov; Kharkiv, Poltava, Kyiv, Kremenets', Pochaiv, Vyshnivets', Berestechko, Rivne, and others in Kostomarov's autobiography. Among the great variety of European and Ukrainian cities and towns, Kharkiv and Kyiv are mentioned most often in nineteenth-century Ukrainian autobiography.

Many Ukrainian autobiographers of this period were born in rural areas (on family estates) or in small provincial towns, but their conscious youth and adult lives were spent in large cities such as Kharkiv or Kyiv, where they received higher education at local universities and were engaged in active scientific, pedagogical, social, cultural, and artistic activities. Consequently, the first perception of these cities began with leaving one's native area and describing one's unforgettable first impressions of the city, which did not always coincide with the stories of people who had visited them before. Here is how Nechui-Levyts'kyi

recalls his first trip to Kyiv to study:

From the Bohuslav school I went to the Kyiv Theological Seminary when I was fourteen. The village women told me many amazing things about Kyiv, most of all about the 'Lion' (a fountain in Podil, Kyiv), about big bells and ancient churches, and my father praised the Dnipro River and the Lavra. I had never been to any city before, and I went to Kyiv with a vivid imagination, hoping to see all those wonders. However, I did not like the 'Lion', the bells, the old churches, or the Lavra. The dark old churches with their dark nooks and crannies and tombs made me sad. I was very impressed by the city with its houses and the huge Dnipro River with its green banks. (Nechui-Levyts'kyi 1989: 234)

Some interesting observations about Kyiv in the mid-nineteenth century were left by Kostomarov, who came here to work after studying at Kharkiv University and was unpleasantly surprised by the way the city looked at that time:

Recalling my survey of Kiev at that time, I cannot but be surprised to note the difference between the city at that time and the appearance it has at the present time. Pechersk was the centre of commercial activity; in the area now included in the fortress were rows of shops, most frequented by the public; the university stood almost in the field, in the midst of hills and sand mounds inconvenient for passage; the Old Town was unpaved, dotted with ugly mud huts and hovels, and besides had large vacant lots. Khreshchatik then had no shops, no benches, no hotels. Most of it was made of wood, there were no pavements at all, and in wet weather it was even more muddy and slushy. There was no embankment along the Dniepr at all; its bank from Podol under the mountain was literally impassable, and I had planned to walk along the bank from Podol with the intention of getting to the Lavra, but was forced to return because it was impossible to walk down

the slope, especially in rainy autumn. The city was poorly lit, so walking at night was a real punishment. For me, who came from Khar'kov, Kiev seemed to be a much worse city than the former. (Kostomarov 1990: 95-96)

The pages of the autobiographies of that time also present a panorama of the cultural and artistic life of the cities. It is perhaps theatrical life that receives the most attention. Kostomarov recalls in his autobiography:

Until 1840, the Khar'kov Theatre was housed in a wooden building on a long square called the Theatre Square [...]. Since 1840, the theatre has been housed in a newly rebuilt stone building at the other end of the same square, and was run by a directorate. Throughout my stay in Khar'kov, I attended performances quite often, and during my service as an assistant inspector, I was even obliged to attend them frequently. The Khar'kov theatre in all the years I knew it was not devoid of more or less gifted actors and actresses ap-

pearing on the stage.  
(Kostomarov 1990: 91)

These nineteenth-century autobiographers had a clearly defined position in life and were active members of local communities (Ukrainian communities in Kharkiv, Kyiv, L'viv, St. Petersburg, Geneva, etc.), political and scientific societies (the Brotherhood of Cyril and Methodius, the Southwestern Division of the Russian Geographical Society). And it was this activity that eventually led to their persecution by the tsarist government. And while Drachomanov mentions the ban on living and working in Ukraine only in passing, Kulish and Kostomarov go into great detail about the details of their arrests, interrogations, and subsequent exile to the provinces of Russia. Kulish served his exile in Tula and this period, according to the author himself, was very difficult for him and his family: "The life of Kulish and his family in Tula was difficult. Governor Kruzenshtern looked at him in a jingoistic way. Other people in Tula looked at him like fools, as if they had lived not under Tsar Mykolaj but under Tsar Borys. He did not know anyone, only his master, a blacksmith, an Old Believer" (Kulish 2005: 126), but despite this, 'he worked there on

foreign languages and wrote *The Tale of Boris Godunov and the False Dimitrii* [Povest' o Borise Godunove i Dimitrii Samozvantse], the historical novel *Aleksei the Unicorn* [Aleksei Odnorog] and the novel drawn from Ukrainian life *The Seekers of Happiness* [Iskateli schast'ia]' (Kulish 2005: 125-26).<sup>15</sup>

Due to his health problems, Kostomarov was offered a choice of four cities in southeastern Russia – Astrakhan, Saratov, Orenburg, or Penza. And as he notes in his autobiography, 'after thinking about it, I chose Saratov because I thought it would be better to swim there' (Kostomarov 1990: 489). Unlike Kulish, who lived in exile separated from other townspeople, Kostomarov immediately became actively involved in the local community, which included many exiled families. At the same time, he continued his historical research, in particular, research on Bohdan Khmelnyts'kyi, and began collecting local ethnographic material. The exile became a difficult test for Kostomarov; due to his arrest, he was forced to cancel his wed-

---

<sup>15</sup> *The Tale of Boris Godunov and the False Dimitrii*, a historical novel *Aleksei the Unicorn*, and the novel *The Seekers of Happiness* were written by Panteleimon Kulish in Tula, during his exile, in Russian.

ding and break up with his fiancée. At the same time, his numerous ailments began to progress. As the author himself notes:

despite all the activities I was doing at the time, I was very depressed, and the *khandra* affected my nerves: I resumed my former thoughtfulness and tendency to exaggerate my ailments or even create non-existent ones. I began to receive treatment; but because there were no experienced and skilful doctors in Saratov, I found myself in the hands of such Asclepiuses who began to stuff me with works of Latin cuisine, and I, out of fear of diseases that I did not have, acquired real diseases – the inevitable consequences of the poisonous substances with which I was treated. (Kostomarov 1990: 492)

Quite often in their autobiographical works, these authors resort to extensive commentary on their own scientific, pedagogical, literary, and critical activities. For example, Kulish explains in detail the history and publication of his works, gives them a critical description, fo-

cuses on autobiographical elements in his own fiction, and describes the reception of his works by his contemporaries. Kostomarov and Drahomanov also provide a detailed bibliography of their scientific, literary, and critical works.

A typical feature of nineteenth-century Ukrainian autobiography is their concentration on the authors' professional and public activities with only a passing mention of their personal and everyday lives. When describing their personal life, nineteenth-century autobiographers usually limit themselves to dry factual information. For example, very little information about his wife, Oleksandra Mykhailivna, better known by her pen name Hanna Barvinok, can be found in Kulish's autobiography. The author refers to the fact of their marriage: 'Kulish turned his thoughts about his family, his ideal, to Bilozers'kyi's sister, and in the winter of 1847, having arrived in Ukraine, he married her' (Kulish 2005: 121). He later explains that 'young Kulishykhya [his wife], an enthusiast like himself, gave all her wine (three thousand karbovanets) as a sacrifice for mother-Ukraine' (Kulish 2005: 124). He does not discuss their sometimes very difficult married life, but it is noteworthy that the author, who

speaks of his wife with great love and warmth throughout the work, does not mention her name anywhere, referring to her simply as 'the woman' or 'my mistress'. Drahomanov also provides limited information about the fact of his marriage: 'In 1864, my fiancée's mother died, and I had to get married earlier than I thought. So I immediately became a man with a family' (Drahomanov 1989: 121). Kostomarov left more information about his relationship with his wife. In the third chapter, the happy protagonist is preparing to get married to his former student Angelina Kragel'ska, better known as Alina Leontiivna:

On 13 February, I became engaged to a girl, Alina Leont'evna Kragel'skaya, whom I had known at the boarding school of Madame de Melian, where I had taught since 1845. After she left the boarding school, I saw her and met her mother in Odessa, where I went to bathe in the sea in the summer in 1846, and after returning to Kiev I visited their home for some time, became closer and got to know her better. The wedding was scheduled for after Easter, on Thom-

as Sunday [the name in Orthodoxy for the first Sunday after Easter], 30 March 1847'. (Kostomarov 1990: 112-13)

As the author further notes, however: 'the day of my wedding was approaching, and I was preparing for it, not suspecting that a cloud was gathering over my head, from which I was to be struck' (Kostomarov 1990: 113). As a result, in the fourth chapter, the young people are separated, seemingly forever, due to Kostomarov's arrest, imprisonment, and subsequent exile, but at the end of the autobiography, in the last chapters, he recalls how he decided to meet with Alina Leontiivna, the widowed mother of three children, when he was already elderly and very ill, how he visited her at her estate in Didivtsi, and how on 9 May 1875, after twenty-eight years of separation, they finally got married (Kostomarov 1990: 642).

However, not all the details of the personal and socio-political life of nineteenth-century autobiographers are reflected in their autobiography. The texts mentioned contain certain autobiographical gaps left by the authors, usually for personal reasons or because of censorship. Kostomarov, for example, when

describing the history of his family, ignores the fact that he was born before his parents, the landowner Ivan Kostomarov and the serf Tetiana Melnykova, were married, and that, according to the laws of the time, Kostomarov was his father's serf, and the fact that after his father's tragic death in 1828, he became a serf of his close relatives, the Rovnevs. Kostomarov also does not mention his mother's financial agreement with the Rovnevs, thanks to which he became a free man. However, the topic of serfdom is repeatedly raised in his autobiography. Kulish avoids a detailed description of his government service in Warsaw, briefly noting at the end of the work that 'it is too early to speak about Kulish's life in Warsaw' (Kulish 2005: 137). Similarly, for personal reasons, he does not dwell on his complex relations with some Ukrainian communities, as, in his opinion, 'it is too early to talk about the Moscow Ukrainian community, the Poltava and Kharkiv communities' (Kulish 2005: 134). In this way these autobiographies became the first classical examples of comprehensive Ukrainian autobiographies with a high degree of artistry, comprehensively revealing the authors' life and creative path. They are a valuable source of in-

sights into the life of people of that time who adopted a clear civic position and took an active part in the social, political, cultural and educational life of the country. Thus, the pages of nineteenth-century Ukrainian autobiography primarily portrayed the image of a nationally conscious citizen whose main concern was serving their people. At the same time, the personal faded into the background, giving way to the social. According to Oleksandr Halych, 'interest in memoir genres always arises in crucial epochs, when fundamental changes are underway that affect the interests of the broader society, radically altering the established life' (Halych 1991: 3). Therefore, it is not surprising that the early twentieth century gave rise to a large number of memoirs that performed not only a cognitive and aesthetic function, but also an ideological one. A special place in the Ukrainian autobiography of the time was given to the memoirs of prominent political and public figures who, with a high degree of documentation and varying degrees of artistry, recreated on paper the story of their individual lives in the context of the history of the country and the history of the life of their generation. Given the great significance of these personal

memoirs as sources of information, these works are becoming a subject of interest not only to literary scholars, but also to historians, anthropologists, sociologists, political scientists, and others.<sup>16</sup>

At the beginning of the twentieth century famous Ukrainian historian and ethnographer Volodymyr Antonovych's socially oriented *Autobiographical Notes* [Avtobiohrafichni zapysky] were published in 1908 in part 43 of the *Literary and Scientific Bulletin* [Literaturno-naukovy visnyk]. In 1911, on the occasion of his election as a full member of the Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv, the famous ethnographer and linguist Kost' Mykhal'chuk wrote his *Autobiographical Note* [Avtobiohrafichna zapyska]. Three years later, in 1914, it was published in issue 121 of the *Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society* [Zapysky NTSh]. In his essay, the scholar fulfils the request of the National Scientific Society to provide basic information about

---

<sup>16</sup> Among the studies devoted to this particular stratum of memoir-autobiographical literature, there are not many scholarly studies (Vynar 1981, Halych 2001, Myronets' 2008, Pustovit 2008), the authors of which analysed mostly individual memoir works without relating them to a specific type of memoir writing characteristic of the period.

himself, including bibliographic information, and focuses on explaining his own socio-political and ideological beliefs, describing his social and cultural activities. In 1909-1911, Kulish's wife Oleksandra (née Bilozers'ka), better known by her literary pseudonym Hanna Barvinok, published autobiographical memoirs recounting the story of her first meeting with Kulish, their marriage and the first months of their life together in the magazines *Future* [Buduchnist'] (part 3, 1909) and *Ukrainian Home* [Ukrainska khata] (parts 5/6, 7/8, 1911).

In 1912-1913, the first two parts of the autobiographical memoirs of the Ukrainian historian and educator Oleksandr Barvyns'kyi were published in L'viv. In 1923, while living in exile in Austria, noted Ukrainian public figure Yevhen Chykalenko completed his autobiographical memoirs. As the author himself explained in the preface to the work, in 1907 he had begun keeping a diary, in which, with short breaks, he described in detail not only his private life at the time, but also the social life around him. In order for 'the readers of that diary to get acquainted with at least a brief biography of the person who wrote it' (Chykalenko 2011: 27), Chykalenko reproduced 'his outline memories of

45 years of his life (1861-1907)' (2011: 26) as an introduction to the diary, which was to become the 'chief book of my life' for the author. The first fragments of Chykalenko's 'Memoirs' were published in 1924 in the American newspaper *Freedom* [Svoboda], and in 1925-1926 this work was published in Lviv as a separate edition in three parts. In 1925-1927, at the request of Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, the celebrated educator and public figure Sofiia Rusova wrote her autobiographical memoirs for the collection *In One Hundred Years* [Za sto lit, 1927-1930], which he edited. In 1928, after lengthy epistolary negotiations between the author and the editor, the first ten chapters of the memoirs were published in the second and third books of the collection on the condition that Rusova would not publish them in other publications, including foreign ones, for the next three years. The full text of the memoirs, completed by 1923, was published in a separate edition in Lviv only in 1937. Between 1928 and 1930, the same collection published the autobiographies of Ukrainian public figures Liudmyla Myshchenko and Vasyl' Chahovets', written specifically for it.

Most of these works were written by authors in exile, mostly in

Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Austria, and later published in Kyiv and Lviv. These autobiographies tend to be factual and lack self-reflexivity. They are primarily Ukraine-centric and socially orientated, so the authors' and their acquaintances' socio-political, social, cultural, and educational activities usually come to the fore. Chronologically, they cover the period from the second half of the nineteenth century to the early twentieth century. For example, Myshchenko brings her memoir up to 1889, Chahovets' – to 1891, Chykalenko – to 1907, Rusova in her 1928 edition – to 1916.

Unlike nineteenth-century autobiographies of this type, the main thing of the Ukrainian autobiography of the first decades of the twentieth century is to leave behind a 'living testimonies' about the author's life, the lives of people around him, the moods and interests that prevailed in the society of the time, and the socially significant events that the autobiographer witnessed or participated in. At the same time, the leading theme of the narrative is not so much their own path in life as the life of the Ukrainian intelligentsia of the period in which the memoirists live. According to Mariia Fedun', 'the memoirist of modern times understood

that memories are not only history (the cognitive function of memories). He tried to explain the past: to cast his own light on events, facts, and people, trying to preserve their inner nature' (Fedun' 2010: 21), so autobiographers, as true chroniclers of their time, relying on their own memory and documentary sources of the time, wrote down for future generations the activities of Ukrainian *hromadas* in Kyiv, St. Petersburg, Odesa, Kharkiv, L'viv, Ternopil', Poltava, Chernihiv, Katerynoslav, Yelysavethrad, and others. Each community had its own interests, which consisted mainly of a comprehensive study of the history and culture of the Ukrainian people, compiling dictionaries, collecting, further processing and publishing ethnographic materials, and educational activities.

Barvynsk'yi recalls the Ukrainian community in Ternopil' at the time:

Our *hromada* was a real school of the science of the native language, literature, and history, precisely those subjects in which we could learn very little or nothing at all in the gymnasium. At the community meetings, which usually took place every Saturday

evening, and more than once on Sundays and holidays, citizens made speeches on the occasion of some celebration, readings on literary and historical topics, and recitations of works by prominent poets. Sometimes letters written to citizens or sexes from the *Vechermyts'* or *Meta* were read and reprisals were carried out against them. (Barvynsk'yi 1989: 82)<sup>17</sup>

Ethnographic trips were made in order to acquire a better understanding of the history, folklore, language, culture, and life of the Ukrainian people. Antonvych, for example, recounts how:

in the late 1850s, our group thought that it was a shame to live in the region and not know either the region itself or its people, and we decided to spend all our vacations from the beginning of April to the end of August travelling on foot around the region [...]. We travelled on foot, in *svytka* [a traditional Ukrainian folk

---

<sup>17</sup> Oleksandr Barvynsk'yi (1847-1926) was a Ukrainian historian, educator, and social and political activist.

clothing, a long coat], and everywhere we were mistaken for peasant boys [...]. During three vacations, we travelled all over the right-bank: Volyn', Podolia, Kyiv, Kholm, and most of the Katerynoslav and Kherson regions. It would take a very long time to tell you about our travels, and probably most of them have already faded into memory. We usually spent the night by asking to stay with peasants, and never once did the host agree to charge for the night and dinner. (Antonovych 1989: 148)

According to Rusova's recollections, she and her husband even 'sat down on the land, as they said at the time [...], with purely folklore competitions' (Rusova 2004: 70):

at home I had never been in the kitchen, and here I dared to take on all the difficult work of a cook and a hostess. Ol. Ol. [Oleksandr Oleksandrovych, Sofiia Rusova's husband] had to move from books and intellectual life to agriculture. I will never forget how one morning the women came

to my house on their way back from the market in Borzna, and I was kneading dough for bread. Red-faced and exhausted from all the hard work, I tried not to show my inability in front of the women, but one of them just looked at me for a while, smiling, and then she couldn't stand it any longer and said: 'Lady, let me do it for you in a minute,' and gently pushing me away from the tub, she began to knead the thick dough. I was ashamed, but what could I do? (Rusova 2004: 70)<sup>18</sup>

But it was precisely this 'going to the people' that allowed her to better understand the life of her people.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>18</sup> The idiomatic expression *to sit down on the land* meant 'to integrate into the people', 'to live among peasants as one of them'

<sup>19</sup> This expression was associated with the activities of the *narodovoltzy*, participants in the revolutionary democratic movement of the Russian Empire that emerged after the peasant reform of 1861. During the period 1873-1875, democratically-minded young people, not only from the Ukrainian lands (primarily Kyiv, Kharkiv, and Chernihiv provinces), but also from the entire Russian Empire, carefully prepared (that is equipped with peasant dress, knowledge of crafts and customs) and

Some autobiographers included detailed ethnographic sketches in their memoirs. For example, Hanna Barvinok describes in detail her wedding and farewell 'hen party' held according to Ukrainian folk traditions (Barvinok 2001: 273-77). Recalling his childhood in the family estate in the Kherson region, Chykalenko does not ignore the rituals and beliefs of the Ukrainian people of that time, which were part of their lives thanks to their servants. Later, according to the author, being fascinated by the ethnographic trend, he recorded and published some of this folklore material in magazines and in separate editions (Chykalenko 2011: 48-49).

However, according to the recollections of the members of these communities, their activities were not always safe, 'because at that time it took a lot of courage and faith in the revival of the Ukrainian nation for people who were in the civil service, burdened by family, to belong to an

---

went out to villages to get closer to the peasants and conduct revolutionary propaganda among them in the hope of rousing them to armed rebellion against the Russian autocracy. This dangerous activity was accompanied by the risk of arrest. Between 1873 and 1879, more than two thousand people were prosecuted for revolutionary propaganda in the countryside in the Ukrainian provinces of the Russian Empire alone.

"illegal community" that could be threatened with "settlement" in Siberia or in "not so distant places" like Vologda, Perm', etc' (Chykalenko 2011: 201). Their revolutionary activities were often linked to their public Ukraine-centric work, a fact which was also reflected in their autobiographies. As Rusova recalls, 'almost every day, the *narodovoltsy* [members of the People's Will] gathered at my place, discussing plans for uprisings [...]. Quite a few strange individuals visited me with various conspiratorial recommendations' (Rusova 2004: 80-81). As a result, the author was imprisoned several times and, after serving her prison sentence, she was closely supervised by the gendarmerie.

The autobiographers of this period came from progressive-minded wealthy families. They had a good upbringing and a brilliant education in the best local and foreign educational institutions, had a broad outlook, were fluent in several foreign languages, travelled the world, were acquainted with the most famous people of their time, and were well aware of contemporary intellectual trends. They were true patriots of their country, with a strong civic position and active social engagement.

Some typical descriptions which they would use for relatives and acquaintances were expressions such as ‘a true Ukrainian’ (Chykalenko 2011: 165), or ‘a man with a deep democratic conviction’ (Antonovych 1989: 147). According to Rusova, Olena Pchilka was a model of the Ukrainian intelligentsia of the time ‘who manifested her Ukrainianness not only in patriotic words, but by actively pursuing it in her family life and citizenship. She spoke only Ukrainian, the pure Poltava language. She brought up her children in the family on Ukrainian culture, adding to it as many Western languages as possible’ (Rusova 2004: 43). The dramatist Mykhailo Staryts’kyi was highly respected by Ukrainian civic activists; Rusova explains the reasons as follows:

when the Ukrainian theatre began with such success as part of the first truly artistic group (Kropyvnyts’kyi, Sadovs’kyi, Zankovets’ka, Saksahans’kyi, Tobilevych), Mykhailo Petr[ovych] was willing to give all his property for the organisation of this troupe, despite the fact that he had a family – four children and a wife, and despite the fact that he himself was constantly

under the threat of death because all this work with the organisation of the theatre and directing caused a lot of very dangerous worries for him. (Rusova 2004: 40)

Autobiographers of this period created self-images of deeply moral, modest people who, despite their significant professional, intellectual, social and political achievements, avoided personal assessments of their own activities, limiting themselves to simple statements of facts. The self-image of women was that of atypical emancipated, well-educated women of that time, who, like their brothers and husbands, actively participated in the social and political life of the country, travelled extensively, spoke foreign languages fluently, and were familiar with the most progressive ideas of their time.

The years 1926 and 1927 were marked by the anniversaries of two outstanding scholars, prominent historians, academics, and prominent political figures, Mykhailo Hrushevs’kyi<sup>20</sup> and

---

<sup>20</sup> Mykhailo Hrushevs’kyi (1866-1934) was a prominent Ukrainian historian, scientist, university lecturer, academician of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and the Czech Academy of Sciences, socio-political figure, chairman

Dmytro Bahalii, and as a result they wrote and published their autobiographies in separate editions.<sup>21</sup> Hrushevs'kyi wrote his *Autobiography* in 1926 on the occasion of his 60th birthday and 40th anniversary of the beginning of his career as a historian. The solemn celebration of the academician's anniversary took place on 3 October 1926 in the assembly hall of the Kyiv Institute of Public Education. And as Liubomyr Vynar notes in his study, despite the numerous 'differences between Hrushevs'kyi and representatives of the "red science" and the Bolshevik authorities' (Vynar 1981: 38), which were also manifest in their anniversary greetings, 'the celebration of Hrushevs'kyi's anniversary went beyond paying tribute to the most prominent historian of Ukraine and turned into a majestic manifestation of the Ukrainian academic world' (Vynar 1981: 38). The scholar's *Autobiography* was published on the eve of the anniversary in

---

of the Central Rada of the Ukrainian People's Republic, and active public figure.

<sup>21</sup> Dmytro Bahalii (1857-1932) was a prominent Ukrainian historian, philosopher, university lecturer, rector of Kharkiv Imperial University, and co-founder and academician of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences.

2,000 copies and consisted of 31 pages of text.<sup>22</sup> Given the practical orientation of his autobiography, Hrushevs'kyi chose to include only what he believed to be the most fundamental autobiographical information about himself, leaving many autobiographical gaps in the text, mostly concerning the events of the last years of his life, not long before these anniversaries. Thus, in a dry telegraphic style, the author reports that:

having been elected chairman of the Ukrainian Central Rada at its organisation and summoned by its telegrams to Kyiv, Hrushevs'kyi arrived in March [...], for the fourteen months of the Ukrainian Central Rada (March 1917 – April 1918), during which Hrushevs'kyi was always its chairman, he filled his time primarily with political work [...]. After the Hetman's coup, Hrushevs'kyi lived in Kyiv incognito [...]. At the end of March, he left for abroad through Galicia [...]. Elected in late 1923 as a member of the Ukraini-

---

<sup>22</sup> This text is now a bibliographic rarity, as almost the entire edition was withdrawn from library collections and destroyed in the 1930s.

an Academy and having been granted permission to return, in March 1924 he returned to Soviet Ukraine, to Kyiv, hoping to conduct intensive scientific work in the new conditions. (Hrushevs'kyi 1926: 28-30)

Given the time and the conditions in which he had to work at the time of writing his autobiography, Hrushevs'kyi confines himself to stating facts about the events of recent years and does not give any assessment or commentary on his own political activity, nor does he mention the people who worked alongside him. At the same time, having described his socio-political, public, and publishing activities during 1906-1924, the author ignores the events of 1924-1926. Bahalii was familiar with Hrushevs'kyi's autobiographies (1906 and 1926) and, recalling them in his own biography, regretted that the author confined himself to a very brief overview of his own life and professional career. He wrote:

It would seem that historians should be memoirists first and foremost, but we do not notice this among Ukrainian historians. And even the author of the

classical history of Ukraine, the academician M.S. Hrushevs'kyi, whose life and work are a diverse and colourful, so to speak, epic, gave us only a short autobiography, and even that was on the occasion of his two anniversaries. (Bahalii 1927: 16)

However, as Vynar notes, in this case, 'the "spirit of the times" must also be considered' (Vynar 1981: 33).

Bahalii wrote his *Autobiography* in 1927 at the request of the Academy of Sciences on the occasion of its 70th anniversary, which was solemnly celebrated on 7 November 1927 in Kyiv at the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. The same year, it was published in Kyiv in the *Jubilee Collection in Honour of Academician Dmytro Ivanovych Bahalii on the Occasion of the Seventieth Anniversary of His Life and Fiftieth Anniversary of His Scientific Activity*. In the preface to the re-issue of the academician's autobiography, Yareshchenko notes that

D.I. Bahalii's anniversary was marked by solemn official celebrations and the authorities literally showered the scholar, unlike his colleague [Hrush-

ves'kyi], with their privileges. A decree of the Council of People's Commissars determined that academician's collected works should be published at public expense, the Kharkiv Research Department of the History of Ukrainian Culture be named after him, D.I. Bahalii be granted a personal pension, and an annual scientific prize to be established in his name (Yareshchenko 2002: 11).

The scholar took seriously to the request of the Academy of Sciences, since, in keeping with the occasion, 'this biography is inevitably needed so that the results of my scholarly work can be summed up with concrete and factual data' and 'I had to start compiling my biography myself, because no one else could have done it' (Bahalii 1927: 15). Bahalii did a lot of research, collecting materials about himself and those events that might be interpreted ambiguously by his descendants. The author himself writes in a note at the beginning of his autobiography: 'My life is to a significant extent my memoirs, so in order to make them factually accurate, I have cited documentary data from archival sources; I consider them espe-

cially necessary where it is actually about me' (Bahalii 1927: 16). This means that the work contains numerous pieces of documentary evidence authored by others alongside Bahalii's text.

Unlike Hrushevs'kyi, who in his autobiography (particularly in the first part) paid considerable attention to explaining his own political beliefs and throughout the work referred to his political activity in one way or another, Bahalii noted at the beginning of the work that 'I stood aside from politics and the active political life of that time' (Bahalii 1927: 16). Later the scholar repeatedly pursues this thesis on the pages of his autobiography, saying, for example: 'Energetically engaged in public education, I resolutely shied away from the political work of the time' (Bahalii 1927: 162). To prove this, he cited documentary evidence from his contemporaries: 'Here is D.I. Doroshenko's recollection of how I was called to the post of prime minister in 1918 and how I resolutely refused this offer' (Bahalii 1927: 163).

Similarly to Hrushevs'kyi's autobiography, Bahalii's autobiography is characterised by self-censorship, caused by concern for his own safety and the safety of his family and friends. That is why the autobiographer speaks quite cautiously and carefully

about the Bolshevik government, his attitude to it, and the conflicts that arose between it and the scholar from time to time. It is noteworthy that, like Hrushevs'kyi, Bahalii paid much more attention to the events of his life before the October Revolution, devoting nine chapters out of eleven to them, while the events of 1917-1927 are contained in only one, the last chapter. As the scholar explains at the beginning of chapter eleven:

This era of my life and activity would require a broad, spacious narrative and my special attention and public assessment in order to illuminate it; however, I think that the time for such a general and comprehensive assessment has not yet come, because the data have not yet been collected, so I will actually be able to confine myself here to a scheme, and even then it is far from complete. (Bahalii 1927: 152)

The autobiographies of Kulish, Hanna Barvinok, Kostomarov, Barvyns'kyi, Nechui-Levyts'kyi, Drahomanov, Chykalenko, Antonovych, Rusova, Myshchenko, Hrushevs'kyi, and Bahalii were the first Ukrainian autobiog-

raphies of the classical type. They laid the foundations of the Ukrainian autobiographical tradition and determined one of the vectors of its development for the next centuries. They became the first examples of Ukrainian autobiographies of an analytical nature; their scale (in terms of the amount of material covered); the detailed description of a large time period of the author's life; the predominance of the memoir component over the autobiographical one; the clear structuring of the narrative with the distribution of autobiographical material into sections and subsections; documentation of the narrative; the indication of precise temporal and spatial reference points; the introduction of actual documentary sources into the textual framework of the work in order to clarify, comment on, and provide additional characteristics; the identity of the author, narrator, and protagonist; an auto-diegetic type of narrative with internal focus; and the construction of a textual plane from authorial and non-authorial texts. If for ancient syncretic Ukrainian autobiographies of the 17th and 18th centuries the idea of serving God was dominant, then the Ukrainian autobiographies of the second half of the 19th century and the first decades of

the 20th century explored above introduce the idea of public service to one's people, whose life was comprehensively studied from an ethnographic point of view; these texts had a nationalist, Ukrainophile character. At the same time, however this type of autobiography still contains features of apologetics inherent to the earliest Ukrainian autobiographies, a feature that was also inherited by autobiographies of this type in subsequent periods of Ukrainian autobiographical writing. Other typological features of Ukrainian autobiographies of the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century (features also inherited by later autobiographies of this type) are a certain thoroughness and commitment to balance in thoughts, assessments, and judgements, as well as a reliance on actual documentary evidence to confirm the veracity of the autobiographer's words. As a result, Ukrainian autobiographies of this structural and typological variety became 'living' historical documents that are still studied today. Further study of Ukrainian autobiographies of this type from different periods of their development (from the nineteenth to the twenty-first centuries) will provide valuable information not only on the development of

Ukrainian autobiography in terms of structure and typology, but also on the history of the formation and development of Ukrainian statehood and Ukrainian nationalism, including their interrelationships with other nations in the region.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> I would like to thank Dr James Rann and Dr Josephine Von Zitzewitz for their invaluable help in translating this paper.

## Bibliography

Antonovych 1989: Antonovych, Volodymyr. 1989. 'Avtobiohrafichni zapysky' in Luckyj, George (ed.). 1989. *Sami pro sebe: Avtobiohrafii vydatnykh ukrainsiv XIX stolittia* (New-York: UVAN u SShA), 147-56

Bahalii 1927: Bahalii, Dmytro. 1927. *Avtobiohrafia. 50 lit na storoni ukrainskoi kultury. Yuvileinyi zbirnyk na poshanu akademika Dmytra Ivanovycha Bahaliia z nahody simdesiatoi richnytsi zhyttia ta piatdesiatykh rokovyn naukovoii diialnosti* (Kyiv: B.V.)

Bahalii 2002: Bahalii, Dmytro Ivanovych. 2002. *Avtobiohrafia. 50 lit na storoni ukrainskoi kultury* (Kharkiv: Prapor)

Barvinok 2001: Barvinok, Hanna. 2001. 'Spomyny A. M. Kulish (Hanny Barvinok)' in Hanna Barvinok, *Zbirnyk do 170-littia z dnia narodzhennia* (Kyiv: Rada), 255-89

Barvyns'kyi 1989: Barvyns'kyi, Oleksandr. 1989. 'Spomyny z moho zhyttia' in Luckyj, George (ed.). 1989. *Sami pro sebe: Avtobiohrafii vydatnykh ukrainsiv XIX stolittia* (New-York: UVAN u SShA), 157-204

Chykalenko 2011: Chykalenko, Yevhen. 2011. *Spohady (1861-1907)* (Kyiv: Tempora)

Drahomanov 1989: Drahomanov, Mykhailo. 1989. 'Avtobiohrafia' in Luckyj, George (ed.). 1989. *Sami pro sebe: Avtobiohrafii vydatnykh ukrainsiv XIX stolittia* (New-York: UVAN u SShA), 115-45

Dziuba 2008: Dziuba, Ivan. 2008. *Spohady i rozдумы na finishnii priamii* (Kyiv: Krynytsia)

Dziuba 2013: Dziuba, Ivan. 2013. *Ne okremo vziate zhyttia* (Kyiv: Lybid')

Fedun' 2010: Fedun', Mariia. 2010. *Vitchyzniana memuarystyka v Zakhidnii Ukraini pershoi polovyny XX stolittia: istorychni tendentsii, zhanrova spetsyfika, poetyka* (Ivano-Frankivsk: Prykarpats'kyi natsional'nyi universytet imeni Vasylia Stefanyka)

Halych 1991: Halych, Oleksandr. 1991. *Ukrains'ka pysmennyts'ka memuarystyka: pryroda, evolutsiia, poetyka*. (Kyiv: KDPI imeni O. M. Hor'koho)

Halych 2001: Halych, Oleksandr. 2001. *Ukrains'ka dokumentalistyka na zlami tysiacholit': spetsyfika, geneza, perspektyvy* (Luhans'k: Znan-nia)

Halych 2008: Halych, Oleksandr. 2008. *U vymirakh non fiction: shchodennyky ukrains'kykh pys'mennykiv XX stolittia* (Luhans'k: Znan-  
nia)

Hrushevs'kyi 1926: Hrushevs'kyi, Mykhailo. 1926. *Avtobiohra-  
fiia* (Kyiv: B.V.)

Kostomarov 1989: Kostomarov, Mykola. 1989. 'Avtobiohrafii' in  
Luckyj, George (ed.). 1989. *Sami pro sebe: Avtobiohrafii vydatnykh uk-  
raintsiv XIX stolittia* (New-York: UVAN u SShA), 57-113

Kostomarov 1990: Kostomarov, Nikolai. 1990. *Istoricheskie proizve-  
deniia. Avtobiografiia*. (Kyiv: Lybid')

Kulish 2005: Kulish, Panteleimon. 2005. 'Moie zhyttia' in Pante-  
leimon Kulish, *Povist' pro ukrains'kii narod; Moie zhyttia; Khutirs'ka fi-  
losofiia i viddalena od svitu poeziia*. (Kyiv: Ukrains'kyi svit), 95-138

Lejeune 1971: Lejeune, Philippe. 1971. *L'autobiographie en  
France* (Paris: Armand Colin)

Lejeune 1975: Lejeune, Philippe. 1975. *Le pacte autobiogra-  
phique* (Paris: Seuil)

Lejeune 2004: Lejeune, Philippe. 2004. *L'autobiographie en France*,  
2nd edn (Paris: Armand Colin)

Lejeune 2005: Lejeune, Philippe. 2005. *Signes de vie: le pacte auto-  
biographique 2* (Paris: Seuil)

Luckyj 1989: Luckyj, George (ed.). 1989. *Sami pro sebe: Avtobiohra-  
fii vydatnykh ukrainsiv XIX stolittia* (New-York: UVAN u SShA)

Mykhal'chuk 1989: Mykhal'chuk, Kost'. 1989. 'Avtobiohrafichna  
zapyska' in Luckyj, George (ed.). 1989. *Sami pro sebe: Avtobiohrafii vy-  
datnykh ukrainsiv XIX stolittia* (New-York: UVAN u SShA), 219-24

Myronets' 2008: Myronets', Nadiia. 2008. *Dzherela istorychnoi pa-  
miati* (Kyiv: Instytut ukrains'koi arkheohrafii ta dzhereloznavstva imeni  
Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho NAN Ukrainy)

Myshchenko 1929: Myshchenko, Liudmyla. 1929. 'Z mynuloho sto-  
littia. Spomyny' in *Za sto lit.* (Kyiv : DVU), vol. 4, 106-60

Naumov 2006: Naumov, Serhii. 2006. *Ukrains'kyi politychnyi rukh  
na Livoberezhzhi (90-ti roky XIX stolittia – liutyi 1917 roku)* (Kharkiv:  
KhNU imeni V. N. Karazina)

Nechui-Levyts'kyi 1989: Nechui-Levyts'kyi, Ivan. 1989. 'Zhyttiepys  
Ivana Levyts'koho (Nechuia), napysanyi nym samym' in Luckyj, George  
(ed.). 1989. *Sami pro sebe: Avtobiohrafii vydatnykh ukrainsiv XIX stolit-  
tia* (New-York: UVAN u SShA), 229-38

Pavlyk 1896: Pavlyk, Mykhailo (ed.). 1896. *Mykhailo Drahomanov (1841-1895). Yoho yubilei, smert', avtobiohrafia i spys tvoriv* (Lviv: V. Manets'ky's printing house)

Pobirchenko 2000: Pobirchenko, Nataliia. 2000. *Pedahohichna i politychna diialnist' ukrains'kykh hromad u druhii polovyni XIX – na pochatku XX stolittia* (Kyiv: Naukovyi Dim)

Procyk 2019: Procyk, Anna. 2019. *Giuseppe Mazzini's Young Europe and the Birth of Modern Nationalism in the Slavic World* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press)

Pustovit 2008: Pustovit, Valeriia. 2008. *Problemy natsiietvorennia v memuarному dyskursi vitchyznianykh pys'mennykiv XIX stolittia* (Luhans'k: Znannia)

Rudenko 2013: Rudenko, Mykola. 2013. *Naibilshe dyvo – zhyttia* (Kyiv: Klio)

Rusova 2004: Rusova, Sofiia. 2004. 'Memuary' in Sofiia Rusova, *Memuary. Shchodennyk* (Kyiv: Polihrafknyha), 9-242

Sarbei 1994: Sarbei, Volodymyr (ed.). 1994. *Narysy z istorii ukrain'skoho natsional'noho rukhu* (Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy)

Shevchuk 2008: Shevchuk, Velerii (ed.). 2008. *Koreni ta parosti: ukrains'kyi genealogikon: pamiatky ukrains'koi biohrafichnoi literatury XI – XVIII stolit'* (Kyiv: Lybid')

Vynar 1981: Vynar, Liubomyr. 1981. 'Avtobiohrafia Mykhaila Hrushevskoho z 1926 roku' in Vynar, Liubomyr (ed). 1981. *Avtobiohrafia Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho z 1926 roku*. (NewYork; Munich; Toronto: Vydavnytstvo ukrains'koho istorychnoho tovarystva)

Yanyshyn 2008: Yanyshyn, Borys. 2008. *Ukrains'ka mis'ka politychna elita v Halychyni ta narodovs'kyi rukh ostannioi tretyny XIX stolittia: stanovlennia ta instytutsiinyi rozvytok* (Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy)

Yareshchenko 2002: Yareshchenko, Artur. 2002. 'Spovid', napysana kroviiu sertsia... Dmytro Bahalii ta yoho *Avtobiohrafia* in Dmytro Bahalii, *Avtobiohrafia. 50 lit na storoni ukrains'koi kultury* (Kharkiv: Prapor), 3-12

Zhylenko 2011: Zhylenko, Iryna. 2011. *Homo feriens* (Kyiv: Smoloskyp)

Maria Teresa Badolati

## **Memoria e finzione tra continuità, interruzioni e cesure: il (macro)testo-vita nel ciclo pseudoautobiografico *Legenda o samom sebe* di A.M. Remizov**

Memory and Fiction between Continuity, Interruptions and Breaks: The (Macro)Text-Life in A.M. Remizov's Pseudo-Autobiographical Cycle *Legend about Myself*.

This paper aims to investigate the complex relationship between life and literature, reality and fiction in the work of Aleksei Mikhailovich Remizov (1877-1957), a multifaceted and prolific prose writer, graphic artist, and calligrapher. Despite a solitary and isolated creative journey, long overlooked by critics, Remizov is now recognized as one of the most original figures in twentieth-century Russian culture.

The analysis focuses on his pseudo-autobiographical cycle *Legend about Myself* [*Legenda o samom sebe*], written during his emigration. The cycle includes eight 'memoir' texts which, despite their complete temporal misalignment, cover the period from 1877 to 1954. In these texts, Remizov retraces, reinterprets, and reinvents his own human and creative journey in a uniquely original way, filtered through the fantastical categories of childhood and fairy tale. The continuous intertwining of fantasy, dream, and reality imparts a magical and irrational quality to Remizov's autobiographical work.

### **1. La riscoperta di Remizov, "rinnovatore arcaico" fra modernismo e avanguardie**

Aleksej Michajlovič Rëmizov (1877-1957), poliedrico e assai prolifico prosatore, grafico e calligrafo dall'esperienza creativa apparentemente solitaria e isolata, è oggi riconosciuto come uno dei più originali e insoliti rappresentanti della cultura russa del '900, sebbene sia stato a lun-

go trascurato dagli studi critici sovietici e russi e sia, inoltre, poco noto e in gran parte inedito in Italia<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> L'unica studiosa che, fino ad oggi, si è occupata in maniera specifica di Remizov in Italia è Antonella d'Amelia, le cui ricerche non sono state portate avanti da altri studiosi italiani. In traduzione italiana sono disponibili, sebbene perlopiù ormai fuori commercio: *Sorelle in Cristo* (trad. di R. Poggioli, Slavia, 1930); *Russia scompigliata*, (trad. italiana di I. Sibaldi, Bompiani, 1981); *Diavoleria: racconti russi di magia* (trad. di L. De Fer-

Di Remizov, artista straordinario ma altrettanto straordinariamente complesso, condannato all'emigrazione dopo la Rivoluzione d'ottobre – destino comune a tanti intellettuali dell'epoca – si occuparono per primi, a partire dagli anni '60-'70, gli studiosi occidentali. Colpisce constatare che gli slavisti italiani furono tra i primi a comprendere il potenziale dello scrittore russo, in un momento in cui egli era semiconosciuto ai più, sia in Russia che in Europa. Poggioli, ad esempio, tradusse, già nel 1930, il romanzo *Sorelle in Cristo* per la casa editrice "Slavia". Lo Gatto fu suo intimo e affezionatissimo amico: come testimonia egli stesso, frequenti erano, infatti, i loro incontri a Parigi, in quel "nido" di emigrati russi che era Rue Boileau 7, dove Remizov visse dal 1935 al 1957 (Lo Gatto 1976: 150-161). In un saggio pubblicato sulla rivista *Solaria* nel 1934, Antonini scriveva che Remizov, "comunque lo si voglia valutare, deve essere considerato [...] come uno degli scrittori più interessanti e originali d'oggi" (Antonini 1934: 84-89).

---

rante, E/O, 1986); *Gli indemoniati* (trad. di M. Caramitti, Voland, 1994); *A spasso sui cornicioni* (trad. di A. Curletto, Il melangolo, 1995). Alcuni racconti o estratti di romanzi sono inseriti in raccolte antologiche o miscellanee di vario genere.

L'opera remizoviana rimase, invece, esclusa del canone della letteratura 'ufficiale', quello del realismo socialista, e fu messa all'indice in URSS dal periodo post-rivoluzionario fino alla fine degli anni '70, quando, come tanti altri autori dell'emigrazione, Remizov venne 'riabilitato' anche in Unione Sovietica e furono pubblicati alcuni suoi scritti, risalenti perlopiù al periodo prerivoluzionario<sup>2</sup>.

È solo in tempi relativamente recenti, a partire dagli anni '80, che, in seguito alla riesumazione del patrimonio letterario degli emigrati, gli studiosi sovietici hanno cominciato a interessarsi assiduamente all'eredità poetica di Remizov, che è stato definitivamente 'riscoperto' anche in patria ed è divenuto oggetto di studio approfondito.

Oggi gli studi remizoviani sono particolarmente vivaci ed intensi e seguono diverse linee di ricerca, soprattutto in Russia, dove ogni anno vengono pubblicate tesi di dottorato, monografie, articoli critici e hanno luogo mo-

---

<sup>2</sup> Prima della rivoluzione erano stati pubblicati in Russia circa 37 volumi delle opere di Remizov; altri 45 furono editi dopo la sua emigrazione in Europa, nonostante una lunga interruzione dal 1931 al 1949, rimanendo perlopiù sconosciuti al lettore sovietico.

stre e convegni specifici a lui dedicati<sup>3</sup>.

È ancora in corso di pubblicazione la *Raccolta* delle opere dello scrittore, un *Sobranie sočinenij* fino ad oggi in 16 monumentali tomi (2000-2021)<sup>4</sup>, a cura del RAN IRLI “Puškinskij Dom”, in cui opera il principale gruppo di ricerca dedicato all'autore e dove è conservato, inoltre, parte del suo archivio personale, che ha avuto, così come la sua vicenda umana, una storia travagliata, trovandosi custodito in differenti luoghi tra Russia e Stati Uniti<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup> Per maggiori approfondimenti sugli studi remizoviani e per una bibliografia completa si rimanda al ricchissimo sito curato da E.R. Obatnina e E.E. Vachenko del RAN IRLI “Puškinskij dom”. Cfr.

< <http://pushkinskijdom.ru/remizov/> > [ultima consultazione 12 agosto 2024].

<sup>4</sup> La raccolta, la cui pubblicazione è iniziata nel 2000-2002 a Mosca per la casa editrice Russkaja kniga ed è poi proseguita, dal 2015, a Pietroburgo per Rostok è parzialmente consultabile al seguente link:

<https://rvb.ru/zovek/remizov/ss10/toc.htm> [ultima consultazione 12 agosto 2024].

<sup>5</sup> Tra questi, oltre alla sezione manoscritti dell'IRLI RAN “Puškinskij dom”, si menzionano, sempre a Pietroburgo, la RNB – Rossijskaja Nacional'naja Biblioteka [Biblioteca Nazionale Russa], la BAN – Biblioteka Akademii Nauk [Biblioteca dell'Accademia delle Scienze], la GTB – Gosudarstvennaja Teatral'naja Biblioteka [Biblioteca Teatrale Statale]; a Mosca, invece, lo RGALI – Rossijskij

Numerosi sono ancora i materiali che necessitano di analisi testuali e critiche più approfondite, nonché quelli inediti: si tratta, soprattutto, della corrispondenza epistolare, dei diari, dei quaderni di lavoro, dei disegni e così via, tutti ‘documenti’ fondamentali per comprendere a pieno l'opera dello scrittore, inscindibile, come forse in pochi altri casi, dall'‘uomo’.

Profondo conoscitore della letteratura antica e moderna, sia russa che mondiale; studioso di paganesimo, folclore e mitologia slava e, al contempo, grande estimatore della cultura orientale e dell'arte calligrafica; amante della musica e del teatro, egli stesso compilatore di testi teatrali e, contemporaneamente,

---

gosudasrtvennyj archiv Literatury i Isskustva [Archivio russo di stato della letteratura e dell'arte], la RGB – Rossijskaja Gosudarstvennaja Biblioteka [Biblioteca Statale di Mosca], il GLM – Gosudarstvennyj Literaturnyj Muzej [Museo Letterario Statale], il GARF – Gosudarstvennyj Archiv Rossijskoj Federacii [Archivio Statale della Federazione Russa], l'IMLI – Institut Mirovoj Literatury [Istituto di Letteratura mondiale Gor'kij]. Negli Stati Uniti, i materiali manoscritti sono conservati presso l'Archivio Bachmetev della Columbia University di New York e il Centro di Cultura russa dell'Amherst College, in Massachusetts. Per una parziale descrizione dei materiali d'archivio, cfr.: <http://pushkinskijdom.ru/remizov/pages/opisi.html>. [ultima consultazione 12 agosto 2024].

grafico originalissimo, Remizov fu una personalità-sfinge dalla notevole ampiezza di interessi e dall'essenza umana elusiva e impenetrabile, multiforme ed eclettica, sfuggente e contraddittoria, un enigma ancora non del tutto svelato, a cui è difficile, per lettori non 'iniziati', avvicinarsi senza la dovuta preparazione e senza un naturale, iniziale timore. Scrive Il'in, filosofo della diaspora russa e fra i primi critici dell'opera remizoviana:

Мастер слова и живописец образов, художественный и духовный отклик которого настолько своеобразен и необычен, что литературный критик, желающий постигнуть и описать его творчество, оказывается перед очень тонкой и сложной задачей. Ремизов как писатель не укладывается ни в какие традиционно-литературные формы, не поддается никаким обычным "категориям"; и притом потому, что он создает всегда и во всем новые, свои формы, а эти литературные формы требуют новых "категорий" и что еще гораздо важнее, – требуют от читателя и от критика как

бы новых душевных "органов" созерцания и постижения (Il'in 1991: 81)<sup>6</sup>.

Osserva, ancora, acutamente:

Чтобы читать и постигать Ремизова, надо "сойти с ума". Не помещаться, не заболеть душевно, а отказаться от своего привычного уклада и способа воспринимать вещи. [...] Своеобразие его акта и стиля очень велико, очень неустойчиво и по отношению к читателю требовательно до неумолимости [...] Нет ничего удивительного в том, что многие читатели изнемогают, не умеют так перестраиваться, не

---

<sup>6</sup>Maestro della parola e pittore d'immagini, la cui risonanza artistica e spirituale è così peculiare e insolita che un critico letterario che voglia comprendere e descrivere la sua opera si trova di fronte a un compito molto delicato e difficile. Remizov come scrittore non si adatta a nessuna forma letteraria tradizionale, non si presta a nessuna 'categoria' usuale; e questo perché crea sempre e dappertutto nuove forme personali, e queste nuove forme letterarie richiedono nuove "categorie" e, cosa ancora più importante, esigono dal lettore e dal critico [...] nuovi 'organi' mentali di contemplazione e comprensione" [Qui e ove non indicato diversamente la traduzione è mia – M. T. B.].

справляются с этой задачей и откровенно говорят, что они “Ремизова не понимают” (Il’in 1991: 83)<sup>7</sup>.

La produzione artistica remizoviana, comprendente racconti, *povesti*, romanzi, poemi in prosa o in verso libero, rielaborazioni di fiabe, leggende e apocrifi, saggi, autobiografie, raccolte di sogni, drammi, disegni, diari e lettere, è infatti straordinariamente copiosa e variegata, di difficile interpretazione critico-filologica e inquadramento letterario e di genere.

Definito a inizio secolo scrittore “decadente” (Kuzmin 2017: 588-593) per le tendenze mistiche ed estetiche, vicino, per la volontà di ‘sintesi’ delle arti e la musicalità della lingua, all’ambiente simbolista pietroburghese, pur non scostandosi da una rappresentazione apparentemente verosimile della realtà; fine stiliz-

---

<sup>7</sup>“Per leggere e comprendere Remizov bisogna “uscire di senno”. Non impazzire, non ammalarsi di mente, ma rinunciare al proprio abituale modo di percepire le cose. [...] L’originalità del suo atto e del suo stile è enorme, molto variabile, e nei confronti del lettore è esigente fino all’implacabilità. [...] Non c’è nulla di sorprendente nel fatto che molti lettori gettano la spugna [...], non riescano ad affrontare questo compito e dicano apertamente che ‘non capiscono Remizov’”.

zatore di testi antichi e folclorici e infine accostato, durante l’emigrazione, ai surrealisti francesi per l’attenzione rivolta all’onirico e al subconscio, Remizov manifestò sin dagli esordi un’individualità artistica forte, peculiare e insolita e rimase, perciò, un viandante solitario, un ‘avventizio’ ai margini di qualsiasi scuola letteraria, nei cui confronti mantenne sempre una posizione ‘eccentrica’, di uomo e scrittore non allineato, isolato e controcorrente, ostico e incomprensibile.

Indefesso sperimentatore di generi e stili, Remizov è stato definito un “rinnovatore arcaico” (Flaker 1994: 49), sempre alla ricerca di nuove forme d’espressione attraverso il recupero e la ricostruzione, in veste moderna, della creatività popolare, dello spirito tradizionale dell’antica Rus’, da lui assimilato in tutte le sue forme e filtrato attraverso l’esperienza di una ben individuata ‘linea’ di scrittori che ne furono interpreti – la “linea gogoliana” della letteratura russa –, di cui il nostro si considerava erede e successore.

Nella sua *Storia della letteratura russa*, scritta nei primi anni ’20 del secolo scorso, il critico Mirskij afferma che “tutta la tradizione russa – dalla mitologia pagana alle forme russizzate della cristianità bizantina, a Gogol’,

Dostoevskij e Leskov – è stata recepita da Remizov” (Mirskij 1998: 421). Lo scrittore si inserisce in effetti a pieno in quel filone alternativo della letteratura russa, caratterizzato dal legame con una tradizione pre-petrina non occidentalizzata e da una ricerca formale e linguistica esasperata, che annovera tra i suoi rappresentanti Avvakum, Dal’, Dostoevskij, Gogol’, Leskov, Mel’nikov-Pečerskij, per giungere fino a Rozanov, Blok e Belyj. Remizov, a sua volta, influenzò in maniera significativa non solo la giovane prosa sovietica della prima generazione (A. Tolstoj, Zamjatin, Zoščenko, Prišvin, Pil’njak)<sup>8</sup> e quella successiva (Šalamov, Šolženicyn), ma anche quella postmodernista (Erofeev, Sokolov, Sinjavskij).

<sup>8</sup> Nel periodo tra gli anni '10 e '20 si può parlare, secondo il critico formalista Ejchenbaum, di una “scuola remizoviana” della prosa russa. (SHANE: 1977, 10-16). In seguito, sarebbe piombato su Remizov il temutissimo anatema del realismo socialista e di Maksim Gor’kij, che metteva in guardia le giovani generazioni dai pericoli del “remizovismo” (Erenburg 2017: 320).

## 2. La poetica (pseudo)autobiografica remizoviana: mito, realtà e finzione nel ciclo *Legenda o samom sebe*

Delineare un quadro esaustivo della vita e dell’opera del nostro è un compito assai arduo, impossibile da portare a termine in una cornice di spazio così limitata. Come scrive lo stesso Aleksej Michajlovič: “Я прожил полную завидную жизнь – ведь, одно то, что я и пишу и читаю и рисую только для своего удовольствия, и ничего из-под палки и ничего обязательного! – но и трудно: вся моя жизнь, как крутая лестница”<sup>9</sup> (Remizov 2000b: 270). Egli ha infatti vissuto un’esistenza tanto ricca quanto difficile, e tale complessità è certamente ascrivibile in parte al periodo storico in cui operò: a un’infanzia moscovita problematica e misera, trascorsa nel cuore della *russità*, all’arresto in gioventù per attività rivoluzionaria, ad un lungo confino nel nord russo ed alla notorietà letteraria a Pietroburgo seguirono la prima guerra mondiale, la rivoluzione e la guerra civile e, poi, dagli an-

<sup>9</sup>“Ho vissuto una vita piena e invidiabile, pensate un po’, scrivo, leggo e disegno per mio diletto, senza fare niente a bacchetta, senza costrizioni! Ma una vita difficile, anche: tutta la mia vita è stata come una scala ripidissima”.

ni '20, l'emigrazione, prima a Berlino, poi definitivamente a Parigi, la povertà, la perdita della sua platea di lettori, l'impossibilità di pubblicare e, ancora, la guerra, l'occupazione nazista e, infine, la morte dell'amata moglie, Serafima Pavlovna Dvogello, sua musa e compagna di vita. Anche il percorso artistico dello scrittore fu tutt'altro che semplice o lineare, anzi, come afferma egli stesso: "Моя литературная жизнь шла кувыркoм. Со мной все так: подъем и срыв. Прожил жизнь скачками"<sup>10</sup> (Remizov 2003: 178).

Il presente contributo mira a riflettere sul complicato rapporto tra vita, letteratura e storia, tra realtà, finzione e mito nel monumentale ciclo pseudo-autobiografico denominato da Remizov stesso *Legenda o samom sebe* [Leggenda su me stesso], redatto in emigrazione e comprendente otto testi 'memorialistici' che, nella loro totale sfasatura temporale, abbracciano il periodo dal 1877 al 1954, e nei quali lo scrittore ripercorre, reinterpreta e reinventa in maniera assolutamente originale il proprio iter umano e creativo.

---

<sup>10</sup>"La mia vita letteraria è stata a capriole. Con me tutto è così: un sali e scendi. Ho vissuto la mia vita a salti".

Secondo la successione cronologica degli eventi, le tappe della memoria remizoviana si snodano attraverso i seguenti testi: *Podstrižennymi glazami. Kniga uzlov i zakrut moej pamjati* [Con gli occhi rasati. Libro dei nodi e viluppi della mia memoria], Paris, YMCA Press, 1951, incentrato sull'infanzia e l'adolescenza (1877-1896) e composto tra il 1933 e il 1946; *Iveren'. Zagoguliny moej pamjati* [Scheggia. Arabe-schi della mia memoria], Berkeley, Berkeley Slavic Specialties, 1986, scritto tra il 1927 e il 1951 e riguardante il periodo dell'arresto e del confino a Penza e poi a Vologda (1896-1905); *Vstreči. Peterburgskij buerak* [Incontri. Il burrone di Pietroburgo], Paris, Lev, 1981<sup>11</sup>, sul periodo simbolista pietroburghese (1905-1917) e redatto tra il 1949 e il '54-'57; *Vzvichrënnaja Rus'. Epopeja* [Russia scompigliata. Epopea], Paris, TAIR, 1927, scritto tra gli anni '10 e il '21 e dedicato al convulso periodo della Rivoluzione russa e della guerra civile (1917-1921); *Po karnizam. Povest'* [Lungo i cornicioni. Povest'], Beograd, Russkaja Biblioteka, 1929, sul periodo berlinese (1921-1923); *Učitel' muzyki. Katoržnaja idillija*

---

<sup>11</sup> La presente edizione, sebbene sia la prima in volume, presenta molte imprecisioni ed incongruenze. Il testo è stato pubblicato nella sua variante autoriale corretta e completa solo nel 2002.

[*Il maestro di musica. Idillio galleotto*], Paris, La Press Libre, 1983, sugli anni dell'emigrazione parigina (1923-1939), e la cui stesura è compresa tra il 1934 e il 1949; *Skvoz' ogon' skorbej* [*Attraverso il fuoco dei dolori*], terza parte della trilogia *V rozovom bleske* [*In un roseo bagliore*], New York, Izdatel'stvo imeni Čechova, 1952, biografia romanizzata della moglie, elaborata tra gli anni '20 e '40 e incentrata sul periodo della malattia e della morte della stessa (1939-1943)<sup>12</sup>; infine, *Myškina dudočka. Intermedija* [*Il piffero del topo. Intermezzo*], Paris, Oplešnik, 1953, riguardo al periodo parigino (1943-1953).

Oltre a quelli appena menzionati, sono stati inoltre presi in esame altri testi che, sebbene non inclusi direttamente da Remizov nella *Legenda*, comprendono note autobiografiche e divagazioni, documenti autentici e saggistica, epistole e pagine di diario, aforismi e citazioni e rientrano perciò a pieno titolo in quello che D'Amelia ha definito lo "spazio autobiografico remizoviano" (D'Amelia 2002: 449-464).

<sup>12</sup> La terza parte può essere considerata indipendente dalle prime due, redatte e pubblicate già in precedenza e dedicate all'infanzia e alla giovinezza di Serafima.

Infine, è stata presa in considerazione la corposa eredità di lettere, annotazioni, appunti, come anche diari e quaderni grafici – il 'disegno' della *Legenda* – compilati da Aleksej Michajlovič nel corso di tutta la vita, giacché tutti questi 'documenti' contribuiscono, come d'altro canto l'intera sua opera, alla costruzione del meta-testo autobiografico e autofinzionale remizoviano e del mito mistificatorio sulla persona e sul destino dello scrittore stesso.

Ci si è concentrati, dunque, sui testi risalenti agli ultimi 35 anni trascorsi da Remizov in emigrazione, la maggior parte dei quali dichiaratamente autobiografici – e, al contempo, dichiaratamente inattendibili – sebbene autobiografica in senso peculiare possa essere considerata tutta la sua eredità poetica, come afferma egli stesso già nel 1912: "Автобиографических произведений у меня нет. Все и во всем автобиография..."<sup>13</sup> (Remizov 1993: 442). L'accento viene posto, evidentemente, sulla seconda parte dell'affermazione, a conferma che, in Remizov, che gioca continuamente con i mutevoli confini di vita e arte, la linea di demarcazione tra opere autobiografiche e non autobio-

<sup>13</sup>"Non ho opere autobiografiche. Tutto e dappertutto è autobiografia".

grafiche nel senso tradizionale del termine è labile, fluida, forse inesistente.

La tecnica di utilizzo – ripensamento, reinvenzione, reinterpretazione, manipolazione – quasi ossessivo, ludico, ironico, contraddittorio e spregiudicato di fatti ed elementi biografici all'interno della letteratura di *fiction* è riconosciuta ed esplicitata da Remizov stesso già dagli esordi. Così come affermato da quest'ultimo e poi evidenziato da diversi critici, sono autobiografici, in senso originale e 'remizoviano', numerosi romanzi, *povesti* e racconti del primo periodo della sua produzione (fra i quali, ad esempio, *Prud* [*Lo stagno*] e *Krestovye sёstry* [*Sorelle in Cristo*]). Sebbene tanto multiforme ed eterogenea, dunque, l'intera opera remizoviana si contraddistingue, sin dal principio, proprio per il carattere intrinsecamente autobiografico e metaletterario, tanto che lo studioso Docenko parla di "panautobiografismo" come suo principio costruttivo (cfr. Docenko 2000). Obatnina, invece, utilizza i termini di "intersoggettività" e "pansoggettività" per descrivere la posizione creativa dello scrittore (Obatnina 2008: 27-45).

Infine, persino alcuni testi che, per genere e caratteristiche, risultano difficilmente ascrivibili al filone pseudo-autobiografico,

ossia le 'riscritture' o 'rielaborazioni' – definite dallo scrittore "ricostruzioni moderne" – di apocrifi, leggende e testi dell'antica Rus', presentano una forte componente autobiografica e contemporanea; ciò costituisce uno degli aspetti più originali della tecnica di riscrittura remizoviana di fonti antiche, il cui principio poetico viene così esplicitato: "в моих 'реконструкциях' старинных легенд и сказаний не только книжное, а и мое — из жизни — виденное, слышанное и испытанное"<sup>14</sup> (Remizov 2000a: 114).

Diviene a questo punto evidente come le classificazioni tradizionali risultino non applicabili e, anzi, quasi limitanti nella descrizione della proteiforme scrittura remizoviana, nella quale, di fatto, viene eliminato ogni confine netto tra autobiografia e *fiction*, tra leggenda 'propria' e leggenda 'altrui', in una radicale, totale espansione dell'Io autoriale nel materiale letterario 'altrui'. "Рассказать о себе нечего – я весь в моих рассказах о

---

<sup>14</sup>"Nelle mie ricostruzioni di antiche leggende e narrazioni, non vi è solo l'elemento libresco, ma anche il mio personale, dalla mia vita, ciò che ho visto, ascoltato, provato".

других”<sup>15</sup> (Remizov 2003b: 59), dichiara ancora Aleksej Michajlovič, proprio a sottolineare la sottile, funambolica, costante abilità di implicare sé stesso nel racconto sugli altri. L’ultimo capitolo di *Učitel’ muzyki* – paradossalmente l’unico testo del ciclo della *Legenda* in cui la narrazione non avviene in prima persona – suona, sin dall’emblematico titolo *Čing-Čang* – a detta di Remizov: “китайская казнь: осужденного разрезают на тысячу мелких кусков”<sup>16</sup> (Remizov 2002: 436) –, come una performance programmatica del metodo autobiografico dell’autore, che in questo testo raggiunge la massima realizzazione: “Прошу не путать никого с Александром Александровичем Корнетовым, ни из его знакомых и приятелей, это я сам. [...] Все я и без меня никого нет”<sup>17</sup> (Remizov 2002: 437-438). L’autobiografismo viene dunque riconosciuto non solo come pro-

<sup>15</sup>“Non ho nulla da raccontare su di me; io sono tutto nei miei racconti sugli altri”.

<sup>16</sup> “Tortura cinese: il condannato viene tagliato in mille piccoli pezzi”.

<sup>17</sup>“Vi chiedo di non confondere nessuno con Aleksander Aleksandrovič Kornetov [il protagonista, alter ego dell’autore – M. T. B.], né con nessuno dei suoi amici e conoscenti, questi sono io stesso. [...]. Sono tutti me e senza di me non esiste nessuno”.

cedimento narrativo, ma come concezione stessa della creazione artistica dallo scrittore, che dichiara ancora: “Литературное произведение [...] ключ для познания автора: по роману, повести и рассказу можно больше сказать о авторе, чем из самой подробнейшей его биографии, написанной кем-то [...]”<sup>18</sup> (Remizov 2002: 437-438). E poi, però, sottolineando che un testo letterario non è di certo la mera riproduzione di fatti concreti e puntuali della propria biografia, aggiunge: “Литературные произведения для писателя все, но не следует искать в них биографическую последовательность, и фактов из его ‘живой’ жизни”<sup>19</sup> (Remizov 2002: 439).

Nelle affermazioni riportate, apparentemente controverse e paradossali, risuona tutta la contraddittorietà propria dell’*autofiction*, genere letterario inteso come “fiction d’événements et de faits strictement réels” (Doubrovsky 1997) – ossia la coesistenza e sintesi di

<sup>18</sup>“L’opera letteraria [...] è la chiave per conoscere un autore: sulla base di un romanzo, di una povel’ o di un racconto, si può dire di più sull’autore, rispetto a quanto dica la più dettagliata biografia, scritta da qualcun altro [...]”.

<sup>19</sup>“Le opere letterarie sono tutto per uno scrittore, ma non si dovrebbe cercare in esse la sequenza degli avvenimenti biografici e i fatti della sua vita ‘viva’”.

due opposte tipologie narrative: autobiografia e *fiction* –, a cui non si può non fare cenno parlando del cruciale, endemico binomio vita-letteratura, realtà-invenzione. Non ci soffermeremo nel dettaglio su questo concetto, su cui esiste già una vasta letteratura critica specifica<sup>20</sup>, in quanto questa etichetta può essere applicata solo in parte, e con le dovute precisazioni, all'opera del nostro, che risulta del tutto originale e unica anche

---

<sup>20</sup> Nel 1968 il critico strutturalista Barthes pubblicava il celebre saggio dal sintomatico e controverso titolo *La mort de l'auteur*, in cui si proclamava l'insignificanza dell'intenzionalità del creatore del testo come soggetto individuale, che assumeva dunque un ruolo quasi subordinato e passivo a vantaggio dell'opera stessa e, di conseguenza, l'affermazione della superiorità del lettore. Proprio dalla constatazione di tale paradosso prese avvio, nel 1975, la riflessione teorica sulla figura dell'autore come oggetto di racconto nel famoso *Le pacte autobiographique* di Lejeune, in cui, nel tentativo di far luce su quelle zone ibride che saranno poi alla base della *autofiction*, viene delineata la netta distinzione tra romanzo e autobiografia. Proprio per colmare gli spazi vuoti lasciati da Lejeune, Doubrovsky conia il termine *autofiction* per questa nuova modalità di scrittura. Consistente è il contributo della scuola francese a tal proposito (cfr. Lecarme 1992: 227-249, Laouyen 1999, Gasparini 2004). Sulla nebulosità di tale concetto, e sulla conseguente necessità di dare una definizione esaustiva e sistematica del genere, cfr. Marchese 2014.

sotto quest'aspetto. Infatti, Remizov supera e oltrepassa, a nostro parere, limiti e confini di tale genere letterario: nella sua opera assistiamo a un continuo, controverso e vorticoso rimescolamento, ibridazione e rinnovamento di codici, linguaggi, generi letterari e materiali, alla trasgressione di qualsiasi convenzionale patto di lettura, alla contaminazione sfrenata e spericolata di vita e creazione artistica, alla compenetrazione osmotica di verità e poesia, dell'insopportabile *byt* quotidiano e della più sbrigliata e fervida fantasia. Un autobiografismo onnivoro, caleidoscopico e sincretico quello remizoviano, che diviene la caratteristica dominante di tutta la sua poetica e che investe, in misura diversa, il testo in ogni suo aspetto, dall'intreccio, ai temi e motivi, alle immagini, ai personaggi, ai generi, al cronotopo, ai procedimenti linguistici e formali, fino all'apparato paratestuale. L'autobiografismo mantiene il suo carattere pervasivo e dominante durante tutte le fasi della creazione artistica dello scrittore, donandole, quindi, una complessa macro-unità strutturale, compositiva, semantica, tematica e simbolica, decifrabile solo attraverso un esame integrato e sistemico della produzione remizoviana nella sua totalità, la

quale si confonde di continuo con la vita stessa, in una trasfigurazione continua della vita nell'arte e dell'arte nella vita.

Dalla sua angusta e fiabesca “tana di talpa”, la stanzetta parigina in Rue Boileau 7, denominata “*kukuškina*”<sup>21</sup> e tutta “gremita di bamboline e diavoletti”<sup>22</sup>, ottantenne e semicieco, il 24 agosto del 1957 Aleksej Michajlovič, ripensando al proprio percorso creativo ed esistenziale, annotava nel diario: “И стал я сочинять легенду о себе, или ‘сказывать сказку’. Мне это помогало самому себе объяснить свою отверженность. Объяснить – оправдать”<sup>23</sup> (Kodrjanskaja 1959: 125).

Tutta l'opera di Remizov è, dunque, una lunga confessione lirica e autobiografica, un testamento poetico – come afferma egli stesso: “Все, что я пишу – моя исповедь”<sup>24</sup> (Kodrjanskaja 1959: 127) – e, al contempo, una fiaba,

<sup>21</sup> Così lui stesso denomina la stanza in cui lavorava, alle cui pareti appunto era appeso un orologio a cucù.

<sup>22</sup> Così Šklovskij descrive la stanza berlinese dello scrittore, poi riprodotta anche nella Rue Boileau parigina (Šklovskij 2002: 46).

<sup>23</sup> “E mi accinsi a redigere una leggenda su me stesso, o a ‘raccontare una fiaba’. Ciò mi ha aiutato a spiegare a me stesso il mio essere reietto. Spiegare è giustificare”.

<sup>24</sup> “Tutto ciò che scrivo è la mia confessione”.

una leggenda, un mito e una stilizzazione di sé stesso, costruita con costanza e meticolosità nell'arco di più di 50 anni. L'utilizzo, da parte dello scrittore, del termine “*legenda*”, definita dal *Tolkovyj slovar' živogo velikoruskogo jazyka* di Dal' (1956) come “предание о чудесном событии”<sup>25</sup>, non è certamente casuale e, anzi, costituisce la chiave per comprenderne il mondo creativo e la concezione poetica. In Remizov, infatti, tutto è sottoposto a una reinterpretazione, a un ripensamento mitologico, legendario, fiabesco, dalla sua venuta al mondo nella magica notte di Ivan Kupala, alla creazione artistica, fino al suo stesso nome e cognome. È una mitopoiesi in cui il processo creativo investe non solo il testo, ma la vita stessa, divenendo regola dell'esistenza.

Per l'originalità interpretativa e la complessità compositiva e stilistica, gli scritti del ciclo *Legenda o samom sebe* e, in generale, tutti quelli ascrivibili all'ampio filone pseudo-autobiografico, costituiscono una forma narrativa aperta, ibrida, composita e idiosincratia difficilmente classificabile, che contiene in sé i tratti della memorialistica e

<sup>25</sup> “Narrazione di un evento straordinario”.

dell'autobiografia-autofiction, della fiaba e della leggenda, dell'epica e della cronaca, del saggio critico-letterario e del racconto magico-onirico. La narrazione, violando ogni principio cronologico-sequenziale e ogni nesso causa-effetto, spezza la tradizionale architettura del racconto autobiografico tradizionale e tenta di restituire il divenire personale, storico e artistico attraverso la percezione individuale, frazionata, disgiunta, sensoriale del narratore, in cui spazio e tempo biografico non coincidono con quello narrativo – il tempo dell'interiorità – che segue invece il flusso vorticoso dei “nodi e i viluppi” della memoria, governati, come la vita umana, dal solo principio della casualità, o fatalità, che dir si voglia.

Frammenti di memorie, “schegge” di ricordi slegati, visioni, accenni, giustapposizioni, interpolazioni, libere associazioni percettive e mentali si susseguono febbrilmente secondo un principio sinfonico dettato dagli “zigzag della memoria”, attraverso un libero flusso di coscienza dove diversi piani spaziali, temporali e punti di vista si mescolano e si sovrappongono, in un continuo e sconcertante collimare, intrecciarsi, fondersi e slegarsi di passato e presente, storico e personale, collettivo e individuale, quotidiano e letterario, reale e

immaginario, ricordo e fantasia, umano e magico, sacro e profano, razionale e irrazionale, microcosmo e macrocosmo, vita e testo.

Dunque, né memorialistica, né autobiografia, e neanche ‘semplice’ *autofiction*, quanto una (ri)narrazione creativa, fiabesca, mitologizzata e mistificata della stessa propria esistenza, in cui dettagli, personaggi, episodi e fatti della vita, attentamente selezionati dalla “memoria casuale” secondo un preciso disegno interiore, associativo e soggettivissimo, assumono un significato speciale, estetico ed esistenziale e si trasformano in simboli, metafore del proprio destino. L'interpretazione e, poi, la reinterpretazione dei fatti biografici diventa più importante dei fatti stessi, e la biografia personale non solo si trasforma in *fiction*, in invenzione, ma assurge a mito, a leggenda.

L'incompiutezza rappresenta il criterio strutturale di tutta la narrazione remizoviana del ricordo. Testo e macrotesto riflettono nella struttura compositiva, secondo una poetica del “frammento” che si evince già dai titoli e sottotitoli dei testi sopra nominati, la scissione, la lacerazione interna dell'io, in una condizione emblematica dell'uomo moderno, del clima dell'epoca e, dunque, della lette-

ratura del XX secolo ma, al tempo stesso, conseguenza della traumatica condizione dell'emigrato. Il ricordo si frantuma in segmenti irregolari di emozioni, sensazioni, divagazioni, appunti e osservazioni, dense unità narrative formate da brevi capitoli-racconti incompiuti, piccoli testi nei testi che si richiamano e ripetono nei diversi libri, in un inusuale e commisto montaggio di differenti materiali scritti e disegnati spesso già editi in precedenza e di brani inediti, legati fra loro da monologhi lirici, come in un mosaico, un puzzle, in cui il filo conduttore del tessuto-matassa narrativo è la memoria polifonica, sincretica e sinestetica dell'ipertrofico ma al tempo stesso impotente Io poetico e autobiografico dell'autore-narratore, fulcro e centro gravitazionale del testo.

L'intreccio narrativo, la 'trama' nel senso tradizionale del termine sono ridotti all'osso, se non del tutto inesistenti; la fabula, tutt'altro che lineare, trabocca, straripa: il tempo viene moltiplicato, le situazioni si ripetono, i dettagli divengono centrali, epici, assumono un nuovo, tragico significato, le leggi che governano il mondo sono apparentemente incomprensibili, i nessi logici si spezzano. La letteratura si fonde totalmente con la vita, in tal senso riflettendone anche

l'a-logicità, il fluire indistinto, magmatico, imprevedibile, involontario di significative casualità e fatali accidenti – il cui legame superiore è però inaccessibile alla semplice comprensione umana –, e che si esprime quindi nella forma di un groviglio di fatti quotidiani, ricordi (reali o immaginari), emozioni, spunti letterari, digressioni liriche, sogni, che s'intersecano e s'ingarbugliano secondo linee arabesche e ghirigori della memoria e, così facendo, sottraggono il libro alla fossilizzazione della scrittura finzionale.

### 3. Sempre in bilico tra testo e vita: Remizov e le maschere letterarie

La poetica remizoviana, dunque, è evidentemente legata alle categorie dell'estetica simbolista di *mifotvorčestvo* [costruzione del mito] e di *žiznetvorčestvo* [costruzione della vita], che rimandano ancora una volta al fondamentale binomio arte-vita, inteso nella duplice accezione di creazione della vita ma anche di vita come creazione, in cui i fatti della vita assumono le caratteristiche del testo letterario. Tuttavia, in Remizov lo stereotipo dello *žiznetvorčestvo* di matrice simbolista viene decostruito, quasi parodizzato. Infatti, seb-

bene lo scrittore delinea, nella propria opera, un minuzioso e dettagliato ritratto di se stesso, molto concreto, vivido e *apparentemente* sincero, si peccerebbe d'ingenuità considerandolo attendibile: si tratta, evidentemente, di una maschera e, anzi, di una serie potenzialmente infinita di maschere letterarie, flessibili, mobili, vivaci, mutevoli, in costante tensione dialettica, interdipendenti e intercambiabili fra loro, dietro ognuna delle quali lo scrittore cela ora se stesso, ora il narratore-protagonista, ora tutti i suoi personaggi, in una continua metamorfosi dell'istrionico Io autoriale, che è poi una delle caratteristiche principali dell'*auto-fiction* (e della fiaba, e del mito) se, come scriveva lo stesso Remizov: "в каждом человеке не один человек, а много разных людей"<sup>26</sup> (Remizov 2002: 279). Nella *Legenda*, infatti, il racconto della propria vita, lo svelamento di sé s'intreccia, si fonde e si confonde costantemente con la sua mitologizzazione che, attraverso travestimenti dietro maschere letterarie, strategie e procedimenti narrativi stranianti, giocosi, parodici e autoironici, fondati su un continuo svilimento del proprio io umano e lette-

---

<sup>26</sup>"In ogni persona non c'è solo una persona, ma tante, diverse persone".

rario, diventa mistificazione, autodenigrazione e autoumiliazione. Del proprio mancato riconoscimento come scrittore, dunque, Aleksej Remizov fece il proprio stile personale, nella vita come nell'arte.

È l'autore stesso, d'altronde, ad affermare: "без обмана я жить не могу"<sup>27</sup> (Remizov 2003b: 123). E lo conferma poi Šklovskij che, conosciuto lo scrittore nella Berlino degli anni '20, in *Zoo o lettere non d'amore* scrive: "Remizov vive nella vita con i metodi dell'arte" (Šklovskij 2002: 46).

Sinjavskij descrive tale strategia narrativa nei seguenti termini: "И когда перед нами Ремизов восстает в самом жалком облики, это, мы должны помнить, не жизнеописание, а мифотворчество, мистификация и стилизация, звучащая почти пародийно, на тему собственной личности и своей несчастной судьбы"<sup>28</sup> (Sinjavskij 1987: 28). La condizione di estraneità, alterità ed esclusione, rifiuto ed emarginazione, il sentirsi costantemente fuori luogo,

---

<sup>27</sup>"Senza inganno non posso vivere".

<sup>28</sup>"E quando Remizov si erge davanti a noi sotto le più pietose sembianze, questa, dobbiamo ricordarlo, non è la descrizione della sua vita, ma è la creazione di un mito, mistificazione e stilizzazione, che suona quasi una parodia, sul tema della sua stessa personalità e del suo infelice destino".

la sensazione di non essere compreso e apprezzato né dall'*establishment*, né dai lettori, vennero dunque esasperati ed ipertrofizzati da Remizov, soprattutto in seguito alla tragica condizione di sradicamento e separazione storico-culturale e linguistica dell'emigrazione, vissuta in modo profondamente drammatico – se, come scrive Erenburg, egli è stato “наирусейший из всех русских писателей”<sup>29</sup> (Erenburg 2017: 321) – ed, infine, da lui stesso utilizzati creativamente, nel tentativo di trovare un suo posto nella letteratura, indossando la maschera dello scrittore perseguitato, incompreso ed eccentrico. Al tempo stesso, però, la finzione letteraria viene riproiettata sulla realtà, il mito diviene fatto reale e la maschera s'impone sull'uomo, diviene modello a cui adeguarsi, in un tentativo continuo, quasi maniacale, di realizzare il proprio stile e intreccio anche nella vita reale. Come nota Sedych nelle sue memorie, infatti: “Если предположить, что однажды он придумал для себя маску и играл роль, то с годами маска эта стала настоящим его лицом”<sup>30</sup> (Sedych 1979: 116).

<sup>29</sup>“Il più russo di tutti gli scrittori russi”.

<sup>30</sup>“Se si suppone che egli abbia inventato una maschera per sé stesso e abbia interpretato un ruolo, nel corso degli

L'influenza reciproca di *fiction* e vita, la loro fusione è così disrompente che sono, in ultima istanza, proprio le maschere letterarie a condizionare di riflesso la biografia, i comportamenti stilizzati e il destino dello stesso scrittore, che viveva la vita come fosse un raffinatissimo gioco letterario. *Leitmotiv* trasversale a tutta la narrazione pseudo-autobiografica e, in realtà, all'intero percorso umano e artistico di Remizov è proprio quello della “reiettitudine” (“*otveržennost'*”), che è però, al contempo, “elezione” (“*otmečennost'-izbrannost'*”).

La poetica remizoviana si pone evidentemente in contiguità sulla linea dello šklovskiano Zoo e del *leitmotiv* che accompagna tutto il primo formalismo, caratterizzato da un eterno e ambiguo gioco di mascheramenti e disvelamenti in cui si cerca di confondere il piano della “personalità letteraria” (“*literaturnaja ličnost'*”) con quello della “personalità biografica” (“*biografičeskaja ličnost'*”), per utilizzare due termini tynianoviani. Dietro la negazione o il camuffamento dell'elemento autobiografico nell'opera letteraria, attuato attraverso la beffa, la continua performance teatrale di diversi

anni tale maschera è diventata il suo vero volto”.

ruoli sul palcoscenico del testo e della vita, il travestimento dietro svariate maschere e personalità letterarie, dall'effetto disorientante e straniante che trasgredisce ogni patto narrativo prestabilito, si cela sempre e soltanto la storia e l'individualità dell'autore. Anzi, proprio la continua, palese, quasi morbosa dissimulazione dell'elemento autobiografico altro non è che un'estenuante, insistente, disperata affermazione del proprio io poetico e umano, come ammette lo scrittore stesso: “ведь для писателя это очевидно, что кроме как о себе, о своем мире чувств, мыслей и слов никто никогда еще не мог написать ни одной путной строчки, т. е. чтобы было живо и кровно, а не пусто, в одних бледных словах”<sup>31</sup> (Remizov 2002: 438).

La necessità di espressione individuale e la volontà di rivendicare il proprio “diritto alla [auto]biografia” (Lotman 1985: 181-199), negatogli dalle condizioni personali e storico-culturali e, dunque, realizzato solo attraverso la costruzione del proprio ‘testo-vita’, di una propria biografia

---

<sup>31</sup>“Dopotutto, per uno scrittore è ovvio che, tranne che su sé stesso, sul proprio mondo di sentimenti, pensieri e parole, nessuno è mai stato in grado di scrivere una sola riga sensata, cioè che fosse vivo e sanguigno, e non vuoto, in pallide parole”.

mitologizzata e leggendaria e la reinvenzione e stilizzazione di sé come personaggio letterario, buffo e, al contempo, profondamente tragico, in un universo in cui realtà, finzione, gioco e mistificazione coesistono, costituiscono il nucleo originario del pan-autobiografismo finzionale e metaletterario remizoviano. In ultima analisi, sotto diverse maschere, dietro forme e contorni ‘altri’, nelle sue infinite, plurime manifestazioni concrete, si cela sempre e soltanto la più profonda essenza e soggettività autoriale. L'epicentro di tutta la narrazione è costituito da un unico, fondamentale tema: la ricerca del proprio ruolo, la definizione della propria figura nella Storia della letteratura russa.

#### 4. Conclusioni

Nonostante la loro eterogeneità compositiva e temporale, i libri del ‘ricordo’ che costituiscono la *Legenda o samom sebe*, sebbene siano narrazioni disomogenee, discontinue, spezzate, composte da Remizov in maniera irregolare, disordinata e frenetica durante l'intero arco della sua vita, sono sorretti da un grandioso progetto pseudo-autobiografico unitario e rappresentano un macrotesto poetico organico, costruito attorno a una serie di

temi, motivi, parole chiave e immagini biografici, esistenziali, letterari e filosofici, riecheggianti nei diversi testi. Tutti i libri sono accomunati, inoltre, dalla continua ricerca e sperimentazione stilistico-formale e risentono della percezione remizoviana del mondo, leggendaria e fiabesca, mistica e mistificatoria, giocosa e infantile. La realtà viene infatti osservata dal Remizov 'autore' e dal Remizov 'personaggio' attraverso il prisma straniante degli "occhi rasati" nell'infanzia da una grave miopia, di cui ci si accorse solo quando egli aveva già 12 anni, ma che, invece di essere lacerazione, fu dono creativo e poetico fecondo. Proprio la metafora degli "occhi rasati", ai quali sono accessibili il meraviglioso e il fiabesco, che permettono di vedere e, quindi, di narrare la vita e il mondo da una prospettiva liminare e soggettiva, straniata e straniante, differente rispetto a come lo vedono tutti gli altri, quelli con gli occhi 'normali', costituisce la chiave di lettura dell'intera produzione dello scrittore. In essa, la vicenda personale e letteraria viene filtrata secondo categorie visionarie, magiche e fantastiche proprie dell'infanzia e della fiaba, in un

continuo sovrapporsi di fantasia, sogno e realtà, che dona all'autobiografismo remizoviano un sapore magico e irrazionale particolarissimo.

## Bibliografia

Antonini 1934: Antonini, Giacomo. 1934. 'Appunti su Remizov', *Solaria*, 9 (4): 84-89.

Badolati 2024: Badolati, Maria Teresa. 2024. 'Memoria e infanzia nel libro pseudo-autobiografico di Aleksej Remizov Podstrižennymi glazami', in *Quaderni del Dottorato in Scienze documentarie, linguistiche e letterarie. 2. Prismi*, a cura di Gianfranco Crupi, Stefano Gensini, Cristiano Pesaresi, Caterina Romeo, Silvia Toscano (Milano: Ledizioni), 213-228.

Barthes 1968: Barthes, Roland. 1968. *La mort de l'auteur* (Paris: Seuil).

D'Amelia 2002: D'Amelia, Antonella. 2002. "Avtobiografičeskoe prostranstvo" A.M. Remizova, in Aleksej Michajlovič Remizov, *Sobranie sočinenij v desjati tomach*, IX (Moskva: Russkaja kniga).

Dal' 1956: Dal', Vladimir. 1956. *Tolkovyj slovar' živogo velikorusskogo jazyka Vladimira Dalja* (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannyh i nacional'nyh slovarej).

Docenko 2000: Docenko, Sergej. 2000. *Problemy poetiki Remizova. Avtobiografizm kak konstruktivnyj princip tvorčestva* (Tallinn: TPÜ Kirjastus).

Doubrovsky 1977: Doubrovsky, Serge. 1977. *Fils* (Paris: Galilée).

Erenburg 2017: Erenburg, Il'ja. 2017. *Liudi, gody, žizni: Knigi pervaja, vtoraja, tret'ja* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo AST).

Flaker 1997: Flaker, Aleksandar. 1997. 'Il rinnovamento arcaico: Remizov', in *Storia della civiltà letteraria russa*, vol. II, a cura di Riccardo Picchio, Michele Colucci (Torino: Utet).

Gasparini 2004: Gasparini, Philippe. 2004. *Est-il je? Roman autobiographique et autofiction* (Paris: Seuil).

Il'in 1994: Il'in Ivan Aleksandrovič. 1994. *O t'me i prosvetlenii. Kniga chudožestvennoj kritiki: Bunin, Remizov, Šmelev* (Moskva: Skify).

Kodrjanskaja 1959: Kodrjanskaja, Natalja. 1959. *Aleksej Remizov* (Paris: s.e.).

Kuzmin 2017: Kuzmin, Michail. 2017. 'O prekrasnoj jasnosti. Zametki o proze (1910)', in *Literaturnye manifesty i deklaracii russkogo modernizma* (Sankt-Peterburg: Puškinskij dom).

Laouyen 1999: Laouyen, Mounir. 1999. 'L'autofiction: une réception problématique' in *Frontières de la fiction*. [https://www.fabula.org/anciens\\_colloques/frontieres/208.php](https://www.fabula.org/anciens_colloques/frontieres/208.php). [ultima consultazione 16 gennaio 2025].

Lecarme 1992: Lecarme, Jacques. 1992. 'L'autofiction: un mauvais genre?', in *Autofictions & Cie*, a cura di Serge Doubrovsky, (Nanterre: Université de Paris X) 227-249.

Lejeune 1975: Lejeune, Philippe. 1975. *Le pacte autobiographique* (Paris: Seuil).

Lo Gatto 1976: Lo Gatto, Ettore. 1976. *I miei incontri con la Russia* (Milano: Mursia).

Lotman 1985: Lotman, Jurij. 1985. 'Il diritto alla biografia. Il rapporto tipologico fra il testo e la personalità dell'autore', in *La semiosfera. L'asimmetria e il dialogo nelle strutture pensanti* (Marsilio: Venezia).

Marchese 2014: Marchese, Lorenzo. 2014. *L'io possibile. L'autofiction come paradosso del romanzo contemporaneo* (Massa: Transeuropa Edizioni).

Mirskij 1998: Mirskij, Dimitrij. 1998. *Storia della letteratura russa*, tr. it. S. Bernardini (Milano: Garzanti).

Obatnina 2008: Obatnina, Elena Rudol'fovna. 2008. *A.M. Remizov: ličnost' i tvorčeskie praktiki pisatelja* (Moskva: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie).

Raevsky-Hughes 1990: Raevsky-Hughes, Olga. 1990. 'Alexey Remizov's later Autobiographical Prose', in *Autobiographical Statements in Twentieth Century Russian Literature*, a cura di Jane Gary Harris, (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press), 52-65.

Remizov 1993: Remizov, Aleksej Michajlovič. 1993. 'Avtobiografija 1912', in *Lica. Biografičeskij almanach*, III, a cura di Alla Michajlovna Gračëva (SPB: Feniks-Atheneum).

Remizov 2000a: Remizov, Aleksej Michajlovič. 2000a. *Podstriženymi glazami*, in *Sobranie sočinenij v desjati tomach*, VIII (Moskva: Russkaja kniga).

Remizov 2000b: Remizov, Aleksej Michajlovič. 2000b. *Iveren'*, in *Sobranie sočinenij v desjati tomach*, VIII (Moskva, Russkaja kniga).

Remizov 2002: Remizov, Aleksej Michajlovič. 2002. *Učitel' muzyki*, in *Sobranie sočinenij v desjati tomach*, IX (Moskva: Russkaja kniga).

Remizov 2003a: Remizov, Aleksej Michajlovič. 2003a. *Peterburgskij buerak*, in *Sobranie sočinenij v desjati tomach*, X (Moskva: Russkaja kniga).

Remizov 2003b: Remizov, Aleksej Michajlovič. 2003b. *Myškina du-dočka*, in *Sobranie sočinenij v desjati tomach*, X (Moskva: Russkaja kniga).

Sedych 1979: Sedych, Andrej. 1979. *Dalekie, blizkie* (New York: Novoe russkoe slovo).

Shane 1977: Shane, Alex. 1977. 'An Introduction to Alexei Remizov', in *The Bitter Air of Exile: Russian-Writers in the West, 1922-1972*, a cura di Simon Karlinskij, Alfred Appel (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Sinjavskij 1987: Sinjavskij, Andrej. 1987. 'Literaturnaja maska Alekseja Remizova', in *Aleksej Remizov: Approaches to a Protean writer*, a cura di Greta Slobin, Vol. 16, UCLA Slavic Studies (Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers).

Sklovškij 2002: Šklovskij, Viktor. 2002. *Zoo o lettere non d'amore*, tr. it M. Zalambani (Palermo: Sellerio).



# **Materials and Discussions**



Giulia De Florio

## **Истина — это источник. Иван Вырыпаев о себе, своем искусстве и имманентной любви.**

*The Truth is a Source. Ivan Vyrypaev about Himself, His Art and Immanent Love*  
An interview with the actor and playwright Ivan Vyrypaev by Giulia De Florio.

Интервью 10 декабря 2024 г.

“Основное направление деятельности духовное развитие человека при помощи искусства”. Такое заявление размещено на официальном сайте драматурга Ивана Вырыпаева (<https://vyrypaev.com/>), в конце раздела “об авторе”. Это и манифест, и искренний портрет драматурга Ивана Вырыпаева, неотъемлемая часть его творческой и нетворческой биографии.

Вырыпаев — один из самых знаменитых драматургов в мире, его пьесы ставят во всех больших и небольших театрах в Европе и в США. Он получил звание почетного доктора кафедры театроведения на факультете изящных искусств Университета Пелопоннеса (Греция). Скорее всего, с биографией драматурга проще познакомиться через его тексты. А он бы, наверное, уточнил, что лучше не знакомиться вообще.

Читатель\_ница и зритель\_ница Вырыпаева привык(ла) к парадоксу и гиперболе. Эти риторические фигуры тесно вплетены в тексты Вырыпаева, он сознательно их употребляет как стилистические приемы, чтобы добиться эффекта. Точнее, контакта. Контакт — первое из некоторых ключевых слов, по которым можно проследить творчество Вырыпаева и его эволюцию. Драматург в своих текстах и через них предлагает собеседнику\_це поискать новый способ общения, в этом и заключается “новизна” современного театра: “Бессюжетная драматургия Вырыпаева сориентирована не на сцену и тех, кто на ней стоит, а на тех, кто сидит в зале. В результате героями драматурга оказываемся мы сами, реципиент трансформируется в коммуникатора” (Мещанский *et al.* 2020: 31). Созданный эффект часто воспринимался (и воспринимается) критикой и публикой как экзотерический, магический, а для драматурга

это всего лишь понимание сути общей имманентно-трансцендентной действительности, как сам Вырыпаев утверждает в интервью 2020 г.:

То, что я сейчас говорю, раньше могло находиться в области мистики или эзотерики. Но сегодня это почти научный подход. Мы с вами — сознание, которое проявляет себя в форме людей, которые сейчас разговаривают. Главным элементом этого проявления является коммуникация. Чем лучше она выстроена, тем легче протекает энергия, и нам всем от этого хорошо (Бебутов 2020).

Иными словами, Вырыпаев посредством искусства выражает мысль о том, что те, кто соглашается существовать в отношениях с другими, могут действительно ощутить свою природу “мы-сознания” (Тюпа 2009), которое по своей природе стремится к взаимодействию, встрече, коммуникативному событию, “как диалог взаимодополняющих равноправных сознаний, которые полностью раскрываются в процессе диалога, не теряя своей самооценности” (Курант 2018: 94).

Второе ключевое слово — структура. Пьесы Вырыпаева не строятся по строгой сюжетной линии, скорее по принципу вращения вокруг одной темы. Они затрагивают экзистенциальные темы, вечные вопросы человечества, которые при этом равны самым простым — даже тривиальным — аспектам любого обывателя. Таковы персонажи его пьес, люди без биографии, которые понимают, что любые мысли, поступки, явления могут восприниматься диалектически, но которые в итоге стремятся к гармонии, разумности мира. Пьеса, по утверждению драматурга, “это прежде всего структура, форма и способ существования” (Вырыпаев 2019: 8). Структура пьесы и есть “ее подлинная суть” (там же: 9), тот зафиксированный текст, в исполнении которого заложен способ коммуникации. А чем выразительнее слово, тем эффективнее оказывается его воздействие на зрителя\_ницу. С его помощью драматург создает, по замечанию П. Руднева, “шаманистическую поэзию, бешеный ритм, галлюциногенную энергетику и острейшее восприятие сегодняшнего дня” (Руднев 2018: 378). Третье ключевое понятие в драматургии Вырыпаева — слово. Произнесенное, исполненное, прожитое актером/актрисой слово для Вырыпаева — не что иное, как проявленная тишина. Навсегда замолчать — сигнал того, что истина бу-

дет достигнута. Как ни парадоксально это звучит, для этой цели искусство и существует: оно воплощает в себе то единое целое, которое мы в большой степени воспринимаем как фрагментарное, временное, ограниченное.

Вырыпаев обращает внимание своей аудитории на акустический пласт слова. Кроме того, он способен довести структурный диссонанс нового сказа (Weygandt 2018: 6) до максимального уровня,

благодаря чему он подчеркивает наличие двойного голоса (double voicedness) — голоса автора и голоса персонажа — значительно усиливается цитационный потенциал произнесенного слова и усложняется многослойность смысла в динамике отношений персонаж-актер-автор (Bonci del Bene, De Florio 2021: 181).

Это приводит к полному вовлечению зрителя, который участвует в поиске подлинного голоса:

When the actor who is speaking or rapping does not identify with the role, the burden of authenticity shifts to the audience. The structural dissonance stimulates the audience's creative potential. It is precisely in the gap between actor and role that authenticity is up for grabs, and the spectator is integrated into the conception (Weygandt 2018: 11).

Об этом и о других тут бегло обозначенных аспектах Вырыпаев рассказывает в нижеприведенном интервью. В своем неподражаемом стиле драматург рассуждает свое видение о себе и своей работе, о роли искусства и авторе в современном мире, утверждая, что духовное развитие человека — это процесс постижения истины, а источник всего бытия — это сама жизнь, то есть любовь. Пьесы Вырыпаева будто нас спрашивают: а что ежели не любовь нам остается испытать в этом нашем — по словам платоновского машиниста Мальцева — “прекрасном и яростном мире” (Платонов 2024: 49)?

\*\*\*

**Джулия Де Флорио** В прошлом выпуске нашего журнала вышло интервью Славы Сергеева, в котором писатель сказал, что “литература не исповедь, хотя почти всегда густо замешана на биографии пишущего”. Ты с этим согласен?

**Иван Вырыпаев** Для меня смысл искусства заключается в создании некой “вещи”, в создании произведения искусства. Искусство — это вещь (не обязательно физическая, это может быть философия, поэзия или даже маркетинг), которая имеет четкие границы (не обязательно физические, но очень заметные), выделяющие эту вещь в пространстве для того, чтобы на нее можно было смотреть и... восхищаться ей. Высшая цель произведения искусства — это вызвать восхищение этим произведением. На входе в музей Виктории/Альберта в Лондоне стоят огромные китайские вазы (не помню какого точно века, но кажется 13-го) и у всех, кто на них смотрит (или скажу по-другому — кто их замечает) это вызывает реакцию “Вау!”. Искусство это Вау! Рекомендую прочесть работу Кена Уилбера “Очи познания”, он там достаточно точно описывает что такое искусство. Поэтому исповедь ли это автора, биография ли, или отстраненная фантазия, это не так важно для предмета искусства. Для предмета искусства важно, как оно выполнено. Важно мастерство! Произведение искусства — это вначале и прежде всего про то “как”, а уже потом “про что”. Но, разумеется, я сейчас упрощаю и разделяю восприятие наблюдателя. Конечно, в глазах того, кто наблюдает искусство “как сделано” и “про что” сливается в одно целое. Это и есть одно целое. Но мастер создавая искусство всегда занят тем, как сделать вещь, которая будет восхищать своим исполнением. Вазы, статуи, картины, литература, предметы быта (часы, вазы, мебель, машины, одежда и т.д.) созданные мастерами — прежде всего поражают своим исполнением. Сегодня в период постмодерна это очень важно понимать (поскольку качество уступает концепциям и идеям, которые не съешь и наденешь на себя). Но мало кто это понимает. Отсюда и все это псевдоискусство, где политическое или социальное высказывание важнее исполнения. Это и есть кризис искусства. И это конец эпохи чистого искусства. Поэтому отвечая на вопрос про себя, — то, когда я создаю пьесу на актуальную тему, то на первом месте для меня всегда качество литературы. Я не торгую своей биографией, я продаю качественно сделанную вещь.

**Дж. Д.Ф.** А это осознанный процесс? В смысле, ты пишешь, и потом видишь себя или узнаешь себя в персонажах, в ситуациях, или просто ты сознательно все это замечаешь?

**И.В.** Это хороший вопрос. В шиваизме, особенно в кашмирском шиваизме, есть такое понятие, что бог Шива — это имманентная любовь и трансцендентная реальность. Так вот и автор всегда одновременно имманентен и трансцендентен к своему произведению.

Это означает, что, конечно, моя пьеса содержит меня, мои боли, мои какие-то проблемы, безусловно, но можно ли сказать, что я — это пьеса? Сейчас ты разговариваешь не с пьесой.

Если я иду с другом в ресторан, он идет не с пьесой Ивана Вырыпаева, он идет с автором, я трансцендентен созданной мною вещи (пьесе). В этот момент где-то в каких-то странах прямо сейчас играют мои пьесы и я там не присутствую. Но это мои пьесы.

Трансцендентность и имманентность существуют в гармонии. Но это зависит от того, кто, какой автор. Кто-то максимально имманентен, то есть он там вываливает всего себя, рассказывает про какие-то свои комплексы и личные проблемы. Например, в кино это Ларс фон Триер, который все творчество строит на рассказывании о своих болях и так далее. А, например, в голливудской продукции, скажем, продукции, фильмов о Гарри Поттере, режиссер больше трансцендентен. Там продукт/вещь на первом плане. Согласись, мало кто знает фамилию режиссеров Гарри Поттера. Кто снял Гарри Поттера 2/3/4/? Обычный зритель этого не знает. Как ни странно, но именно в коммерческом искусстве вещь находится на первом месте. Вот почему я считаю, что сегодня самое важное в искусстве находится на территории коммерческого мейнстрима, а не в так называемом “авторском искусстве”. И что это вообще за понятие (но его постоянно используют) — авторское искусство. У любого искусства есть автор, даже если имя автора Парамаунт Пикчерс (Paramount Pictures). Но то, что сегодня подается как “авторское искусство” на самом деле является видом “нарциссизма”, потому что серьезный большой автор (то есть мастер) всегда хочет, чтобы зритель видел не его лично, а созданное им произведение. Разумеется, я сейчас даю эти понятия, конечно, не совсем корректно, это скорее метафоры. Но надеюсь, это понятно.

**Дж. Д.Ф.** То есть трансцендентность и имманентность, во-первых, параллельные процессы, и во-вторых пропорциональные процессы.

**И.В.**

Вещь — это всегда процесс. А и искусно и мастерски выполненная вещь — это вещь показывающая процесс. Какой процесс? А вот знаешь, я на самом деле, думаю, что процесс всегда один. Это процесс жизни. Фильм Вонг Карвая и мастерски выпеченные хлеб или мастерски сшитый костюм всегда про одно и то же, про процесс жизни.

**Дж. Д.Ф.** Но есть некоторые твои пьесы, в которых, мне кажется, тема и вопрос об авторстве и об авторе выдвигается на первый план. Первый показательный пример — пьеса “Волнение”. В пьесе “Волнение” есть подзаголовок “Пьеса об авторе”. При этом, меня поразили эпитафии к тексту. Эпитафии в твоих пьесах дают очень важный ключ к пониманию того, что ты пишешь. А в “Волнении” есть две цитаты от философа Льва Лосева про миф и одна цитата про любовь творца. Когда я прочитала твою пьесу, я дошла до последней страницы и сказала себе: это не пьеса об авторе, это песня об истине. А может, это одно и то же?

**И.В.** Это именно одно и то же. Театр для меня — это такая институция, которая создает искусственные модели бытия, чтобы показывать их людям, чтобы те смотрели на эти модели бытия, узнавали там (по Аристотелю) уже свою жизнь и себя, и вот тогда происходит контакт наблюдателя (зрителя) и произведения (спектакль) и вот этот контакт и есть цель и суть театра. Суть театра (как и всего искусства) — это контакт произведения (вещи) и наблюдателя (потребителя вещи) и этот контакт происходит по следующей схеме: восхищение тем “как сделано”, узнавание в вещи себя (это про мою жизнь), чувственного переживания и потом рефлексии. И хотя я сейчас разделил это на сегменты (восхищение, узнавание, переживание и рефлексию) на самом деле это все происходит одновременно, и зритель этого не разделяет. Ему просто это нравится. Но мастер, создающий произведение все свое внимание сосредотачивает на том “как”. Потому что “про что вещь” это уже заложено в самой личности мастера. Это его жизнь, его боль, его биография,

если угодно. Но простой артист создает произведения на уровне “про что”, а для мастера самое главное “исполнение/создание” вещи. Для Страдивари важно качество скрипки, для Рафаэля качество живописи, для Стивена Джобса уникальность айфона. Повторю, для тех, кто может сейчас меня неправильно понять. “Про что” это очень важно! В айфоне главное его функциональность (ну разумеется). Но дизайн для Джобса не менее важен чем функциональность (на самом деле это неделимые компоненты). Поэтому мастер, создавая вещь, прежде всего, хочет, чтобы люди оценили саму вещь, а уже потом звонили и высылали смс (повторяю “как” и “про что” — это неделимое целое). А что касается моей профессии, то драматург это тот, кто создает макровселенную, он творец, он как бы макромодель Творца, в смысле Творца всего творения вообще. Автор — это Творец. Но Творец и Творение всегда имманентно и одновременно трансцендентно Создателю. И в пьесе “Волнения” я хотел показать именно этот принцип. Это пьеса, где может (конечно, я не могу этого утверждать на 100 %, ведь я не знаю всех пьес в мире) впервые появляется сам автор. Не игра автора как у Пиранделло, не заигрывание в автора как у Брехта, а именно сам автор. Не автор Вырыпаев, а автор как Принцип. Это, возможно, совершенно новое явление в драматургии. Жаль, что сегодня в период постмодернизма нет режиссеров, которые бы могли понять это и поставить пьесу именно так. Но возвращаясь к вопросу. О чем эта пьеса? Об авторе или об истине? Автор это и есть истина. Истина это источник. У вещи всегда есть источник. И что самое главное — источник вещи всегда и проявлен в самой вещи. А точнее, источник вещи всегда имманентен и трансцендентен вещи. Гамлет — это Шекспир. Но Шекспир не Гамлет. И поэтому мастер Шекспир произнес: “Жизнь театр, а люди в нем актеры”. Это ведь не о том, что люди играют и кривляются в жизни. А о том, что у поведения людей есть Источник и этот источник (об этом уже Шекспир не говорил) сама жизнь. Жизнь является источником и драматургом поведения людей. И самое удивительное что мастер Шекспир пришёл к этому пониманию не путем медитации и духовной практики, а путем создания вещи под названием “пьеса”. Все вещи в этой Вселенной имеют одни и те же универсальные законы их создания. Ваза, торт, стихи, машина, компьютер, философская теория, пиар стратегия, AI, ракета, фильм, спектакль или рецензия критика создаются по одним и тем же универсальным принципам. И создатели этих вещей делятся всего на две

категории: на мастера и не мастера. Не мастер создает вещи интуитивно, а мастер осознано. Не мастер просто высказывается и хочет, чтобы обратили внимание на него самого, а мастер хочет, чтобы восхитились его Творением, его вещью. Страдивари или Микеланджело прежде всего хотели, чтобы восхитились их Творениями, а для большинства современных театральных режиссеров важно, чтобы оценили их самих (уверен, что они ни за что не согласятся с моей оценкой, но созданные ими вещи и то как эти художники позиционируют себя в обществе говорит именно об этом). Артист может быть гением, но не мастером. Мастер это тот, кому подчиняется форма, это тот, кто является хозяином формы, а чаще всего в искусстве форма и содержание является хозяином создателя (но разве Создание может является хозяином Создателя?). Впрочем, это всего лишь теория. Но как проверить эту теорию? Верна ли она? А ведь ее и не нужно проверять. Для зрителя это совсем не важно. И вот сейчас мы подошли к главному моменту этого разговора. Мастер это тот, кто “знакомит” зрителя (наблюдателя) с Процессом. В произведении мастера всегда виден “процесс”, поскольку мастер — это всегда, абсолютно всегда это “Мастер процесса”. В китайской вазе 13 века в музее Виктория/Альберт виден Процесс. Вещь, созданная мастером, всегда показывает и сам процесс. Процесс Бытия. Жизнь — это процесс. Чем больше понимания того, что жизнь — это процесс, тем больше включения в этот процесс. В этом то и заключается суть создания “вещей” — обращать внимание пользователя/наблюдателя/зрителя на процесс (то есть на саму жизнь). Но повторяю: сейчас я сознательно разделяю все на части, но в реальности все существует в единой целостности.

**Дж. Д.Ф. Мне кажется, частично об этом ты пишешь тоже в “Иллюзиях”, что это мы разделяем например время, мы фиксируем время как прошлое, настоящее и будущее. Это мы так устроены, а на самом деле прошлое, настоящее и будущее существуют одновременно. И поскольку у нас последовательность неизбежна и нет *постоянства* — ключевое слово в “Иллюзиях” — у нас создается иллюзия чего-то. Но если бы мы смотрели на реальность как одно целое, у нас не было бы вот этого деления “любовь-ненависть”, “радость-грусть”, “измена-доверие”.**

**И.В.** Мы физические фигуры, существующие в трехмерном мире (в смысле наши тела), и мы видим тот мир и ту реальность, которую видим. И деление реальности на фрагменты — это важный эволюционный механизм нашей жизни. Чтобы заказать бокал пива в пабе мы должны выделить пиво из всех остальных вещей в этом баре. Когда мы хотим куда-то попасть нам нужен точный адрес. Так что выделение вещей и предметов — это необходимость нашей жизни. Это не ошибка природы, не первородный грех это то, как “Тут все устроено”. Но вот что забавно, что сейчас в период постмодернизма человечество пришло к странной идее о том, что различие и границы объектов не очень-то важны, и что поиск реальности заключается в ломании границ и стирании различий. Постмодерн, особенно ярко проявившийся в так называемом “либерализме”, стал требовать свободы вещи от своего источника. Это поразительный абсурд! Но это именно то, что сейчас происходит в современном искусстве и в западноевропейской политике. Свобода стала пониматься как Независимость “объекта” (люди это тоже объекты) от всего. Но никакой объект не имеет независимого существования — это просто факт. Любой объект всегда имеет причину своего возникновения, а значит источник. Поэтому идея постмодернистов что нет единой универсальной истины и каждая истина зависит от контекста, это ошибочная идея, которая возникла только из-за того, что под Источником прежде “традиционное общество” понимало тоже объект. Например религия прошлого понимали Бога как объект. Как Старца, или как отдельное Сознание и поскольку это тоже не так, то в результате поиска свободы и возникло еще более абсурдная теория о том, что Единого для всех вещей источника не существует, поскольку этот единый источник мыслился как Объект. Разумеется, ни один Объект не может быть Источником всех объектов. Именно поэтому постмодерн и утверждает, что у объектов нет единого Источника, а у каждого свой. То есть у каждого объекта свой Источник. Из чего следует что у пьесы нет одного автора, но и режиссер и актер, и продюсер тоже могут быть (а точнее “стать”) авторами и создателями уже созданного объекта. Вы только вслушайтесь в это. Режиссер может стать равноправным автором пьесы (не спектакля, а пьесы) которая — Внимание! — уже была создана. И вся эта путаница происходит лишь от того, что несчастное человечество, измученное и изнасилованное тоталитаризмом (царями, боссами и религиозными авторитетами) кинулось искать свободу от объектов,

причиняющих им насилие в свободе от единого источника, потому что (и вот это главное!) перепутала Источник с объектом. Но Источник никогда не является объектом. Ибо источник как мы уже сказали выше всегда трансцендентен всем проявленным объектам и всей Вселенной. Источник путают с объектом и ищут свободу от него. И именно поэтому театральные критики очень часто допускают невероятную филологическую/философскую и если хотите космическую ошибку говоря, что Антон Павлович Чехов якобы когда-то сказал, что: “В человеке должно быть все прекрасно. И душа, и тело, и мысли”. Но на самом деле эта фраза принадлежит герою пьесы Чехова “Дядя Ваня” Астрову, который во время ее произнесения был сильно пьян. Вещь/объект/герой/пьеса были перепутаны с Источником. Чехов никогда бы не мог так считать. Это абсолютно глупое высказывание пьяного героя его пьесы (Чехов имманентен Астрову создавая его характер, но трансцендентен ему, как человек).

**Дж. Д.Ф.** При такой конфигурации понятие “аутентичность” подвергается кардинальному изменению. И ты это четко сказал в интервью с Мишей Понятовским, когда верно предугадал, что через полтора-два года киноиндустрия распадётся, или, по крайней мере, сильно изменится, потому что можно будет придумать какую-то дипфейковую реальность через искусственный интеллект, и все будут принимать это за реальность. Мой вопрос следующий: если все поверят в ту реальность, которую искусственный интеллект создает — не важно, аутентична или не аутентична она —, если она вызывает какие-то эмоции, подталкивает к действию, то имеет ли смысл уточнить, аутентичный ли текст, или аутентичное ли произведение, или в конце концов аутентичный ли человек?

**И.В.** Как здорово, что ты коснулась темы AI. Поскольку если раньше мне никогда не хватало настоящего примера, ведь то, о чем я говорю, находится на территории личного опыта, а не концепции и идей (Источник — это не идея и не концепция, он познаваем только опытом, это ведь не объект) то теперь благодаря нейросетям, у меня появился наглядный пример. Сегодня мы видим как нейросеть из текста создает видео-образ. Мы пишем текст: “Молодая японка идёт по улице Токио в предвечерний час” и нейросеть

визуализирует наш текст в видео образ — то есть на экране появляется видео, где японка идет по Токио. Слова становятся материальным образом. Ну как тут не вспомнить: “В начале было Слово”. Видимый нами видео мир создается при помощи слов. Но ведь и пьеса — это слова, которые превращаются в видимые физические образы при помощи актёров. Драматург пишет слова, но зритель то видит живых героев на сцене. Этот процесс хорошо бы понять поглубже. Я пишу слова, которые становятся героями (исполняемые живыми людьми) на сцене. И вот теперь про аутентичность. Что такое аутентичность? Что такое “неповторимость”? Если все объекты не имеют самостоятельного бытия, а всегда являются следствием множества причин (причина стола: дерево/плотник/заказчик и многое другое, причина стекла: песок/стеклодув/покупатель и многое другое) то, что же это такое “уникальность”? Ответ: в этой Вселенной все формы уникальны своим неповторимым, аутентичным узором/рисунком. Нет ни одного одинакового объекта. Отпечатки пальцев 8 миллиардов людей неповторимы. Ни одна роза не является точной копией других роз. Все атомы и молекулы в своем рисунке/узоре отличаются друг от друга. Вселенная не создает точных (один до одного копий). Источник, который является единым источником всего — создает бесконечное количество уникальных форм. И только наш мозг создает сам себе копии, классификации и кладет все на “полки”. Кстати слово Дьявол, содержит корень Дуа, — два и является символом копии, подделки. Дьявол — это подделка, копия, то есть мертвечина, ведь все живое всегда новое и неповторимое. Две с виду одинаковые бабочки хоть похожи друг на дружку, но они все равно имеют индивидуальное различие в своем рисунке. Отношения семейных пар похожи, но каждые отношения на самом деле всегда уникальны. Поэтому в чем же проявляется индивидуальность художника? В том, что он являет окружающему миру свой личный неповторимый рисунок. Он не создает ничего нового. Нет нового искусства. Есть только проявление своей уникальной неповторимой формы бытия. Все объекты уникальны, но мастер это тот, кто может эту уникальность сделать объектом восприятия для других. “Большой артист” это не тот, кто готов раздеться на сцене или рассказать публике о смерти своей матери, а тот, кто может явить публике свой уникальный рисунок. Узор — себя. Величайший мастер слова суфий Руми сказал: “Каждый человек — это нота, а Бог это музыка”. Нет ничего точнее этих слов. Но возвращаясь

в AI. Нейросеть это всего лишь инструмент в руках Источника. Тому, кто находится в контакте с Источником всех вещей, такая вещь как нейросеть ничем не угрожает. Даже если AI и убьет человечество (ну есть такой вариант) то и в этом случае она убьет только формы, но никогда, никогда, никогда не убьет Источник, поскольку такие вещи как Нейросеть, Атомная бомба и инопланетяне являются объектами созданными Творцом. Творец не объект, а источник объектов. Но Творец (тут я вынужден использовать мужской род “Творец” это конечно не корректно, но не могу найти замену этому слову, разумеется Творец не какой-то там мужик) проявляет себя в Творении имманентно как неповторимые узоры (такова формула мира — единство в многообразии). Гамлет, Нора, Астров — это неповторимые объекты, а Шекспир, Ибсен и Чехов — это люди трансцендентные своим пьесам и героям. И только именно поэтому возможна любовь. Поскольку любовь — это всегда любовь Творца (творец не объект) к своему творению. Ведь Шекспир любит Клавдия и Гамлета одинаково. И вот сейчас важно! Творец (творец не “он” и не объект) любит Гитлера и евреев одинаково (надеюсь на правильное понимание). Главная мантра Шиваизма (надеюсь, никто тут не свалится в оценку меня как религиозного шиваиста, это бы означало полное непонимание всего сказанного выше) звучит так: “Шива есть имманентная любовь и трансцендентная реальность”. Для мастера это формула является определением истины. Это формула драматурга!

**Дж. Д.Ф.** Пока ты это все рассказывал, я по-другому стала смотреть на твою пьесу “Махамая электроник девайсис”. В ней персонажи говорят миллион раз слово “Я” и дают себе разные определения. Послушав то, что ты только что сказал, мне кажется, что ты смотришь с иронией на то, что мы всегда разные “Я” проявляем и проявляем себя в разных “Я”, но при этом ты ставишь вопросы, в отличие от ранних пьес, когда ты более утвердительно говорил и писал.

**И.В.** Это в моей молодости...

**Дж. Д.Ф.** Да, ты теперь чаще задаешь себе вопросы, но тем не менее, как бы это вопросы, которые уже включают в себя ответ. Ну, вот эти все “Я — сознание”, “Я — никто”... Это своего рода осознание того, что уже есть.

**И.В.** Да, и здесь мы подходим к очень старому и избитому вопросу, что такое “новый театр”? Вот смотри: Еврипид, Мольер, Чехов, ну и какой-нибудь современный драматург (не могу привести в пример никакой фамилии). Так вот, все эти объекты/драматурги они создали “новый театр” (этих авторов намного больше, я просто привожу в пример этих, чтобы раскрыть суть). Но в чем же эта новизна? (Критики и литературоведы не набрасывайтесь на меня, я не следую истории культуры, я мажу крупными мазками, так что сосредоточьтесь на сути). Еврипид (конечно, не он один) создал для зрителей возможность воспринимать богов и мифы как фантазию приносящую удовольствие, не поклоняясь и молясь, а попивая вино наслаждаясь произведением, в котором сам он зритель (в отличие от прихожан на религиозной литургии), не принимает прямого участия (пьет вино и просто смотрит) Трагос Одас (песнь за Козла) превратилось в светское искусство не для молитв, а для наслаждения искусством, Мольер (не он один) создал в зрительном зале невероятный опыт, что смеяться можно не только над чем-то банальным низменным, но и над чем-то невероятно глубоким и наслаждаться комедией (низким жанром) как высочайшим произведением наравне с трагедией, Чехов заставил людей сопереживать обычной повседневной реальностью, делая бытовую реальность предметом высокого искусства (не он один, это просто пример) и наконец, Современный драматург (допустим он есть) впервые перевел действие пьесы/спектакля в зрительный зал, делая восприятие объекта содержанием самого этого объекта (спектакль со сцены ушел в восприятие зрителя). И так, как мы видим, что все изменения, которые вносили эти авторы, вся новизна театра происходила в аспекте восприятия. Новое всегда в восприятии, а не в самой форме. Новый театр — это новая система взаимодействия спектакля (вещи) и зрительного зала (наблюдателя). Не формы являются новыми (нет новых форм, есть уникальные, помнишь?), а система взаимодействия/коммуникация/способ общения. Еврипид — кричащая маска, Мольер — изображение героя, Чехов — реальность поведения героев, Современный драматург — героем пьесы является процесс восприятия пьесы (возвращаясь к твоему вопросу — о про “Я”. Нет — я, источник не объект). Мастер драматург не гоняется за новыми формами, а при помощи пьесы/вещи организывает новый способ восприятия в зрительном зале. Мой театральный учитель Вячеслав Кокорин говорил: “Спек-

такль — это организация внимания в зрительном зале и развитие впечатлений”. Поэтому новый театр, во-первых, создает драматург, а во-вторых, Большой драматург всегда выстраивает взаимоотношения пьесы с залом. И эти взаимоотношения (что важно!) прописаны в пьесе. Ведь вещь содержит в себе и способ взаимоотношения вещи с потребителем этой вещи. Поэтому новое в театре это не видео экран, не голые актеры, не голограммы, не падающие сверху на сцену рояли, не переодевания мужчин в женщин и наоборот, а новое это то, как зрителю предлагается смотреть спектакль, как зрителю предлагается воспринимать. Поэтому для меня почти весь театральный мейнстрим европейского театра является в подавляющем большинстве все еще старым театром прошлого века. Нового по-настоящему нового театра очень мало. Ведь для этого нужны драматурги мастера, а их сегодня очень мало, поскольку режиссер провозгласил себя создателем уже созданной пьесы и начал борьбу за свободу объекта от источника.

**Дж. Д.Ф. Если продолжать разговор вокруг “я” и “автор”, давай думать о пьесе “Энтертейнмент”. Я была в Питере, и мне удалось попасть на этот спектакль.**

**И.В.** Да теперь это воистину историческое событие. Ведь теперь такого больше уже никогда не случится. Больше сочетаний таких объектов, как “Питер”, “Вырыпаев” и “спектакль”, уже не случится на территории России.

**Дж.** Да, это правда<sup>1</sup>. В “Энтертейнмент” ты драматург и актер. Ты играешь на сцене, причем с женой. Там герои становятся зрителями или становятся разными персонажами, все смешивается. Почему именно в этой пьесе ты решил исполнять роль, чем это мотивировано? А то, что это вы с женой играете

---

<sup>1</sup> В декабре 2023 года Ивану Вырыпаеву вынесли первый приговор. Басманный суд Москвы заочно приговорил его к восьми годам колонии общего режима. В июле 2024 года Мосгорсуд отменил приговор и направил дело на новое рассмотрение. В августе 2024 г. Басманный суд Москвы вынес повторный приговор драматургу и режиссеру по обвинению в распространении “фейков” о российской армии (пункт “д” части 2 статьи 207.3 УК). Как сообщает ТАСС со ссылкой на источник в правоохранительных органах, Вырыпаеву заочно назначили семь лет и шесть месяцев колонии.

**и стоите за постоянно меняющимися масками добавляет какое-то значение?**

**И.В.** Во-первых, не “играете”, а играли. Последний раз я был в России в начале Пандемии в феврале 2020 год и больше я туда, скорее всего, никогда не вернусь. А играли мы вместе, потому что всегда мечтали сыграть вместе. Моя жена выдающаяся актриса, а я просто среднего таланта актер (это не кокетство, я ведь правда не актер) но мы хотели сыграть друг с другом. И сделали это в режиссуре Виктора Рыжакова (очень важного в моей жизни человека/художника). Но спектакль увы совсем не получился. По причинам, которые я не буду называть (но эти причины вполне конкретные, однако, неважно). Но отвечая на твой вопрос — было ли наше решение играть вместе частью драматургического замысла — нет. Потому что, когда я создаю пьесу/вещь я создаю ее для того, чтобы ее потом играли в разных театрах разных стран. Для меня пьеса это ведь еще и заработок. Я профессиональный драматург и этим зарабатываю себе на жизнь. Поэтому я не пишу пьесы как перформансы для одноразового использования. Подтверждением этому является очень успешная постановка в Италии (которую я увы не видел, но тем, те, кому я доверяю говорят что спектакль удался, что подтверждается успехом у публики) в исполнении прекрасных актеров, которая играет до сих пор. Так что это пьеса не была написана только для нас с моей женой. И повторяю, увы, в отличии от итальянской постановки, наш спектакль был неудачным. И по иронии судьбы это был последний мой спектакль в России. Но и предыдущие два спектакля в театре БДТ и в театре Современник (где режиссером был я) тоже были неудачные. Так что последние годы в России был для меня творчески неудачными. А потом была пандемия, а потом моя акция пикет у посольства РФ в Польше в поддержку Навального после чего мне посоветовали не появляться в России (моя фамилия была в списке у ФСБ) ну а потом война, потом тюремный срок (заочно) и теперь я уже туда не вернусь. А возвращаясь к пьесе “Интертеймент” то она именно про процесс. Она про Знание того, что Зритель/наблюдатель и спектакль/объект являются одним целым. Наблюдатель и наблюдаемое это одно и то же. До этого театр никогда не говорил об этом. Вернее, может и говорил, но не организовывал этот опыт в зрительном зале. Потому что идея и опыт это не одно и то же. Сейчас вот я говорю: наблюдаемое и наблюдатель это одно, но это просто слова. Чтобы

понять то, о чем я говорю, нужно испытать опыт этого. К сожалению, спектакль, сделанный нами с Рыжаковым, не организовал такой опыт в зрительном зале, так и оставшись концепцией. Но кстати, играл я в этом спектакле еще и потому что был продюсером этого спектакля, и как продюсер я понимал, что мое участие в режиссуре Рыжакова (который двадцать лет до этого поставил со мной Кислород) будет являться коммерческим ходом для привлечения зрителя. Но это не сработало.

**Дж. Д.Ф.** Кстати о “Кислороде”: ученые считают, что тексты, которые попадают под категорию “автофикшен”, всегда связаны с травмой. То есть человек начинает говорить про себя, о себе, потому что это результат или попытка переосмысления, проработки какой-то травмы. Я вижу, как в твоих ранних текстах — “Сны”, “Кислород” — говорится открыто о травмах, не знаю насколько личных, но точно близких. В более поздних пьесах больше нет таких национальных травм. Есть всегда какой-то кризис, то ли экологический, то ли экзистенциальный, то ли любовный. Но нет ГУЛАГа, например, нет распада Советского Союза. А может быть, они все-таки есть, играют какую-то роль в твоём творчестве. Сознательно дистанцируешься или не берешь это в сюжеты, потому что не интересно?

**И.В.** Я не такой автор, который пишет о социальной проблеме и только. И мне очень нужна дистанция между мной и вещью, которую я создаю. Например, у меня есть пьеса “Солнечная линия”, в которой разыгрывается ссора между мужем и женой. И меня часто спрашивают: “Иван у вас как там с вашей женой, все ок?” намекая, на то, что скорее всего ведь нет. Но дело именно в том, что я смог написать пьесу о дикой ссоре в семье между Им и Ей, только потому что у меня идеальный брак и очень хорошие отношения с женой. Только поэтому. И я такой автор, который может писать только о том, что не является моей личной проблемой. Потому что только в этом случае, я могу любить создаваемый мной объект/вещь/произведение искусства. Потому что для того, чтобы по-настоящему любить нужно видеть объект любви. Но если ты застрял внутри объекта, то ты не можешь его видеть (ведь ты внутри), невозможно любить страдание находясь внутри самого страдания, невозможно любить боль находясь внутри боли, невозмож-

но любить творение находясь внутри этого творения. Творец может любить только являясь трансцендентным по отношению к объекту своей любви. А знаешь почему? Потому что объект и есть любовь. Любовь — это не любовь к объекту, любовь — это и есть сам объект. “Шива это имманентная любовь и трансцендентная реальность”. Драматург любит не каждого своего героя в отдельности, и даже не саму пьесу, драматург любит писать пьесы (процесс). И этой любовью к созданию пьес и пронизана вся пьеса. Настоящая “большая” пьеса — это всегда любовь драматурга к театру, которой он делится со зрителями. Все мои пьесы только о том, что я очень, очень хочу любить (но у меня больше нет сцены и любить я могу теперь только просто жизнь). Бог любит нас всех без исключения, только потому что мы являемся его творчеством. Настоящее творчество — это и есть любовь. Потому что у творчества нет цели, как и у любви. У настоящей любви нет цели. Или так: цель любви — любовь.

**Дж. Д.Ф. На разных выступлениях и в интервью, и в текстах своих, ты говоришь постоянно, что ты постигаешь мир при помощи написания пьес. Вот когда тебя спрашивают, “Зачем ты пишешь? Ты что за драматург?” у тебя вот такой ответ. А значит, что мир в конечном итоге постигаемый?**

**И.В.** Мир, как сегодня было много раз сказано, это объект, и чтобы постичь этот объект (то есть познать его до самого конца) нужно находиться за границами этого объекта. Знать — значит видеть. Но нельзя видеть то, внутри чего ты сам находишься. Мы видим только то, что мы “превзошли”. Ведь именно так и работают психологи — показывают пациенту его поведение и реакции со стороны. В этом же и суть медитации, или трансового опыта с ЛСД, грибами или Айваской — увидеть свою проблему со стороны. Но и есть и еще один путь познания. Путь мастера. Мастер создает вещь, а все вещи во Вселенной имеют несколько универсальных принципов. И сама Вселенная тоже является вещью (в определенном смысле) и поэтому создавая вещи мастер постигает законы и принципы создания Вселенной. Вот почему я так отвечаю. Создавая пьесы (уже почти 30 лет) я автоматически узнаю законы создания всех вещей включая и законы создания Вселенной. Но! И вот сейчас это “Но!” является критически важным “Но!”. Дело в том, что единственное Знание, которое я могу получить это Знание об

Источнике. Но поскольку я и есть Источник, то значит, что все что я могу тут узнать, то это узнать самого себя. Но знаю ли я себя? Хороший вопрос. Но сама подумай, могу ли я ответить на этот вопрос. Разве знание самого себя может являться ответом на вопрос: “Знаешь ли ты себя?”. Знает ли Гамлет, что он Шекспир? Ну конечно, нет. Может ли Гамлет узнать о том, что он на самом деле Шекспир? Ну конечно нет. Почему? Потому что никакого Гамлета в реальности не существует, это герой пьесы Шекспира. Но может ли Шекспир узнать, что он Шекспир? Станный вопрос, правда ведь. Шекспир ведь и так знает, что он Шекспир (это метафора, конечно, ведь драматург не источник! Он и сам роль). Поэтому вот мой ответ на твой вопрос: никакого Знания просто нет. Узнавать нечего, потому что некому. Поэтому все что я узнал про себя, за все эти годы, пока я пишу пьесы это только то, что я просто на просто трагическая / неповторимая / уникальная / странная / непостижимая жизнь.

## Библиография

Bonci del Bene, De Florio 2021: Bonci del Bene, Teodoro, De Florio, Giulia. 2021. 'Tradurre Vyrypaev per il teatro', *Performing Arts / Arti dello spettacolo*, 7: 178-189.

Weygandt 2018: Weygandt, Susanna. 2018. 'Revisiting skaz in Ivan Vyrypaev's cinema and theatre: rhythms and sounds of postdramatic rap', *Studies in Russian and Soviet Cinema*, 12 (3): 195-214.

Бебутов 2020: Бебутов, Трифон. 2020. 'Искусственный интеллект уже нас забрал: Иван Вырыпаев — про театр, йогу и экологию' <[https://daily.afisha.ru/brain/14262-iskusstvennyy-intellektuzhe-nas-zabral-ivan-vyrypaev-pro-teatryogu-i-ekologi-yu/?fbclid=IwARzZF6GFcSgAqoTlj4afNn\\_W8BwUV5SoaNwlfMogBjuTqarRTAU\\_IBXo](https://daily.afisha.ru/brain/14262-iskusstvennyy-intellektuzhe-nas-zabral-ivan-vyrypaev-pro-teatryogu-i-ekologi-yu/?fbclid=IwARzZF6GFcSgAqoTlj4afNn_W8BwUV5SoaNwlfMogBjuTqarRTAU_IBXo)> [последнее посещение 15 декабря 2024].

Вырыпаев 2019: Вырыпаев, Иван. 2019. *Пьесы* (Москва: VLAB).

Курант 2018: Курант, Елена. 2018. "Диалоги согласия": конвергентная стратегия в пьесах Ивана Вырыпаева 'Иллюзии', 'Летние осы кусают нас даже в ноябре', 'Пьяные', 'Солнечная линия', *Литература*, 60 (2): 92-106.

Мещанский *et al.* 2020: Мещанский, Александр и Савелова Любовь. 2020. 'Человек и действительность в драматургическом тексте И. Вырыпаева', *Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практик*, 13 (7): 28-32. <https://doi.org/10.30853/filnauki.2020.7.5>.

Платонов 2024: Платонов, Андрей. 2024. *В прекрасном и яростном мире* (Москва: Эксмо).

Руднев 2018: Руднев, Павел. 2018. *Драма памяти. Очерки истории российской драматургии. 1950 – 2010-е* (Москва: Новое литературное обозрение).

Тюпа 2009: Тюпа, Валерий. 2009. *Литература и ментальность* (Москва: Вест-консалтинг).

# Materials and Discussions

# Reviews



Bartosz Osiewicz

**Bykau, Wasil. 2023. Długa droga do domu (Wrocław – Wojnowice: KEW).**

The 2020–2021 Belarusian protests have led to increased interest in Belarusian culture in Poland. The Polish publishing market has seen the publication of many relevant tomes, among them *Wschód wolności. Antologia współczesnej literatury białoruskiej* [*East of Freedom. An Anthology of Contemporary Belarusian Literature*] (Walczak 2020) and a volume of poetry by the Belarusian Russian-language poet Dmitry Strotsev, *Reportaż poetycki* [*Poetic reportage*] (Strocew 2024), as well as works by recent and contemporary Belarusian authors, and the final work by Vasil' Bykaŭ (1924–2003), one of the great masters of Belarusian literature, namely his autobiography, *Długa droga do domu* (2023) [*Доўгая дарога дадому, 2002; The Long Road Home*] (Bykau 2023). This Polish-language version of Bykaŭ's autobiography has been produced by an experienced translator of Belarusian literature, Joanna Bernatowicz. Bernatowicz based her work on the Belarusian original text, but also took into account the corrections made by Bykaŭ, which were introduced into the Russian translation by Valiantsin Taras (Bernatowicz 2023: 406). After reading her brilliant translation, I decided to write a review for this journal.

*The Long Road Home* was written when the author was on his deathbed, far from his beloved homeland. Bykaŭ clearly did not like the prospect of removing the death mask from his own agony-distorted face, that of a dying man. He therefore painted a more artistic self-portrait, returning a last time through memory, to the people and events that had conditioned his fate. In the last years of his life, Bykaŭ was the object of persecution in his homeland and forced to abandon Belarus, experiences that influenced the final form of his autobiography. As Bernatowicz notes, the dates of these events are missing and their chronology is sometimes distorted, due to the fact that at the time of writing Bykaŭ did not have access to his archive, which he had left in Minsk. Many key pieces of information could thus not be verified (Bernatowicz 2023: 406).

From a methodological perspective, Bykaŭ's *The Long Road Home* meets the criteria adopted by Philippe Lejeune in *Le Pacte autobiographique* [*The Autobiographical Pact, 1975*]. According to Lejeune, au-

tobiography is “a retrospective prose story in which a real person presents his or her life, emphasizing his or her individual fate, especially the history of his or her personality” (Lejeune 2001: 22). The author of an autobiographical text is both narrator and protagonist, and this identity is essential to the genre (Lejeune 2001: 24). It should be emphasized that Bykaŭ scrupulously follows the rules of the genre: the identity of the narrator and main character is, as is characteristic of autobiography, manifested – above all – in the use of the first-person singular (Lejeune 2001: 24), making it what Lejeune calls “classical first-person autobiography” (Lejeune 2001: 26). Moreover, Bykaŭ also signals the unity of the narrator and protagonist more directly as “when the narrator-protagonist appears in the text under the same name as the author’s name on the cover” (Lejeune 2001: 36). In other words, “the author’s name [within the text is] a fragment of the text endowed with [...] a real [external] reference” (Lejeune 2001: 45–46).

According to the findings of Janusz Sławiński, one can distinguish “[t]wo basic types of [...] autobiographies”: the first are “accounts corresponding to an extroverted attitude, in which the external world in its richness and complexity – other people, historical events, realities – is viewed through the prism of the ‘I’”; the second are “accounts in which an introverted attitude dominates”, where “the world is treated in them mainly as a setting for the internal experiences of the ‘I’” (Sławiński 2000: 50). In *The Long Road Home*, Bykaŭ makes use of an extroverted attitude, focusing on events that he has participated in and people he has met (Sławiński 2000: 50). His narrative is a story for his contemporaries and for their descendants, readers who, in accordance with Lejeune’s autobiographical pact, must trust the narrator-hero. In *The Long Road Home* Bykaŭ reconstructs his life. He recalls his childhood and youth. A special place is occupied here by the story of his participation in the war against Germany in the ranks of the Red Army. He focuses primarily on his own creative path, however, and on the fate of his literary heritage. His literary works were written in Belarusian and translated into Russian, often the condition for their publication in Soviet Russia; the writer openly admits that “the translation did not bring me pleasure” and “[i]t took much more paper and time than the original Belarusian version” (Bykau 2023: 219). Western literary criticism tends to perceive Bykaŭ as an outstanding representative of Belarusian culture, which, as Geoffrey Hosking notes, “is peculiarly threatened by its very closeness to the dominant Russian [culture]”, the reason that Bykaŭ “has sometimes spoken out bitterly against the swamping of his

native language and literature by [this] powerful neighbour” (Hosking 1989: 569). Hosking’s words recall a comment in Bykaŭ’s own autobiographical narrative: “The national language of Belarusians [...] was contemptuously abused in all fields, replaced by Russian, although this was not officially remarked upon. [...] Ignorance of the Belarusian language among the younger generation led to Belarusian culture being lost [dissipated, squandered, depleted] in its entirety” (Bykau 2023: 266–67).

The extroverted model of autobiography also influences the writer’s ability to capture a holistic concept of his or her own life. In Bykaŭ’s case, the most important thing (among others) is his awareness of his own individuality and his understanding of his own national identity, as well as his connected concern for his native Belarusian language and culture in difficult historical conditions. This was apparent equally during his career as a writer and during his professional travels abroad. Bykaŭ spent time on both sides of the Iron Curtain and mentions in his autobiography, among other trips, a visit to an institute in Paris “where all the languages of the Soviet Union were taught except Belarusian” [Bykau 2023: 346]. Informed that this curricular absence was due to “lack of interest”, the writer states: “Why should they know it in Paris, if they do not want to know it in Minsk?” [Bykau 2023: 346]. He also recalls meeting with students of the Free University in West Berlin, where he answered questions such as “What is Belarus? Where is it? In Siberia or closer?” [Bykau 2023: 333]. Thanks to his trip to Finland, the Finns “learned about a country unknown to them at that time – Belarus” [Bykau 2023: 288]). Bykaŭ was never “ashamed of his Belarusianness” (Bykau 2023: 261), he opposed the “destruction of the Belarusian language” (Bykau 2023: 338) and in Soviet Belarus, “a completely Russified, communist country [...], he retained the courage to stick to his language and to the remnants of the culture that came before” (2023: 284). Bykaŭ experienced being forced to “create in a linguistic vacuum, when not a single word of [one’s] native language can be heard nearby”, and where the Belarusian language “has been preserved as a relic and there is a risk that it will soon join Sanskrit or Latin” (Bykau 2023: 328).

The dominant elements in Bykaŭ’s autobiographical narrative are the motifs of travel and home. His home town was Grodno, located on the border of cultures and civilizations, characteristics shared by his autobiographical writing. Here the writer contributed to the emerging genre of “lieutenant’s prose” (stories of the war time experience of junior officers), an artistic emanation of his life on campaign during the war. Bykaŭ’s image of war differed from the stereotypical ideas of the con-

flict that were sanctified by official literature, however. It is therefore “not difficult”, as Grigorii Svirskii notes, “to understand why bureaucrats of all ranks conceived such a hatred for him and why the Grodno KGB, with the tacit approval of the Union of Writers under the control of Fedin and his ilk, proceeded to hound him the way it did” (Svirskii 1981: 376). Autobiography aims at consolidating the image of an author through a textual narrator-hero. Through this genre, Bykaŭ introduces facts from his own life into the public sphere, emphasizing the importance of his own national identity and patriotic attitude towards Belarusian culture. He uses the “extroverted” model of autobiography model and as a result, manages to paint a self-portrait against the background of the era, the portrait of “a simple Belarusian, wearied of life”, who had only “one goal – to remain an honest person” – and a “dream” that “apparently will not come true”: “to live to see freedom” (Bykau 2023: 394).

## Bibliography

Bernatowicz 2023: Bernatowicz, Joanna. 2023. 'Od tłumaczki' in Bykau, Wasil. *Długa droga do domu* (Wrocław – Wojnowice: KEW), 405–407.

Bykau 2023: Bykau, Wasil. 2023. *Długa droga do domu* (Wrocław – Wojnowice: KEW).

Hosking 1989: Hosking, Geoffrey. 1989. 'The twentieth century: in search of new ways, 1953–80' in *The Cambridge History of Russian Literature*, ed. by Charles A. Moser (New York: Cambridge University Press), 520–94.

Lejeune 2001: Lejeune, Philippe. 2001. *Wariacje na temat pewnego paktu. O autobiografii*. (Kraków: UNIVERSITAS).

Sławiński 2000: Sławiński, Janusz (ed.). 2000. *Autobiografia: Słownik terminów literackich*. (Wrocław – Warsaw – Kraków: Ossolineum), 50–51.

Strocew 2024: Strocew, Dmitrij. 2024. *Reportaż poetycki* (Wrocław – Wojnowice: KEW).

Svirskii 1981: Svirskii, Grigorii. 1981. *A History of Post-War Soviet Writing. The Literature of Moral Opposition* (Ann Arbor: Ardis).

Walczak 2020: Walczak, Emilia (ed.). 2020. *Wschód wolności. Antologia współczesnej literatury białoruskiej* (Bydgoszcz: Miejskie Centrum Kultury w Bydgoszczy).



Ярослав Голубинов

**Панченко, Анатолий (под ред.). 2022. “Ах, скорее бы мир!” Письма прапорщика Д. И. Шишакина. 1914–1918 гг. (Новосибирск: Сибирское отделение Российской академии наук, Государственная публичная научно-техническая библиотека)**

Неожиданные находки подстерегают на каждом шагу. Так, в 1990-е годы историк Анатолий Михайлович Панченко<sup>1</sup> приобрел на рынке в Новосибирске у частного лица несколько десятков документов, созданных в годы Первой мировой войны (Ах, скорее бы мир, 2022: 7) и оказавшихся серией писем с фронта домой в Самару некоего прапорщика, не попадавшего до того в поле внимания исследователей.

Именно эти документы представлены в рецензируемом издании, подготовленном Анатолием Михайловичем Панченко, Ириной Сергеевной Трояк, Александром Григорьевичем Минаковым и Дарьей Леонидовной Шереметьевой. Комплекс опубликованных источников включает 84 письма и почтовые карточки, отправленные в 1914–1918 годы Дмитрием Ивановичем Шишакиным, призванным в русскую императорскую армию жителем Самарской губернии, своей супруге — Лидии Константиновне Шишакиной (в девичестве Вержбовской), а также три его послания (одно из них на почтовой карточке) детям — сыновьям Борису и Вадиму (у супругов еще была дочь Галина). Кроме того, опубликованы послания к нему от супруги (четыре письма) и сына (одно письмо от Бориса). Присутствует некоторая путаница в указании общего числа дошедших до нас документов переписки семьи Шишакиных. Так, Панченко в статье, посвященной описанию этого комплекса источников, упомянул о хранящихся в его собрании 87 письмах (78 — супруге от главы семейства, пять детям и четыре к нему от жены) (Панченко 2021: 23). По-видимому, какие-то почтовые карточки были в этом случае не включены в общий итог, или письма до-

---

<sup>1</sup> Об Анатолии Михайловиче Панченко, замечательном исследователе истории библиотечного дела в России, см. подробнее в библиографическом сборнике, подготовленном его коллегами (Кузнецова et al. 2018).

чери Галине позднее были атрибутированы уже как письма супруге, поскольку Шишакин отправлял их дочери с пометкой “для мамы” на адрес учебного заведения, опасаясь, что из-за перемены места жительства почта может затеряться.

Публикуемые письма снабжены примечаниями, раскрывающими подробности фронтовой жизни и биографии сослуживцев и начальников Шишакина, а также справочной информацией о работе продовольственных транспортов армии (в одном из них служил автор писем), и представлены еще извлечения из положения о военной цензуре. В целом оформление работы производит приятное впечатление, но иногда видны следы поспешной редактуры. Так, в примечании № 17 можно видеть вопрос, оставленный, судя по всему, кем-то из публикаторов, но так и не убранный при окончательной верстке: “Как далеко от линии фронта обычно должен был находиться продовольственный транспорт?” (Панченко 2022: 197). Однако эти мелочи, во-первых, не снижают научную важность текста, и, во-вторых, никак не мешают чтению.

До настоящего времени подробности биографии Шишакина известны далеко не все. Так, не ясны не только его сословное положение, но и даты рождения и смерти, а также подробности жизни до войны кроме тех, что он упомянул в письмах. Остается загадкой судьба Шишакина после Брестского мира (последнее его письмо датировано 13 февраля 1918 года).

Авторы предисловия Панченко и Трояк установили, что Д. И. Шишакин — сын чиновника Ивана Павловича Шишакина, который управлял Бугульминским имением, входившим в Самарский удельный округ (Панченко 2022: 12). В официальной периодике можно найти сведения, что крестьянин Иван Шишакин был удостоен в 1882 году звания личного почетного гражданина (*Сенатские ведомости* 1882: 168), а через 20 лет уволен со службы по болезни в чине надворного советника (*Сенатские ведомости* 1902: 1). Таким образом, Шишакин мог не быть дворянином (Иван Павлович Шишакин не успел дослужиться до нужного чина, дававшего потомственное дворянство), но, по крайней мере, мог принадлежать к сословию потомственных почетных граждан.

Также известно, что Шишакин закончил реальное училище и работал до Первой мировой войны химиком на Тимашевском сахарорафинадном заводе, принадлежащим удельному ведомству. Супруга Шишакина была дочерью чиновника, служившего на том же заводе. В 1905 году Шишакин отбыл “шестинедельные военные

сборы как вольноопределяющийся (нижний чин) запаса и сдал экзамен на чин прапорщика” (Панченко 2022: 12), и 29 ноября того же года он был произведен в прапорщики запаса армейской пехоты (*Русский инвалид* 1905: 1). После начала Первой мировой войны и объявления призыва Шишакин был определен в 330-й пехотный Златоустовский полк и оказался в военном лагере под Уфой, откуда и отправился на фронт. Однако большую часть войны он прослужил в корпусном продовольственном транспорте 30-го армейского корпуса и находился всегда на некотором расстоянии от передовой, а противниками, которых он видел и опасался, были только вражеские аэропланы. “Милые мошки”, как он их называл, уповая, например, в ноябре 1916 года, что “скоро будут дожди и кончится сезон” самолетов, вынуждающих постоянно заниматься маскировкой (Панченко 2022: 10).

Карьера Шишакина до войны и обстоятельства армейской службы (насколько можно ее представить по имеющейся информации) позволяют рассматривать его как типичного обывателя, но не только в смысле официальной принадлежности к городскому обществу, но и в смысле культурного типажа. Хотя автор писем был, если смотреть на показатели грамотности в Российской империи и императорской армии, образованным человеком, и комплекса поведенческих практик (например, стремление к личной выгоде, его желание избежать любой опасности, иногда даже, по-видимому, симулируя или преувеличивая физическое недомогание) вполне соответствует литературному образу типичного обывателя-мещанина.

Панченко и Трояк увидели ценность писем Шишакина в том, что эти документы, во-первых, проливают свет на характер управления продовольственным транспортом, делопроизводственная документация которого, судя по всему, утрачена. Во-вторых, письма позволяют оценить психоэмоциональное состояние именно “маленького человека”, оказавшегося на мировой войне, а затем и вовлеченного в революцию. Таким образом, можно увидеть “всеобщее, глобальное, общечеловеческое через призму конкретной личности” (Панченко 2022: 9). Можно согласиться с этими утверждениями публикаторов, равно как и с тем, что из писем исследователи почерпнут много любопытных подробностей фронтового и тылового быта, повседневной жизни русской императорской армии в годы Первой мировой войны.

В письмах Шишакина постоянно проводится сопоставление фронта и дома, семьи и сослуживцев, даже природа и климат в местах дислокации сравниваются с таковыми в Самаре. Очень характерны записи, как в письме 3 ноября 1915 года:

Ничто кругом меня не интересует и в голове только Лидуся да маленькие Галя, Боря и Вадя. Наши офицеры находят утешение в картах, хотя играют и не в азартные игры. Я же не могу этим заниматься без скуки и отвращения. Через ½–1 час они мне делаются противными, и я перестаю следить за игрой (Панченко 2022: 43).

Шишакин существовал всегда как бы в двух временных линиях одновременно. Его темпоральные практики (организации времени) были подчинены требованиям фронтовой жизни, приказам начальства, и в тот же самый момент письма показывали, что он абсолютно всегда оставался в ритме жизни своей семьи в Самаре. Так, в письме от 6 ноября 1915 года, например, он спрашивал об успехах сыновей в чистописании, волновался за кляксы в их письмах и тетрадях, интересовался уроками дочери, а 3 мая 1916 года воображал как “после ванны в одном белье и туфлях почитал бы у себя в кабинете газету” (Панченко 2022: 48, 91). И такие мечты, советы, волнения транслировались Шишакиным в каждом письме домой, совпадая, в общем и целом с настроениями супруги. Лидия Константиновна Шишакина, судя по всему, испытывала большие трудности, оставшись одна, пусть супруг и старался регулярно пересылать ей жалованье и какие-то вещи из прифронтовых городов. Особенно характерно письмо от 8 декабря 1915 года, в котором она честно пишет мужу о своей усталости и тоске в преддверии Рождества и Нового года (Панченко 2022: 192). Стоит отметить, что супруги Шишакины были необычайно честны и смелы в выражении своих чувств. Особенно эмоции зашкаливали у Шишакина, впадавшего временами в какую-то экзальтацию и пересыпавшего текст уменьшительно-ласкательными именами, словами о поцелуях и т.п., хотя сам же предупреждал своих солдат, чтобы они лишнего в письмах не писали (Панченко 2022: 90).

Любопытно, что переключаться между временем фронта и тыла, менять темпоральную оптику Шишакину помогали также книги (их, правда, на фронте было у него немного и те, что ему попадались, не слишком нравились) и газеты. Жалобы на отсутствие по-

следних, их запаздывание, а также радостные возгласы, когда их доставляли относительно свежими, есть практически в каждом письме. Особенно жажда новостей стала нестерпимой в период революции 1917 года, потому что политическая ситуация менялась чуть ли не каждый день, и знакомство с перипетиями борьбы партий в Петрограде и вообще в тылу стало насущной задачей каждого сознательного гражданина (а Шишакин, в общем, хотел им казаться).

Вообще, он признавался, что его “война ужасно состарила и научила быть серьезным”, а “если бы не было войны”, то он “прыгал и до сих пор” (Панченко 2022: 173). Письма в марте 1917 года хорошо показывают, как изменились взгляды Шишакина, а беззаботное время игры в карты с начальником и товарищами сменило беспокойная пора, когда привычный мир рушился на глазах. Шишакиным с тревогой отмечал, что “командир наш выбит из колеи и переменялся окончательно” (автор писем подозревал, что его начальника преследовали мысли о самоубийстве), но и сам Шишакин тоже стал другим.

Думается, что дальнейшее изучение биографии Шишакина (вполне возможно, после находок других эго-документов, созданных им и членами его семьи) глубже и точнее раскроет картину того смятения, что творилось в душах российских “маленьких людей” в время Первой мировой войны и революционных вихрей, покончивших с империей в 1917 году. Тогда исследователи смогут, наконец, успокоить дух несчастного прапорщика, в отчаянии писавшего супруге в феврале 1918 года:

Мне хочется, чтобы кто-нибудь сказал, что я все сделал, все было возможно. Мне хочется, чтобы мне сказали, что я честно исполнил свой долг гражданина и солдата (Панченко 2022: 182)

Исследование выполнено за счет гранта Российского научного фонда № 24-28-01430.

## Библиография

Кузнецова *et al.* 2018: Кузнецова, Ирина и Тимофеева, Юлия (под ред.). 2018. *Анатолий Михайлович Панченко: биобиблиографический указатель: к 60-летию со дня рождения* (Санкт-Петербург; Новосибирск: ГПНТБ).

Панченко 2021: Панченко, Анатолий. 2021. 'Обзор частной коллекции фронтовых писем Первой мировой войны, адресованных в Самару', в *Национальное культурное наследие России: региональный аспект: Материалы IX Всероссийской научно-практической конференции с международным участием, посвященной 50-летию СГИК, Самара, 14–15 мая 2021 года*, под ред. Анатолия Панченко и Юлии Тимофеевой (Самара: Самарский государственный институт культуры), 22–26.

Панченко 2022: Панченко, Анатолий (под ред.). 2022. "Ах, скорее бы мир!" Письма прапорщика Д. И. Шишакина. 1914–1918 гг. (Новосибирск: Сибирское отделение Российской академии наук, Государственная публичная научно-техническая библиотека).

*Русский инвалид* 1905: *Русский инвалид*, № 250, 1905.

*Сенатские ведомости* 1882: *Сенатские ведомости.*, № 39, 1882.

*Сенатские ведомости.* 1902: *Сенатские ведомости*, № 70, 1902.

# Authors



**Maria Teresa Badolati** is a Postdoctoral Fellow in the Department of Modern Letters and Cultures at Sapienza University of Rome, where she is currently working on ancient Russian literature. In 2022, she completed a PhD in Documentary, Linguistic and Literary Sciences (Curriculum: Russian Linguistics and Culture) at the same university. Her doctoral thesis focuses on the work of Aleksei Remizov and contains a detailed analysis of his pseudo-autobiographical text *With Clipped Eyes* [Podstrizhennymi glazami, 1951]. She has taken part in seminars and conferences in Italy and abroad. Her main research interests include Ancient Russian culture and literature, comparative analysis of Russian and Italian phraseology, twentieth-century Russian literature (with a focus on the work of Remizov), and textual analysis.

**Tetiana Cherkashyna** is a Doctor of Philology and Full Professor of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University (Kharkiv, Ukraine). Her main research interest is autobiographical writing, but she also works on: the study of the theory and history of non-fiction literature, the poetics of non-fiction works, the peculiarities of autobiographical self-representation, and geocriticism and geopoetics. Her main scholarly publications are the monographs *Narrative Dimensions of Literary and Biographical Prose* [Naratyvni vymiri khudozh'no-biografichnoi prozy] (Luhansk, 2009; in Ukrainian), *Memoir and Autobiographical Prose of the Twentieth Century: The Ukrainian Vision* [Memuarno-avtobiografichna proza XX stolittia: ukrains'ka viziia] (Kharkiv: Fact, 2014; in Ukrainian). She is the editor of the following collections of scholarly essays: *Non-fiction Literature: The Theoretical Dimension* [Literatura non fiction: teoretychnii vymir] (Kyiv, 2018; in Ukrainian), and *Geography and Text: The Literary Dimension* [Heografiiia i tekst: literaturnii vymir] (Kharkiv, 2022; in Ukrainian).

**Claudia Criveller** is Associate Professor in Russian Literature and Language at the University of Padua. Her main research areas are Russian modernism and early twentieth-century Russian literature, with a particular focus on the works of Andrei Belyi. She has also worked on intersemiotic translation, working on Fedor Dostoevskii as well as Belyi. She has authored theoretical works on Russian autobiographical fiction with a focus on Vladimir Nabokov, Venedikt Erofeev, Andrei Siniavskii and Evgenii Kharitonov.

**Giulia De Florio** is Senior Researcher at the University of Parma and a translator. She obtained her PhD at the Sapienza University of Rome. She is a member of the editorial board of the international academic journals *AvtobiografiЯ* and *Detskie Chteniia*. Her main areas of research are: Russian children's literature of the twentieth century, Russian *magnitizdat* and sung poetry of the second half of the twentieth century, Russian rap, and translation studies. She works as a translator and consultant for Italian publishing houses such as Salani, Mondadori, Morcelliana, and Valigie Rosse. Her latest monograph, *L'isola che (non) c'è. La letteratura russa per l'infanzia (1945-1991)* [The Island That Is (Not) There: Russian Literature for Children (1945-1991)] (Firenze University Press, 2021; in Italian) focuses on translations of Russian children's literature in Italy from 1945 to 1991. She is working on a book about children's literature and the Gulag.

**Iaroslav Golubinov**, PhD in History, is Assistant Professor at Samara National Research University. His main field of research is the study of social, cultural and environmental aspects of the First World War in different European countries (especially in Eastern Europe). He is the author of several articles in journals such as *Mouvement Social*, *Scando-Slavica*, and *Quaestio Rossica* and in collected volumes such as *Multilingual Environments in the Great War* and *Science, Technology, Environment, and Medicine in Russia's Great War and Revolution, 1914–22*.

**Simone Guagnelli** is Lecturer at the Department of Humanities Research and Innovation, University of Bari. He is one of the directors of the literary festival *Pagine di Russia* and a co-founder of the journal *eSamizdat*. His research focuses on émigré literature (especially Georgii Ivanov), Russian memoir writing, samizdat, Gulag literature, and intellectual relations between the USSR and Italy in the post-war period.

**Andrea Gullotta** is Associate Professor in Russian at the University of Palermo. He has also worked for the University of Glasgow, the Ca' Foscari University of Venice and the University of Padua, where he obtained his PhD. His main field of research is the literature of the Gulag. He is the author of several articles and of the monograph *Intellectual Life and Literature at Solovki 1923-1930. The Paris of the Northern Concentration Camps* (2018). He is the principal investigator of the Research Project of National Interest (PRIN) *Literature of Socialist Trau-*

*ma: Mapping and Researching the Lost Page of European Literature*, funded by the Italian Ministry of University and Research.

**Natalia Lebedyntseva** is Associate Professor at the Department of Ukrainian Philology and Intercultural Communication at the Faculty of Philology of Petro Mohyla Black Sea National University. She is the author of about 35 publications related to important issues in Ukrainian poetry of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries studied through the prism of body theories and psychoanalysis. Among the most recent are: 'Ukrainian Poetry at the Turn of the Millennium' [Ukrajinska poezija na prijelazu tisućljeća: ponovno otkrivanje identiteta], *Književna smotra*, 2021 (in Croatian); 'The Body as a Generational Marker in Ukrainian Poetry of the Late Twentieth and Early Twenty-First Centuries' [Tilo iak heneratsiinii marker v ukrainskii poezii druhoi polvyny XX – pochatku XXI storichchia] in *Postcolonialism. Generations. Culture* [Postkolonializm. Heneratsii. Kul'tura] (Kyiv, 2016; in Ukrainian); 'Corporeal Experience in the Identity Structures of Ukrainian Emigré Author Vasyl' Makhno' [L'esperienza corporea nelle strutture identificative dello scrittore ucraino emigrato Vasyl' Machno], *Niprò. Rivista di studi ucraïni* 2023 (in Italian).

**Rosanna Morabito** has held a PhD in Slavistics since 1997 and is an Associate Professor at the Department of Literary, Linguistic and Comparative Studies at L'Orientale University in Naples. Her publications include: *L'ultima meta: L'isola (Ostrvo) di Meša Selimović* [The Final Destination: The Island (Ostrvo) by Meša Selimović] (Alessandria, 2020; in Italian); 'Il luogo incantato: Kod kuće (A casa, 1907) di A.G. Matoš' [The Enchanted Place: 'Kod kuće' (At Home, 1907) by A. G. Matoš], *Semicerchio* 66/67, 2022 (in Italian); "'Dove tutto ha fine": il primo viaggio psico-poetico di Miloš Crnjanski' ['Where Everything Ends': Miloš Crnjanski's First Psycho-Poetic Journey] in G. Baselica, Lazarević P. Di Giacomo, O. Perišić, (eds), *I gigli nel campo. Studi in onore di Ljiljana Banjanin* [The Lilies of the Field: Studies in Honour of Ljiljana Banjanin], Alessandria 2023 (in Italian).

**Bartosz Osiewicz** is a University Professor in the Institute of East Slavic Philology, Faculty of Modern Languages and Literatures at Adam Mickiewicz University. He is the author of the monographs *Intertekstual'nost' v poezii Vladimira Vysotskogo* [Intertextuality in Vladimir Vysotsky's Poetry, 2007] and *Formy i źródła poezji Aleksandra Galicza*

[Forms and Sources of Alexander Galich's Poetry, 2016]. He is also the author and co-author of several articles published in *Przegląd Rusycystyczny*, *Slavica Wratislaviensia*, *Studia Rossica Posnaniensia*, *Australian Slavonic and East European Studies (ASEES) Journal*, *AvtobiografiЯ: Journal on Life Writing and the Representation of the Self in Russian Culture*, *Mundo Eslavo*, *Rusistika: Journal of the Korean Association of Russianists*, *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, *Russian Literature* and *Slavistična revija*.