

SLAVICA TER
СЛАВИКА ТЕР

**SLAVICA TER
СЛАВИКА ТЕР**

20

SLAVICA TERGESTINA

European Slavic Studies Journal

VOLUME 20 (2018/I)

Literary Theory in Bulgaria

ISSN **1592-0291** (print) & **2283-5482** (online)

WEB **www.slavica-ter.org**

EMAIL **editors@slavica-ter.org**

PUBLISHED BY **Università degli Studi di Trieste**
*Dipartimento di Scienze Giuridiche, del Linguaggio,
dell'Interpretazione e della Traduzione*

Universität Konstanz
Fachbereich Literaturwissenschaft

Univerza v Ljubljani
Filozofska fakulteta, Oddelek za slavistiko

EDITORIAL BOARD **Roman Bobryk** (*Siedlce University of Natural Sciences and Humanities*)
Margherita De Michiel (*University of Trieste*)
Tomáš Glanc (*University of Zurich*)
Vladimir Feshchenko (*Institute of Linguistics,
Russian Academy of Sciences*)
Kornelija Ičin (*University of Belgrade*)
Miha Javornik (*University of Ljubljana*)
Jurij Murašov (*University of Konstanz*)
Blaž Podlesnik (*University of Ljubljana, technical editor*)
Ivan Verč (*University of Trieste*)

EDITORIAL
ADVISORY BOARD **Antonella D'Amelia** (*University of Salerno*)
Patrizia Deotto (*University of Trieste*)
Nikolaj Jež (*University of Ljubljana*)
Alenka Koron (*Institute of Slovenian Literature and Literary Studies*)
Đurđa Strsoglavac (*University of Ljubljana*)
Tomo Virk (*University of Ljubljana*)

DESIGN & LAYOUT **Aljaž Vesel & Anja Delbello / AA**

Copyright by Authors

Contents

LITERARY THEORY IN BULGARIA

- 10 **What is it That is Being Threatened? Introductory Words**
Что находится под угрозой? Введение в тему
✦ **DARIN TENEV**
- 16 **Poststructuralist Backgrounds: the Political Strategies of Resistance in the Literary-Theoretical Debates during the 1960-1970s in Bulgaria**
Постструктуралистские предпосылки: политические стратегии сопротивления в литературоведческих дебатах в 1960-1970-х годах в Болгарии
✦ **ENYO STOYANOV**
- 46 **Anti-Odysseus: Orphism and Late Communism in Bulgaria**
Анти-Одиссей: Орфизм и поздний коммунизм в Болгарии
✦ **MIGLENA NIKOLCHINA**
- 70 **Authentic and Heterogeneous Mimesis: Reflection and Self-reflexivity in Todor Pavlov and Yuri Lotman**
Аутентичный и гетерогенный мимесис: отражение и авторефлексивность у Т. Павлова и Ю. Лотмана
✦ **KAMELIA SPASSOVA**
- 98 **Exotopy: Mikhail Bakhtin and Jacques Lacan on the Outside Context of Discourse**
Экзотопия: Михаил Бахтин и Жак Лакан о внешнем контексте дискурса
✦ **MARIA KALINOVA**
- 118 **Tension Episodes (A Fragment of the History of Literary Theory in Bulgaria. The Case of the Bulgarian Guillaumist School)**
Эпизоды напряженности (Фрагмент истории литературной теории в Болгарии. Случай с болгарской школой гийомизма)
✦ **DARIN TENEV**

VARIA

- 152 **Between the Sureness of Theory and the Folly of Literature. A commentary to the reception of Saussure's theory of language (from Jakobson to Bagić)**
Между уверенностью теории и безумием литературы. Комментарий к восприятию теории языка де Соссюра (от Якобсона до Багича)
 ✦ ANNA SKUBACZEWSKA-PNIEWSKA
- 174 **Das slowenische Gesicht: Literarische Reportage über Auswandereridentitäten**
The Slovene Face: a Literary Reportage on Emigrant Identities
 ✦ LIDIJA REZONIČNIK
- 196 **«Четыре жизни» Василия Ивановича Чапаева (об одном мифотворческом феномене Гражданской войны в России 1917–1923 гг.)**
The „Four Lives“ of Vasily Ivanovich Chapayev (about one Myth-making Phenomenon of the Russian Civil War 1917–1923)
 ✦ НЕНАД БЛАГОЈЕВИЋ
- 214 **(Еще раз) о перспективах российской лингвокультурологии**
Russian Lingvokulturologija: Cultural Linguistics or Linguistic Culturology?
 ✦ ЮРИЙ ВИКТОРОВИЧ ФИЛИППОВ
- 238 **Tendenze recenti nella formazione delle parole del russo contemporaneo**
Recent Trends in Contemporary Russian Word-Formation
 ✦ LORENZO PENTA

REVIEWS

- 276 **Ritorno alla filologia**
Return to Philology
 ✦ IVAN VERČ
- 310 **Monografija o pesnici Anni A. Ahmatovi**
Monograph about Poet Anna A. Akhmatova
 ✦ DENIS PONIŽ

Literary Theory in Bulgaria



What is it That is Being Threatened? Introductory Words

Что находится
под угрозой?
Введение в тему

What is it that is being threatened by the approaches to literature that developed during the sixties and that now, under a variety of designations, make up the ill-defined and somewhat chaotic field of literary theory? Paul de Man, "The Resistance to Theory"

By the end of the seventies Paul de Man defined in a famous article the resistance to theory as a resistance to reading. Almost forty years later it has become obvious that the resistance to theory is in the first place a resistance to reading theory, to reading what theory had and still has to say. The recent opening of the dossier of Julia Kristeva and the allegation about her collaboration with the Bulgarian Secret Services is a perfect case in point as it provided a welcomed excuse not to read "difficult" texts. At the same time, as de Man himself pointed out, the resistance is not something external to theory but "a built-in constituent of its discourse", it is triggered, as it were, by the inner tensions of the field, and it is this fact that most probably made possible theory's own resistance to dominant ideologies and hierarchies. Theory was – and still can be – a form of resistance.

Yet, the stakes of doing theory then and now are not obvious. The ongoing fetishization of the word "resistance" in the present day context facilitated by its exploitation in the cultural industry (think, among so many other instances, of the last Star Wars episodes) makes us ever more blind to what the mechanisms and the practices of resistance in the complicated context of yesterday were. In this sense, the history of theory is necessary for theory as it can reveal through the transversal movement and the transformative development of concepts the logic of its inner tensions as well as their relation to the political and social conjunctures. It can be said generally that the stakes of literary theory throughout the 20th Century were at least triple – epistemological,

political and social. And what this means is that literary theory was seen as posing at least a triple threat, a threat for the established scientific paradigms, a threat for the political order, a threat for the social status quo.

This still too general account might be misleading and too dogmatic if one were not to look into concrete cases and investigate the overdetermined particular contexts. In the present issue of *Slavica TerGestina* the authors present episodes of the history of literary theory in Bulgaria from the 1960s to the end of the 1980s. The case of Bulgaria is interesting in more than one aspect. Even though Tzvetan Todorov and Julia Kristeva, both of whom played a crucial role for the development of literary theory in the West, came from Bulgaria, none of the literary scholars of their generation who remained in the country came to be as known or reached their world fame. What is more, unlike USSR, Czechoslovakia or Poland, for the most part the very context of literary studies in Bulgaria remained non-transparent to the outside world despite the fact that at least two other Bulgarians, Alexander Ludskanov and Miroslav Yanakiev had important positions in the International Association for Semiotic Studies, and many others communicated intensively with renown colleagues from both the East and the West. As Todorov and Kristeva came to be associated with Bakhtin and structuralism, one should ask what was the role of Bakhtin and structuralism in their country of origin. What was the reason structuralism was so attractive? Why structuralism and not phenomenology, hermeneutics or something else? And what was the response to structuralism on the part of the Communist Party? Where did Bakhtin fit in all this? Were there other socially relevant theoretical paths at the time? How were the theoretical problems connected to the political conjuncture and to the Cold War ideologies?

The authors in the present issue address these and other related questions with the belief that every good theory should be self-reflexive and aware of its own history and its position. All the authors are members of the Literary Theory Department at the University of Sofia and the texts are to a large extent the result of their seminars and discussions in the framework of the Sofia Literary Theory Seminar. The history of literary theory proposed here is not history for history's sake, but a proper moment of theoretization.

The closer look, which the authors offer, shows that things were not as one would have expected, if one were to follow the widely accepted scholarly representations of the period. The dividing line between the East and the West, or the one between the official representatives of the Party and the literary scholars, etc., were never simple; these were lines traversing the very things they were delineating, multiplying lines betraying internal struggles and discordances but also unexpected resonances, unforeseeable chances, and unstable alliances. The theories of these times, theories imbued with tensions, unstable and mobile, transformative, were sometimes deliberately blind to their environment and in this very blindness offering insight into the political and social stakes of the debates they were taking part in or refusing to be a part of; and sometimes were an involuntary and oblique offering to the system they were passionately opposing. Theoretical writing made difference in an unpredictable way with the disseminations of conceptions it operated at the margins of the dominant philosophical discourse. The phenomenon of the theoretical voices in the often dissonant choir of competing strategies striving to gain control over the state of affairs, caused sense of imminent danger with the promise for new possibilities eluding any form of external control. To read always poses a threat. Reading theory now, reading into the history of theory

now, when forms of naïve positivism find their way back to the academia and the politically correct offspring of the late critical reflection become functionaries of censure not that different from the one from socialist times, can reveal not only what the possibilities once were but also in what way theory can still open up ever new alternatives, alternatives to any attempt to seal off critical thinking. ♡

Darin Tenev

Darin Tenev is associate professor at the Literary Theory Department at the University of Sofia and at the Sociology and Humans Sciences Department at the University of Plovdiv. He is the director of the Institute of Critical Social Studies. He has published two books in Bulgarian – Fiction and Image. Models (2012) and Digressions. Essays on Jacques Derrida (2013), as well various articles on literary theory, model theory, deconstruction, and contemporary philosophy, among which the most recent are: “Jacques Derrida” in Oxford Bibliographies in Literary and Critical Theory; “Models of Poetics. A Response to Robert Matthias Erdbeer’s Poetik der Modelle” in Textpraxis; “Modes of Fiction, Models of Fiction” in Literary Form. Theories – Dynamics – Cultures. Perspectives on Literary Modelling.



Poststructuralist Backgrounds: the Political Strategies of Resistance in the Literary- Theoretical Debates during the 1960–1970s in Bulgaria

Постструктуралистские
предпосылки: политические
стратегии сопротивления в
литературоведческих дебатах
в 1960–1970-х годах в Болгарии

The article attempts to reconstruct some of the political stakes in the conceptual and methodological debates among two groups of literary critics during the 1960ies and the 1970ies in Bulgaria: the structuralists and their opponents, the so-called “Impressionist critics”. This debate seems to be a pertinent context for addressing the emergence of poststructuralism since it was the intellectual ferment, in which Julia Kristeva formed her conceptual background, before later becoming among the first poststructuralist critics of structuralism in France. Before, emigrating, Kristeva was part of the group of the “impressionist critics”, who were developing ways of resisting official Marxist doctrine while retaining claims for Marxists legitimacy. They were very critical of the structuralists, who also were attempting to gain legitimacy, though by aligning with Marxism as a materialist science, a stance the “impressionists” viewed as contributing to alienation.

LITERARY THEORY, RESISTANCE,
BAKHTIN, KRISTEVA, MARXISM,
STRUCTURALISM, POSTSTRUCTURALISM

Статья пытается восстановить политический залог в концептуальных и методологических дискуссиях между двумя группами литературоведов в 1960-х и 1970-х годах в Болгарии – между структуралистами и их противниками, так называемыми «импрессионистскими критиками». Эта дискуссия, по-видимому, является важным контекстом возникновения постструктурализма, поскольку она представляет собой интеллектуальную среду, в которой Юлия Кристева первоначально сформировала свои идеи, перед тем как впоследствии стала одним из первых критиков структурализма во Франции. До эмиграции Кристева является членом группы импрессионистских критиков, которые пытаются разработать стратегии противостояния официальной марксистской доктрине, не отказываясь от поиска марксистской легитимности. Они критикуют структуралистов, которые также стремятся к легитимности, но основываясь на настойчивости марксизма как материалистической науки – позиция, в которой «импрессионистские критики» видят фактор, способствующий отчуждению.

ТЕОРИЯ ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ,
СОПРОТИВЛЕНИЕ, БАХТИН, КРИСТЕВА,
МАРКСИЗМ, СТРУКТУРАЛИЗМ,
ПОСТСТРУКТУРАЛИЗМ

1 These debates formed the conditions for the canonization of works, themed around the traditional values of Bulgarian peasantry and the crisis of these values due to modernization. The Bulgarian structuralists stringently rebuked the valorization of traditionalism in these works, while most of the impressionist critics eagerly celebrated them. The latter stance ultimately became dominant in the Bulgarian literary scene during the 1980ies. The short stories of one of the authors, Nikolay Haytov, were the subject of the most public clash between Nikola Georgiev and Toncho Zhechev – one of the most conservative members of the “impressionist critics”. While these debates won’t be the focus of this article, it is important to note here that such seemingly trivial critical disagreements were often the only public form the theoretical debates took during the period. For example, Nikola Georgiev elected to avoid publishing theoretical texts, preferring instead to write critical analyses of concrete works that were highly suggestive of underlying non-explicit methodological coherence.

The present article will attempt to reconstruct some of the political stakes in the conceptual and methodological debates among two groups of literary critics during the 1960ies and the 1970ies in Bulgaria: the structuralists and their opponents, the so-called “impressionist critics”. Such a reconstruction seems appropriate when discussing the poststructuralist legacy of Eastern Europe, since it may produce understanding about some aspects of the conceptual background, out of which one of the earliest forms of poststructuralist criticism of structuralism emerged: the early theoretical works by Julia Kristeva in France, who before emigrating, was very active in the group of the “impressionist critics”. The group earned its name due to their style of writing and their perceived lack of consistent methodology. As early as the first half of the 1960ies it was embroiled in a heated polemic with the current Bulgarian structuralists, and especially with one of their most influential representatives, Nikola Georgiev. While the crux of the public debates between the two groups involved taking dissenting stances on the merits and the overall cultural and political value of the works of different Bulgarian writers that emerged during the 1960ies¹, these discussions had an even higher stake – both groups presented conflicting forms of implicit resistance to the dominant Marxist orthodox doctrine in literary studies at the time – the so-called “theory of reflection”, developed in the 1930s by one of the most prominent ideologues of the Bulgarian Communist Party, Todor Pavlov. Both groups were attempting divergent heterodox brakes from the dominant party line, while claiming to remain strictly within Marxist methodology. This was done by highlighting heterogeneous aspects of Marxist doctrine – populism, progressivism, scientism, each side in the debate making claims for Marxist legitimacy through appeal to some of these notion at the expense of the rest. In this way the theoretical,

the literary and the political formed a very tight knot – a somewhat subtle strategy of resistance to the official ideology.

One noteworthy point of contention between impressionists and structuralists was their reception of Mikhail Bakhtin’s thought and especially his notion of “carnival”, developed in his book on Rabelais (Bakhtin 1984), as well as its ideological and methodological ramifications, though this aspect of the debate was less public on the structuralist side and thus requires some reconstruction. The “impressionist critics” at the time were among the first to embrace Bakhtin’s ideas outside the USSR. The structuralists resisted Bakhtin precisely because the impressionists embraced him, while the impressionist relied on his ideas as a backdrop for their criticism of structuralism. Thus the contrasting attitude toward his positions to a large degree informed the theoretical aspect of the work of both of these groups. The article will focus on the different takes on Bakhtin that emerged in these debates, not least because they lead into Kristeva later work, since she was instrumental in introducing Bakhtin to western audiences and based her influential notion of “intertextuality” on his writings.

THE “IMPRESSIONIST CRITICS” AND THE AHISTORICAL “VALE”

What brought the “impressionist critics” together was a diagnosis of the modern condition as suffering from almost inextricable effects of alienation. Most of them – Toncho Zhechev, Zdravko Petrov and Krastyo Kuyumdzhiev – developed a strikingly conservative project for the overcoming of this condition. They advocated that cultures like the Bulgarian one, situated in a geographical and historical “vale” in the periphery of Western civilization, may indeed have the capacity to retrace back the steps on the road of modernity and reestablish traditional

values and an ahistorical, cyclical existence. This contra-modern conservative nationalism was still marginal during the 1960s, being more overtly incompatible with orthodox Marxist progressivism, but would eventually come to dominate the rhetoric of the Bulgarian Communist Party during the 1980s and even paved the way for some of the political language of the far right in current Bulgarian politics.

The conceptual basis for this conservative turn in most of the writings of the “impressionist critics” was effectively presented in a monograph by Toncho Zhechev (1975), dedicated to the history of the struggle for an independent Bulgarian church in the 19th century, which ends with a discussion of the plot of a poem from the Bulgarian Revival, involving the folklore motif of embedding living sacrifices in buildings, so that their basis is stable. This folklore motif was used by Zhechev as an allegory for the sacrifice of traditional values in the name of progress and modernization. He dwelled upon the notion of debt, accumulated by such sacrificial logic of history and insisted upon the need for making amends in the form of restoration of lost traditions.

In his appeal to tradition Zhechev nonetheless was seeking Marxist legitimization. In the introduction to *The Bulgarian Easter*, he claims the authority of Marxist historical theory as overcoming the alternative between the “ancient” view of history as a circle and the “petit bourgeois” notions of perpetual progress (13). According to Zhechev its superiority amounts to seeing repetition of conflicts and contradictions within historical continuity. What is remarkable here is the strategic appropriation of orthodox Marxist revolutionary rhetoric in favor of an affirmation of tradition. This involves a double gesture. On the one hand, the historical paradox Zhechev highlighted in the introduction to his book was the perceived coincidence of the “patriarchal” order with the most radical egalitarian politics: “The more undeveloped,

patriarchal in socio-economic sense [a people is][...] the more susceptible and prone it is to the most radical, the most daring... ideas” (14). Thus for him “*only* [my emphasis] the national idea, formed in the fight for an independent church”, a fight, that was steeped in traditional religious values, “passed with all of its strength into later Bulgarian revolutionary movements and had a long life in the post-Liberation political history” (14). A similar logic is found in the discussion of the ideas of the Russian 19th century arch-conservative politician and philosopher Konstantin Leontiev: “The tragedy of Leontiev was the tragedy of the Russian conservatism [...] Why it managed to have a positive social function, only being in opposition to power, thus becoming a sort of liberalism?” (136).² By a conceptual and rhetorical “sight of hand”, he emphasized the quasi-dialectical “contradiction” as this precise continuity of tradition within revolutionary practice, rather than the more orthodox Marxist presentation of revolution itself as having a history and tradition, or history itself as a revolutionary process. This gesture comes with the implication that there is no revolutionary practice that is not rooted in the “patriarchal life” of the community. Thus for Zhechev conservatism and traditionalism can be seen paradoxically as the drive behind progress and radical political action.

On the other hand, he seems to be insisting, that while the deficiency of societal and institutional progress spurs radicalization, this radicalization itself amounts to a betrayal of its own conservative conditions. He discusses the political activism of various figures during the Bulgarian Revival as perceiving their own society and traditions as deficient in comparison to the “more developed” societies, and thus attempting a sort of “Imitation” that goes further than what was being imitated:

2
The interest of Zhechev with Leontiev in the book is premised on the part the latter played in the struggles for an independent Bulgarian church, but he is referenced not so much because of being representative of the inherent conservatism of this struggle, but rather because the discussion of his ideas allow Zhechev direct engagement with conservative politics.

3

Apparently his strategy worked - by his own admission, Zhechev's book was enthusiastically received by the leader of the Bulgarian Communist Party, Todor Zhivkov, who asked him for a meeting and an autographed copy of the book immediately after its publication. See (Zhechev 442).

In the most backward countries, patriarchal until recently, there emerges a particularly extreme political and ideological radicalism, which imitates the ready results in the advanced countries, without knowing the evolution that led to them. Forces that are new, formless, lacking tradition, thirsting for innovation and success come to life, and they rapidly exchange the religious conscience, developed by superstition, with bourgeois political superstitions. In their slogans and cultural program from most backward they become not just advanced, but the most advanced, most progressive. (14)

He seems to be implying that this “overradicalization” stems from a breakdown of the immanence of the dialectical process of history, i.e. from the lack of continuity between radical political practices with traditional ways of life. In this way Zhechev’s early writings seem to stake the following project: evolution out of tradition is the only true horizon for emancipatory politics.³

These pronouncements resonated with the current literary process itself - many authors during the period were writing about the dissolution of the traditional Bulgarian peasantry due to the party politics of nationalization of private agricultural lands. This crisis was held by Zhechev, Petrov and Kuyumdzhiev as only an episode in the grand process of modern dismantling of traditional forms of life. Sometimes their take on these topics even amounted to naturalizations of this profoundly political process.

While most of the authors that focused on the suffering of the peasantry at the time wrote in a social realist style, there was one marked exception - the works by Yordan Radichkov. Radichkov’s prose involved the setting of Bulgarian peasantry, but it relied on almost modernist techniques of writing that espoused various forms of absurdist

humor. While some of the more traditional critics were displeased by his style – after all, the life of Bulgarian peasants was not supposed to be a laughing matter – Kuyumdzhiev attempted to assess his work as conforming to the overall tendency of depictions of the crisis of traditional ways of life due to the degradation, brought about by the process of modernity. For this purpose in a series of articles from the beginning of the 1970s he evoked Bakhtin’s notion of carnival as an explanatory concept of the seemingly unorthodox and extravagant laughter in Radichkov’s works⁴:

[Radichkov] observes from a position, from a perspective that may be called sub specie aeternitatis, that is – from the point of view of eternity. This is the ancient peasant’s view of the world, the view of the ‘peasant civilization’, more ancient than religions, the state, ideology, and history. A civilization, which with some of its layers – the oldest, the firmest, the most conservative – remains untouched by history, beyond it. [...] And if here everything attains a carnivalesque and grotesque form, displays its comic sides, this is not Radichkov’s fault, but the worldview of the peasantry itself, the peasant’s ‘eternity’ that has seen a lot more than a few changes of civilization, of spiritual and worldly powers, of decorations and costumes. [...] At the peasant’s forum during the carnival everyone is devil and angel, mocker and mocked, perpetrator of evil and victim at once. (Kuyumdzhiev 68–70)⁵

The passage ends with a reference to Bakhtin having described this atemporal, prehistorical, mystical “worldview of the peasantry [...] in his famous book on Rabelais” (70). This ahistorical reading of the significance of Bakhtin’s carnival, its use as a conceptual template for a return to the past, was later combined with a similarly “eternalist”

4

In a recent article on the insertion of Radichkov’s works into the Bulgarian literary canon, Boyko Penchev also discusses this reading by Kuyumdzhiev. (Cf. Penchev 11–20).

5

The quote is from a later article that combines two earlier texts by Kuyumdzhiev on Radichkov that were published in the beginning of the 1970s.

6
It is notable that in the West this humanist turn was vigorously opposed primarily by structuralists like Louis Althusser. For more on this very complex dynamic around the humanist - anti-humanist controversy, see (Nikolchina 2013, 2014).

7
Later it was reprinted in (Stoyanov 1988b: 209–540).

8
For some parallels between the ideas of Lukács and Bakhtin, see (Tihanov 2000).

reading of Nietzsche's notion of the Dionysian (see Miglena Nikolchina's article in this issue).

The radical conservatism, legitimized through a populist sentiment in the still dominant Marxist environment of the 1960–1970s, was not the only heterodox doctrine that emerged within the literary debates, it wasn't even the only position that formed in the work of the "impressionist critics". One of the most influential members of the group, Tzvetan Stoyanov, a prominent figure in the field of Comparative Literature, presented a markedly different strategy. What brought him close to Zhechev and Kuyumdzhiev was their agreement in identifying a problem in modernity – the problem of alienation, considered both psychologically and socially. Yet, there was a stark contrast in the way he sought to remedy the situation.

TZVETAN STOYANOV: AMBIVALENCE AS A POLITICAL STRATEGY

The notion of "alienation" was the core concept for the "humanist" reformation movement of Marxism, most prominent in the Eastern Bloc during the 1960ies. It held Marx's early writings, and especially his *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* as its conceptual pivot and attempted to provide an alternative to the more rigid structural Leninist reading of Marx, thus serving as a form of resistance to official party politics.⁶ One of the more systematic attempts in Bulgaria to pose the problem of alienation as the crux of modernity was Tzvetan Stoyanov's book *The Ties that Break Off: Ideas and Motifs of Alienation in Western Literature*, first published in 1967⁷.

The study attempts to trace various forms of alienation in Western European literature since the Enlightenment, while the basic premise is strikingly similar to Lukács's *History and Class Consciousness* (1972)⁸:

the various forms of the psychological experience of alienation are seen as stemming from the reification of the dynamic productive forces and relations in society, which leads to destruction of the numerous social threads that tie the individual to his or her community and world. Of course, these early ideas of Lukács, which emphasize the Hegelian heritage in Marx, while extremely influential in the West, were repudiated in orthodox Marxist circles. That is probably why Stoyanov never explicitly cites Lukács, though the parallels are very prominent. He even reaffirms the solution, proposed by Lukács – that the working class should not be considered as fully defined by alienation and reification, since it is supposed to produce the remedy for alienation (Stoyanov 1988b: 218–219). For Lukács this comes in the form of thought directly intervening in the social process (which was one of the reasons for the rejection of his position by orthodox Leninists). Although Stoyanov doesn't expressly state this solution to the problem of alienation, his study is primarily dedicated to presenting the various historical forms of alienation, together with the proposed *intellectual* projects for overcoming and compensating it. While the starting thesis seem not too terribly original, the following analyses present a fascinating multifaceted approach to the problem of alienation, which is developed in a dialectical manner. Different historical actors, philosophers and literary authors are presented as identifying a form of alienation and then proposing compensations that in turn only deepen the alienation they were supposed to overcome.

Similarly to Kuyumdzhiev, Stoyanov makes a strategic use of Bakhtin's ideas as disclosing a counterpoint to alienation in his presentation of the historical process. The significance of Bakhtin for this project is primarily in offering a picture of a *historical* cultural form that lacks alienation – the famous “carnival” in its employment of the grotesque:

The grotesque in the Renaissance is vital, we can even say positive, not in the cheap, but in the grand, philosophical sense of the world, as Bakhtin has convincingly demonstrated in his work on Rabelais. It is tied to the germination and birth, with cycles of life in the living organism, with the eternal continuity of life. [...] The grotesque speaks in the name of the organic, non-alienated consciousness, merged with the continuity of time and space, with the ancestral and cosmic communities. (Stoyanov 1988b: 372)

This reference is at first part of a contrast that Stoyanov is outlining between this carnivalesque continuity and the Romantic uses of grotesque and “freakish” imagery. He insists that the Romantic grotesque has lost its ties to this overwhelming cosmic integration of carnival and is one of the many ways in which alienation manifests itself in modern art:

Thus the grotesque degrades from a symbol of cosmic and biological energy into a symbol of degradation, of ugliness, and the disguises of this degradation take three forms. In some cases the Romantic grotesque is ‘demonized’ – becomes a pure monster, a vampire, carrier of evil without any positive charge. In other case, the reverse takes place – it is sentimentalized [...], it plays the part of a frightening rigid façade, beyond which the suffering subject contorts and entices sympathy [...] And at last there are ‘middle cases’, where the two principles start to merge and seemingly return to the former ambivalent whole – but this ambivalence now has a different basis: even in the most freakish human type remains pure subjectivity, the abstract sympathy towards the destructive self remains. Objectively [...] this grotesque body undoubtedly [...] must be removed from the face of the earth. But subjectively, seen from the ‘inside’, we feel for it. [...] It is ‘a monster that suffers’! (373)

According to Stoyanov this split into two sides, into two “worlds”, is foreign to the Bakhtinian carnival and thus opens up radical contradictions, fosters alienation.

Still, there is some ambiguity on Stoyanov’s part as to this dismissal of Romanticism. Later on he explicitly states that the Romantics were attempting a return to the fullness of life in carnival, and not just substituting it with these modern contradictions:

The Romantics attempt to revive what Bakhtin termed ‘culture of popular laughter’, the spirit of carnival during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. [...] They show keen sense, understanding and love for the carnival. [...] With the Romantics [...] we see a longing for laughter, in which things change places, merge or lose their bounds. Frightening and happy, ugly and sweet, vicious and good-natured emerge together form one element, here there no longer are any coordinates, but a single ambivalent ‘field of meanings’. (417–418)

This integral and dynamic in its continuous ambivalence “field of meanings” is precisely presented as a worthy project for overcoming alienation. Stoyanov praises the Romantics for emphasizing interest in historical continuity: “The Romantics are very sensitive to this feeling of wholeness, they want to understand the continuity of matters, they feel the transitory, change” (419). Yet, their historicism instead of restoring the de-alienated integrity of life turns into passive sentimentalism.

Longing passionately for a return of the past, the Romantics also mourn it as irretrievable, which is crucial part of their attitude toward it. [...] What the Romantics achieve is not a return of the past, but a return to

the past, i.e. their efforts are not aimed at active change of the present in the direction of the past, but rather the subjective immersion in past times, interest, study. It is restored ideally, not actually (449).

Thus carnival degrades into a masquerade: “The masquerade is false, repulsive, it is also a symbol of life, yet this is not the creative organic life, but rather the life of alienation, disintegration [...]” (451) This problem of the modern masquerade as a degradation of cosmic and organic unity of opposites Stoyanov detects (472) in Edgar Allan Poe’s uses of parodies as comic cyphers, hidden behind the horrific overt meaning, a product of a *rational* procedure. As long as the reader has managed to acquire or discover the code, he or she can decipher the comic subversion as the governing principle of the language of Poe’s writings. The parodic elements in carnival, in contrast, are seen as “neutralizing the separate in its hypertrophic tendency, not allowing it to become dominant, to disturb the harmony and to introduce its ‘dictatorship’. Parody is agent of harmony!” (473).

While he constantly describes how the Romantics missed the mark with their nostalgia for the carnival, Stoyanov remains unclear whether he himself endorses an active attempt at reconstituting the lost holism of carnival. On the one hand, he certainly presents Bakhtin’s descriptions of the carnival as a social institution that provides a model for de-alienation. Still, his constant focus in his study are the various attempts at presenting the past as a positive model for the present with the concomitant failures of such nostalgic projects: he traces a line from Rousseau through Herder to the Romantics, in which all “nostalgic” compensations turn out to produce further alienations. It seems that instead of a contra-modern attempt at avoiding modern conflicts and contradictions, he rather intends to project a dynamic model of

uninterrupted and ambivalent integration of these continuously emerging contradictions into a “field” of non-hierarchical, non-stable, ambiguous meanings. This is less a return to carnival, and more an insistence on something akin to what Bakhtin sees in the novel – polyphony.

This is even clearer in the text Tzvetan Stoyanov wrote last (and couldn’t quite finish before his death in 1971) – *The Genius and his Mentor* (1988a: 417–599). The subject of this book was the “guidance”, provided by Konstantin Petrovich Pobedonostsev to Feodor Dostoyevsky. Pobedonostsev, the de facto censor of Dostoyevsky’s later works, was a prominent political figure in the Russian Empire, who was deeply involved with the “paternalist” conservative movement in 19th century Russia. The paternalist doctrine involved emphasis on the “fatherly” nature of traditional forms of power and was distinctly contra-modern. Still, there was something very peculiar in Pobedonostsev style of conservatism. Pobedonostsev’s paternalism, according to Stoyanov, employed a very modern strategy of manipulation:

[...] ‘manipulation’ of the public, the organized mass ideological and psychological effect of the governing structure on society. ‘Manipulation’, of course, is an ancient phenomenon, but now it receives such stark specific manifestations [...] the conservative Pobedonostsev is among the first that recognized the ‘modern’ side of the phenomenon and decided to put it to use [...] The soul becomes a battleground – in the past it was still a battleground, but the whole of society, unified by faith, was struggling against the devil as something foreign; while now the society itself is split, the devil is on the inside...! Thus Konstantin Petrovich axiologically defines two types of manipulation – on the one hand, he defends the good, the right, ‘our’ manipulation, which is noble and blessed [...]; on the other, he rejects the antagonistic, the ‘devil’s’ manipulation, which brings doom. (439)

For Stoyanov, what is modern in Pobedonostsev's views is the acknowledgment of this disintegration of the fabric of society through ideological means, this breakdown of social ties that brings about alienation. By reinforcing one of the positions, Pobedonostsev himself becomes an agent of alienation. It is worth to note that the distinction between "right" and "wrong" ideology that is criticized here mirrors precisely the Leninist rhetoric that was predominant in the official party doctrine, especially in terms of the place of the artistic expression in society. Stoyanov insists on developing this analogy by focusing on Pobedonostsev's politics towards the arts:

[...] the traditional practice [of control over artistic expression] could not satisfy Konstantin Petrovich. It was predominantly negative – persecution, punishment, preventive, its aim was not so much to do something, but to block others from doing something – which was necessary, yet insufficient. Together with the negative side there had to appear a positive one. (468)

This "positive" strategy was to attempt a non-traditional form of manipulation by becoming a mentor for a literary genius and turning him into his ideological instrument by subtly guiding him to the "right" conceptual position. The benefit of this procedure was, of course, a work of art that hides its manipulative nature, while at the same time heightening the effectiveness of the ideological message by engaging not only rational thought, but the imagination as well. Stoyanov points towards the prolific correspondence between Pobedonostsev and Dostoyevsky during the latter's work on the "Brothers Karamazov" novel, which shares many features of Pobedonostsev's paternalistic position.

Yet, the intent of Stoyanov in this book is to show how this relationship brings a dialectically opposite result, and Dostoevsky turns out almost unwittingly to be a “manipulator of the manipulator”. This ideological mismatch between the mentor and the writer comes about in an even subtler way. Stoyanov focuses on two aspects of the novel – the way it intensifies the complexity of its criticism of modern western ideologies and the way in which it somewhat fails to consistently provide a positive counterpoint. In respect to the first ambiguity Stoyanov presents a reading of Ivan Karamazov’s “Great Inquisitor” as Dostoyevsky’s way of presenting western Catholicism and socialism as collapsing into the same nihilistic position – they both lose God, and by losing God, lose everything, for which they stand:

According to Dostoevsky, the ‘materialists’, or, which for him is the same, the ‘nihilists’ in their internal development reach a moment, where they ‘destroy’ not only the hierarchy of God’s world, but the world itself. [...] As long as the materialist negates God’s reason, he needs to negate ‘matter’ itself, i.e. himself. [...] Usually things are considered to be the other way – that ‘materialists’ elevate matter, while religious thought degrades it. [...] But Dostoyevsky tries to convince us this is so only apparently – you can have ‘matter’ only with God, because God nurtures it and moves it (508).

This complex dialectic in Dostoyevsky, outlined by Stoyanov, seems both consistent with paternalistic denunciations of “materialism” as “nihilism”, and at the same time exceeds its one-sidedness. In effect Dostoyevsky seems to be drawing upon the language of his mentor’s ideology, in order to produce a new conceptual position. This excess of complexity in Dostoyevsky’s writing is presented by Stoyanov as

9

The reference Stoyanov made to Leontiev as an embodiment of the paternalist position may easily be read as an indirect criticism of the strategic use of his ideas by Zhechev.

troubling for Pobedonostsev and his reductive instrumental attitude towards literature.

Yet, according to Stoyanov⁹, a further embarrassment for Pobedonostsev became the portrayal of the “positive” (from the paternalistic perspective) characters in the novel. Alyosha, the supposedly “utterly beautiful human being” in the novel, barely acts in it and Dostoevsky confessed to Pobedonostsev that in terms of this character the novel was not even a start of a novel. The situation with his mentor Father Zosima became problematic as well – his speech in the novel, which is rife with notions, taken wholesale from the rhetoric of paternalism, was faced with criticism from a very unlikely source – from Konstantin Leontiev, a fellow traveler of Pobedonostsev, who publicly took issue with Zosima’s position as being “almost heretic” (529–35, 542).

But the worst perpetrator of the subtle subversion of the mentor’s ideological rationale was the unfinished structure of the book itself. Stoyanov speculates about the thoughts, burdening Pobedonostsev after Dostoyevsky’s funeral:

Maybe during the first days after the funeral he was reconsidering his long history of closeness with the genius. [...] Was he evaluating things only from the side which benefited him? [...] And taking into account only this “first novel”, with all of its apparent tendency, was everything in it “all right”? If Alyosha’s story was finished, maybe it would have been otherwise, but now the novel was as it was – in this case wasn’t there a change in the basic points, wasn’t there a need for a new evaluation, this time only of what was written and not what was intended? Wasn’t there a need for deciphering Brothers Karamazov once again [...] especially since Dostoyevsky loved circumlocution [...]? Wasn’t there some hidden “half-expressed” [...] beyond all the mentioned meanings

in favor of the “conservative” ideology, what in fact was the deepest symbolism of the novel, what was it “trying to say” as an autonomous work [...]? What was it [the novel itself] “trying to say” first of all with its plot, with the horrific murder of the father, around which the whole appearance and disappearance of the characters revolves? [...] [A]fter all who exactly killed Feodor Karamazov, and, which is even more important, why was he killed? (548-549)

A “paternalist” novel about the unresolved and unresolvable murder of the father! Here the crucial point is that this predicament is ensured primary by the text itself, rather than some sly trick, perpetrated by Dostoyevsky himself. This almost deconstructive potentiality of the complex structure of the novel to strain, to override, to overturn the intended meaning, the product of the mentor’s “guidance”, is the propensity of writing, on which Stoyanov staked both his methodological engagement with Bakhtin, and his personal and political activity. Dialogical meaning, even, as mentioned earlier, to a point of parodic travesty that undermines any dominant position, was seen as subverting the ideological manipulative pressures and restrictions and seems indeed to have been Stoyanov’s own utopian political and intellectual project. Pobedonostzev here turns into an allegory of the various manipulative party operatives and censors that Stoyanov had to work with on daily basis, and the ambivalence of words, used in these exchanges, is presented as a strategy for expression of conceptual dissent, hidden precisely in its ambiguous manifestation. However, this strategy is not presented as akin to the calculated operation of the likes of Poe, whom Stoyanov criticized precisely on this point. He sees true resistance not so much in intending a hidden “parodic” meaning that subverts the manifest one as in a form of an overcoded doublespeak, but rather

10

In fact structuralism during the 1960ies was a target of methodological and political scrutiny from many sides, including party officials. See Darin Tenev's contribution in this volume.

in the unintended fact of ambiguity that comes about with language itself. This general heteroglossia is what seems to be the crux of his reliance on Bakhtin.

The ideas of the “impressionist critics” converged around common topics, yet they diverged significantly in the way they interpreted them. Both Stoyanov and Kuyumdzhev used Bakhtin's notion of carnival, but on closer scrutiny pertinent differences emerge. Unlike Stoyanov, who explicitly praises the continuity of history and the Romantics for emphasizing it, and considers Bakhtin's carnival as precisely historical cultural institution from pre-modern times, Kuyumdzhev stylizes it as a persistent ahistorical timelessness that remains parallel to the movement of historical time. In fact this type of conservative antihistoricism comes very close to the ideology of “paternalism” that Stoyanov was trying to demystify. One can even speculate whether *The Genius and his Mentor* was an allegorical polemic not only with party “manipulators”, but also with this conservative tendency in Stoyanov's own circle.

ANTI-HUMANISM, VAGUENESS AND BAKHTIN

For Tsvetan Stoyanov and his impressionist colleagues structuralism with its purported scientific rigor embodied the modern ill of alienation.¹⁰ While the two groups had fundamental disagreements, the theoretical and ideological lines of dissention were rarely publicly discussed before the 1980s, which demands an effort for reconstruction. The present article will attempt to explicate the structuralist position through the way they engaged in criticism of Bakhtin, whose ideas were largely instrumentalised by their opponents. The structuralist answer to the use of Bakhtin in the writings of the “impressionist critics” became public at a later point. During

the 1990s Nikola Georgiev published a couple of articles (1990, 1999) containing criticisms of Bakhtin. These articles seem to attempt to shed light upon Georgiev's earlier antagonistic engagements with the Bulgarian Bakhtinians during the 1960s and 1970s, where the brunt of his resistance to Bakhtin was left without express comments, in the background of his arguments. The first article directly engages with the case of Radichkov and makes a point about the use of Bakhtin (though without expressly mentioning Kuyumdzhiev) with the aim of depoliticizing his writings:

[...] the ruling ideologeme created an image of him [Radichkov] [...] that was conservative in literary terms and devoid of conflict in social terms. [Radichkov] was interned into the package of the freshly formed at the time official mythologemes of the originally native, the roots, the Bulgarian folklore, the mythological [...] If he's read with both eyes open, it becomes clear that all these roots and speculations about the people's psyche are secondarily taken up and ironically displaced. [...] Radichkov's works were driven through his [Bakhtin's] notions of carnival, the grotesque, popular laughter culture [...] and emerged from them once again as ours, native, non-modern. [...] Because Bakhtin's carnival is the triumph of the popular, and consequently democratic element over some pretentious scientists. [...] (Georgiev 1990: 4)¹¹

This sarcastic polemic continues in the second article, on which we will focus our attention, since it discusses Bakhtin in detail.

This latter essay is titled “The Stuttering Dialogue” and it is dedicated to the jubilee of a former structuralist who turned to Bakhtin's notion of dialogue as a basis for his humanist ethics – Tzvetan Todorov, who in his youth used to be Georgiev's peer during their

11 Boyko Penchev (12, 19) also makes a point of these comments by Georgiev as indications of the struggles around the canonization of Radichkov during the 1970ies, though he does not go into detail about the conceptual position, espoused by Georgiev.

studies in the University of Sofia. While the occasion of the article is celebratory, the text itself is far from it. It reads more as a scathing demystification of the perceived unethical and authoritative aspects of Bakhtin's writings. Georgiev opens the article with a questioning of the "dialogical principle" in Bakhtin, Todorov and others by alluding to its being "unprincipled" (Georgiev 1999: 5). While the article focuses largely on the different interpretations and engagements with Bakhtin in the West, it points toward a possible reconstruction the lines of dissent around the Russian theorist in the Bulgarian debates during the 1960s and 1970s.

The primary attention here is given to the ways, in which the figure of Bakhtin was developed into an "image" (6) by his various exegetes, a process that, according to Georgiev, amounted to a full blown mythology. He meticulously combs texts by different commenters for phrases that form a perception of Bakhtin as "enigmatic", "mysterious", "prophetic", and even "saintly". Then he proceeds to propose a reason for their persistence in the writings on the Russian literary theorist: "[...] in literary studies during the 20th century the longing for the "harmonious person" (I borrow this cliché from the dictionary of the communist propaganda in Bulgaria during the 1970s) was vigorous. It turned out that too many people do not want to see "the humanities without the human", and consequently literary studies without the man" (11). The "harmonious person" is, of course, a cliché, developed out of the "humanist" Marxist discussions around alienation. It seems clear, that the mythologizing of Bakhtin in the eyes of Georgiev was an obvious symptom of resistance to the anti-humanist materialism in literary studies that structuralist methodology was in the process of developing during the 1960s and 1970s. This statement directly references the primary theoretical discord between

the structuralists and their rivals, but the political significance of these disagreements from the point of view of Georgiev needs some further clarification.

In an attempt to show the way Bakhtin's theories have been compromised politically during socialism, he points to some radical attempts at the demythologizing of Bakhtin's work in the writings of Russian scholars during the 1990s.¹² His insistence is on the various ways, in which Bakhtin's views, and especially the concept of carnival, were completely consistent with the orthodox party emphasis on collectivism and "the people".

But the crucial examination of the political relevance of Bakhtin comes when Georgiev turns to a discussion of Bakhtin's style. He continues the strategy of amassing quotations from various authors, all possessing a common feature – they all describe Bakhtin's writing as "puzzling", unclear, nebulous, vague (9–13). He even tackles from this perspective one of the most frequently debated issues in Bakhtin studies – the problem around the authorship of some of the works, bearing the signatures of his "circle". He insists on the view, that there is a stark contrast between the way Medvedev's "The Formal Method in Literary Studies" attempts to clearly define its concepts and Bakhtin's style both in his early and later works and points to Tzvetan Todorov's description of Medvedev's style as "concise, purposeful, with clear straightforwardness, with striving for terminological transparency and consistency" and of Bakhtin's writing as "confused composition"¹³, while criticizes him for resisting the questioning of the authorship on the basis of these observations (13).

This issue of the "vagueness" of Bakhtin's style leads Georgiev directly to the topic of the "ambivalence" that was so favored by Tzvetan Stoyanov:

12

See, for instance (Ryklin 34–51). Ryklin claims, that in his notion of "carnival" Bakhtin presented the Stalinist terror as some form of repeatable and necessary ritual violence, thus serving as some sort of relief for the trauma of the concrete historical political violence. Similar connections between Bakhtin's notions and totalitarianism draws Vadim Linetskiy in *Anti-Bakhtin* (1994). An older colleague of mine, Mihail Nedelchev, once mentioned a rumor he heard on a trip to the USSR in the 1980s, that during the 1960s the communist party let Yuri Lotman publish his structuralist studies in Tartu as a kind of "scientific export", a showcase for the heights of socialist scholarship, while at the same time combating its "dangerous" influence locally by allowing Bakhtin's criticism of structuralism to be published and to gain ground. While unconfirmed, this rumor clearly points at a perception of Bakhtin's theories at that time as conforming to official party doctrine.

13

"Bakhtin's signed works are characterized by confused composition, repetitions to the point of restatement, and a tendency toward abstraction (due, perhaps, to German philosophy)." (Todorov 8).

It turns out, that one of the key concepts in Bakhtin, “ambivalence”, needs to be applied above all to his own writings – and to their evaluation. Whether this vagueness, nebulousness, etc. is for the better or for the worst depends on the evaluation of the means and ends, but in one direction it is clearly for the best: it contributes to the authority of Bakhtin’s discourse and the authority, rational or irrational, of the image that was created of it. Experience shows, that authoritarian language may with equal success or failure be based on mystifying metaphorical vagueness, or the opposite, on brevity, conciseness and simplicity... The two types, seemingly contradictory, merge and often are used together, though clearly during the 20th century there appeared ideologies [...] that were slanted in one or the other direction”. (14)

The ambiguity of language, on which Stoyanov based his political project, here is presented as deeply suspect and profoundly ideological. Let’s reiterate: the two “authoritarian” strategies, outlined by Georgiev, are, first, ambivalence and vagueness, and second, declarations of simplicity. The first one bears the marks of Stoyanov’s preferences for Bakhtin’s heteroglossia, while the other has seemingly quite a lot to do with Zhechev’s and Kuyumdzhiev’s praise for the simplicity of the ahistorical condition of the “peasant’s worldview”, beyond the temptations of modernity. One can easily conclude by way of elimination that according to Georgiev the value of the scientific rigor of structuralism may be found in its being both clear and complex, that is – both non-manipulative and non-reductive. This line of reasoning is in line with the way the structuralists during the 1960s defended themselves from attacks – just like the “impressionist” humanists, they were claiming a Marxist lineage for themselves, though on a different basis: as continuing the tradition of developing Marxism as a materialist science.

While Marxist humanism and structuralism may no longer be as relevant in themselves in current theoretical debates, what can be glimpsed from the complex and multifaceted divergences from the official Marxist doctrine in literary studies during the 1960–1970s is theory itself as a site of struggle and political resistance, rife with risk and promise, and with conceptual and political creativity. Furthermore, as we mentioned in the beginning of the article, this clash between incompatible conceptual positions in Bulgaria would eventually bear fruit in the West – Julia Kristeva, who was very much directly influenced by Tzvetan Stoyanov in her formative years as a scholar, emigrated to the then bastion of structuralism, Paris, where she criticized the static models of structuralist thought and ultimately developed a theory, in which poetic language compensates the *alienating* effects (especially vis-à-vis the body) of the signifying chain of symbolic language, thus becoming one of the foremost voices of what soon after became known as “poststructuralism”. ♡

References

- BAKHTIN, MIKHAIL, 1984: *Rabelais and His World*. Trans. Helene Iswolsky. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- GEORGIEV, NIKOLA, 1990: Ot svirepoto nastroenie kam igriviat konformizam [From the Savage Mood to the Playful Conformism]. *Puls* 29. 4–5.
- GEORGIEV, NIKOLA, 1999: Zaekvashtijat dialog [The Stuttering Dialogue]. *Literaturna misal* 2. 5–28.
- KUYUMDZHIEV, KRASTYO, 1977: Fenomenat Radichkov [The Radichkov Phenomenon]. *Kritika i literaturnen zivot* [Criticism and Literary Life]. Sofia: Balgarski pisatel. 58–79.
- LINETSKIY, VADIM, 1994: *Anti-Bakhtin*. Saint Petersburg: Typographia, im. I.E. Kotlyakova.
- LUKÁCS, GYÖRGY, 1972: *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*. Trans. Rodney Livingstone. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- NIKOLCHINA, MIGLENA, 2013: *Lost Unicorns of the Velvet Revolutions: Heterotopias of the Seminar*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- NIKOLCHINA, MIGLENA, 2014: Inverted Forms and Heterotopian Homonymy: Althusser, Mamardashvili, and the Problem of ‘Man’. *boundary 2* 41. 79–100.
- PENCHEV, BOYKO, 2017: Kanon i prisposobyavane. Opakovaneto na Radichkov [Cannon and Adaptation. The Packaging of Radichkov]. Ed. Nadezhda Alexandrova et al. *Nadmoshtie i prisposobyavane* [Domination and Adaptation]. Sofia: Faculty of Slavic Studies Publishing. 11–20.
- RYKLIN, MIKHAIL, 1992: Tela terrora [The Body of Terror]. *Terrorlogiki* [Terrorlogics]. Moscow: Tartu. 34–51.

- STOYANOV, TZVETAN, 1988a: *Sachinenia v dva toma* [Selected Writings in Two Volumes], Ed. Antoaneta Vojnikova et al. vol. 1. *Kulturata kato obshtenie* [Culture as Communication]. Sofia: Balgarski pisatel.
- STOYANOV, TZVETAN, 1988b: *Sachinenia v dva toma* [Selected Writings in Two Volumes], Ed. Antoaneta Vojnikova et al. vol. 2. *Otchuzhdenieto* [Alienation]. Sofia: Balgarski pisatel.
- TIHANOV, GALIN, 2000: *The Master and the Slave: Lukács, Bakhtin and the Ideas of their Time*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- TODOROV, TZVETAN, 1984: *Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogical Principle*. Trans. by Wlad Godzich. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- ZHECHEV, TONCHO, 1975: *Balgarskijat Velikden ili strastite balgarski* [The Bulgarian Easter, or the Bulgarian Passions]. Sofia: Marin Drinov Publishing.

Резюме

Статията се опитва да реконструира част от политическите залози в концептуалните и методологическите спорове между две групи литературоведи през 60-те и 70-те в България – структуралистите и т.нар. „импресионистични критици“. Това начинание е полезно за адресирането на постструктуралисткото наследство на Източна Европа, тъй като дава достъп до интелектуалния контекст, в който се формират идеите на Юлия Кръстева, която впоследствие ще се превърне в един от първите „постструктуралиски“ критици на структурализма във Франция. Преди да емигрира, тя е много близка до кръга на „импресионистичните критици“. Групата получава това название най-вече заради липсата на следване на ясна методология в техните изследвания. През 60-те групата е ангажирана с разпалена полемика с българските структуралисти и особено с един от най-представителните им фигури, Никола Георгиев. Публичните дебати между тези две литературоведски направления се съсредоточават главно около спорове, свързани с оценката на творчеството на конкретни автори (най-голяма острота конфликтите придобиват в обсъждането на дебюта на Николай Хайтов) и рядко достигат до директни обсъждания на концептуалните им предпоставки, което налага нуждата от реконструкция на теоретичните им възгледи. Удачен подстъп към такава реконструкция се оказва разнопосочната употреба на идеите на Михаил Бахтин в текстовете на „импресионистичните критици“, тъй като това може би е една от най-ранните рецепции на Бахтин извън Русия през 60-те. Ключовият акцент в статията е начина, по който тези групи оформят своите възгледи в съпротива срещу официалната марксистка доктрина, доминираща през периода, като редом с

това правят опит да легитимират тази съпротива в марксистки термини. Част от „импресионистичните критици“ (Т. Жечев, З. Петров и Кръстю Куюмджиев) развиват една подчертано консервативна концепция, залагаща на представата за аисторични съпротивителни сили на българското село, сили, които те искат да задействат срещу разрушителните ефекти на модернизацията. Но този възглед се оказва неприемлив за друг важен представител на групата – Цветан Стоянов. Стоянов споделя безпокойството на Жечев, Петров и Куюмджиев от ефектите, съпровождащи процеса на модерността, и особено проблема за „отчуждението“. Същевременно той е силно скептичен към техния консерватизъм и традиционализъм. От своя страна структуралистите (възгледите на които са реконструирани в статията най-вече въз основа на по-късни текстове на Никола Георгиев върху Бахтин) търсят своята легитимация през връзката на своята методология с марксистското настояване върху материалистична научност. Георгиев прививда в концепциите и жестовете на Бахтин (и имплицитно в писанията на българските му последователи) две взаимосвързани авторитарни тенденции – опростяване и неяснота. Последната е особено важна в контекста на разглеждания дебат, доколкото проекта за политическа съпротива, който Стоянов се опитва да оформи през 60-те, разчита силно именно на „амбивалентността“, понятие, което, разбира се, заема от Бахтин.

В своя финал статията посочва по-директните връзки на елементи от разглеждания дебат с по-късните критики на Кръстева към структурализма – в тях именно проблемът за отчуждението ще изиграе ключова роля.

Enyo Stoyanov

Enyo Stoyanov is an assistant professor at the Literary Theory Department at the University of Sofia. He has published studies on various theoretical topics in literary theory and philosophy and his research interests are in the field of political theory, aesthetics, and continental philosophy. Some of his publications include “A Poem, Learned by Heart” (2012), “The Event of Literature: The Deleuzian Reversal of Platonism Continued” (2013), “Fictional Worlds Theory and the Persistence of Mimesis” (2015).



Anti-Odysseus: Orphism and Late Communism in Bulgaria

Анти-Одиссей: Орфизм
и поздний коммунизм
в Болгарии

A 1980s debate between Bulgarian “structuralists” and so called “impressionist critics” provides a line of demarcation between structuralists and post-structuralists while simultaneously delineating “Orphism” as the heavily controversial theoretical counterpart to the rise of Thracian studies in archeology and historiography. Since national identity turns out to be a major ideological wager of these controversies, they acquire an unforeseen relevance today.

ORPHISM, THRACIAN MYTHOLOGY,
LATE COMMUNISM, NATIONALISM,
NATIONAL IDENTITY

В этом исследовании дискуссия с восьмидесятих годов XX века между болгарскими «структуралистами» и так называемыми «импрессионистскими критиками» рассматривается как способ разграничения болгарских структуралистов и постструктуралистов. В то же время эта дискуссия позволяет наметить «орфизм» как арена теоретических разногласий, разворачивающихся параллельно с ростом фракологии в исторических науках. Поскольку национальная идентичность является одним из идеологических залогов этих разногласий, они оказываются сегодня неожиданно актуальными.

ОРФИЗМ, ФРАКИЙСКАЯ
МИФОЛОГИЯ, ПОЗДНИЙ
КОМУНИЗМ, НАЦИОНАЛИЗМ,
НАЦИОНАЛЬНАЯ ИДЕНТИЧНОСТЬ

1 The master mind behind the rocketing of Thracian studies (Thracology) and the inventor of Orphism (Fol 1986) as the ancient religion of the Thracians was historian Alexander Fol who founded the Institute of Thracology in 1972 and who, before our own disbelieving post-structuralist eyes, constructed Bulgaria's Thracian ancestry out of a few scattered references in Ancient Greek sources. With all the archeological activity which accompanied his theoretical endeavors, the reality of Bulgaria's monumental Thracian roots is now obviously here to stay.

2 The publication of Miroslav Yanakiev's book *Bulgarsko stihoznanie* might be regarded as the beginning of Bulgarian structuralism although Yanakiev's influence was already under way in the second half of the 1950s. Given the isolationism of the regime, Yanakiev had pretty good international connections. He was in contact with Jakobson: a facsimile of Jakobson's letter regarding *Bulgarsko stihoznanie* is included in Garnizov (239–242). In one of the many battles waged against Yanakiev, Yuri Lotman (1982) interfered in his defense. For a more detailed account of the controversies triggered by structuralism see Darin Tenev and Enyo Stoyanov in this issue.

This essay explores a peculiar trend in 1980s Bulgarian theoretical thinking which might be termed Orphism and which accompanied – without necessarily recognizing, or being recognized by – the rise of Thracian studies in archeology and historiography.¹ Although the genealogy of this trend has been traced back to the first half of the 20th century, the immediate point of departure for my examination will be the antagonism between structuralists and so called impressionist critics, which marked intellectual life in Bulgaria since the 1960s.² My goal, however, will be to foreground a certain brand of orphism, if there ever was one, which ignored and was ignored by this antagonism, while participating in theoretical communications with a broad spectrum of disciplines and discourses ranging from dissenting Marxist critiques of the regime to various post-structuralist orientations.³ What made the exchange not only possible but also quite fruitful was a common strategy for evading, displacing, and ultimately erasing all traces of the official dogma, *even when it was contested*. Ignoring the structuralist-essayists clashes was hence intentional and strategic. Contestation, it was implied, would already contaminate the contestant with the discourse of the enemy; complete disregard would be the only proper road to take.

The “Orphic” link was nevertheless there. Towards the end of the 1970s there was, so to say, a classical turn to the controversies, theoretical, ideological, and obliquely political, between the rather irregular brand of Bulgarian structuralism⁴ and the “impressionist critics” whose major representative was Toncho Zhechev. A number of paradoxes surround these controversies. Toncho Zhechev and his group were prevailingly perceived then, as they tend to be perceived today, as courageously antagonistic to the official dogma and hence subversive. This view disregards Zhechev's efforts to ground his ideas in a certain

reading of Marx, however superficial and misconceived (Panova 15; see also Enyo Stoyanov's contribution in this issue), as well as his easy-going relationship with the central publishing venues: all this in stark contrast to the situation with the structuralists who were attacked in the central press and frequently had trouble publishing their works. As Iskra Panova, representing the camp of structuralism, acerbically remarked (14) apropos of Zhechev's essay "The Myth of Odysseus": "One might envy the courage of [Zhechev's] creed if it were not well known that Odysseus was never one to take uncalculated risks."

The publication of Zhechev's essay "The Myth of Odysseus" and the controversy it triggered is what I describe as classical turn in the structuralist-impressionist confrontation. "The Myth of Odysseus" initially appeared at the end of 1979.⁵ In it, Zhechev opposes the home-coming Odysseus to the sea-faring Odysseus. Odysseus' home-coming to the bucolic joys of agriculture is proclaimed to be the quintessence of Bulgarianness. The sailor is transformed into a settled tiller of the land; Odysseus – into a noble Bulgarian peasant who has never given in to cravings to leave his fruit-bearing vale. This retro-utopian patriarchal vision had already become apparent in Zhechev's previous writing; its articulation through Greek myth, however, might be seen as symptomatic of a more general tendency. The 1980s are characterized by the infiltration of Ancient Greek literature, culture and philosophy in various areas of the humanities, which, via the arc of antiquity, find a way to connect and share, or sometimes oppose, their agendas. I do not claim that the turn to antiquity during this decade is stronger qualitatively or quantitatively in comparison with other periods of Bulgarian culture. Its specific aspect is, rather, the effort to translate the highly specialized classical studies into broader philosophical, ethical, esthetical and ultimately political horizons.

3
I analyze the 1980s multidisciplinary exchanges and their political implications in (Nikolchina 2013a).

4
What I call "irregular" is, among other things, branding it as structuralism in so far as its major representatives resisted being branded as structuralists – or, indeed, as anything. Nikola Georgiev has meanwhile argued for the impossibility of schools in literary theory (17–136). This position is subtended by a certain "vertical" orientation of Bulgarian theoretical thinking – a meta-positioning with respects to all brands and schools (Cf. Nikolchina 2013b: 146–147), which, set side by side with what will appear here as Orphism, acquires a curious new dimension.

5
The essay was reissued twice before the fall of the regime and has been reissued many times since. Iskra Panova's response has never, so far as I know, been re-issued.

Multiple factors were probably at work. At a time when practically all Bulgarian intellectuals knew Russian, the influence of A.F. Lossev and Sergei Averintsev was definitely among those factors: not only in terms of their contribution to their concrete fields of study but most of all in terms of their ability to transform these fields into a meta-reflexive position with regards to the present. This ability was typical of the efforts to escape the ideological clichés of the regime yet the manner of its application was far from homogeneous. In Bulgaria, in the 1980s, Bogdan Bogdanov and Tzotcho Boiadjiev succeeded in consolidating classical studies into a dynamic mode of dissenting thought. As their younger colleague Kalin Yanakiev points out after the fall of communism, what inspired such endeavors was “resistance to the dead official philosophical thinking, which drove us to oppose it with a blend of rhetoric, imagination and reflection, at times, perhaps, too expressive and too trustful of subjectivity.” (Preface 7) In spite of the ingredients of imagination and subjectivity – which were, after all, present to a different degree in the different authors – this mode was also, as Kalin Yanakiev’s book *Ancient Greek Culture: Problems of Philosophy and Mythology* demonstrates, inflected by close reading, linguistic discipline, and attention to the letter of the text. Although totally opposed in its implications to Zhechev’s *Odysseus*, the book never mentions him and never makes clear who exactly is implied in the lash at the “official semi-ideological semi-anachronistic Bulgarian academism.” While the structuralists’ attack of Zhechev’s *Odysseus* is explicit and direct, Yanakiev keeps a sanitary distance from the controversy by avoiding any reference to it.

This divergence with respect to Zhechev’s *Odysseus* might in fact serve as a line of demarcation between structuralists and posts-structuralists in Bulgaria during the 1980s. Among the post-structuralists

there were many who were deeply and personally indebted to their structuralist teachers (Cf. Kiossev); their own work, however, thrived in a heterogeneous and multidisciplinary milieu which was a major feature of the epoch and which included classical studies as one of the most active strands. At the time, various authors working in various spheres of the humanities resorted to the classical inheritance in the spirit described and exemplified by Kalin Yanakiev. Many of them were closely connected through a dense network of seminars which allowed constant and immediate exchange of knowledge and ideas. The range of what they did with the ancients was sometimes staggering. There was Bogdan Bogdanov's voluminous output which elegantly, cunningly, and expertly undermined official clichés. There were, at the opposite end, extremist "dada" theoretical gestures like Vladislav Todorov's "Eros, Knight of the Prosthesis." From ethics and axiology (Videva) to literary studies (Nikolchina 1988), it was as if paying tribute to the Greeks were some sort of rite of passage. Tzotcho Boiadjiev's influential study *Plato's 'Unwritten Doctrine'* with its emphasis on oral philosophical communication became emblematic for the penchant to sidestep censorship through seminar discussions. The propensity to think the shared dialogic fields via ancient Greek prisms is even more explicit in Boyadjiev's "Socratic Discussions and Modern Dialogue," as well as other texts like Rajcho Pozharliev's "Phenomenology of the Dialogic Situation in Plato's *Symposium*," Boriana Katsarska's "Soul. Eros. Community," etc. In the 1980s this exchange almost completely disregarded Toncho Zhechev's *Odysseus* and Fol's *Thracology*. Yanakiev's "alienated individualist" approach to antiquity was following a shared project for inhabiting a parallel universe with regards to the methodological, ideological and political wagers of the controversy surrounding *Odysseus*.⁶

6

I cannot go here into the full complexity of either the individual development of the authors discussed, or the trends of which they are part.

ODYSSEUS AND NATIONAL(IST) EXOTICISM

A decade later Boyan Manchev employs the concept of “national exoticism” in order to examine Zhechev’s use of the myth of Odysseus. Manchev explores both the specific Bulgarian genealogy and the broader European context of Zhechev’s approach. At various moments of time, a number of European cultures construct their national identity through classical reference. Manchev evokes the structural paradox inherent in this practice – the paradox of a national, i.e. particular universalism – in order to address the dilemmas of Bulgarian culture when, in the second half of the 19th and the first half of the 20th century, it came to face the task of such construction. Orpheus and Dionysus – the Orphic-Dionysian, Bacchic, ecstatic, sacrificial, carnal, transgressive, primal, chthonic elements – become central to this effort because of a double or triple causality with respect to European but also Balkan and especially Greek (the most problematic for multiple reasons) uses of the classical inheritance. On the one hand, these chthonic aspects remained more or less vacant after earlier European uses which emphasized the rationality, harmony, and classical measure of the ancients; on the other hand, both Orpheus and Dionysus have a Thracian connection, so Bulgarian could claim a geographic relatedness; and there was Nietzsche, of course, whose early 20th century influence played its role. Manchev sees Zhechev’s return to the earlier efforts as an answer to the failure of the communist regime to implement a communist identity and the ensuing ideological crisis which produced the Thracian myth as one of its symptoms:

| [...] *The “Thracian myth” is de facto a project for the “rediscovery” (equivalent to a “re-planting”) of the roots of the Bulgarian nation:*

an apparent tendency toward de-europeanization [...] which in fact unconsciously is trying to reconstruct the traumatic – because seen as lacking – European identity of the Bulgarian nation as “central” rather than “peripheral.” In short, this is an attempt to re-write the Bulgarian (or now Thracio-Bulgarian) culture as the cradle of the European civilization tout court. Through its new self-identification as inheritor to Thracian culture the Bulgarian national project discovers the veiled road to identification with the Other of Greece, or the other Greek – Dionysian (i.e. “Thracian”) culture.

The dynamic Manchev uncovers is that, while being late and left with no other options but the exotic ones for its identity, Bulgarian culture implements the Thracian myth as a mechanism for transforming the exotic into universal. This, however, implicates an anti-modernity move in so far as identity is sought for in a unique archaic past. Zhechev’s specific input into this effort is, according to Manchev, to “tame” and “domesticate” the Thracian Orpheus through the image of the home-coming rather than sea-faring Odysseus. The failed future-oriented communist identity is thus translated into a return to patriarchal roots. Zhechev transforms elemental excess into pastoral morality and tragedy – into idyll. As other studies have noted, Zhechev subjects to the same domesticating procedure key historical figures from the Bulgarian past, trimming their questionable bohemian ways into models of pristine patriarchal virtue (Penchev 20–21). This taming tendency sums up Zhechev’s ideal of Bulgaria’s “vale culture” (small, isolated, misunderstood by the harsh big world but beautiful) and his take on national identity.

There may have been, however, an additional and more personal trigger for his “Myth of Odysseus.” Zhechev was part of a small circle

which took care of the posthumous publication of the works of his friend Tzvetan Stoyanov, a brilliant theoretician and writer who died prematurely in 1971 under circumstances his friends found suspicious. (Cf. Vassilev) In the early 1960s, according to Zhechev's own testimony, Stoyanov wrote a dialogue "Orpheus: Delirium with Mythology" which was published for the first time in 1978, a year before the first appearance of "The Myth of Odysseus" (Zhechev 1988: 13–14). Hardly a dialogue, Stoyanov's "Delirium" alternates powerful and terrifying soliloquies in which Orpheus recounts now Dionysus invoking and raping him, now the Bacchante tearing him ecstatically to pieces (Stoyanov 357–362). It so happened that 1978 was also the year of the infamous Bulgarian umbrella case in which expat Bulgarian writer Georgi Markov was assassinated on a bridge in London, presumably by the Bulgarian secret services. Georgi Markov was a close friend of Tzvetan Stoyanov. When "Orpheus: Delirium with Mythology" was published for the second time ten years later, Zhechev and the other editors had it followed by "The Second Part of the Conversation," a dialogue which had not been previously published, and for good reasons. In it, transparently disguised as 19th century Bulgarian writers, Stoyanov depicts Georgi Markov and himself discussing, deploring, and ultimately accepting self-sacrifice in the face of a hopeless situation which, again quite transparently, was the communist regime (Stoyanov 357–385).

Orpheus, sacrificial terror, Stoyanov's untimely and disturbing end, Markov's exile and violent death, as well as both Stoyanov and Markov's dream of participating in the "grand dialogue" (Stoyanov 64) of world literature might have been, therefore, the very concrete background from which Zhechev's idyllic Odysseus was differentiating himself, finding shelter in his vale, brushing the sweat from his forehead like some sort of agricultural Sisyphus. Odysseus was, perhaps, the fruit of

Zhechev's on-going debate with his dead friends. Benignly, this could be perceived as survivor's guilt and some sort of plea for the nation's survival. But at what price? Iskra Panova, the most vehement and articulate critic of "The Myth of Odysseus," does not mince her words when asking why Zhechev did not choose some other mythical figure for his hero. "All the others are losers, all the others are vanquished... Only Odysseus the Cunning scores all the points, collects all the profit, never misses a chance and is the only one to reach old age and close the cycle under the skirts of Grandma Penelope." (Panova 33)⁷

While this may look all too personal, Panova's critique is relentlessly logical and follows two major lines of argumentation. The first one targets Zhechev's methodology or, rather, lack thereof: he uses Ancient myth in order to produce a conservative and rightist new mythology disregarding scientific knowledge and analytical rigour. "His village becomes the Bulgarian village in general, the village becomes the people, the people becomes the People with a capital P, immutable and sacred." (Panova 31) The second one targets the ideological implications of his essay. In counter distinction to received ideas about structuralism, Panova focuses on Zhechev's tampering with context and temporality: his musings deny concrete realities, specific history, change, process, innovation, the courage of producing the new and – as she keeps repeating – of stepping into the unknown.

The fate of Panova's article is rather strange: always mentioned, never quoted, its points frequently recycled without acknowledgment.⁸ Strangest of all, it has been denounced as an attack against Zhechev from the positions of the official party line (cf. Karev). In fact, apart from the editorial note with which the journal introduces her article, there is not a single instance of the orthodox Marxist rhetoric in Panova's own text. Panova emphasizes the anti-European, anti-democratic,

7 Being a loser, being vanquished, fighting beyond hope were recurring motifs in Tzvetan Stoyanov's work. In this passage, as so very often in those parabolic times, we might be dealing with more than meets the eye.

8 Her biography is a bit too complicated for the simplistic divisions dominating Bulgarian political life: during World War 2 Panova was member of the illegal communist and antifascist Union of Working Class Youth; in the 1980s she was monitored and molested by the secret services and expelled from the Bulgarian Communist Party for founding and being an active member of the Club for Glasnost and Democracy which played a key role in bringing down the regime. She was, to put it in terms of her own discussion of Odysseus, never one to calculate risks.

anti-intellectual, and anti-modernization consequences of Zhechev's nationalism: with this, she would make perfect sense today in the face of contemporary nationalisms. There is unavoidably too much Zhechev in a critique of Zhechev, which must have been a problem for Kalin Yanakiev's milieu, but there is no discrepancy between her position in its broad outlines and the position exemplified by Yanakiev's *Ancient Greek Culture: Problems of Philosophy and Mythology*. A curious illustration of their subterranean agreement may be found in their use of a rather rare word – wombness (*utrobnost*): the wombness and the return to the womb it implies is something they would both prefer to see avoided, culturally speaking, while Zhechev, according to Panova, keeps taking his Odysseus and Bulgarianness back there. That the wombness is equivalent to going back to brutal male domination, a return to padre padrone (the film with the same title was fresh then), Panova does not fail to hint. Yanakiev's strategy was nevertheless quite different from Panova's: instead of offering a direct critique of Odysseus, he reverses the reversal implemented in Zhechev's myth.

THE DIAPHRAGMIC SOUL

Yanakiev's point of departure is precisely the "Other Greece" described by Boyan Manchev as the orphism which remained vacant and thus open to the aporias of Bulgarian cultural identity. *Ancient Greek Culture: Problems of Philosophy and Mythology* is based on a straightforward and clear-cut rejection of the ideas about Greek antiquity as noble simplicity and tranquil greatness. This, according to Yanakiev, is the dominant but misleading paradigm to which his reflections will oppose an angry, passionate, troubled, brutal, voracious and ultimately tragic spirituality, which is material and carnal in its very abhorrence and revolt against

the material and the carnal. This is Dionysus who has devoured Apollo into a “unity of the epic and the tragic.” Dionysus, so to say, does the work of Apollo: the spiritual, the distant, the archer shooting from afar is seen here as only possible through spastic and enraged interaction with the bodily and the material. This stormy border is implemented as a constant passage between reason and madness, affect and control, exploit and crime, heroism and monstrosity, Olympian and chthonic: it is an antagonistic merger of Dionysus and Apollo, a tragic coincidence of liturgy-and-defilement, which acquires its anatomo-philosophical expression in the “pneuma” of the “diaphragmic soul,” conceived as a foundational spastic agitation, as seething and stormy breathing, and as infuriated expulsion of elemental materiality in a confrontational articulation of the world. Anger is the mode of existence of this soul:

Human existence in so far as it is animated – unlike the chthonic one – is essentially an enraged existence, it is a constant spasm, a constant and heterogeneous irritability against the world and in the world.
(Yanakiev 1989: 15)

Being spiritual means being infuriated in the most literal sense of the word. (Yanakiev 1989: 19)

Yanakiev proposes the diaphragmic spirituality, the *thumos* of Homer’s hero, as uncovering the tragic in the Homeric epic: this re-writes Nietzsche who did influence Yanakiev’s early 20th century predecessors but most importantly it completely pulverizes Zhechev’s transformation of tragedy into idyll. It is not that the epic turns tragedy with Yanakiev: their unity, rather, engenders his own genre of “expressive” philosophical reflection. If – according to Manchev – the result

of Zhechev's Odysseus operation is a "horizontal immanentism" and an incarnation of the transcendent in the immanent, with Yanakiev the furious and tireless breathing in and out of the chthonic constantly brings forth the transcendent which keeps collapsing back into the immanent: hence the rage. An acquiescent and cosy identification with the topos of the native vale is completely incompatible with this dynamic.

And yet, perhaps, this is again Bulgarian, too Bulgarian. Or is it Thracian?

ORPHEUS THE IRONIC

Bogdan Bogdanov's book *Orpheus and the Ancient Mythology of the Balkans* appeared in 1991: i.e. after the changes, after Yanakiev's *Ancient Greek Culture: Problems of Philosophy and Mythology* and more than 10 years after Zhechev's "The Myth of Odysseus." The book includes and re-writes various articles beginning with the late 1970s: thus, Bogdanov's interest in this theme precedes and is co-extensive with the debates around Zhechev and with their displacement exemplified by Yanakiev. Alexander Fol is also an important explicit reference point for Bogdanov, which is not the case with the other authors discussed here. Bogdanov is critical of Zhechev and Fol but, like them, he is concerned with the problem of identity, Bulgarian but also Balkan. This is a major difference from Yanakiev for whom national or ethnic identity, vale or peninsular, simply did not exist as a problem worthy of discussion. Orpheus seems to have been a rather dramatic topic for Bogdanov. In the Introduction to the 1991 edition, he claims that writing the book was motivated by his lack of satisfaction with his earlier publications (Bogdanov 4). Towards the end of his life he once again edited and re-worked the book which

appeared a few months before his death: the theme of Orpheus, which according to some of his close friends Bogdanov hated, accompanied him for about 40 years.

Unlike Toncho Zhechev (a literary critic) or Kalin Yanakiev (a philosopher), Bogdanov is a classical scholar proper. Furthermore, Bogdanov explicitly associates his methodology with semiotics which amounts to taking a side in the structuralist-impressionist debate. And yet, in a note at the beginning of the book he waives aside these aspects in order to emphasize that his true interest is “through the analysis of ancient written sources about Orpheus to reconstruct the ideological background, which found concretization in the image of the hero. The author believes that the resilience of this background is the major factor explaining the vitality of this character in the ancient and more specifically the Balkan cultural tradition.” (3) Bogdanov, therefore, explicitly enters the discussion via its ideological implications (like Iskra Panova who makes a similar move in her article on Zhechev). Like Zhechev, Bogdanov seems to situate his “homo Balcanicus” in a sort of timeless or at least sufficiently ancient framework; unlike Zhechev, he introduces the “resilience of the background” in a critical manner. The critique is carried out through the opposition of “open” and “closed” societies (not without a reference to Karl Popper, of course), a problem which will keep appearing in Bogdanov’s books in the 1990s. In this framework the Orphic, transcendent and (hypothetically) Thracian orientation of the cosmos is taken as an example of closedness and indifference towards the creation of a rich and varied social world. It is monotonous and apocalyptic, but it is also extremely hierarchical in its penchant to “flee social reality”, its “a-sociality,” its “imperviousness and intolerance towards variety” and its proclivity for “forms of irrational abreactions:”

[...] The Thracian idea of the world is produced through the enhanced relation between the chthonic and the uranic along a vertical axis which seems to be less formal and endowed with greater value than it is in the Hellenic cultural sphere. The passion for differentiation allows us to presume that, unlike the Hellenic domain in which the vertical axis is a tool for describing a natural hierarchical articulation, the Thracian domain leaves the vertical direction undeveloped as a hierarchy and shapes it as a simple vertical tension. (Bogdanov 165–166)

If Bogdanov is thinking of Yanakiev here, he never says so. Did Yanakiev? Bogdanov appears in Yanakiev's acknowledgements in the 1988 edition and is no longer there in the 1999 edition. It is clear, though, that funnily enough philosophy which is considered to be one of the greatest Ancient Greek contribution to Western culture, is identified by Bogdanov as an "unarticulated" Thracian and Orphic verticality, which has been "devoured" by the Hellenic world. Orpheus, verticality, and (the poverty of) philosophy are thus opposed to the seafaring horizontal openness of the Hellenic polis with its inclinations towards realism and rationalism, and towards the "pleasures of plurality," which can explain

[...] political phenomena like the democracy of the polis and the free spirit in the Athenian social life, as well as facts like the Hellenic polytheism and concrete phenomena like the circulation of writing in the early Hellenic world. A direct consequence of this tendency is the penchant of ancient Greek culture towards written communication and the early emergence of secular literature with an array of different genres and especially genres of prose. (Bogdanov 163)

So if with Zhechev the idyll absorbs the epic and the tragic, if with Yanakiev they are blended into philosophical reflection, with Bogdanov, it is narrative and the early Greek novel that wins the day. It is important to emphasize that Bogdanov's opposition of Thracian and Hellenic is highly strategic in the early stages of Bulgarian democracy when his Orpheus book appeared. While always insisting that there cannot exist an ethnically pure culture ("Thracian" philosophy is Greek, after all), Bogdanov is clearly sending a warning through his distinction between the democratic, plural, seafaring, and open Hellenic world (an idealization that played a key role in Western democracies) and the monotonous and unarticulated vertical hierarchism of the Thracian cosmos which was being produced as Bulgarian identity. This warning obviously refuses to differentiate between the enclosure of Zhechev's stationary Odysseus who, as Manchev points out, collapses even the vertical in agricultural immanentism, and Yanakiev's intense verticality. Yanakiev's passionate and infuriated diaphragmic soul, if read via Bogdanov, would appear to dump any colourful multiplicity in the tension between chthonic and uranic. It is extremely Orphic and Thracian, and, ultimately, apocalyptic.

REPETITIONS: THIRD PART OF THE CONVERSATION

Tzvetan Stoyanov's post-humous publications, although written in the 1960s, became part of the debates of the 1980s. Adding to the genre diversity, his "Orpheus: Delirium with Mythology" has been defined as a "dialogue."⁹ Yet there is nothing dialogic in the terrifying ravings of Dionysus and the ferocious extasy of the chorus. Orpheus is the one who narrates their invocations in a strange temporality which is both future ("and then he will tell me... and then they will tell me") and past because it is the severed head of Orpheus which seems to repeat the

9

Theatre joined the Orphic party in the 1990s. In the article quoted here, Boyan Manchev discusses this theatrical input as an alternative to national exoticism. Later on, Manchev entered into a long and fruitful "Orphic" collaboration, both theoretical and performative, with stage director Ani Vasseva. (Cf. Vasseva, Manchev) And finally, there is Ivan Stanev's art film *Moon Lake* (2009) in which the Orphic myth provides the framework to the film's melancholy reflections on a dying civilization. The film inspired a book of theoretical essays with Bogdan Bogdanov, Boyan Manchev, Darin Tenev, Kamelia Spassova, Maria Kalinova and myself among the contributors. (Nikolchina 2009) There has been a number of Bulgarian novels treating the Orpheus myth in various ways but, in tacit agreement with Bogdanov's views, none of them can match the quality of the theoretical and performative elaborations.

10

Zhechev's embarrassment - which might relate not only to the violent and pessimistic but also to the explicit homosexual aspects of the dialogue - is quite perceptible in his story about how Stoyanov read aloud the dialogue while Zhechev's mother was around. (Zhechev 1988: 14).

story, post-mortem, into eternity. The merger of pneuma and spirit, of the carnal and the heroic, which Yanakiev foregrounds as “tragic mystery,” follows, with Stoyanov, a downward spiral of destruction and horror. His Orpheus/Dionysus is a figure of doom face to face with chthonic and gory sacrificial carnage:

Come, let me touch you one last time before you become a minced pile, before they rip your white sacrificial flesh! I will never hear you again, never! How unbearable this rite is, this subterranean secret! Stench and fissures, and seething mud – disgusting! Beautiful and disgusting! Look at me, Orpheus, look at me closer, even closer, look in my eyes! Don't you recognize me? Don't you remember – how many times you have looked into these eyes, with these eyes? Now you know me! This is me, this is you, I am you, you are Dionysus, yes, you yourself are Dionysus! Mud in the mud! Have you recognized yourself? Murderer and victim! [...] Born from mud – die in mud! (Stoyanov 361)

Toncho Zhechev domesticates the sacrificial into the pastoral; he excludes it from the cosy patriarchal “vale” which will become the signature of his nationalist exoticism.¹⁰ With Tzvetan Stoyanov sacrificial doom is tied to the national problematic. In “The Second Part of the Conversation,” the dialogue which follows “Orpheus,” the Bulgarian twist to sacrifice is described as a “principle of deterioration,” as a law of “constant sinking,” which postulates that the “vale concealment,” which hides horror in its complacent heart, transforms any heroic act, any exceptionality and sacrifice for the common good into a senseless and fruitless defeat bound to vanish without a trace. Quotations from emblematic Bulgarian poems are mingled in Orpheus's delirium explicating the connections with “The Second Part of the Conversation:”

You say that the river will take [the severed head of Orpheus] – the big river that runs towards the plains seething with blood; the crimson river; the widow crying for husband and sons lost in the rite; she will take it; she will carry it; and the head will sing, it will keep singing with earth and sky, beasts and nature; covered with blood; my head will sing floating down through the inseminated, fertile, dark, muddy native plain! (363)

The infinite loop which the temporality of “Orpheus: Delirium with Mythology” introduces – the still living Orpheus narrates what his severed head will be singing, what it has already sung – is re-enacted in “The Second Part of the Conversation.” In it, 19th century poet Botev discusses with another 19th century writer, Karavelov, whether to undertake a suicidal revolutionary act which he has already undertaken, which he will keep undertaking. Repetition is implied by the very title but also by the fact that Botev and Karavelov are in fact performing a later conversation, a mid-20th century conversation, one which implies the author himself and his friend, the writer Georgi Markov. According to Maria Kalinova the principle of deterioration, expounded in the conversation, is not entirely hopeless because Stoyanov offers as a way out,

[...] not innocent self-sacrifice but another Dionysian logic: theatre. Like an actor, performing his role, Botev stages and rehearses his own death. Escaping Dionysus is through repeating Dionysus. In “The Second Part of the Conversation” self-sacrifice is replaced by the mimicry and mimesis of death, by a theatre act, a performance [...] (Kalinova)

And yet, this performative repetition works back and forth in time and as bloody as ever: Georgi Markov will be (is, was) assassinated; Stoyanov’s own end will be (is, was) strange without, as he seems to have

feared, even the benefit of being recognized as sacrificial. Repetition... repeats; it repeats its own unacknowledged sacrificial gore. Against this background the anger of Yanakiev's furious diaphragmic soul acquires a double function: it is a universal principle of rejecting the chthonic in which it is nevertheless immersed; but it is also a refusal to accept the fate of vale deterioration, the fate of a doomed local identity. Anger (which I call revolt in my Promethean reading of romanticism) preserves the struggling verticality, which acquiescence collapses into Zhechev's idyll and drowns in the blood of unacknowledged scapegoats, as Stoyanov's Orpheus has it. Maintaining the vertical is a rejection of sacrifice; a refusal to play the victim. A year after the publication of Yanakiev's youthful book the anger will explode into the streets... ♡

References

- BOGDANOV, BOGDAN, 1991: *Orfej i drevnata mitologija na Balkanite* [*Orpheus and the Ancient Mythology of the Balkans*]. Sofia: Sofia University Press.
- BOIADJIEV, TZOTCHO, 1984: “*Nepisanoto uchenie*” na Platon [*Plato’s ‘Unwritten Doctrine’*]. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.
- BOIADJIEV, TZOTCHO, 1991: Sokratovite besedi i moderniyat dialog [*Socratic Discussions and Modern Dialogue*]. *Filosofski pregled* 2. 38–57.
- FOL, ALEXANDER, 1986: *Trakijskijat orfizym* [*Thracian Orphism*]. Sofia: Sofia University Press.
- GARNIZOV, VASSIL (ED.), 2017: *Vekat na strukturalizma* [*The Century of Structuralism*]. Sofia: New Bulgarian University.
- GEORGIEV, NIKOLA, 2006: *Trevozhno literaturoznanie* [*Anxieties of Literary Theory*]. Sofia: Prosveta.
- KALINOVA, MARIA. “The Second Part of the Conversation: Tzvetan Stoyanov, Georgi Markov.” (manuscript)
- KAREV, GEORGI, 2014: Toncho Zhechev i negovoto zavryshtane kym Itaka. [Toncho Zhechev and his Homecoming to Ithaca]. [<http://www.librev.com/discussion-culture-publisher/2308-toncho-zhechev>]
- KATSARSKA, BORYANA, 1992: Dusha. Eros. Obshtnost [*Soul. Eros. Community*]. *Filosofski pregled* 2.2. 3–14.
- KIOSSEV, ALEXANDER, 2014: An Interview. [http://piron.culturecenter-su.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Aleksander_Kiossev_interview_ED%Do%B5dAKfinal.pdf]
- LOTMAN. JURI, 1982: Otvoreno pismo do redaktsiata [*An Open Letter to the Editors*]. *Literaturen front* 11: March 18, 1982.

- MANCHEV, BOYAN, 2003: Modernost i Antimodernost. Bylgarskiat natsionalekzotizym [Modernity and Anti-Modernity: the Bulgarian National Exoticism]. *LiterNet*. [<http://litenet.bg/publish2/bmanchev/modernost2.htm>]
- NIKOLCHINA, MIGLENA, 1988: *Mityt za Prometej i poetikata na anglijskia romantizym* [The Myth of Prometheus and the Poetics of English Romanticism]. Sofia: Sofia University Press.
- NIKOLCHINA, MIGLENA (ED.), 2009: *Moon Lake*. Sofia: Altera.
- NIKOLCHINA, MIGLENA, 2013A: *Lost Unicorns of the Velvet Revolutions: Heterotopias of the Seminar*, New York: Fordham University Press.
- NIKOLCHINA, MIGLENA, 2013B: Byzantium, or Fiction as Inverted Theory. Ed. Benigno Trigo. *Kristeva's Fiction*. State University of New York Press. 143–155.
- PANOVA, ISKRA, 1980: Po povod na edin mit [On the Occasion of a Myth]. *Filosofska misyl*, 7. 13–34.
- PENCHEV, BOYKO, 2017: *Spornite nasledstva (Contested Legacies)*. Sofia: Literature vestnik.
- POZHARLIEV, RAJCHO, 1991: Fenomenologiya na dialogichnata situaciya v „Piryt“ na Platon [Phenomenology of the Dialogic Situation in Plato's Symposium]. *Filosofski pregled* 2. 27–37.
- STOYANOV, TZVETAN, 1988: *Sachinenia v dva toma [Selected Writings in Two Volumes]*, Ed. Antoanta Vojnikova et al., vol. 1. *Kulturata kato obshtenie [Culture As Communication]*. Sofia: Balgarski pisatel.
- TODOROV, VLADISLAV, 1992: Eros, ritsaryat na protezata [Eros, Knight of the Prosthesis]. Ed. Orlin Spasov. *Ars Erotica*. Sofia: DLIDU. 219–253.

- VASSEVA, ANI, BOYAN MANCHEV, 2018: *Meteor – izbrani teatralni tekstove* [*Meteor: Selected Texts for the Theatre*]. Sofia: Meteor.
- VASSILEV, YORDAN, 2010: Tzvetan Stoyanov: lych svetlina [Tzvetan Stoyanov: a Ray of Light]. *LiterNet* 128, 7. [<https://litenet.bg/publish7/jvasilev/cvetan-stoianov.htm>]
- VIDEVA, NEDYALKA, 1987: *Grytskoto moralno syznanie do epohata na elinizma* [*Greek Moral Consciousness before the Epoch of Hellenism*], Sofia: Sofia University Press.
- YANAKIEV, KALIN, 1999: Preface to the Present Edition. *Ancient Greek Culture: Problems of Philosophy and Mythology*. Sofia: Emaliol. 7–8.
- YANAKIEV, KALIN, 1988: *Ancient Greek Culture: Problems of Philosophy and Mythology*. Sofia: Sofia University Press.
- YANAKIEV, MIROSLAV, 1960: *Bulgarsko stihoznanie* [*Bulgarian Versification*]. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.
- ZHECHEV, TONCHO, 1979: Mityt za Odisej [The Myth of Odysseus.]. *Septemvri* 10. 138–183.
- ZHECHEV, TONCHO, 1988: Preface to Tzvetan Stoyanov. *Sachinenia v dva toma* [*Selected Writings in Two Volumes*], Ed. Antoanta Vojnikova et al., vol. 1. *Kulturata kato obshtenie* [*Culture As Communication*]. Sofia: Balgarski pisatel. 5–27.

Резюме

Текстът разглежда една специфична насока в теоретичното мислене в България през 1980те години, която би могла да се нарече „орфизъм“ и която съпровожда възхода на тракологията в историческите науки, като връзката между двата феномена често пъти остава неразпозната. Дебатите около „Митът на Одисей“ (1979г.) от Тончо Жечев са поставени в този контекст благодарение на изследването на Боян Манчев „Модерност и антимодерност. Българският националекзотизъм.“ „Митът за Одисей“ с неговото патриархално-идилично „котловинно“ „опитомяване“ на Орфеевското е разгледан от Манчев в генеалогията на, от една страна, усилията по конструиране на българска идентичност от първата половина на 20 век и, от друга страна, идентификационната криза, настъпила през втората половина на 20 век след краха на опита да се изгради комунистическа идентичност. Настоящото изследване показва как през 1980те години споровете, предизвикани от Жечев, очертават зоната на противопоставяне не само между „импресионистичната критика“ и структурализма, но също така между структурализъм и пост-структурализъм, който в онази епоха в българския контекст има характера на подвижно и хетерогенно сговаряне на множество дисциплини, школи и типове дискурси и за който самата тема за национална идентичност е ирелевантна. Така докато статията на застъпващата структурализма Искра Панова „По повод на един мит“ (1980) влиза в пряка полемика с националекзотизма на Жечев, ранната книга на Калин Янакиев *Древногръцката култура – проблеми на философията и митологията* (1988) радикално преобръща визията на Жечев и функционира като страна в този дебат, като обаче по един знаков начин отказва

да го припознае. Наред с Искра Панова и Калин Янакиев, Богдан Богданов с монографията *Орфей и древната митология на Балканите* (1991), както и диалогът „Орфей. Бълнуване с митология“ от Цветан Стоянов (написан още през 1960те години, но излязъл посмъртно едва през 1978г. и по такъв начин оказал се част от дискусиите на 1980те) са разгледани тук като реплики в един критически обмен, който показва проблематичността и рисковете на дясно-националистическия ретро-утопизъм, намерил израз в *Одисей* на Тончо Жечев. Този обмен би могъл да хвърли изобилна светлина върху явления, превърнали се в част от политическия ни живот днес, и си заслужава да бъде изследван още по-внимателно, включително с оглед на по-късните му трансформации.

Miglana Nikolchina

*Miglana Nikolchina is a literary historian and theoretician whose research engages the interactions of literature, philosophy, political studies, and feminist theory. She is professor at the Literary Theory Department at the University of Sofia, Bulgaria. In English, her publications include the books *Matricide in Language: Writing Theory in Kristeva and Woolf* (2004), *Lost Unicorns of the Velvet Revolutions: Heterotopias of the Seminar* (2013).*



Authentic and Heterogeneous Mimesis: Reflection and Self-reflexivity in Todor Pavlov and Yuri Lotman

Аутентичный и гетерогенный
мимесис: отражение
и авторефлексивность
у Т. Павлова и Ю. Лотмана

The paper focuses on the mirror as a metaphor in the Marxist and structuralist paradigm by means of which contradictory concepts of literature in terms of its mimetic activity crystallize. The term mimetic reflection was in circulation in the Soviet Union at that time as one of the key concepts of the dogmatic Marxist-Leninist aesthetics and especially of Todor Pavlov's theory of reflection, in which literature is seen as an authentic reflection of reality. A detachment of reflection theory can be traced in the works of Lotman and Kristeva. In their theoretical works the mirror functions as a metaphor for intertextuality, and self-reflexivity as the ability of literature to refer to its own techniques, its own process of creation and its own fictional status. Thus, the article outlines two mimetic types: authentic mimesis, represented by Pavlov's theory, and on the other side, heterogeneous creative mimesis, developed by Lotman's *text within a text structure* and Kristeva's *genotext* in merging Jakobson and Bakhtin's legacy.

MIMESIS, REFLECTION,
MIRROR, SELF-REFLEXIVITY,
INTERTEXTUALITY, REALISM, DEVICE

В центре внимания этого текста стоит зеркало как метафора в марксистской и структуралистской парадигме, посредством которой кристаллизуют противоречивые понятия о литературе с учетом ее миметической активности. Термин «миметическое отражение» циркулирует в Советском Союзе как одно из основных понятий марксистско-ленинской эстетики и особенно теории отражения Тодора Павлова. Расстояние от теории отражения можно проследить в работах Лотмана и Кристевой. В их теоретических текстах зеркало функционирует как метафора интертекстуальности, а авторефлексивность – как способность литературы ссылаться на свои собственные методы, на свой собственный процесс творения, на свой собственный фикциональный статус. Соответственно, в статье описаны два типа мимесиса: аутентичный мимесис, представлен в теории Павлова, а с другой стороны – гетерогенные творческий мимесис, разработанный структурой Лотмана, текст в тексте, и в генотексте Кристевой, где наследие Якобсона объединяется с наследием Бахтина.

МИМЕСИС, ОТРАЖЕНИЕ,
ЗЕРКАЛО, АВТОРЕФЛЕКСИВНОСТЬ,
ИНТЕРТЕКСТУАЛЬНОСТЬ,
РЕАЛИЗМ, ПРИЙОМ

**MIRROR, MIRROR ON THE WALL, WHO'S THE FAIREST:
ADORNO OR PAVLOV?**

| *A novel is a mirror taken along a road.*

| *SAINT-REAL*

| *Stendhal 1830: The Red and the Black, Vol. I, chapter XIII*

| *We discovered (such a discovery is inevitable in the late hours of the night) that mirrors have something monstrous about them. Then Bioy Casares recalled that one of the heresiarchs of Uqbar had declared that mirrors and copulation are abominable, because they increase the number of men.*

| *Borges 1940: Tlön, Uqbar, Orbis Tertius*

It is possible to approach the broad and prolific topic of mirrors and literature by staging a conceptual typology, differentiating realistic mirroring from fantastic mirroring. The pivotal point of the contradiction and dissimilarity is the function of specular reflection, concerning the relation between the inner space of literature and the outer empirical context. The realistic and the fantastic mirrors rely on disparate techniques and dissimilar aesthetic strategies: the one places an accurate mirror before reality, while the other places a distorted mirror within the literary work. The latter produces distortions, disfigurements and deformations, it poses the question about the ontology of fiction.

The realistic mirror of Stendhal and the fantastic mirror of Borges illustrate two antithetical mimetic modes. It is evident that the transposition from the fictional world into such a conceptual apparatus implies acts of subtraction, reduction and allegorization. Thus, Stendhal's and Borges' mirrors are just figures, exemplifying the realistic and anti-realistic paradigms of literature and the relevant presupposed theory or ideology behind them.

The relation between reality and Socialist Realism in the frame of Soviet Marxist ideology at the time was examined through the metaphor of the mirror reduced to the requirement that art should be an accurate copy of reality. Stendhal's sentence that 'a novel is a mirror taken along a road' was taken out of the context of its more complex implications, the irony inherent in it remained unnoticed, it was instead reduced to a slogan by East European theory of reflection.

Discussing Hegel's legacy, Adorno criticized the immediacy of a copy theory in view of its mechanistic limitations and false pretensions to objectivity. He pointed out that such a theory is not really based on dialectics, but on *authenticity*: 'This needs to be remembered at a time when those who administer the dialectic in its materialist version, the official thought of the East Bloc, have debased it to an unreflected copy theory' (Adorno 8). The main deficiency of such a concept of realism for him was the unreflected relation between reality and the subject, or its immediacy. Adorno mocked the East European version of dialectic for being rigid, static and suited to dogmatism, or a kind of dialectic without a real concept of change. The dynamic element in the so diminished copy theory of realism was the flat, unmediated identity. From this perspective, the crucial task of philosophy was to reflect on the language via negative dialectics. Negative dialectics divided the subject through his/her critically self-reflexive (and also self-destructive) capacity: doing

1 In a beautiful article Artemy Magun clarifies the moment of negativity with relation to the mimetic theory and its embodiment of negativity: “Adorno claims that his ‘negative’ dialectic rests on the ‘preponderance of the object,’ that it is asymmetrical in this sense, and that the object belongs on the side of the ‘non-identical’ (Adorno’s logical *analogon* to mimesis) [...], the object is not a ‘beyond’; it is rather a chaotic confusing movement already within the subject.” (128).

2 Quite contrary to Adorno’s reading of Odysseus as negatively subverting the mythological structures, the same Homeric hero was figured out as conservative, anti-modern myth in the writings of the Bulgarian critic Toncho Zhechev. On the Bulgarian Odysseus and anti-Odysseus tendencies, see Nikolchina’s article in this issue.

3 His authority was tremendous: “he dared to attack — with strong ‘dialectical-Leninist’ arguments — such leading Communist critics as the Hungarian Georg Lukács, the Croat Zvonimir Richtman, and the Russians Mikhail Lifshitz, Elena Usievich, and Valerian Fedorovich Pereverzev” (Kiossev 135).

and undoing activities. Adorno’s mimetic theory insisted on the negative moment of the non-authentic components. Instead of advocating the reflection of empirical reality, Adorno proposed a mimetic theory of the *non-identical*. He stressed the possibility of language in art to express hiatuses, gaps, ellipses, absences, empty places.

What is important is that the negative element of indeterminacy has a material expression.¹ Adorno claimed that the immediate can be reached only by tracing what is most mediated and inauthentic in art. The paradigm of the mimetic and self-reflexive subject was the figure of Odysseus, who ‘for the sake of his own self, calls himself Nobody and manipulates resemblance to the natural state as a means of controlling nature’ (Adorno and Horkheimer 2002: 53).² According to Adorno’s conceptual framework, the main strategies for a *non-authentic mimesis* in art were the processes of a non-identical, linguistic mimicry and self-reflexivity. Those processes can be named and expressed by language. The very moment of non-recognition (*negative anagnorisis*) is exactly the point of interruption and hiatus: the withdrawing of the subject that is objectified and embodied in the figure of Nobody. Adorno would have definitely preferred the monstrous mirror of Borges.

What was this unreflected copy theory that provoked Adorno’s rejection? Even though there is no specific reference, it is not difficult to recognize Todor Pavlov’s *Theory of Reflection* (Teorija otrazhenija, 1936). Pavlov, a Bulgarian orthodox Marxist philosopher, wrote this work while he was an exile in Moscow.³ It was not before long that his theory became – with its conceptualization of literature as reflection of reality – the cornerstone of dogmatic aesthetics for the entire Eastern bloc. A second and revised edition appeared in Bulgarian in 1945, with Pavlov already back in his native country after the Communist takeover. English translation was also edited and published in Sofia in

1962, in order that the aesthetic maxims could be better transmitted to the west of the Iron Curtain.

The theory of reflection is an elaboration of Lenin's ideas of knowledge as reflection of reality. Lenin himself used the metaphor of the mirror in his article 'Leo Tolstoy as the Mirror of the Russian Revolution', 1908, where he claimed:

A mirror which does not reflect things correctly could hardly be called a mirror. [...] And if we have before us a really great artist, he must have reflected in his work at least some of the essential aspects of the revolution. [...] From this point of view, the contradictions in Tolstoy's views are indeed a mirror of those contradictory conditions in which the peasantry had to play their historical part in our revolution.

Lenin pointed to the role of Tolstoy as an (in)accurate mirror and the (dis)ability of his works to correctly reflect the revolution. The admiration for Tolstoy's *sober realism* contradicted with the disgust for his inclination towards religion and clericalism. Lenin's critique of non-resistance to evil was aimed at the political inexperience of the masses in the late 19th century, and Tolstoyan contradictions only mirrored the historical and economic conditions of the time. It is symptomatic that such a diagnosis related directly to the figure of the author and the social context, regarding the degree of organized revolutionary activity, bore no remarks on genre, language, or literary devices. The theory of reflection and its foundation in Lenin's ideology required the authentic mirror of sober realism.⁴

In the 20th century, the concept of *mimesis* became the contested ground of a permanent clash between the antagonistic paradigms of *Marxism* and *formalism*, renewed by the debate on what is realism in

⁴ Jameson in his book on Realism points out that the theory of reflection was Lenin's and that Lenin identified Tolstoy's novels with the peasantry (1; 79).

5 Mareeva outlines an alternative Marxist theory developed by Mikhail Lifshitz, who emphasizes not so much the element of reflection, but, rather, the element of creativity. Her conclusion confirms the dominant character of Pavlov's theory: "They isolate and juxtapose, even though not in a banal form, two dialectical aspects of the Marxist concept of practice, namely, reflection and transformation. Todor Pavlov's version of the reflection theory was officially approved while Lifshitz' ontognoseology went into the philosophical underground." (304).

art and what is the literariness of literature. The typological division of *authentic* and *non-authentic mimesis* can trace the different trends in the Marxist approach between East and West.⁵ On a meta-level it makes more palpable how the metaphor of the mirror renders both the reality in literature and the fictional reality either as a direct transposition and identification of the outer world, or as an autonomous self-reflexive device, related to language and poetic function in the theory of Jakobson. The most authentic mirror of all aesthetic mirrors, which reflects *things correctly* (i.e. the accurate version of the Marxist-Leninist dialectics) in Eastern Europe was Pavlov's *Theory of Reflection*.

AUTHENTIC MIMESIS: IN THE THOUSANDS OF MIRRORS

THE SAME REFLECTION OF REALITY

Pavlov succeeded in imposing the formula of literature as a mirror of reality, based on the evolution from Marx through Engels to Lenin. The foundation of Pavlov's theory of reflection was Lenin's view that *consciousness is like a subjective image of the objective world*. The epistemology developed by Pavlov relies on the precondition of the objective things reflected in human consciousness. All matter has the capacity for reflection, understood as a type of cognition: this is an objective necessity of matter – a formulation of a materialistic imperative. The dialectic element in such a doctrine is actually the never-ending process of authentication between matter and consciousness: "And because this is so, epistemology, unlike psychology, seeks to determine chiefly in how far the image does or does not resemble the object, in how far it is *an accurate and adequate reflection of the object in consciousness* and in how far there is *likeness, similarity or coincidence* between them" (Pavlov 1970: 85). The higher is the degree of similarity, the better is the mirror.

The “logical” (or better ideological) chain of the argument is: first, ideas are copies, photographs and mirror images of objective reality, of things; and, second, phenomena exist regardless of consciousness and are reflected in consciousness, thus they become possible objects of cognition. This is a process in which material entities are *transplanted* and *transposed* from reality directly into the human mind. The procedures of transplanting and transposing are based on Marx and his critique of Hegel (the famous turning of Hegel on his head). Todor Pavlov relied very often on the following quotation from Marx: “With me the reverse is true: the ideal is nothing but the material world *reflected* [*umgesetzte*] in the mind of man, and *translated* [*übersetzte*] into forms of thought.”⁶ (1976: 102). In the *Theory of Reflection* the sentence above has a nodal role. Pavlov’s work followed the premises that the material world is reflected in the mind, but in such reflection and translation there is no space for language as a tool for self-reflexivity and modification of reality. The images in the consciousness are the same, accurate and adequate, repetition of material world in the thousands of mirrors. They are identical copies without any deformation: materializing the *idea* of Plato, inverted Hegel.

In short, the function of language was ignored. Pavlov’s theory of reflection was against language as a mediating agent. It opposed the linguistic method, which copes only with hieroglyphs, subjective signs without connection with reality. However, it is evident that signs can refer to completely fictitious things, as in ‘unicorn’ or ‘dragon’. What happens to dragons in this theory? In the case of unicorns and dragons, there lurks the danger that no philosophical guarantee of the objective reality can be given. Ergo, such cases are ideologically subversive, undermining the regime. Dragons and unicorns are politically unacceptable.

6
In original: “Bei mir ist umgekehrt das Ideelle nichts anderes als das im Menschenkopf umgesetzte und übersetzte Materielle.” (Marx 1968: 25)

7 On the theory of *refraction* (преломление) in the Bakhtin's Circle's as a more complex dynamic between the work of art and the outer space of the context, see Maria Kalinova's article in the present issue. It demonstrates the wager of completely different mimetic theory, based on a Marxist theory of language.

8 Adorno posed the same argument of authenticity against Lukács's concept of realism. The anti-realist aesthetics of Adorno and Althusser was opposed to Lukács's realism in (Lee 2004: 61–79). For the letter exchange on realism between Lukács and Anna Seghers, and also for the Lukács-Brecht debate, see (Lukács 1980).

Lukács position on reality was clearly manifested in his critique against Bloch and expressionism in "Realism in the Balance" (1938), conserving the technique of montage in Joyce, a technique incapable to give a total and coherent view of reality, but only fractions of reality: "Such effects arise from its technique of juxtaposing heterogeneous, unrelated pieces of reality torn from their context [...]. However, as soon as this one-dimensional technique - however legitimate and →

The distinction between mimetic anti-linguistic and linguistic approaches emerged as early as the 1920s and 1930s debates on realism between, on the one hand, Formalism (Jakobson, Shklovsky) and Bakhtin's Circle, and, on the other, Lukács's understanding of realism and the novel. Galin Tihanov, who has explored this debate, notes that "For Lukács, language is completely neutral to the process of reflection"; while "Voloshinov's arguments in *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* [...] grants all ideologies the power to refract rather than reflect reality." (2000: 59; 99). The observations on supra-linguistic reflection as opposed to linguistic refraction can be transposed to our case.

Pavlov's theory of reflection was anti-linguistic.⁷ In its mechanics there was a direct transposition of objects in human consciousness. While in Bakhtin's Circle's refraction by means of language was conceived as deforming and transforming reality, Pavlov kept reality unchanged by reflection. The main requirement for art was to reflect reality, and the more accurate it was, the more reliable it became. This was the traditional 'translation' of mimesis in the socialist-realistic discourse for literature in the Eastern Block.

JAKOBSON'S GREEN HERRING AND THE EXTREME RELATIVITY OF REALISM

In his early article "On Realism in Art", first published in Czech language and later in Russian, Roman Jakobson introduced the phrase "*extreme relativity of the concept of 'realism'*". This early formalist work can be seen as offering *avant la lettre* a critique and an alternative to the dogmatic reflection theory of Pavlov and also anticipate Lukács-Brecht debate in the 1930s, the other prominent protagonists, who were arguing on the *real realism*.⁸

Jakobson insisted on more strict scholarly terminology in order to escape from the common causerie among historian of literature, chatting about life and time under the umbrella of realism. He gave definition of various forms of realisms, focused on the figure of the author [A₁; A₂], the reader/ the critic [B₁; B₂], the context [C₁; C₂], the device [D₁; D₂] and the code [E], so we can retroactively recognize the six communicative functions of language used already at this point as a model. What is crucial here are two tendencies, operating within the entire model: (1.) the function of de-automatization and deformation (revolutionary, avant-garde, atypical mode with its rejection of the current conditions, and strive for *anomaly* and *novelty*). and (2.) the function of naturalization and faithfulness to already established reality (the conservative, traditional, canonical, typical mode with its pretention of genuine realism). The two modes can be related to the author and thus we have the *realistic author*, who opts for maximum verisimilitude to truth, nature and reality [A₂], or the modern impetus of “realist in a higher sense”, as the *sur-realist* [A₁]. But the operation can also be attributed to the reader’s horizon of expectation, and then there emerges the conservative reader [B₂], who expects the familiar employment of old literary techniques, and the rebellious reader [B₁], who recognizes the automatization of the devices. In the frame of the context we have the historical movement of Realism of the 19th Century [C₁] and the later naturalization of exactly this meaning [C₂]. Thus, there is a progressive realism and classic realism and both of them are in opposition to the modern movements with their invention of higher degree of reality. In sum, Jakobson differentiated the classic conservative realism from the atypical realism of de-automatization and estrangement. The first type does not recognize the self-sufficient aesthetic value of deformation, whereas the second type does. Not

→ successful it may be in a joke – claims to give shape to reality (even when this reality is view as unreal) [...] or of totality (even when this totality is regarded as chaos), then the final effect must be profound monotony.” (1997: 44). The axis of homogeneity and heterogeneity is important distinctive symptom in approaching different mimetic concepts.

9 For the function of the device, Shklovsky's theory of estrangement has a foremost role in Russian Formalism, for the differences between Shklovsky and Jakobson regarding the autonomous status of the device, see (Tihanov 2005: 667-668).

10 For reading Jakobson's metalingual function as a metapoetic, see (Finke 1995). The multi-perspectives technique, introducing a mirror inside the literary work, is high-lightened as a metafictional move, which enhances the mimetic activity, by Herman in his valuable book on *Concepts of Realism* (56).

to miss the forest for the trees, it is important to focus on the core point, which is device⁹. The modes of de-automatization and naturalization corresponds to typical normal device and atypical abnormal device, which can be normality or deviation, regarding the author, the reader or the context. The two axis of deformation by the device has been already discussed in this early article: the metonymical prose deformation and the poetical metaphor as an “inverted negative parallelism” (1987: 26). Jakobson himself defined realism [E] as “the requirement of consistent motivation and realization of poetic devices” (27), stressing the techniques in art and their transformative forces. This can be read as an introduction to the poetic function. In addition he claimed that the motivation of the device can be an internal factor. “[I]t is possible to motivate and justify this device in the painting itself; an object is doubled when reflected in a mirror. The same is true in literature. The herring is green because it has been painted... Why did you paint it?” The author will always have an answer, but, in fact, there is only one right answer: “To make it harder to guess.” (26). The mirror of Jakobson redoubles the object inside the work of art and makes things harder to guess. This kind of redoubling of the device makes the code visible and the deformation more palpable. It is the self-reflexive function, which generates the surplus of commentaries of one's own poetic.¹⁰ The mirror mechanism of a text within a text is a simple autopoietic procedure.

LOTMAN'S TEXT WITHIN A TEXT

Yuri Lotman, founder of the Tartu-Moscow Semiotic School, also provided a transformation of the dominant Marxist theory of reflection, as a particular combination of Bakhtin's and Jakobson's premises. Lotman

explicitly affirmed that his methodological wager is an attempt to combine the formal-structural paradigm of Roman Jakobson and the contextual-dialogical paradigm of Mikhail Bakhtin. The Tartu scholar conceived the *structure* of the text as heterogeneous because he saw it as at least dually coded, as being always already a kind of a text within a text. To put it briefly, *semiosis* is exactly the process of this inner hybridization, which has a creative potentiality. The dual codes reveal *autopoiesis*, the immense capacity of literature not simply to repeat, but also to generate creation in the process of repetition, to produce its own motifs, topoi and new forms from within.¹¹ This concerns the immanent hybridization, or the shift of levels in the literary work.

The Tartu school members had a fascination for the functions of the mirror within the work of art. A whole issue of *Sign Systems Studies* was dedicated to the semiotics of the mirror, with texts by Z.G. Mintz, G.V. Obatnin, V.M. Meizerski, S.T. Zoljan, and L.N. Stolovits, but also with the most profound observations of Lotman and Levin (1988). The structure of the text within a text implies a mechanism of the mirror inside the text. The mirror in the work of art redoubles the semiotics process, which makes it a complex self-referential system. The mirror is no more a metaphor of the reflection of reality, but a self-reflexive device, which has a subversive political implication: substituting the mirror of Stendhal with the one of Borges.

For the Tartu school the mirror was a device of fantastic literature; whereas the theory of reflection forbade the fantastic elements and used the metaphor of the mirror to insist on a sober realistic thinking of art. Thus the function of dual codes could trick the Soviet system and use their weapon of mirror against the logic of realistic representation. The exact methods of Tartu school could blind the authorities because they explored the idea of dual codes, mirror effects, and heterogeneous

11

For repetition as part of the creation processes, see: (Kolarov 2009).

12
 Julia Kristeva introduced the Tartu school in an issue on semiotics in *Tel Quel* with regard to this School's desire for a scientific approach to theoretical discourse and its dynamic generative methods (1968: 6).

13
 The four devices are catalogued by Borges (a typical Borgesian catalogue of an atypical paradigm) in his lecture on 2 September 1949.

mimesis in a scientific language that was complex and not easy to be criticised.¹² Such methods served as an encoding system.

The historical context reveals that Lotman's article "Text within the text" first appeared in the semiotics journal of the Tartu school *Sign Systems Studies - Σημειωτική* 14 (1981). The topic of the whole issue coincided with the article, i.e. it was exactly a "text within the text", particularly as Lotman's contribution was the first in the issue while its author was the chief editor of the journal as well. But in that issue several contributors from the Tartu school developed brilliant observations with regard to the idea of 'text within a text' in different contexts and cultural dimensions. Thus, Lotman was not alone in opening the heuristic potential of the text within the text – there was a theoretical network of shared ideas, methods, and concepts represented. Here I will focus on the articles by Yuri Levin ("The Narrative Structure as a Generator of Thought: Text in the Text in the Works of J. L. Borges") and by Peeter Torop ("The Problem of Intext") in order to outline two crucial aspects: the scientific mathematical approach and the productive layers of text and language.

The article by Yuri Levin in this journal explored the notion of text within a text by means of logic structures in a generative perspective. Levin, who himself was a mathematician and a semiotician, provides a good example of how mathematical formulas can clarify certain paradoxes in literature (the matheme of the simple structure of Borges' stories is: $A: \{a_1|_A, b_3 : \{b_1|_C, c_3|_B\}\}$), such as the recursive structure of the narrative, the comment-frame, the transformation of the frame, etc. At the very beginning of the article Levin recalled Borges' four devices in examining fantastic literature: 1. the text within a text; 2. the contamination of reality and dream; 3. time-travelling; 4. *doppelgänger*.¹³ All of these devices serve to make an *as if*' world and they

use a *double replication* structure in a synchronic and in a diachronic perspectives in order to produce self-referential transformation in art. These four devices of fantastic literature were investigated in both Levin's and Lotman's observations on the device of the text within a text. Levin kept exemplifying these fantastic devices only with stories by Borges, while Lotman used examples from art in general – from Renaissance paintings (Jan van Eyck, “The Arnolfini Portrait”, Velasquez, “Las Meninas”, Massys, “The Moneylender and his Wife”) to films and literature. The structure of these examples that produce a replica by a replica is the double coded device: “In these cases the object and its representation are so glaringly not equivalent, and the transformation of the representation in the process of replication is so obvious, that attention is naturally drawn to the *mechanism whereby the replica is made*, and the semiotic process becomes a conscious one rather than a spontaneous one.” (1990: 55). The semiotic process can be either naïve, non-reflected and automatic, or a manifested one by the meta-levels of self-reflexivity: the mirror is inside the text.¹⁴

In “Text within a text” Lotman explained that each text has a layer structure with upper-levels, lower-levels, or units on its own level. The meta-levels are not outside the text, respectively the system, but are composite parts of self-description. They are upper-levels in a hierarchic sense, as they subordinate and organize the lower levels. Thus meta-layers describe the text from within and accomplish internal control. This procedure opens up the capacity of self-development for the system. Meta-levels are a package of metadata, i.e. the meta-language from within (Lotman 1988: 35).

The conflict between levels is the key generator of novelty and creation, of “cultural explosions” if we are to use Lotman's favourite expression. So each code-text could be unpacked in at least two

14

An interesting fact is that practically all of the examples analyzed by Lotman and the Tartu school for the *text within a text* structure were also commented in Lucien Dällenbach's book *Le récit spéculaire. Essai sur la mise en abyme*, published in 1977 in the collection *Poétique*, edited by Gérard Genette and Tzvetan Todorov. The book examined the mirror in the text, taking as a departing point André Gide's passage from 1893 on *mise en abyme* (a kind of reflection and miniature replica of itself), in which were depicted the replications within a work. Gide's examples of *mise en abyme* in art enumerated the typical repertoire on mirror as a self-reflexive device; and already in his text one can see listed together “Las Meninas”, “Hamlet”, “Wilhelm Meister”, “The Fall of the House of Usher” (Dällenbach 1989).

It is noteworthy also that the observations of the Tartu semioticians were in fact directly relevant for what came to known as ‘*metafiction*’. The term ‘*metafiction*’, coined by William H. Gass in 1970, describes in a sense precisely the mirror in the text as a metaphor, grasping the awareness of literature of its own fictional status. Lotman himself was attentive to the different functions of the mirror and the double replication in the non-verbal pictorial art and in literature, focusing in his analysis on Velasquez and Jan van Eyck.

15

I cannot do this in the space of the present article, but it is interesting to trace also how the mirror was taken up in Bulgarian literary theory after Lotman. The main figure on the side of Bulgarian structuralism was Nikola Georгиеv, who – just like Lotman, whose works he had read from early on – undermined the Marxist sober realistic mirror with a self-reflexive one. In Nikola Georгиеv's writings the mirror functioned as a metaphor for *homo legens* in literature (don Quixote as a reader of "Don Quixote"; Hamlet as an actor in "Hamlet", etc.). The names of Miglena Nikolchina, Kleo Protophristova, and many others should also be mentioned but, also follow this shift of mirror paradigm. I will just note that it seems that in all their works, as singular and irreducible as they remain, the mirror turned out to be important as curved or crooked, producing distorted reflections.

layers – the upper and the lower – and that is the condition for the text to be a self-organised, self-regulated, and self-developed system, or to be a semiosphere. According to Lotman, every text, and not only the literary work, is an autopoietic mechanism. The text of literature, however, makes this auto-modelling capacity of the text more explicit, it exposes and illuminates this capacity. The mirror in Todor Pavlov's theory stands between literature and social reality; the mirror in Lotman – with awareness of its genesis in Jakobson's writing – is inside the text and is a metaphor for dual codes and self-reflexive device that constructs the literary space.

HETEROGENEOUS MIMESIS: THE BACKGROUND

CODING AND KRISTEVA'S GENOTEXT

It is tempting to compare Kristeva's concept of *genotext* and Lotman's analysis of the structure of *text within a text*.¹⁵ Both are inflective and generative mechanisms; they can be observed in terms of *dual codes* and *heterogeneity*. I will examine the dual-coded structure of Lotman in the light of Kristeva's early distinction between *semiotic* and *symbolic* functions, namely between *genotext* and *phenotext*. Text, or more precisely the dual coding of a text within a text, or the *genotext* within a *phenotext*, is a notion that functions similarly in Lotman's and Kristeva's accounts of semiotics. In the context of the 1960s, both of them explored the semiotic levels of the text in its potentiality for creation and novelty. The semiotic levels with them were no longer structures and symbols but non-revealed processes of genesis, a space of engendering. This dynamic dimension of the text was called *semiosis* in both Lotman's and Kristeva's writings, whereas the theoretical approach to semiosis was termed *semanalysis* by Kristeva.

One aspect that was pointed out by Kristeva as representative of the Tartu school is the generative and dynamic principle, which traces back the process of the production of the text (1968). It is relevant to Kristeva's own theory about the two types of texts (genotext and phenotext) or the two types of processes (semiotic and symbolic). The phenotext includes the symbolic level of the language; it includes subject-object relations and it has a communicative function. On the other hand, there is a sub-level beyond the symbolic – namely, the semiotic level, or the genotext. It includes the semiotic creative process, pre-Oedipal relations, creative drive energy, and the repetition of drive charges (Kristeva 1984). Similarly to Lotman's structure of dual codes, the genotext is a text within the text, a kind of hidden creative process, an underlying foundation of language. The genotext inputs material discontinuity in the signifying process. It is more of a *process* than a structure, more of an *energy* than an object, it is para-linguistic: “even though it can be seen in language, the genotext is not linguistic (in the sense understood by structural or generative linguistics).” (1984: 86) This is the crucial difference between Lotman's and Kristeva's understandings of text: for Lotman the text is always a semiotic phenomenon and a discursive formation that implies signs and language; for Kristeva the forming and transforming potential of the genotext is beyond language. And Kristeva gets even further in “transposing” the textual codes into dynamical and psychical terms.

The parallel trajectories between Kristeva and Lotman were recognised in Peeter Torop's article “The Problem of Intext.” Torop was familiar with the French editions of Kristeva's *Séméiôtiké* and *Revolution in Poetic Language*. He linked the intertextuality in Kristeva (and its genesis back to Bakhtin's dialogue) and the genotext/ phenotext organization with the process of transposition. Torop claimed that

Kristeva even refuses the term intertextuality and prefers the term transposition instead (35). She defined transposition in connection with Freud's dream-work and "considerations of representability (die Rücksicht auf Darstellbarkeit)." (1984: 60) Her precise definition of transposition was "the signifying process' ability to pass from one sign system to another, to exchange and permutate them [...]. In fact, this transposition as the passage from one sign system to another was pointed out by poetic mimesis – this is not a mimesis ruled by the logic of identification, sameness, and the one truth but a creative heterogeneous mimesis mastered by way of polysemy. "Mimesis, in our view, is a transgression of thethetic when truth is no longer a reference to an object that is identifiable outside the language." (1984: 58) The axis of the metaphor (condensation) and the axis of metonymy (displacement) were seen as two operators of the transformation and pluralisation of denotation. The third transformation was transposition, that is, a passage from one system to another, as it deconstructs an old stage and opens a new stage. Kristeva's description of the creative poetic mimesis was very similar to Lotman's understanding of semiosis and the exchanges between semiospheres. The process of semiosis was conceived as always transferring information from the periphery to the core of one semiosphere, between the different levels of one text, or between semiospheres. The semiosis implied a theory of heterogeneous mimesis that subverted the strict identical theory of reflections.

In Lotman's approach, the text, by definition, merged a minimum of two texts, two languages, or, in other words, it was always double-coded. The most axiomatic characteristic of a text was its internal and immanent heterogeneity. Lotman referred to the structure of the text as heterogeneous because of its dual code. Because of this the text was claimed to function as a "thinking device" which could *generate*

new semantics and new forms¹⁶. The text had an immanent heterogeneous structure which was self-developed and subordinated. It always coded with a dual code: one was dominant and explicit and the other was hidden and implicit, but the focus and background codes, or the dominant and local codes, could transform their positions in the process of semiosis. “A background coding, which is unconscious and consequently usually not noticed, is introduced into structured consciousness and acquires conscious significance.” (Lotman 1988: 37) The ‘background coding’ in Lotman was a concept parallel to Kristeva’s ‘genotext’. There is a negative aspect in both of them – a moment of undoing, of non-meaning, of unconscious processing. Exactly such a negative side was seen as the foundation of the generative process, it was thought to be inherent to the act of creation.

The difference between Pavlov’s theory of reflection and semiosis in Lotman was marked by the relationship between text and context. Lotman radically inverted the notion of context – it was not equal to the reality or the everyday world as it was in the theory of reflection. The context in the discourse of the Tartu school functioned like a text. Text and context were isomorphic; they were parallel structures framing a common paradigm. Each context included at least two perspectives; there were always interactive processes within it, between the kernel and the periphery. The more heterogeneous the context was, the more probable the event, the “cultural explosion”. The novelty of Lotman’s implicit mimetic theory was the substitution of the pair ‘reality/fiction’ for the pairs ‘nucleus/periphery,’ ‘focus/background,’ and ‘homogeneous/heterogeneous.’ (Cf. Grigorjeva 217–237.) Heterogeneous mimesis in literature and events in culture, from his viewpoint, were possible only when the positions, units, and elements were not at one and the same level but were hybrid, so that they continuously produced differences

16

On the creative function of language and the generic feature of literariness in the Tartu school see: (Grishakova 63).

between levels. The intercourse of the maternal and foreign semiosis accelerated the process of creation. The idea of “maternal” and foreign semiosis in Lotman is close to Kristeva’s own conceptualisation of semiotics. “Introduction of an alien semiosis that is untranslatable into the ‘maternal’ text puts the latter in a state of excitation: the object of attention shifts from the message to the language as such and reveals the explicit code heterogeneity of the code of the maternal text itself.” (Lotman 1988: 40) Jakobson’s notion of code was entangled here with Bakhtin’s polyphonic approach, which produced a polyphony of codes transforming themselves in a process of never-ending mutual “translation” or encoding. The dialogue between maternal and foreign semiosis was understood as a transposition that generates novelty.

It is crucial that for Lotman two codes, two languages, or two texts have already been interfering in a single text. This inner fold of a redoubling structure like a *text within a text* reveals and illuminates the inner mechanism of automodelling. This illumination shows how the text functions by a self-referential device, drifting down and up the sub/meta levels outlined in the pairs of ‘internal/external,’ ‘core/periphery,’ ‘text/context,’ ‘representation/transformation,’ ‘unconscious/reflexive,’ and ‘hidden/visible’. The self-referential device illuminates exactly the conventional “nature” of an automodelling work. Even though the text is self-referential, it is not self-sufficient, i.e. it requires an external impetus or unfamiliar input to continue the work of hybridization and transformation, a process in which the formulations of a new law are established. The paradigmatic aspect of Lotman’s semiotics is not closed in the structure of the work of art. On the contrary, it is open to the dynamic approach of shifts in the paradigms, crossing the boundaries between the separate semiospheres. Only by such shifts in the paradigms can new forms and new theories be observed. According to

Lotman the capacity of novelty by is produced by the minor changes in the system. His theory of cultural explosions was an endeavour parallel to Kristeva's revolution of the poetic language.

In order to outline the differences between Pavlov and Lotman, I defined two types of mimesis: authentic and creative; or homogeneous and heterogeneous mimesis. The first works within the logic of identification and accurate reflection (T. Pavlov's version), the second within the process of creation and transformation (Lotman's version). Beginning during the 1960s, Lotman's conceptualization of the dual code structures elaborated a strategy of reloading the mimetic theory beyond the official discourse. Lotman and his adherents used the mirror to show the reduplication of the semiotic process, and in particular the implosive fold of the mechanism of text within a text.

Thus it is possible to say that mimetic theory was considered in a twofold manner in the Marxist and Formalist paradigm in the Eastern Block. But, as I demonstrated in this paper, there were turbulent clashes in both paradigms. Adorno and Pavlov had different type of mirrors and mimetic practices in mind, and the same can be said of the case with Adorno and Lukács. The most rigid and the most influential theory in the Eastern Bloc was Pavlov's theory of reflection, which insisted on an authentic mimesis. Lotman with the idea of 'dual codes' and Kristeva with the notion of 'genotext' approached the heterogeneous mimesis relying both on the poetic function in Jakobson and on Bakhtin's heteroglossia. Their resistant theoretical practice used the 'legitimate instrument' of the mirror, they just multiplied the layers: and instead of reflection of the outer space in the inner space of fiction, the device was revealed to serve as a self-reflexive function within the work of art, making it – despite all institutional attempts for its subjugation – autonomous precisely because it is heterogeneous. ♡

References

- ЛЕВИН, Ю. И., 1981: Повествовательная структура как генератор смысла: текст в тексте у Х.Л.Борхеса. Ред. Ю. Лотман. *Труды по знаковым системам – Σημειωτική XIV, выпуск 567*. Тарту: Издательством Тартуского университета, 14. 45–64.
- ЛЕВИН, Ю. И., 1988: Зеркало как потенциальный семиотический объект. Ред. Ю. Лотман. *Труды по знаковым системам – Σημειωτική XXII, выпуск 831*, Тарту: Издательством Тартуского университета, 22. 6–24.
- ТОРОП, П. Х., 1981: Проблема интекста. Ред. Ю. Лотман *Труды по знаковым системам – Σημειωτική XIV, выпуск 567*. Тарту: Издательством Тартуского университета, 14. 33–44.
- ADORNO, THEODOR, 1993 (1963): *Hegel: Three Studies*. Trans. Shierry Nicholsen. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- ADORNO, THEODOR W., AND MAX HORKHEIMER, 2002: *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. Trans. Edmund Jephcott. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- BORGES, JORGE LUIS, 1961 (1940): Tlön, Uqbar, Orbis Tertius. Trans. James E. Irby. *New World Writing, April*, No. 18.
- DÄLLENBACH, LUCIEN, 1989: The Mirror in the Text. Trans. Jeremy Whiteley and Emma Hughes. University of Chicago Press.
- GRIGORJEVA, JELENA, 2003: Lotman on Mimesis. *Sign Systems Studies* 1. 217–237.
- GRISHAKOVA, MARINA, 2008: Literariness, Fictionality, and the Theory of Possible Worlds. Ed. Lars-Åke Skalin. *Narrativity, Fictionality, and Literariness: the Narrative Turn and the Study of Literary Fiction*. Örebro: Örebro University Press. 57–76.

- FINKE, MICHAEL C, 1995: *Metapoesis: the Russian tradition from Pushkin to Chekhov*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- JAKOBSON, ROMAN, 1987: "On Realism in Art". *Language in Literature*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. [first published in: Jakobson, Roman, 1921: 'O realizmu v umeni'. *Cerven*, 4. 300–304.]
- JAMESON, FREDRIC, 2013: *The antinomies of Realism*. London: Verso Books.
- HERMAN, LUC, 1996: Roman Jakobson: *Concepts of realism*. Columbia, SC: Camden House. 50–60.
- KIOSSEV, ALEXANDER, 2004: Heritage and inheritors: The literary canon in totalitarian Bulgaria. Ed. Marcel Cornis-Pope and John Neubauer. *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe: Junctures and Disjunctures in the 19th and 20th Centuries*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 132–141.
- KRISTEVA, JULIA, 1968: Linguistique et sémiologie aujourd'hui en U.R.S.S. *Tel Quel* 35. 3–8.
- KRISTEVA, JULIA, 1984: Breaching the Thetic: Mimesis. Genotext and Phenotext. *Revolution in Poetic Language*. Trans. Margaret Waller. Foreword Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press.
- KOLAROV, RADOSVET, 2009: *Povtorenie i satvorenie. Poetika na avtotekstualnostta* [*Repetition and Creation. Poetics of Autotextuality*], Sofia: Prosveta.
- LEE, TAEK-GWANG, 2004: The Politics of Realism. Lukács and Reflection Theory. *The Ana Chronist*, 10. 61–79.
- LENIN, VLADIMIR ILYICH, 1908: Leo Tolstoy as the Mirror of the Russian Revolution. *Proletary No. 35, September 11 (24)*; [also in Lenin, 1973: *Collected Works*, Vol. XV, Moscow: Progress.] [<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1908/sep/11.htm>]

- LOTMAN, YURI, 1988: “Text within a Text”, *Soviet Psychology* 26. 32–51.
 [Translation of Лотман, Юрий, 1981: Текст в тексте. Ред. Ю. Лотман. Труды по знаковым системам–Σημειωτική XIV, выпуск 567. Тарту: Издательством Тартуского университета, 14. 3–18.]
- LOTMAN, YURI, 1990: Iconic rhetoric. *Universe of the Mind. A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. Trans. Ann Shukman. Introduction by U. Eco. London / New York: I. B. Tauris. 54–62.
- LUKÁCS, GEORG, 1980: *Essays on realism*. Trans and Rodney Livingstone. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- MAREEVA, ELENA, 2016: Lifshitz’ Ontognoseology as a Version of Lenin’s Theory of Reflection. *Studies in East European Thought*, 68. 295–305.
- MARX, KARL, 1976: *Capital: a Critique of Political Economy*, vol 1. Trans. Ben Fowkes. London: Penguin.
- MARX, KARL, 1968: Nachwort zur zweiten Auflage. *Das Kapital, Werke*, Band 23, Bd. Berlin: Dietz Verlag. 18–28.
- MAGUN, ARTEMY, 2013: Negativity (Dis)embodied: Philippe Lacoue-Labarthe and Theodor W. Adorno on Mimesis. *New German Critique*, 40. 119–148.
- NIKOLCHINA, MIGLENA, 2013: *Lost Unicorns of the Velvet Revolution*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- PAVLOV, TODOR, 1945: *Teoriya na otrazhenieto: Osnovni vuprosi na dialekticheskoto-materialisticheskata teoriya na poznanieto* [Theory of Reflection. Basic Problems of the Dialectical and the Materialistic Theory of Knowledge]. Sofia: Narizdat.
- PAVLOV, TODOR, 1970: Theory of Reflection. Basic Problems of the Dialectical and the Materialistic Theory of Knowledge (Fragments). *The Philosophy of Todor Pavlov*. Sofia: Sofia Press.

- HUBER, WERNER, MARTIN MIDDEKE, AND HUBERT ZAPF (eds),
2005: *Self-reflexivity in Literature*. Text & Theorie Band 6.
Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2005.
- SHKLOVSKY, VICTOR, 1991: Art as Device. *Theory of Prose*. Trans.
Benjamin Sher. Elmwood Park: Dalkey Archive. 1-14.
- STENDHAL, 2015 (1830): *The Red and the Black. A Chronicle of
the Nineteenth Century*. Trans. K. Scott Moncrieff. Ware:
Wordsworth Editions.
- TIHANOV, GALIN, 2000: *The Master and the Slave: Lukács, Bakhtin and
the Ideas of their Time*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- TIHANOV, GALIN, 2005: The politics of estrangement: The case of the
early Shklovsky. *Poetics Today* 26, 4. 665-696.
- TIHANOV, GALIN, 2015: Aktualnostta na ruskia formalizam [The
Actuality of Russian Formalism]. *Literaturen vestnik* 31. 1, 9-12.

Резюме

Огледалото е литературоведска метафора в рамките на марксистките и формалистски подходи, през която кристализират противоречиви концепции за литература с оглед на миметичната ѝ дейност. От една страна е вярното реалистичното огледало на Стендал (автентичен мимесис), а от друга е фантастичното огледало на Борхес, което винаги размножава, разкривява и разпластява (хетерогенен мимесис). Тези метафори имат идеологически фон, който е свързан с подновяващия се дебат между антагонистичните парадигми на марксизма и формализма върху въпросите: що е реализъм в изкуството и какво точно представлява литературността.

Догматичната марксистко-ленинска естетика в лицето на Тодор Павлов налага клишетото за литературата като отражение на действителността, с което залага на отношение на идентификация и автентичност между емпиричния свят и творбата. Теория на отражението е антилингвистична теория, тя радикално изключва “носителя” на произведението. Трансформацията на подобен автентичен мимесис може да се открие в работите на Лотман и Кръстева върху разпластяването на езиковите равнища. При тях огледалната метафора става ключ за обозначаване на двойни структури, междутекстови прочити и въобще оформя една саморефлексивната концепция за творчеството като процес на самооглеждане и самонаправа.

Така миметичните теории в Източния блок типологично могат да бъдат разделени на два типа: автентичен и хетерогенен мимесис, но те далеч не покриват деленето марксизъм/ формализъм. В статията съм се опитала да покажа, че картината е по-сложна. Така например в рамките на марксистките теории, Адорно категорично

застава на страната на неавтентичния негативен мимесис, имплицитно критикувайки теория на отражението на Павлов и експлицитно теорията на романа на Лукач. Друго изместване на теория на отражението идва от марксистката теория върху езика и теория на пречупването на кръга Бахтин.

Лотман и неговите съмишленици използват огледалните ефекти, за да покажат как функционират двойните кодове и удвояването на семиотичния процес през особеното импозитивно вгъване на творбата от типа на текст в текста. Кръстева в Революцията в поетическия език засяга миметичната дейност през опозицията фенотекст/генотекст, която е на принципа на разподобяването между символично/семиотично. В този смисъл генотекстът е повече процес, отколкото език. Той е скрит творчески преобразувател, който използва процедурите на деформация на метафората и метонимията (по Якобсон) и на транспозицията (по Бахтин). И Кръстева, и Лотман открито заявяват, че в основата на теориите им е смесване на поетическата функция на Якобсон с диалогичния принцип на Бахтин. Така те оказват имплицитна съпротива на теория на отражението, използвайки собствения му теоретичен инструмент – огледалото – за диаметрално различен подход към литературната творба. Автентичният мимесис използва реалистичното огледало на Стендал, докато хетерогенният мимесис – огледалото на Борхес, което употребява като саморефлексивен похват, който да бележи новаторството и самонаправата на художествената творба.

Kamelia Spassova

Kamelia Spassova is an assistant professor at the Literary Theory Department at the University of Sofia and a lecturer at the Slavic Institute, University of Cologne. She has published in Bulgaria a book on the poetics of example: Event and Example in Plato and Aristotle (2012), which deals with the tension between literary examples and theoretical discourses. She is working on the project of the transformations of the concept of mimesis in XX.



Exotopy: Mikhail Bakhtin and Jacques Lacan on the Outside Context of Discourse

Экзотопия: Михаил Бахтин
и Жак Лакан о внешнем
контексте дискурса

The present text treats the concept of exotopy in Bakhtin and Lacan, explicating the direction and the possible indices for comparison between post-Marxism and Psychoanalysis. The general idea is not to seek a new causative element – the unconscious in place of economics, although this problem cannot be overlooked in view of contemporary debates – but rather to trace the logic of outsidedness of truth and knowledge: the concept of desire in Eastern and Western theory constitutes an immanent (real) outside, which cannot be subsumed into *Aufhebung* or any higher level of unity. Both Bakhtin (1895–1975) and Lacan (1901–1981), without having met each other, belonging in one and the same generation and facing different conceptual challenges and problems, work in a condition of unique philosophical ‘likelihood’ on the subject of the human being’s ex-centricity – the secret of the human being, its innermost intimacy, is located outside itself.

OUTSIDEDNESS, EXOTOPY, REFRACTION,
OUTSIDE-STANDING, IDEOLOGEME,
EXTIMACY, INTERMEDIATION

Текст посвящен экзотопии Бахтина и Лакана, показывая направление и возможные индексы сравнения между постмарксизмом и психоанализом. Идея не в том, чтобы искать новый причинный элемент – бессознательное вместо экономики, хотя этот вопрос нельзя игнорировать с учетом современных дискуссии, а заключается в том, чтобы проследить логику вненаходимости истины и знания, стремление восточной и западной теории конструировать имманентное (реальное) внешнее, которое нельзя удалить в *Aufhebung* или на более высокий уровень единства. Здесь и Бахтин, и Лакан – не встретившись никогда, принадлежащие почти к одному поколению (Бахтин жил с 1895 по 1975 г., Лакан – с 1901 по 1981 г.) и, несмотря на разные мысленные трудности и проблемы, которым они посвящают свое время в поисках ответа – в удивительных «окрестностях» мысли развивают тему, что человек является экс-центричным и его центр находится снаружи. Секрет человека, его глубокая интимность, скрыта снаружи.

ВНЕНАХОДИМОСТЬ, ЭКЗОТОПИЯ,
ПРЕЛОМЛЕНИЕ, ЭКС-СИСТЕНЦИЯ,
ИДЕОЛОГЕМА, ЭКСТИМНОСТЬ,
МЕЖДИННОСТЬ

The present study compares the *exotopy* theories of two of the most prominent thinkers of the 20th century – Mikhail Bakhtin and Jacques Lacan, both of whom belong to different intellectual traditions (Bakhtin’s semiotics is greatly indebted to Marx, Neo-Kantianism, *Lebensphilosophie*, but also to folklore; Lacan’s psychoanalysis is faithful to Sigmund Freud’s and concordant with the structuralism of Saussure, Lévi-Strauss, Jacobson, as well as with French Heideggerianism and the Neo-Hegelianism of Alexander Kojève). In many respects both schools – Bakhtin’s circle and Lacanian psychoanalysis – are parallel in their conceptual movements, assuming critical stances in relation to dominant discourses, Soviet totalitarianism and Western capitalism respectively. In both cases the criticism is directed against the constitution of truth as a dominant category, against its tautological enclosure and against the denial of the subject’s ability to construct his or her own autonomous meaning.

If we are to trace shared influences in the course of history, they would be related to the theoretical tendency, advancing Kierkegaard’s polemical attitude towards Hegel and the shift in the dominant position of the cognitive subject at the expense of the object’s subjectivization. With Bakhtin and Lacan alike, monumentality of speech is split up by the *Other*, who is not merely the listener in a communicative situation, but someone believed to be able to commune with us through the medium of one’s *outsidedness*. According to Bakhtin, human consciousness attains maturity by mastering the virtue of *dialogism*, while Lacan defines human unconscious as *the discourse of the Other*. The communication model of intersubjectivity with both thinkers is an attempt to indicate the topos of the social relation, realized through transformation of the outside context of the discourse. According to Bakhtin, the outside context is connected to the concept of *outsidedness*; for Lacan this would relate to *ex-sistence* as *outside-standing*.

In relation to method, both authors attribute to art and literature the status of *via regia* when tackling the problem of reality's hybrid nature. For Bakhtin literature becomes *refraction* of the world which has come undone with the emergence of language. For Lacan literary fiction, apart from its employment in the practice of interpreting works of art in defense of psychoanalytical propositions, is associated with the functioning of the signifying chain and refers to the constitution of truth as the truth has the structure of fiction (Tenev 2012: 250–251).

The basic theoretical differences between the two schools are related in their respective references to Saussure's linguistics and Freud's psychoanalysis. Language according to M. Bakhtin, V. N. Voloshinov, P. Medvedev is an ongoing process of becoming and practically there exists no actual moment in time, – as Saussure suggests – in relation to which the synchronic system of language can be structured. The sign can only come about on an 'international territory' i.e. it is a necessary condition that individual consciousnesses are socially organized and that individuals inhabit a certain community. On the other hand, an individual consciousness related to *answerability* not only cannot explain or understand a certain something but, on the contrary, is in need to be furnished with an explanation by the social ideology (Voloshinov 1973: 12). Lacan, as well as Laplanche and Lecercle after him, employs spatial graphics in relation to the signifier/signified pair, differing from Saussure's presentations in that the signifier is composed of a multi-level metaphoric chain, while the demarcating line between signifier and signified demonstrates a peculiar value of its own, nowhere to be found in Saussure. With Lacan the signifier and the signified exist in a relationship of variability and become fixed (coincide) only at particular points of communication, the line between them comprising the repression of the signified (Barthes 1967: 49).

In 1927 under the authorship of Voloshinov is published the short critical article ‘Freudianism’ (Voloshinov 1976), treating the unconscious as an aspect of consciousness – it is the ‘unofficial conscious’ – linguistic in nature – which comes into opposition with the ‘official conscious’ (Bruss, Titunik 1976: vii). It is believed that Voloshinov exerts a direct influence on the structuralist studies of the Prague Linguistic Circle, an influence which in turn affects the works of Lacan through the studies of Roman Jakobson and Claude Lévi-Strauss (Wilden 1980: 1–30, 31–62). If possible, although within certain limits, such an influence of Bakhtin’s circle on Lacan’s ideas should refer to the Marxist philosophy of language, rather than to the critique of Freud. Despite the French translation of ‘Freudianism’, published in Switzerland, the book remained overlooked in France due to situational reasons (Lecerle 2006: 116).

Despite the lack of explicit dialogism between Bakhtin and Lacan, belonging in one and the same generation, and the different conceptual challenges and problems, to which they devote their time in search of answers, the points of proximity between them confirm Koyré’s observations on the complexity and unpredictability in the history of ideas: ‘We must not forget, moreover, that “influence” is not a simple, but on the contrary, a very complex, bilateral relation.’ (Koyré 1957: 5). In a state of unique conceptual ‘likelihood’ the two thinkers work on the subject of the human being’s ex-centricity – the secret of the human being, its innermost intimacy, is located outside itself.

Although working with different concepts and enduring the effects of different political coercions, both Bakhtin and Lacan think that the unconscious has an exotopic character. They approach the problem of the ‘outside’ by dissociating it from the naïve realism (in the form of socialist realism or as a return to ‘positive’ or ‘empirical’ narratives on

consciousness, behavior and sexuality). Both scholars invest an ambivalent meaning into their notions of exotopy – at once *outsidedness* and *lack*. According to both, exotopy refers to the opposite of positive reality, to an outside context, which is not simply located on the exterior of a surface or structure, but also in the sense of functioning as a lack in relation to it.

CULTURAL EXOTOPY, IDEOLOGEME, EXTIMACY

In his article from the early 1924 ‘The Problem of Content, Material, and Form in Verbal Art’ Bakhtin points out that culture should not be understood as a spatial totality with an inner territory of its own: ‘A cultural domain has no inner territory’ (Bakhtin 1990: 274). Culture is entirely situated upon boundaries, it is a boundary in itself – composed and refracted by other boundaries. They traverse creative activities transversely, so they cover all their composite characteristics. Bakhtin compares the boundary with a ray of sunlight, refracted in every drop of cultural life. In his last text ‘Response to a Question by the *Novyi mir* Editorial Staff’ from 1970 Bakhtin discusses the relationship between one’s own society and the foreign culture, again insisting that in order to delve deeper into one’s own culture, one has to cross its boundaries. Only through the eye of the Outsider or the Foreigner can one comprehend one’s own culture (Bakhtin 1986: 1–10). The notion of culture composed of similar elements (actually each separate element can be refracted into or constitute a boundary for another) is related to the theory of *refraction* (Rus. *преломление* [*prelomlenie*]) worked out by Bakhtin’s circle of scholars. This theory is an objection against the former formal-structural proposition, which radically constrains the work of art into a kind of inner space, having no relation to the outside

context, as well as against the theory of *reflection*, which proposes a mechanical and objective representation of the outside context. The refraction theory poses the problem of the more complex dynamics (dialogue) between the inner and the outer space of the work of art, of the possibility for the ‘outside’ to invade and transform literary phenomena on the level of their minimal units.

In Lacan’s works the problem of traversing the outer space is often illustrated with topology figures – Möbius strip, Klein bottle, torus. Employing topological figures, he provides solutions for different problems: the Möbius strip represents the exteriority of the *object a*, preceding the negation non-I/I, outside/inside; Klein’s bottle describes the relation between the master-signifier and the Other; the torus represents the relation between demand and desire. Those are two- or three-dimensional figures which disrupt the traditional Euclidean representation of space – they represent the way in which psychoanalysis problematizes binary oppositions such as outside/inside, social/natural, real/fictional. With the Möbius strip and Klein’s bottle we cannot affirm which point is on the inside and which one on the outside, nor can we say at which particular moment one moves from the inside outwards (or vice versa), any localization becomes impossible. In his tenth seminar on anxiety Lacan shows how a remainder of the *cross-cap* figure has the form of a Möbius strip. If an ant is crawling on one of its visible sides – by virtue of their identical character – it shall move on to its opposite side without having to traverse the edge of the strip. In a similar way the vase from Bouasse’s famous experiment can only become, in Lacan’s version, a one-sided surface, its outer and inner side being caught up into one and the same continuity: ‘From then on, the whole vase becomes a Möbius strip because an ant walking on the outside comes onto the inside without any difficulty at all.

The specular image becomes the uncanny and invasive image of the double.’ (Lacan 2014: 97)

Both Bakhtin and Lacan show how each of the dichotomous terms inside/outside can ‘transition’ into one another. Although such a process may seem dialectical (interpretation of Hegel’s master/slave dialectics is of key significance in the approach of both authors), here the crucial point is not the mutual transformation of opposites, but rather the formulation of an ‘outside’ which is immanently postulated. Exotopy actually assumes the status of *intermediation* and represents an attempt to conceptualize the ‘outside’ as traversing, transitioning, continuity between two discourses. Working out the details of overcoming theoretically the inside/outside dichotomy, Bakhtin and Lacan introduce various neologisms, which make the demarcating line between them grow thinner. Bakhtin’s circle comes up with the neologism ‘ideologeme’, while Lacan coins the term ‘extimacy’.

The history of the ‘ideologeme’ neologism can be traced back from its coinage during the 1930s in Voloshinov’s monographic study ‘Marxism and Philosophy of Language’ (1930) up to its ‘resuscitation’ in the context of French humanities after 1968, related to Julia Kristeva’s work on the concept of dialogism. Her conception of the ideologeme preceded her theory of intertextuality – the ideologeme of the sign displaces the symbol, representing that which has not yet, but will or may come to pass, setting the modes of an infinite variety of future transformations (Kristeva 1969: 71).

Voloshinov introduces the concept of ‘ideologeme’, formulating it as a regulator between authorial intentions (inner context) and ideology (outer context). The ideologeme is ambiguous and immaterial, incomplete thought, the trace of the outer context, of that which is in the air, a sort of *Zeitgeist*, functioning on a micro-individual level.

Voloshinov makes a distinction between immaterial ideologeme and ideology that possesses form, structure and solidity. According to him ‘The ideologeme is a vague entity at that stage of its inner development when it is not yet embodied in outer ideological material; it can acquire definition, differentiation, fixity only in the process of ideological embodiment’ (Voloshinov 1973: 33). According to Bakhtin an example of a speech that is similarly incomplete and unfolding ‘in the midst’ of the dialogue is the speech of human self-definition. The self, defining itself by way of ‘Who am I?’ and ‘With whom am I?’ is a moment of *opening up of speech*, in order that the possibility for the emergence of an ever new meaning is preserved. The very opening up presupposes that what exists on the outside participates in the constitution of one’s identity (Bakhtin 1984: 233).

The concept of *extimacy* is introduced by Lacan at the seminar on February 10, 1960, and defined by him as follows: ‘What we described as the central place, as the intimate exteriority or *extimacy*, that is the Thing.’ (Lacan: 1992, 139). The neologism is derived from the oxymoron intimate exterior – through the desire of the Other the secret is exteriorized. It is namely the Möbius strip that can demonstrate the paradox of extimacy: the real is all at once exterior to the symbolic and central to it in the sense of exception (‘excluded in the interior’). If we favor a distinction between the uncanny (*das Unheimliche*) and the extimate (*extimité*), then in Lacan’s terms the uncanny would belong to the domain of the imaginary, while the extimate – to that of the real. Speaking in spatial terms, in contrast to the extimate, determined by the coinciding of inside and outside, *das Unheimliche* seems to have the effect of coinciding distant and close: a threatening approach of something we have kept at a distance (Spassova 2017: 134–161).

In *City Lights*, one of Chaplin's masterpieces made at the time when Warner Bros. created the first sound-track series, we find an illustration of Lacan's extimacy (Žižek 2006). Chaplin chooses to demonstrate sound severed from speech, to focus the attention onto its materiality and blur the distinction between what lies outside the body and what resides within it. His character 'The Tramp' swallows a whistle and starts hiccupping, each hiccup resulting in a whistling sound emission from the inside of his body. By virtue of the fictional framework this extimacy produces a comic effect in the audience, while the character himself burns with shame since what is constitutionally excluded from the interior becomes an exterior, a haunting sound. With extimacy we have the illusion that something screened becomes visible, while in fact the concept refers to a structural exception which serves to displace the lack.

Should we choose to look for another example from Chaplin's oeuvre that would illustrate Bakhtin's ideologeme then it seems that the most adequate one can be found in his autobiography, particularly in the account of how the image of the Tramp came to be invented. In *My Autobiography* Chaplin recounts that during the shooting of *Kid Auto Races in Venice* Mack Sennett told him to make himself up as a comedian and put on whatever he fancied. On his way to the check-room, having no idea of the image he was after, Chaplin decided to huddle on a pair of loose and baggy pants, put a bowler on his head and pick up a small cane. The only thing he had been after was the discrepancy – between the baggy pants and the tight jacket, between the small bowler and the oversized shoes, between the moustache of an adult and the expression of a youth in his twenties. The make-up and the costume gave rise to the character and his image emerged on the scene – The Tramp became alive. Those behind the camera started laughing, a crowd gathered,

composed not only by the rest of the actors but also by various laborers, woodworkers, check-room keepers etc. (Chaplin 1964: 154). The episode of the actor, discovering his peculiar fictional persona, approximates Bakhtin's idea of the creation of the hero – moving from the make-up and the costume toward the character proper. In such a way the face is born out of the mask (the persona), while consciousness becomes a product of the social role. Human self-definition proceeds from the inside outward.

Both examples from Chaplin's actor's experience, although describing to a certain extent the traversing of the outside and inside contexts in Bakhtin and Lacan, manifest a flaw by creating the impression that extimacy and the ideologeme comprise a 'risk-free', controllable and indestructible outsideness. What remains insufficiently emphasized is that, in order to evade the threat forewarned of by both authors, a particular structural presence of a lack or an exclusion from the domain of the Other should be preserved. In the case of *City Lights* the conventionality of comedy refers to its opposite – the extimate – nonetheless preserving the divide (non-coincidence) between reality and madness. The ideologeme in turn possesses a transformative and revolutionary force by virtue of its incompleteness. This incompleteness (non-sublimation) of negation is a condition of it not becoming a 'fossilized' construct. Should it attain its complete embodiment without reserve, it transforms into a slogan, an ossified mark of totalizing ideologies, a dead-end for dialogism.

TO STEP OUTSIDE

In Bakhtin's philosophical anthropology the notions of autonomy and completeness of the human body are generated by an illusion, similarly

to Lacan's 'mirror stage' where the I's visual field registers missing 'pieces' of 'my' body. At any given time exterior contexts of the human being and its self-likes (Lacan will term the human self-like *objet petit a* – *object little a*) do not coincide – there is always something inaccessible to vision and consciousness, something strictly subjective, yet belonging in the context of the other who is outside and in front of myself. The head, the face and its particular expression – mostly the world behind our own back – are accessible only as a reflection in others (Bakhtin: 1990, 23). The concept of 'context' in Bakhtin's early aesthetics is understood through the term *krugozor* (*field of vision*, literally *circumvision*; Rus. *кpyгoзoп*), the outside context being the *krugozor* in the world of values, a spatial form, traversed and refracted by the perspective of others. Similarly, in *Lost Unicorns of the Velvet Revolutions* Miglena Nikolchina interprets the Bulgarian neologism *obzhivayavam* ('*living about and around*'), seeking to clarify the mysterious moment in theoretical exchange as a kind of drawing on of the unknown (the outside) towards the known (the familiar). The prefix *ob-* presupposes an emptiness, a possibility of accepting in your *krugozor* foreign life and speech in a way that what is foreign never assumes the status of absolute takeover and 'possession' of the individual interior (Nicolchina: 2013, 38). Bakhtin's context is organized around the constant presence of such a lack – the center of dialogism is situated on the outside, on the side of others. The concept of lack is interpreted as remainder, as insufficiency, as something which is 'nowhere' for the personal horizon to attain completeness – hence, in Bakhtin's view, the 'lack' and the 'excess' of seeing conceptually coincide. In his treatment lack and excess come as a surplus and at the same time as something lesser in relation to the outside context, they constitute its disproportionateness, irremediability and excessiveness. The lack-excess of the subject in the

dialogue characterizes its ‘outsidedness’: ‘Cognition surmounts this concrete outsideness of me myself and the outsideness-for-me of all other human beings, as well as the excess of my seeing in relation to each one of them, which is founded in that position of outsideness.’ (Bakhtin: 1990, 23).

Lacan, on his part, introduces the neologism *ex-sistence*, outside-standing, in order to demonstrate that the center of human being is radically exterior, other, outer, while the subject of the unconscious is decentered and *ex-centric*. The new term from the Seminar on ‘The Purloined Letter’ is introduced on condition that outsidedness is correlative to compulsive repetition (*Wiederholungszwang*), the principle of which is organized in accordance with the insistence of the signifying chain (Lacan, 2006: 6). Lacan borrows Heidegger’s term *ex-sistence* as in French translations of ‘Being and Time’ ‘*ex-sistence*’ renders the Old Greek *ἔκστασις* and the German *Ekstase* (Fink: 1995, 122). The ancient meaning of the word is usually employed in the sense of ‘being or standing outside oneself’, ‘being displaced’. Heidegger aims at splicing different nuances of meaning into the term: from the derivatives of the Old Greek ‘to stand outside’, ‘to step outside’, ‘to be into the open’ to a search for the associative relation with the lexical base of the word ‘existence’. Without rejecting the nuances, already introduced in the course of history from Plotinus through Meister Eckhart and Saint Teresa of Ávila to Heidegger, Lacan employs the term with a view to point to the place of the subject in the unconscious. At the same time he points out that something is lacking on the inside but demanding on the outside. Such an exotopic positioning of the subject alludes to a type of recurring context or to the existence of an outside which recurs. *Τύχη* is on the one hand sought for, and on the other – ‘banished’ outside the functioning as *ἀυτόματον* ‘network of signifiers’ (Vidinsky: 2017, 91).

According to Jean-Jacques Lecercle such a shift in the position of the unconscious – not as something deeply concealed but as a surface – can be traced already in the Marxist critique of Voloshinov’s ‘Freudianism’. According to the latter, what Freud calls ‘unconscious’ is to him an internalization of the outer social dialogue (ideology), while the transference between analysant and analyst is a social interaction related to the linguistic agon, and, ultimately, a speech genre (Lecercle: 2006, 107). The result of matching Lacan’s subject of the unconscious with Bakhtin’s concept of ideology – in the present case, not as a set of ideas but as a set of signs, comprising the arena of class struggle and forming the contents of the unconscious – would allow us to think ideology as a space, constantly re-accentuated and polyphonically displaced by the activity of subjects. Also, the ideology, moving behind one’s invisible back in order to fill in the missing materiality of our *krugozor* of values, will make use of us as its own distorting mask, its excess.

According to Harold D. Baker, Bakhtin and Lacan exhibit specifics which prevent the ultimate splicing of their respective notions of discourse. For Bakhtin the discourse is dialogically articulated, it is always a historically concrete sequence of utterances, while for Lacan ‘the signifying chain’ is an imaginary construct in the unconscious, traversing the axis of the utterance at each and every one of its points (Baker: 1995, 502). Where Bakhtin will insist on diachronic relations, Lacan will refer to linguistic synchrony. Bakhtin sticks to the sound (intonation), Lacan subtly points towards the letter (writing).

Although approaching intersubjectivity from different perspectives, both Bakhtin and Lacan pose the problem of the *outside* of truth and knowledge. It is precisely in the mode of outsidedness that truth and knowledge could have the chance of being explicitly formulated and clarified. Presently, theoretical thought is deeply concerned with

the problem of truth and knowledge that seem to shed their specific 'outside' status and become engulfed by economics as its last remaining refuge of outsideness (Habjan: 2011, 73-74). The market is perceived as a natural context, as a whole new Nature, as the only factor capable of imparting significance to values. In a broader context or, as Bakhtin himself might put it, within the scope of 'Great Time', we ought to persistently pose the question what would happen should we do away with the concept of subjective oscillation and the human being loses the ability to displace or step outside itself. ♡

References

- BAKER, HAROLD D., 1995: Psychoanalysis and Ideology. Bakhtin, Lacan, and Žižek. *History of European Ideas* 20, 1-3. 499-504.
- BAKHTIN, MIKHAIL, 1984: *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Trans. Caryl Emerson. London: University of Minnesota.
- BAKHTIN, MIKHAIL, 1986: *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- BAKHTIN, MIKHAIL, 1990: *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays*. Trans. Vadim Liapunov. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- BARTHES, ROLAND, 1967: *Elements of Semiology*. Trans. Annette Lavers and Colin Smith. New York: Hill and Wang.
- BRUSS, NEAL, TITUNIK, I. R., 1976: Preface. *Freudianism: A Marxist Critique*. By V. N. Volosinov. New York: Academic Press. vii-xiv.
- CHAPLIN, CHARLES, 1964: *My Autobiography*. New York: Penguin Classics.
- HABJAN, JERNEJ, 2011: The Vicissitudes of the University Discourse: on Ducrot's Formalization of Bakhtinian Polyphony. *Sociological Problems* 3-4. 65-79.
- KALINOVA, MARIA, 2017: The Human Being's Last Word. *The Parahuman: Grace and Gravity. In honour of prof. Miglena Nikolchina*. Ed. K. Spassova, D. Tenev, M. Kalinova. Sofia: St. Kliment Ohridsky University Press. 923-933.
- KOYRÉ, ALEXANDRE, 1957: *From the Closed World to the Infinite Universe*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- KRISTEVA, JULIA, 1986: *The Kristeva Reader*. Trans. Toril Moi. Oxford: Columbia University Press.
- LACAN, JACQUES, 1992: *The Seminar. Book VII. The Ethics of Psychoanalysis, 1959-60*. Trans. Dennis Porter. London: Routledge.

- LACAN, JACQUES, 2006: *Écrits*. Trans. Bruce Fink in collaboration with Héloïse Fink and Russell Grigg. New York, London: W.W. Norton & Company.
- LACAN, JACQUES, 1977: *The Seminar. Book XI. The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*. 1964. Trans. Alan Sheridan. London: Hogarth Press and Institute of Psycho-Analysis.
- LACAN, JACQUES, 2014: *The Seminar. Book X. Anxiety*. Trans. A. R. Price. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- LECERCLE, JEAN-JACQUES, 2006: *Marxist Philosophy of Language*. Trans. by Gregory Elliott. Leiden: Brill.
- NIKOLCHINA, MIGLENA, 2012: *Lost Unicorns of the Velvet Revolutions*. Heterotopias of the Seminar. New York: Fordham University Press.
- SPASSOVA, KAMELIA, 2017: *Mimetic Machines in the Uncanny Valley. The Parahuman: Grace and Gravity*. In honour of prof. Miglena Nikolchina. Ed. K. Spassova, D. Tenev, M. Kalinova. Sofia: St. Kliment Ohridsky University Press. 134–161.
- TENEV, DARIN, 2012: *Fictzia i obraz. Modeli [Fiction and Image. Models]*. Plovdiv: Janet 45.
- VIDINSKY, VASSIL, 2017: *Sluchainosti: istoricheska tipologiya [Contingencies. A Historical Typology]*. Sofia: St. Kliment Ohridsky University Press.
- VOLOSHINOV, V. N., 1973: *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Trans. Ladislav Matejka and I. R. Titunik. New York: Seminar Press.
- VOLOSHINOV, V. N., 1976: *Freudianism. A Marxist Critique*. Trans. I. R. Titunik and ed. in collaboration with Neal H. Bruss. New York: Academic Press.
- WILDEN, ANTHONY, 1980: *System and Structure: Essays in Communication and Exchange*. New York: Tavistock Publications.
- ŽIŽEK, SLAVOJ, 2006: *The Parallax View*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Резюме

В статията се съпоставят теориите на екзотопията у двама от най-значимите мислители на ХХ век – Михаил Бахтин и Жак Лакан. В много отношения двете школи – кръгът на Бахтин и лаканианската психоанализа – са паралелни мисловни движения, заемащи критични позиции спрямо господстващи дискурси, било на съветския тоталитаризъм или капитализма на Запада. И в двата случая критиката е насочена срещу конструирането на истината от доминираща позиция, нейното тавтологичното затваряне и отричането на субекта да изработва свое автономно значение. Интерсубективният модел на комуникацията при двамата е опит да се посочи местонахождението на социална връзка, осъществена чрез трансформация на външния контекст на дискурса. За Бахтин външният контекст ще бъде свързан с понятието *вненаходимост*, за Лакан това ще е *ex-sistence*.

През 1927 г. изпод авторството на В. Н. Волошинов излиза критическият очерк “Фройдизъм”, който разглежда несъзнаваното като аспект на съзнанието, то е „неофициално съзнание“ – лингвистично по своята природа, – което влиза в противоречие с „официалното съзнание“. Счита се, че Волошинов пряко влияе върху структуралните изследвания на Пражкия лингвистичен кръжок, което влияние от своя страна през работата на Роман Якобсон и антропологията на Клод Леви-Строс достига до работата на Лакан. Ако е възможно подобно, макар и ограничено влияние на Бахтиновия кръг върху идеите на Лакан, то трябва да се отнесе обаче по-скоро към марксистката философия на езика, отколкото към критиката на Фройд.

Въпреки отсъствието на експлицитен диалог между Бахтин и Лакан, принадлежащи почти на едно и също поколение (Бахтин

живее от 1895 г. до 1975 г., Лакан – от 1901 г. до 1981 г.), въпреки различните мисловни предизвикателства и въпроси, на които посвещават времето си в търсене на отговор – точките на близост между тези две фигури са впечатляващи. В удивително “съседство” на мисълта и двамата автори развиват темата, че човешкото съществуване е екс-центрично и неговият център е извън него. Тайната на човека, неговата най-дълбока интимност, е скрита отвън.

И при Бахтин, и при Лакан – въпреки че работят с различни понятия и са подложени на различни политически принуди – несъзнаваното е *екзотопично*. Те подхождат към проблема за “външното”, спасявайки го от наивния реализъм (под формата на социалистически реализъм или пък като връщане към “позитивни” и “емпирични” разкази за съзнанието, поведението и сексуалността). И Бахтин, и Лакан придават на разбирането си за екзотопия амбивалентен смисъл – на *външност*, но и на *липса*. За двамата екзотопичността препраща към противоположното на позитивната реалност, към външен контекст, който не е просто вън от една плоскост или структура, но и в смисъла на липсващ от нея.

Maria Kalinova

Maria Kalinova is an assistant professor at the Literary Theory Department at the University of Sofia, Bulgaria. She defended her doctoral thesis on the subject of literary publicity in the Bulgarian Revival era. She published the book 'Childhood and Intellectual History of Bulgarian National Revival Writers' (2012) based on her dissertation. Editor of the 'Literary Journal' weekly. Managing director of VS Publishing House, member of the 'Bulgarian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies'. Member of the 'Bulgarian Psychoanalytic Space' association. Editor of the series for contemporary Bulgarian literature 'New Bulgarian Literature', 'Literary Journal' Foundation and "p.m." by VERSUS. Her academic interests include the logic of dissent in language and literature, Lacanian Psychoanalysis, Chaos Theory, Lyric Theory.



Tension Episodes
(A Fragment of the History
of Literary Theory in Bulgaria.
The Case of the Bulgarian
Guillaumist School)

Эпизоды напряженности
(Фрагмент истории
литературной теории в
Болгарии. Случай с болгарской
школой гийомизма)

The development of structuralist ideas in Bulgaria coincided with the liberalization of the human and social sciences during the 1960s and the 1970s and from the start was involved in various discussions, both internal and external. The present paper focuses on the case of the literary theoretician Christo Todorov, a representative of the Bulgarian Guillaumist School, and his curious siding with Pantelei Zarev, a powerful professor in the highest ranks of the Bulgarian Communist Party and at the time a Rector of the University of Sofia, during his attack on structuralism. At the end I propose a Guillaumist interpretation of the situation in which Todorov found himself, using his own methodological instruments.

STRUCTURALISM, CHRISTO TODOROV,
GUSTAVE GUILLAUME, PANTELEI
ZAREV, MODALITY, TENSION

Развитие структуралистских идей в Болгарии совпало с либерализацией гуманитарных и социальных наук в 1960-х и 1970-х годах и с самого начала принимало участие в различных дискуссиях, как внутренних, так и внешних. В настоящей статье основное внимание уделяется случаю литературного теоретика Христо Тодорова, представителя болгарской гильомистической школы, и как он встал на сторону Пантелей Зарева, профессора в высших чинах болгарской коммунистической партии и ректора Софийского университета, во время его нападения на структурализм. В конце, используя его методические инструменты, я предлагаю гийомистскую интерпретацию ситуации, в которой оказался Тодоров.

СТРУКТУРАЛИЗМ, ХРИСТО ТОДОРОВ,
ГЮСТАВ ГИЙОМ, ПАНТЕЛЕЙ ЗАРЕВ,
МОДАЛЬНОСТЬ, НАПРЯЖЕННОСТЬ

There is a tendency to look at the history of the human sciences in Eastern Europe during the socialist times as if they were sharing the same fate everywhere (cf. Znepolski). It doesn't seem to be the case and this becomes evident when one starts investigating carefully the destiny of the different trends that were popular in the so called 'West' (a generalization just as misleading since what was happening in Germany was not what was happening in France, in Italy, in the USA, etc.). If one uses the widespread – and often questionable – distinctions of different theoretical schools as introduced by American literary criticism readers and textbooks from the 1980s and the 1990s as a starting point (cf. Selden; Newton; Rivkin, Ryan), one can easily see that even aside from the Russian Formalism and the American New Criticism – labels that define the critical school geographically already on the level of its name – structuralist semiotics, hermeneutics, phenomenology, etc., are distributed in a quite uneven way throughout the different countries on both sides of the Iron curtain. The case alone of Marxism and its many divisions and subdivisions would suffice to make it clear that there was an inner dynamics to the historical transformations of any critical attitude specific to the different regions and thus even Marxism was “practiced”, as it were, very differently in USSR, in Hungary, in Poland, etc. The detailed tracing of particular cases could help the researcher draw a much more complex picture of the state of human sciences, a picture that would put in question the simplifying generalizations about “theory” in “Eastern Europe” and would lead to a reconsideration of the simple dividing line between “East” and “West”.

In this paper I want to address such a specific case, the case of the Bulgarian Guillaumist School which appeared during the years when structuralism was both most flourishing and most criticized in Bulgaria, namely the 1960s and the 1970s. This School and its relation to

other manifestations of structuralism in this country is to this date completely unaccounted for, even in the most recent research that maps out the general history of Bulgarian structuralism (see Garnizov; Nedelchev 2014, 2017; Trendafilov). I will focus more particularly on Christo Todorov (1938–1983) of whom it can be claimed that together with Krassimir Mantchev (1938–1997) is the co-founder of this School.

It should be kept in mind that the context of the debates around structuralism in Bulgaria is much broader and goes beyond the rather limited scope of a particular school, beyond also the field of literary theory, on which I will be focusing. It can be said that these debates have as a background ongoing processes of transformation and liberalization of the human and social sciences in Bulgaria that started by the end of the 1950s (cf. Deyanova 2009; 2015) and that lead to a surprising explosion of theoretical discourses in the philosophical and literary seminars in 1980s (cf. Nikolchina 2013, Goncharova). During the 1960s the “young”, the “non-conformists”, the “reformists” were often tolerated by the Party and scholars of today point to the noticeable “difference in the force of control” exerted by the Party over them compared to other cases (Deyanova 2015: 140–141).

A look at these processes would reveal that it was never a question of a simple opposition between the dogmatic Party representatives and the progressive researches introducing Western or underground Soviet theories. There was a constant negotiation born out of tensions both in the areas of scholarly work (competing approaches producing methodological ‘force fields’) and in the dominating ideological tenets (related to power struggles in the Party and all the important institutions – universities, journals, publishing houses, etc.). This situation created “mechanisms that imply incessant interactions and renegotiations, network games reducing uncertainties but also increasing the odds

1 Miglena Nikolchina points to this “double-edged hermeneutical problem” which the socialist history poses with the dissolving of the context in which certain parabolic levels of meaning were self-evident and with the simultaneous accruing of contexts previously unknown, the contexts brought up by the opening of the archives of the State Security and the like. (Cf. Nikolchina 2011) Of course, the very reading of the archives is quite problematic given the dissolving contexts and this puts in question the status currently given to recently accrued contexts (Nicolchina 2011, Deyanova 2015).

2 See Yanakiev 1960.

for submission.” (Deyanova 2015: 136) The mechanisms of the network games leave traces in the published texts that it is getting harder and harder to grasp.¹ Furthermore, there were interactions, actions and reactions, events which were not recorded in the published texts and whose reconstruction should rely on interviews, memoirs and oral histories dating from later. In the case of the Bulgarian Guillaumists even the personal archives of the scholars sometimes lack evidence as to the way they were treated and threatened, how and why they chose their strategy and so on.

If I turn now to the history of structuralism in Bulgaria, I should stress the fact that perhaps no other theoretical school was as influential in the domain of literary theory during the 1960s and the 1970s. Neither phenomenology, nor hermeneutics, nor thematic criticism, nor genetic criticism can be conceived as a significant factor in the literary studies of the period. Structuralist semiotics, on the other hand, – together with the exact methods in human sciences it was promoting – was from early on seen as important and it immediately provoked vivid discussions that were to last from the beginning of the 1960s (with the attack on what could be claimed to be the first Bulgarian structuralist book in literary theory, the book by Miroslav Yanakiev on the Bulgarian verse structures²) to the mid-1980s (and the attacks on Kleo Protochristova’s use of mathematical formulas in the analysis of prose rhythm) (Garnoziv 192–213).

At the same time, structuralism was so multifaceted that it is hard to point to univocal traits that can help the researcher of today understand which texts and authors were seen as structuralist and why. Thus, if one looks closely at the writings of Nikola Georgiev, a scholar who was thought at the time to impersonate the structuralist position *per se*, one cannot fail to notice that his approach is much closer to New

Criticism and Russian Formalism than to structuralism. And Mihail Nedelchev, who was accused at the time of being a “young structuralist critic” admits in recent texts that in a sense he was not and could not have been a structuralist and that the accusations were rather used in an instrumental way for a sort of ideological oppression (Nedelchev 2014, 2017). This alone makes it clear that the stakes of “structuralism” were both theoretical and political. And while some were labelled structuralists without it being so, others were avoiding the term precisely in order to introduce and develop structuralist ideas.

But if structuralism was so important in Bulgaria (so much so that two of the most prominent names of French structuralism came from Bulgaria – Tzvetan Todorov and Julia Kristeva³) why is it the case that so little is known about Bulgarian structuralism abroad? There were two Bulgarians (three if we count Julia Kristeva) on the executive committee of the International Association for Semiotic Studies – Miroslav Yanakiev and Alexander Ludskanov, the last being also among the vice-presidents with Juri Lotman and Roman Jakobson.⁴ And yet the same Jakobson, who has been exchanging letters with Yanakiev at least since 1960 (cf. Garnizov 239–243) and was holding in high esteem Ludskanov, in an interview for the Bulgarian journal *Lik* in 1972 forgets to mention Bulgaria when he enumerates where structuralists semiotics is mostly developed and names USSR, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Romania from the Eastern Bloc. (Jakobson 1972). This is not an exception. In the same way in his introduction to the Brown University Press edition of Lotman’s *The Structure of the Artistic Text* in 1971 Thomas Winner writes that the semiotics of literature “have been a central concern of scholars in both the West (especially France, the United States, and Germany) and the East (especially Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the Soviet Union)”, omitting Bulgaria (Winner ix).

3 On the role of Tzvetan Todorov and Julia Kristeva for the development of structuralism and post-structuralism, see Todorova 2012.

4 The full list of the members of the executive committee of the Association, the vice-presidents, etc. can be found on the last page of the journal that the Association was publishing, the journal *Semiotica*.

5

In fact, already in 1972 the Belgian linguist Marc Wilmet (1972) speaks of a Sofia School of Guillaumists. Other members of the group include Alexandra Mantcheva, Roumiana Kamenova, Assen Tchaouchev, Yossif Simeonov, Radka Bechkova, Albena Vassileva, Silvia Boteva, Paissii Hristov and others.

6

For a general introduction, see (Valin; Hirtle 3-104, 205-236).

This effect of partial invisibility is most probably a product of the particular strategies adopted by Bulgarian structuralists, product of the games they played or refused to play with Party functionaries and dogmatic Marxists but also with other styles of thought and other theoretical approaches. In the limited space of this essay I will delineate only a fragment of this complicated history.

The name Bulgarian Guillaumist School usually denotes a group of linguists that were inspired by the work of Gustave Guillaume (1883-1960). The members of the group were not the ones who invented the name, it was rather introduced by French and Canadian linguists much later.⁵ The main principles of the group were articulated in the second half of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s in a series of articles written in French by Krassimir Mantchev and Christo Todorov separately or together (cf. Mantchev 1967, Todorov 1968, Mantchev, Todorov 1971, Todorov, 1971). The group continued functioning actively mainly in the universities in Sofia and Veliko Tarnovo at least to the beginning of the 2000s. In 2007 the French *Langages* journal published a special issue on “L’École guillaumienne de Bulgarie” (Gandon, Tchauchev). Not everything, however, was about linguistics. Christo Todorov from the very beginning started building a literary theory based on their own Guillaumist linguistics and later Krassimir Mantchev also turned to literary theory (cf. Mantchev 1998) transforming and developing further Todorov’s postulates. This line of theoretical and analytical work was continued in the second half of the 1990s by some of the texts by Boyan Manchev (cf. Manchev 2003) with a particular stress on the philosophical stakes of such a linguistic and literary theory.

Here, unable to present more fully Gustave Guillaume’s theory, I will but point to some of its aspects most relevant for the Bulgarian scholars of the time.⁶ For Guillaume, the mechanical explication of

linguistic phenomena is insufficient for it cannot take into account the inner logic of language and the causality of linguistic transformations which brings forth these phenomena. This inner logic and its causality can be grasped only on the level of the mental, on the level of thinking, for language is a way to conceive the thinkable and give it form. Therefore the mechanical explication should be doubled by a psychological one (cf. Guillaume 1970: 5-6), leading to the formulation of this theory as a psycho-mechanics of language. “The invention of the sign [...] is the second time of the phenomenon whose result is language; its first time is the creation of that of which the sign, when the invention will have been done, will be the vehicle. In the history of language the phenomenon is irreversible: it is not the sign that calls forth the idea, but the idea that calls forth the sign.” (Guillaume 1973: 241-242; translation mine.)⁷ The psychomechanical viewpoint permits Guillaume to describe not only the static but also the dynamic aspect of language, the becoming of linguistic categories such as the article, the tenses and aspects, the auxiliary verbs, etc. According to him, the becoming of a language forms part of the structure of this language and the genesis of the linguistic representation of ideas, which is also the genesis of the ideas themselves – what he calls *ideogenesis* – is not lost but preserved with every next development of the language. He calls *law of non-recurrence* the law according to which all the previous stages in the articulation of an idea remain part of the actual state. This means nothing less than the inscription in the actual of a dynamics that would keep it in transformation.

There are a couple of tendencies for the development of the idea and the tendencies themselves are based on *tensions* that form two types of movement. The first type comprises the movements between the universal and the singular, called singularization (from the universal to the

⁷ Whenever not specified the translations are mine.

8 Guillaume, and later the Bulgarian Guillaumeists, used as synonyms universal and general, on the one hand, and singular and particular, on the other. Therefore, in different texts *particularization* and *generalization* are employed instead of *singularization* and *universalization*,

9 To put things this way is simplifying and misleading. In fact, Guillaume's early use of the triad tension – extension – bi-extension in the description of the three plans of the time *in posse*, the potential time (including the infinitive, the compound and the double compound (surcomposées) forms), was substituted with the triad immanent – transcendent – bi-transcendent (see Guillaume 1973: 184–192), while the term *tension* started being employed for the general mobility or transformability in the direction of the actual or the virtual, resp. the singular or the universal.

singular) and universalization (from the singular to the universal).⁸ Guillaume calls these movements themselves tensorial movements (*movement tensoriel*) (cf. Guillaume 1973: 40) and speaks respectively of singularizing and universalizing tension. The second type comprises the movements between the virtual and the actual, respectively the virtualizing and actualizing tensions. The very term *tension* was often employed without an explicit definition, although already in his early work *Temps et verbe* (1929) he proposes a definition which holds also for the later uses. There he writes that the tension is “the impression of progressive mobility” and claims that it is inseparable from the potentiality of the idea. (Guillaume 1970: 15–16). In *Temps et verbe* however he described the actualization of the virtual as a distension, making use of the couple tension/ distension that he was to abandon substituting it with two tensions – virtualizing and actualizing one.⁹ Here I will retain the use of *tension* as *the immanent progressive transformability* of a state of affairs which imbues the state with a direction of change.

It would not be wrong to say that the couples universality-singularity and virtuality-actuality are homologous (cf. Guillaume 1973: 25–26). They allow for descriptions that are complementing each other. It should be noted also that when Guillaume envisaged a complex process like the two compound transition from the universal to the singular and again to the universal – as when he was describing the ontogenesis of the vocables of the Indo-European languages, or when he was analysing the ideogenesis of the articles in French (cf. Guillaume 1973: 25–45, 87–98, 143–183) – the initial and the final universal were not the same. The universal, what it meant, how it was grasped, etc., just like the singular, in this theory, is not a constant, but a non-predetermined variable subjected to the work of tensions.

Krassimir Mantchev used Guillaume's work as a ground for the development of his own understanding of ideogenesis, where the most crucial operation was *the progressive discrimination of subject and object*. The process of gradual differentiation of subject and object not only in the linguistic but also in the epistemological and philosophical sense was grasped as a linguistic event in which a semantic hierarchy among verbs was produced, where *being (être)* is at the basis, followed by *having (avoir)* and then by *doing (faire)*, *being*, *having* and *doing* being the three stable position in the progressive discrimination (Mantchev 1967). It is easy to note that the first two of these verbs ('to be' and 'to have') are also an auxiliary verbs and the third ('to do' or 'to make') can be used also in syntactic constructions in a special way in French (roughly corresponding to the English 'making someone do something'). Guillaume himself has noted that the verbs who become auxiliary are in no language just random verbs and insisted that 'I am' (*être*) pre-exists in the ideal filiation of words the 'I can' (*pouvoir*), which in its turn pre-exists 'I do' (*faire*) (Guillaume 1973: 73) but he never associated this with the becoming of the subject and the object. According to the law of non-recurrence, this becoming should be understood as a part of language, which means that people witness it again and again. Subject and object are not pre-given, they are in constant becoming. What is more, for Krassimir Mantchev and Christo Todorov in the gradual differentiation the different positions suppose not just a further development of the same type of subject and object, but the production of new classes of subjects and objects and also a new configuration of their relation (cf. Todorov 1985: 71-76, 147-148). Beside the three stable positions of being, having and doing, there are two unstable positions of transition. The first one, between being and having, is the position of the modal verbs 'can' (*pouvoir*), 'want' (*vouloir*), 'must' (*devoir*) where

the discrimination between subject and object is further operated. The second position, between having and doing, is occupied by verbs for perception and intellection called by Mantchev and Todorov *transmodal*. Here is the place for ‘see’, ‘hear’, ‘think’, ‘understand’, etc.

I will give a short and simplifying account of the hierarchy produced by the progressive discrimination of subject and object. At the position of *being* (*être*) subject and object are indistinguishable. No differentiation between animate and inanimate is possible here and from the point of view of the subject there is no difference between ‘He is smart’ and ‘The house is big’. In this position the subject is “plerotrope” (Todorov 1985: 73) and general. The distinction at the point of *ability* (*pouvoir*) is still too fable and it gives the image of a passive subject. There is a partial overlapping between *being* and *ability* to which testifies the semantic synonymy between, say, ‘being rich’ and ‘able to buy’. The position of *desire* singularizes the subject. It polarizes the subject and object, introducing an obvious direction from one to the other. Desire (*vouloir*) necessitates the appearance of an object and constitutes the subject as subject of desire. The *duty* or *obligation* (*devoir*) retains the direction and even intensifies it while simultaneously subjecting the subject to the object pole in the sense that *obligation* transcends the subject and is independent of the subjective desires. This produces a split dividing the subject into a neutral empty subject who is “the subject proper to the modal verb” and a real one put in a passive position, expressed by the passive voice of ‘I am obliged to...’ (Todorov 1985: 121, Todorov 2003: 198–199). Thus, here the true subject position, which is bound to be implicit, remains empty and unoccupied, while the explicit subject position is that of a “subject-patient” or “object-agent” – someone on whom the obligation or duty falls upon (Todorov 1985: 64–65, 73, 102). Christo Todorov describes the transition from *ability* to

desire to obligation in terms of increasing ‘force of actualization’ (Todorov 1971: 130). At the next stable position, namely the point of *having* (*avoir*), the subject and the object are separated, the idea of possession defining them both, the subject as subject of possession and the object as something being possessed. As a second stable position there is no longer direction here notwithstanding the obvious differentiation. A good example in English for the close relation between *obligation* and *having* can be given with the expressions ‘to have to do’ and ‘to have sth’. The transmodal position introduces an active subject (who listens to, thinks about, ponders over, notices, etc.) who however leaves the object unaltered. The last position – that of *doing* (*faire*) – produces an active subject who alters the object.

In this account of the hierarchy I referred to Christo Todorov’s texts written between 1968 and 1983, and I should add that these were not linguistic but rather literary-theoretical texts, that introduced Krasimir Mantchev’s ideas into narratology, genre theory and later into the history of French literature. Todorov’s understanding was that literature is not some kind of second-order language (I will come back to this), a connotative system that relies on the denotative system of natural language. Such a Barthesian conception, he claimed, leaves the researcher mainly with the problem of interpretation. For Todorov however, with literature before it is a question of interpretation, it should be a question of the immanent logic of the system, a logic that is linguistic in its core. The progressive discrimination of subject and object is operated in literary works as language and this language and the discrimination do not precede the work but are part of it forming its very structure. He puts an accent on the modal notions showing how they are at the basis of any narrative text¹⁰ driving the characters and constructing the coherence of the plot. Where there are only open

10 Unfortunately, in the limited space of this essay I cannot go into Christo Todorov’s work on poetry and I will have but to refer the reader to the second volume of his history of French literature dedicated to the French poets: Todorov 1982.

11

In this Todorov's conception was analogous to that of Claude Bremond (Bremond 1964, 1966). As it was in accordance with his own Guillaumist understanding, Todorov accepted Bremond's idea for a transition between three phases: virtuality, actualization and result, but he criticized him for seeing this triad as an objective property of any real process, introducing an extra-linguistic factor in the narrative organization. For Todorov himself, the very knowledge of the real could not be but linguistic (language having the function "to apprehend the integrity of the thinkable", Guillaume 1973: 240) and therefore these categories are immanent to language (Todorov 1971: 128-129).

possibilities (like in Voltaire's *Candide* or in some adventure novels) the integrity of the story is weak, the episodes are relatively autonomous and the intrigue can be prolonged indefinitely. Desire introduces a clear direction and finality that only become stronger with obligation and thus these modalities hold the story together keeping it from falling apart. The clash of desire and obligation produces narrative conflicts; and when the conflict occurs in one and the same character the effect is psychologization. The conflict creates the strongest integrity of a story. (Todorov 1985: 163-170) In order to have a story, Todorov insisted, it is not enough to narrate different events with the same characters. Two sentences put next to each other still do not make a story. There has to be a modal link between the sentences (he called this link *lien interphrastique*), the events should be associated on a deeper level by the modal notions.

In the approach to the basic semantic level of the literary works Todorov's work was perhaps closer to A. J. Greimas than to any other theoretician. But how is one to get to the deeper level? Taking up Guillaume's understanding of the singularizing and universalizing tensions he described the finished literary work as a product of a singularizing tension that go from virtuality to actuality. "The virtual phase is assumed by the implicit modal notions, while the actual phase is expressed by the verbs for action themselves." (Todorov 1985: 162) The actualization of the virtual is the mental operation of *affabulation* (or the construction of the intrigue in the thought) whose final point is the narrative text itself. At the virtual phase there are many possibilities to tell the story; at the position of the singular only one of these possibilities turns out to have been realized.¹¹ Now, the usual direction of reading would have been to start from the singularity of the work and move forward with its *interpretation* based on the given

physical organization of signs (the signifiers). The mental operation of interpretation – be it psychoanalytic, “mystique, rationalistic, spiritualistic or materialist, progressist or reactionary” (Todorov 1985: 156) – generalizes and reaches a new kind of universality by investigating the different meanings attributable to the intrigue. If we term U₁ the initial virtuality with its universality, S – the singularity of the finished work, and U₂ – the universality which results from interpretation, it becomes obvious that U₁ and U₂ are rather different. U₁ – S forms the first tension and S – U₂ forms the second one. Christo Todorov’s own approach was not to interpret in the sense of moving in the direction to U₂, but to go back from S to U₁ and in this sense to focus on the first tension and the way the intrigue is built. He discovered that in order to move back from the realized work to its virtuality it is enough to *summarize* the story. The summary makes explicit precisely what in the narrative work of art remains implicit – the role of the modal notions. (Todorov 1971, 1985, 2003) Using the summaries of different works of authors from Corneille and Racine through Diderot and Voltaire to Camus and Marcel Aymé, summaries most often taken from textbooks, he demonstrated convincingly how the modalities of possibility, desire and obligation produced the integrity and the coherence of the works.

In his texts Christo Todorov was debating with A. J. Greimas, Roland Barthes, Claude Bremond and G. Genette. Gustave Guillaume and Krassimir Mantchev served as reference points. He used sometimes the Russian formalists and Vladimir Propp and only on very rare occasions the Soviet structuralists such as Lotman.¹² No Bakhtin who was most popular at the time in Bulgaria.¹³ No reference in any of the texts in French to any Bulgarian scholar apart from those belonging to the Guillamist School, most often people from the same university department. No Marx or Lenin.

12

To my knowledge there are only two occasions where he refers to Lotman. In 1971 he refers to Lotman’s thesis that literary value is not immanent to the work but is conceivable only on the basis of the relationship between text and context. Todorov seems to agree but adds that whatever the relation between work and context is, it has to be based on the degree of organization of the text, organization which is immanently produced by language. (Todorov 2003: 97) Later, in 1982, he includes Lotman’s *Analysis of the Poetical Text* (1972) in the bibliography to his work on the history of French poetry with a short annotation saying the book is important but without however actually referring to him in the text (Todorov 1982: 139, 142). As with the majority of his publications, both of these texts were in French.

13

On the reception of Bakhtin in Bulgaria see Enyo Stoyanov’s paper in this issue.

14

For a period of fifteen years Todorov published in *Literaturna misal* only three texts and one book review. Beside the article discussed here, the other two texts were a criticism of the anti-novel (1971) and a paper on the relationship between linguistics and aesthetics in literature (1984); the book review is on Georges Poulet and dates from the same 1973 as the article on which I will focus.

Most of his texts were published either in international semiotic journals such as *Informations sur les Sciences Sociales* and *Semiotica* or in the *Annular* of the University of Sofia. As I said, almost all of his texts, just like those of Krassimir Mantchev, were written in French.

Looking at these facts one can get the feeling that the Bulgarian Guillaumists were not living in Bulgaria, at least not in socialist Bulgaria of the 1960s and the 1970s.

There was one important exception to this strategy of writing in French and not dialogizing with the Bulgarian literary context – an article from 1973 written and published in Bulgarian in the most important journal for literary studies, the journal *Literaturna misal* (*Literary thought*).¹⁴ The article offered a severe criticism of Roland Barthes and the Saussurean-Barthesian type of structuralism. At the time one of the strategies for the introduction of foreign theories was to pretend to criticize them lightly as an excuse to present them in detail. This was not the case with Todorov's article. He had a genuine argument. Simply put, his point was that the structuralist semiology of Barthes had put the stress on the arbitrariness of the signifier-signified distinction and had privileged the signifier because it had a physical quality, thus reducing the role of the thought process and the mental operation behind the becoming of language. There is arbitrariness, Todorov claimed following Guilaume's conception, only on the level of sounds and words since they are discrete units, but with a phrase or with a text the meaning is global and not just a mechanical sum of the meaning of the discrete parts. The generalization of arbitrariness and the privileging of the signifier made Barthes – and Saussure before him – blind for the ideogenesis of language. This misstep further led to the application of the denotation-connotation couple to literature and to the understanding that literature uses the first order signs of natural

language and is therefore a connotative – or second order – system. This understanding resulted in the idea that the doubling of the arbitrariness of signs in literary text reveals the freedom for innumerable interpretations. As I pointed above, for Todorov in order to grasp the nature of the literary work first one has to go backwards from the singularity of the text to the first tension ('backwards' means from S to U1) and the linguistic becoming of the text structure, which is following the progressive discrimination of subject and object along the line of modal notions. And he believed that there is nothing arbitrary about that procedure. For him, Barthes's views were problematic as they, on the one hand, reduced the linguistic becoming or the ideogenetic part of literature, and on the other, made the interpretation based on the analysis of linguistic structures seem frivolous with the stress on the arbitrariness.

Todorov was not the first to criticize the arbitrariness of the sign from a Guillaumist position. This criticism was part of a more general disagreement with Saussure on the part of Guillaume and was taken up by his students. The title of a book by a Guillaumist linguist published ten years after Todorov's article, is much telling: *Against the Arbitrariness of the Sign* (Toussaint 1983).¹⁵ The 1973 article against Barthes is undoubtedly interesting for taking the debate in the field of literary theory. At the same time it is no less interesting for the one who is tracing the history of theory in Eastern Europe in general and Bulgaria in particular. For it appeared in a singular context.

The debates in Bulgaria around structuralism that began in 1960 with Miroslav Yanakiev's book (1960) on Bulgarian verse structures reached their climax in the first half of the 1970s.

In 1969 Pantelei Zarev, a powerful professor in the highest ranks of the Bulgarian Communist Party, who was at the time a Rector of the

15

There is an explicit reference in Toussaint's book both to Christo Todorov and to Krassimir Mantchev. Cf (Toussaint 13).

16

There were two series of the bulletin, a white one and a blue one. The issue on structuralism was in the white series, which was rather secret and was not distributed openly.

University of Sofia, published a small book criticizing structuralism. Even though he praised Lotman and the Tartu School and wrote that to an extent structuralist ideas can be useful, his attack was severe, as he claimed that structuralism was an “anatomy of the dead, and not of the living”, that it was “wrong” or “reactionary” in its exclusion of “the human essence of artistic production” and its intentional ignorance of the relation between the artist and the people. (Zarev 19–20, 26–27, 29). For him one of the problems of structuralism was that it had replaced “the organic whole” with a mechanical one, producing thus “a rupture between the work and the separate phrase, a rupture between the phrase and the word”. (Zarev 12)

It seems that part of this criticism was included in his rectorial address in 1968 and was immediately recognized as a threat making some of the youngest scholars leave to other universities (Manchev 2018).

The same 1968 in August Bulgarian students and professors were sent to Prague for the Sixth International Slavic Congress, where Miroslav Yanakiev was next to Roman Jakobson and Jan Mukařovský and the students, inspired by the formalist legacy and the structuralist semiotics brought back this inspiration to Bulgaria (Nedelchev 2017: 134–140). Later some of them were asked to edit an issue of the Bulgarian Writers Association’s bulletin¹⁶ on structuralism and in 1970, the year after Zarev’s booklet got out, they published there a chapter by Saussure, eight texts by Levi-Strauss, seven texts by Barthes, three by Philippe Sollers and one by Genette (Nedelchev 2017: 151; Garnizov 247).

In 1969 the International Association for Semiotic studies was founded with Miroslav Yanakiev and Alexander Ludskanov being on the Executive Committee next to people from all around Europe, including Jakobson, Umberto Eco, Lotman, Benveniste, Fonagy, etc.

In 1972 Roman Jakobson was invited to Bulgaria and gave a long interview for the *Lik* journal (Jakobson 1972). He was interviewed by some of the former students who went to the Prague congress. 1972 was an important year also because Lotman (1972) succeeded to publish in Moscow a volume with translations of semiotic texts from various countries and opened in a sense the Soviet academia to semioticians that were not “home-grown”. The book included texts by Levi-Strauss, Jakobson, Jiří Levý, Claude Bremond, Meyer Shapiro, Max Bense and others. It had an immediate impact in Bulgaria and it was mentioned as an important book in the preface to the 1972 Jakobson interview.

Meanwhile the attack on structuralism was getting stronger, involving critics and writers that presented it as “western” and “individualistic” fashion choking the life out of the literary works. It is difficult to describe the position from which the attack was launched. It comprised people with different views and different interests. On the one hand, it was the position of Marxist humanism of those critics who were already seen as dogmatic and who in hold of institutional power tried to maintain this power.¹⁷ Zarev’s small book can be included here. On the other hand, there were younger critics who were not dogmatic Marxist-Leninists and who were rather irritated by the introduction of the exact sciences in literature simply because this contradicted their own understanding of what literature is and how it should be studied. As I pointed at the beginning of this text the discussed period was one of liberalization of the human sciences and the ongoing transformation of the field of literary studies allowed for various forces to intervene and curious alliances to be formed. Thus there was a group of the younger scholars formed during the 1960s who were later called “essayists” and “impressionists” in which there were traditionalists and even proto-nationalists like Toncho Zhechev but also

17

I cannot go here into the problems the place of humanism poses to the researcher. For a more subtle way to pose this question, see (Nikolchina 2014).

18
I take the expression from Enyo Stoyanov's article in this issue.

19
On the structuralist-impressionist debate see Manchev 1999 and the texts of Enyo Stoyanov and Miglena Nikolchina in this issue. On Todor Pavlov's criticism of the proto-nationalistic views of Lyudmila Zhivkova's circle including Toncho Zhechev's group, see (Kiossev 174 n79).

20
Todorov's relation with Barthes and Greimas should be further researched, but it seems certain that he knew them both personally and that he was close with Greimas. I could not specify when he met them – was it during his first specialization in France (Nancy) in 1961–1962 or during the second specialization in 1967–1968 in the Sorbonne? According to Boyan Manchev (2018), at the second big Urbino conference on narratology in 1968 he had most probably a long debate with Barthes but unfortunately I could not find written traces of this debate. Todorov's text from the Urbino conference ("The Hierarchy of Narrative Functions", Todorov 1985: 96–103) refers only to Guillaume and Krassimir Mantchev which is only natural as it was written →

progressive thinkers like Tzvetan Stoyanov and Julia Kristeva (before her departure to France) and it seems to be the case that apart from the personal friendship what was uniting them was “their agreement in identifying a problem in modernity”.¹⁸ It was the impressionists who in 1974, several years after the death of Tzvetan Stoyanov, started on the pages of the *Literaturna misal* journal perhaps the most important controversy on structuralism. At the time their attitude was getting more and more conservative and they were criticized for that by some of the old Marxists such as Todor Pavlov.¹⁹ Structuralists, for their part, were often defending Marxist positions sometimes against the humanist dogma and sometimes not.

It is in this complicated context that Christo Todorov's article on Barthes was published. The article referred to Zarev's criticism of structuralism as one of “the transformations of the contemporary bourgeois ideology”, stating that this aspect was already well studied by Zarev (Todorov 1973: 22). That it has been well studied meant among other things that Todorov himself did not have to dwell on this topic which allowed him to focus on his Guillaumist reading of Barthes. But the complexity of Todorov's gesture deserves attention. The reference to Zarev can be read also as a sort of insurance so that such a text be published in the first place. Such an interpretation is not without ground as it was a common practice at the time. However, in this specific case Todorov was pretending to criticize structuralism in general and in this sense it seems plausible that he would not have needed such a protection. Furthermore, albeit different in almost every point from Zarev's attack, the article shared with it something important. Both Zarev and Todorov criticized the privilege bestowed to the discrete units of language and both of them claimed that in this way a crucial part of the meaning construction is lost. And after all this was a sort of

a starting point for the whole ideogenetic theory. Also, as I said earlier, Todorov's criticism was not superficial, it was not just an excuse to present Barthes's views.²⁰ At the same time presenting his criticism as a criticism of structuralism as a whole meant stepping up and taking a position in the ongoing debates. And this position sided with the dogmatic functionaries and the conservative impressionists instead of with people like Miroslav Yanakiev. Was he trying to imply that the Guillaumist theory he and Krassimir Mantchev were developing had nothing to do with structuralism?

Zarev must have had liked the article against Barthes because two years later a shorter version of it was included together with Zarev's own text in a volume on structuralism published in Moscow and gathering authors from various countries (Basina, Polyakova 377–395).²¹ Judging from this collection of essays one cannot but get the impression that Pantelei Zarev and Christo Todorov formed a front in Bulgaria against structuralism as such.

The political stakes of literary theory in the Eastern Bloc are yet to be studied. It was rarely about the possible direct influence on politics. Sometimes, the explicit distancing from political questions was a political gesture. Sometimes, the production or introduction of theoretical thought was political in the sense that it created places of freedom; and then theoretical thinking in itself was an active transformation or subversion of a system that often tried to control it and reduce it. Also, theory always provides new categories for the analysis of what is going on, be it in a story, in a poem, or in a real event.

Christo Todorov's own theory can give the researcher tools for the understanding of his situation. The way Krassimir Mantchev and he were developing their Guillaumist theory lead inevitably to the particularization²² of the theory distancing them from the French

→ before the conference and therefore before the debate. On the other hand, in a note to a text of his published during the same year he thanks Greimas for his suggestions during the work on the text (Todorov 1968: 41). Which means that they communicated personally. Is it possible that with his criticism of Barthes Todorov was taking Greimas's side after the fall out of Barthes and Greimas that took place precisely at that time? Or is it rather the case that Greimas's approach with the focus on the semantic level and the deep structures was from the outset closer to Guillaume and therefore also to Todorov? Much is still to be clarified but even these facts would have remained unknown to me without Boyan Manchev's help, to whom I would like to express here my gratitude.

21

I want to thank again Boyan Manchev for drawing my attention to this volume.

22

Following Guillaume and Todorov hereafter I will use generality and universality, on the one hand, and particularity and singularity, on the other, as synonyms.

structuralists in general and from the other Guillaumists in particular (cf. Pottier 44; Gandon, Tchaouchev 3–12). The initial virtuality and universality were gradually reduced to a singular theory. From this perspective the reference to Zarev and the decision to publish the text on Barthes in Bulgarian can be interpreted as a move of generalization, to which the shared criticism of the Barthesian preference for discrete units and the following inability to see the global meaning testifies. In such a generalization and virtualization Christo Todorov was apparently searching to find the common ground between the dogmatic humanist-Marxist position of Zarev and his own Guillaumist views. However, on this level of generality no theory could have been developed; the development would have inevitably led to a new particularization. What is more, the generalization of Marxism and Guillaumist structuralism was producing simultaneously particularizations both in non-structuralist Marxism and in structuralism (Marxist or not). The generalization was not unification.

The virtuality of the common ground should be further questioned as to its modal structure and the subject-object relationship this structure presupposed. One possibility will be to see Todorov's own motives as based on the goal to achieve knowledge (an intellective and thus a transmodal notion), knowledge what literature is and what is the role of language in its constitution. In short, a desire for knowledge. A modal notion directed at a transmodal one. A subject of desire who desires to become a subject of knowledge. The desire however cannot be achieved if possibility/ ability is lacking thereof, for possibility holds a more basic position in the hierarchy of modal notions and desire depends on it. In the context of the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s the possibility for such type of knowledge was threatened and it is not improbable that this gave Todorov another motive for siding with

Zarev. Such a siding was a possibilization of the achievement of desire. The price he had to pay was that he had to occupy a position which was no longer the subject position of his desire. It is hard to think that Zarev himself, like Todorov, wrote his article against structuralism because he wanted. It would be much more appropriate to say that he had to, it was his obligation or even duty, because he was a subject put in the place of an object-agent by the empty subject of power. Siding with Zarev meant that Todorov also had to abandon being a subject of desire and become an object-agent, a tool in a game it didn't matter he liked or even understood. He was, indeed, instrumentalized as the 1975 volume clearly shows. Of course, there were struggles between different *devoirs* in the ruling Party as well as among the functionaries in the University, but the point is that the level of obligation meant a different subject structure. In the force field of literary theory in Bulgaria the articulation of a strong theoretical position was possible only if subjected to some of the obligations that the association with dominant Party figures presupposed.²³ Notwithstanding the internal power struggles, these “network games” (Deyanova 2015) produced empty subjects of power to whom the real subjects were subjected by forms of obligations and duties. The subject of obligation turned out to be the true structure resulting from the virtualization and the reaching of common ground.

So there was modal conflict, a modal conflict between “I want” and “I must”, between desire and obligation. It is clear what the choice Todorov made was. He turned to a new particularization, writing almost exclusively in French but after 1973 to my knowledge publishing only in Bulgaria. It was a sort of self-isolation. And even to this day he remains a figure unknown to the wide academic circles in this country.

23

This hypothesis could provide another answer to the question posed by Boyan Manchev (1999) as to why the Bulgarian structuralists did not produce a general literary theory. It could have been a choice not to play if possible the institutional power game which would put them in the position of object-agents.

24

In this sense the Christo Todorov's case would confirm Boyan Manchev's observation that the problem of the clash between structuralism and institutionalized Marxism in Bulgaria was never conceptual. Cf. Manchev 1999.

If Todorov was faced with a modal conflict between desire and obligation, then it becomes obvious that the problem was neither methodological, nor conceptual, for a productive singularization of a Marxist-Guillaumist theory is thinkable.²⁴ It was a problem of becoming a subject and what kind of subject is one becoming. The dynamics of the modal conflict reveals at least one more thing beyond a possible explanation of the situation. It reveals the political stakes of Todorov's Guillaumist literary theory. The stake of theory (and of that particular theory) was to explicate the relationship between the modal and the transmodal notions and in a reflexive way to indicate the crux of transformation. The modal notions characterize the actions, the transmodal notions characterize the subject of action (Todorov 1985: 171–172) but theory is the point where the transmodal can have as its object the modal, a reflexive point where the desire to know leads to a knowledge of desire. And the theoretical knowledge of desire is simultaneously a knowledge of the tension, of the inherent tendencies within a given context. Every movement of singularization and universalization was a tensorial movement. The tensions opened up directions, directions for change, even if the change that actually happened to these particular scholars was not the one they were imagining. The appearance of the generality, the tense generality of Zarev-Todorov, was a product of a non-predetermined potentialization disclosing the immanent transformability of the field beyond the particular agents. Above, following Guillaume, I defined tension as the immanent progressive transformability of a state of affairs which gives a direction of change. The tension episodes of Bulgarian literary theory in the 1960s and the 1970s *made evident* – and here is the transmodality of *theory*, both perception and cognition, reflexively turned to the dynamics of the modal notions it rests on – the immanent transformability and the constant becoming

of subjects. Some chose to play the game and change it from inside. Some chose self-isolation. Some immigrated and others just kept on reading carefully literary works. But theory made it clear, it does so every time, that things can no longer be the same, that every status que is filled with tensions that eventually will change it. ♡

References

- BASINA, E., M. POLYAKOVA (eds), 1975: *Strukturalizm: za i protiv* [*Structuralism: pro and contra*], Moskva: Progress.
- BREMOND, CLAUDE, 1964: Le message narratif. *Communication* 4. 4–32.
- BREMOND, CLAUDE, 1966: La logique des possibles narratifs. *Communication* 8. 60–76.
- DEYANOVA, LILIANA, 2009: *Ochertania na malchanieto* [*Outlines of Silence*]. Sofia: Kritika I humanizam.
- DEYANOVA, LILIANA, 2015: Socialnite nauki v arhiva na Darzhavna sigurnost [The Social Sciences in the Archives of State Security]. *Sociologicheski problem* XLVII, 1–2. 134–153.
- GANDON, FRANCIS, ASSEN TCHAUCHEV (eds), 2007: *Langages* (“L’École guillaumienne de Bulgarie”), 165.
- GARNIZOV, VASSIL, 2017: Strukturalizm i kasen socializam [Structuralism and Late Socialism]. *Vekat na strukturalizma* [*The Century of Structuralism*]. Ed. Vassil Garnizov. Sofia: Nov bulgarski universitet. 178–252.
- GONCHAROVA, GALINA (ed.), 2013/2014: *The Academic (Under)Ground 1981–1989. A Special Issue of Piron Journal*. 8.
- GUILLAUME, GUSTAVE, 1970: *Temps et verbe suivi de L’Architectonique du temps dans les langues classique*. Paris: Libraire honoré Champion.
- GUILLAUME, GUSTAVE, 1973: *Langage et science du langage*. Paris: Librairie A.-G. Nizet.
- HIRTLE, WALTER, 2007: *Language in the Mind. An Introduction to Guillaume’s Theory*. Montréal: McGill-Queen’s University Press.

- JAKOBSON, ROMAN, 1972: *Poetika-Semiotika-Literaturoznanie. Razgovor* [Poetics-Semiotics-Literary Theory. An Interview]. *LIK* 48 (23 December 1972).
- KIOSSEV, ALEXANDER, 2009: *Istinskiat naslednik* [The Real Heir]. *Kritika I humanism* 29, 2. 145-174.
- LOTMAN, YURI (ED.), 1972: *Semiotika i isskustvometria* [Semiotics and Art-Measurement]. Moskva: Mir.
- MANCHEV, BOYAN, 1999: *Interpretatsii na ideologiatata, ideologii na interpretatsiata* [Interpretations of Ideology, Ideologies of Interpretation]. *Literaturna misal* 1. 5-30л
- MANCHEV, BOYAN, 2003: *Nevuobrazimoto* [The Inimaginable]. Sofia: New Bulgarian University.
- MANCHEV, BOYAN, 2018. Interview with the author, taken on 29 January 2018.
- MANTCHEV, KRASSIMIR, 1967: *Hiérarchie sémantique des verbes française contemporains. Cahiers de lexicologie*, 10: 31-46.
- MANTCHEV, KRASSIMIR, CHRISTO TODOROV, 1971: *Eléments d'idéogénie. Annuaire de l'Université de Sofia*, LXIV.
- MANTCHEV, KRASSIMIR, 1980: *Approche de l'idéogénèse*. Eds. André Joly, Walter H. Hirtle, *Langage et psychomécanique du langage*, Lille: Presses Universitaires de Lille.
- MANTCHEV, KRASSIMIR, 1998: *Sémiotique et Narratologie*. Sofia: University of Sofia Press.
- NEDELICHEV, MIHAIL, 2014. "Eskiz kam literaturovedski memoari" [A Sketch in view of the Memoirs of a Literary Theoretician]. *Nevidimata shkola* [The Invisible School]. Ed. Miglena Nikolchina et al. Sofia: *Literaturen vestnik*. 49-59.

- NEDELICHEV, MIHAIL, 2017. Kogato biah ‘mlad kritik-strukturalist’ [When I Was a ‘Young Structuralist Critic’]. *Vekat na strukturalizma* [The Century of Structuralism]. Ed. Vassil Garnizov. Sofia: Nov bulgarski universitet. 129–157.
- NEWTON, K. M., 1988: *Twentieth Century Literary Theory: A Reader*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- NIKOLCHINA, MIGLENA, 2011. Prochitat na komunisticheskoto nasledstvo mezhdurazplazvashtite I nabavyashtite se konteksti: Julia Kristeva and Vera M [Reading the Communist Legacy Between Dissolving and Accruing Contexts: Julia Kristeva and Vera M.]. *Sociologicheski problemi* XLIII. 3–4. 96–113.
- NIKOLCHINA, MIGLENA, 2013. *Lost Unicorns of the Velvet Revolution*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- NIKOLCHINA, MIGLENA, 2014: Inverted forms and Heterotopian Homonymy: Althusser, Mamardashvili, and the Problem of “Man”. *boundary 2*, 1. 79–100.
- POTTIER, BERNARD, 1976: Sur la formulation des modalités en linguistique. *Langages* 43. 39–46.
- RIVKIN, JULIE, MICHAEL RYAN (eds.), 1998: *Literary Theory: An Anthology*. Maiden, MA: Blackwell Publishings.
- SELLEN, RAMAN, 1985: *A Reader’s Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky.
- TODOROV, HRISTO, 1968: Logique et temps narratif. *Information sur les sciences sociales* VII, 6. 41–49.
- TODOROV, CHRISTO, 1971: La hiérarchie des liens dans le récit. *Semiotica* 2: 121–139.
- TODOROV, CHRISTO, 1973: Kritika na literaturovedskite vazgledi na Rolan Bart [A Critique of Roland Barthes’s Literary Views]. *Literaturna misul* 2: 10–28.

- TODOROV, CHRISTO, 1982: *Histoire de la littérature française XVIIIe – XXe s. Deuxième partie: La poésie*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.
- TODOROV, CHRISTO, 1985: *Etudes d'histoire de la littérature française (18–20 s.)*. Sofia: University of Sofia Press.
- TODOROV, CHRISTO, 2003: *La théorie opérative et la littérature française*. Veliko Tarnovo: Faber.
- TODOROVA, PETYA, 2012. *Kum istoriata na humanitaristikata ot vtorata polovina na 20 vek: bulgarskiat prinos za razvitiето na strukturalizma i poststrukturalizma (Tzvetan Todorov i Julia Kristeva)* [Toward a History of the Humanities in the second half of the 20th Century: the Bulgarian contribution for the development of structuralism and poststructuralism (Tzvetan Todorov and Julia Kristeva)]. Dissertation defended on 10 April 2012 at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.
- TOUSSANT, MAURICE, 1983: *Contre l'arbitraire du signe*. Paris: Didier Erudition.
- TRENDAFILOV, HRISTO, 2017: *Izvanstolichni nauchno-prosvetni centreve po vremeto na soc-a* [Scientific Enlightenment Centres Outside of the Capital City in the Socialist Times]. *Vekat na strukturalizma* [The Century of Structuralism]. Ed. Vassil Garnizov. Sofia: Nov bulgarski universitet. 158–167.
- VALIN, ROCH, 1954: *Petite introduction à la psychomécanique du langage*, Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval.
- WILMET, MARC, 1972: *Gustave Guillaume et son école linguistique*. Paris: Fernand Nathan, et Bruxelles: Labor.
- WINNER, THOMAS G., 1971: Introduction. In: Iu. M. Lotman, *Struktura khudozhestvennogo teksta*. Providence: Brown University Press. vii–x.

YANAKIEV, MIROSLAV, 1960: *Bulgarsko stihoznanie* [*Bulgarian Versification*]. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.

ZAREV, PANTELEI, 1969: *Strukturalizm, literaturoznanie i estetieski ideal* [*Structuralism, Literary Studies, and Aesthetic Ideal*]. Sofia: Balgarski pisatel.

ZNEPOLSKI, IVAYLO, 2017: Roland Barthes i Yuri Lotman: Semiotikata v Zapadna i Iztochna Evropa. Komparativni razmishlenia. [Roland Barthes and Yuri Lotman: Semiotics in Western and Eastern Europe. Comparative reflections]. *Vekat na strukturalizma* [*The Century of Structuralism*]. Ed. Vassil Garnizov. Sofia: Nov bulgarski universitet. 92–99.

Резюме

Развитието на структуралистски идеи в България съвпада с политиката на либерализация на хуманитарните и социални науки в страната и така от самото си начало се оказва въввлечено в множество дискусии, вътрешни и външни, както и част от все по-усложняващото се поле на литературознанието. В този контекст се появява и българската гийомистка шола, водена от езиковеда Красимир Манчев и литературоведа Христо Тодоров. Специализирали във Франция през шестдесетте, и двамата диалогизират повече с френските си колеги, пишат предимно на френски и почти изцяло пренебрегват в текстовете си българската среда. Сред малкото статии на Тодоров, написани на български, обаче се откроява една критика към Р. Барт от 1973 г., която се представя като критика на структурализма въобще и в която той взима страната на Пантелей Зарев, тогава ректор на Софийския университет, който още през 1969 вече е нападнал структуралистките тенденции навън и в страната от своите догматични хуманистично-марксистки позиции, функциониращи като официална позиция на БКП по въпроса за границите на позволеното в теорията. Въпреки че гийомизмът на Тодоров може да бъде видян като вид структурализъм и въпреки че изследователите, с които обсъжда идеите си по това време, са всичките структуралисти (А. Ж. Гремас, Кл. Бремон и т.н.), с тази своя статия той сякаш скрива този аспект на теориите си. Това съвсем не означава, че критиката му към Барт е повърхностно извинение за запознаване на българската публика с неговите трудове – напротив, става дума за сериозно несъгласие и добре обосновани аргументи, естествено изведени от гийомисткия подход. Може да се каже, че тази му работа се

намесва в един задълбочаващ се теоретичен разрив между Гремас и Барт, като сам Тодоров подкрепя негласно, но очевидно Гремас. Същевременно, с публикацията на български по странен начин не просто се указва към разрив в структурализма, но посредством това указване се разкрива и възможно разноречие в настоятелно неструктуралистичния български марксизъм. Въпреки това, шансът, който връзката с могъщата институционална фигура на Зарев дава, не изглежда да е бил привлекателен за Христо Тодоров, който следващите единадесет години спира да публикува в Литературна мисъл и се изолира повторно от по-широкия български контекст.


В настоящата статия се предлага хипотезата, че изборът на Христо Тодоров не се основава на концептуална невъзможност за теоретизиране, обединяващо марксистки и гийомистки предпоставки, а се дължи на модалности и модален преход от желание към дълг и задължение, описани в собствената му теория, при което се произвежда различен субект, „празен субект“ на властта, спрямо който реалният субект на действието ще бъде пасивен, сведен до обект-агент, инструментализиран. В този смисъл откъдето от бъдещо сътрудничество на Тодор има не концептуални, а модални основания.

Въпреки привидния неуспех на стратегията му, направеното от него ще е разкрило напрежения и възможности в онзи контекст, които дотогава не са били видими.

Darin Tenev

Darin Tenev is associate professor at the Literary Theory Department at the University of Sofia and at the Sociology and Humans Sciences Department at the University of Plovdiv. He is the director of the Institute of Critical Social Studies. He has published two books in Bulgarian – Fiction and Image. Models (2012) and Digressions. Essays on Jacques Derrida (2013), as well various articles on literary theory, model theory, deconstruction, and contemporary philosophy, among which the most recent are: “Jacques Derrida” in Oxford Bibliographies in Literary and Critical Theory; “Models of Poetics. A Response to Robert Matthias Erdbbeer’s Poetik der Modelle” in Textpraxis; “Modes of Fiction, Models of Fiction” in Literary Form. Theories – Dynamics – Cultures. Perspectives on Literary Modelling.

Varia



**Between the Sureness
of Theory and the Folly
of Literature. A commentary
to the reception of Saussure's
theory of language
(from Jakobson to Bagić)**

Между уверенностью теории
и безумием литературы.
Комментарий к восприятию
теории языка де Соссюра
(от Якобсона до Багича)

Rather small in number but highly influential works of the Swiss linguist still trigger fierce controversies and heated interpretation disputes. According to some researchers, de Saussure embodies a scientific paradigm and represents what in the humanities is most systematized and scientific while to others, he is an insane scientist secretly studying old poetry in order to discover meanings encoded in poems. The article sums up a hundred-year-old reception of the Genevan's thought in the literary studies and it explains anagrammatic poems dedicated to Saussure's theory.

STRUCTURALISM, ANAGRAMS,
POSTSTRUCTURALISM,
DECONSTRUCTION, GRAMMATOLOGY,
SEMIOLOGY, RECEPTION

Скромные по объему, но очень влиятельные достижения швейцарского лингвиста по-прежнему вызывают разногласия и страстные интерпретационные споры. Согласно одним исследователям де Соссюр воплощает научную парадигму и является представителем того, что в гуманитарных науках наиболее систематизировано и точно, для других – это скорее всего сумасшедший ученый, тайно изучающий древнюю поэзию для того, чтобы раскрыть секретное содержание, зашифрованное в стихотворениях. В статье подводятся итоги столетней рецепции мысли женева в литературоведении и обсуждаются анаграмматические стихи, посвященные теории де Соссюра.

СТРУКТУРАЛИЗМ, АНАГРАММЫ,
ПОСТСТРУКТУРАЛИЗМ,
ДЕКОНСТРУКЦИЯ, ГРАММАТОЛОГИЯ,
СЕМИОЛОГИЯ, РЕЦЕПЦИЯ

For several years we have been witnessing an increased interest in the works of Ferdinand de Saussure and in himself, which is not without a relation to two round anniversaries celebrated in 2013 and 2016. Both the 100th anniversary of the scholar's death and the 100th anniversary of the publication of the history's most famous linguistic compendium, which his *Course in General Linguistics* (*Cours de linguistique générale*) undoubtedly is, were commemorated in conferences and scientific sessions which took place almost all over the world as well as in numerous publications re-interpreting the works of the linguist from Geneva and outlining the up-to-now reception of his ideas. To be more specific, the reception which has been very stormy, "even adventurous and romantic" (Grzegorzczuk 2017: 77).

Rather small in number, especially taking into consideration papers which the author prepared to publish, but highly influential works of the Swiss linguist triggered and – as the latest publications show – still trigger such fierce controversies and such heated interpretation disputes that one cannot but have an impression as if the participants were not discussing the same scientist. According to some, he embodies a scientific paradigm and represents what in the humanities is most systematized and scientific while to others, he is an insane scientist secretly studying old poetry in order to discover meanings encoded in poems. Suffice to say, the "duality" or the "dualism" of Saussure ("Les deux Saussure", "la dualité saussurienne" [Calvet 1975: 46]) became a scientific problem which was discussed in separate papers, even at scientific conferences (Lotringer 1974). Following such rhetoric, one should add that from the perspective of over a hundred years' presence of the Genevan scholar's thought in the world science, it would be legitimate to hold a conference entitled "Four Saussures". The term "Saussure's theory of language" was defined in different ways by various

researchers at various stages and referred to four different text corpora which were presented to the world at long intervals.¹

The first and the most well-known Saussure would be the nominal author of the *Course in General Linguistics*, edited by Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye. Until 1957, when *The manuscript sources of the Course in General Linguistics by F. de Saussure (Les sources manuscrites du „Cours de linguistique générale” de F. de Saussure)* by Robert Godel was published, it had been the only source of the Saussurean theory of language which by that time had already changed the face of science and made the modest linguist from Geneva a legend. The second Saussure would be the author of the Genevan lectures on general linguistics which were the basis for the *Course*, but, as it was proved, were significantly distorted and radicalised² by the editors using students' notes. One can see the extent of the distortion by reading papers by Rudolf Engler or Eisuke Komatsu. The first researcher compared the text of the *Course*, four sets of notes of students and the notes of the professor himself by printing corresponding fragments in six columns (Engler 1968–1974).³ Each of the three volumes edited by Komatsu, on the other hand, presents both in English and in French the materials from one of the three series of the famous lectures on general linguistics delivered at the University of Geneva (Komatsu 1993–1999). The fact that the last words of the *Course* indicating “the fundamental idea” (*l'idée fondamentale*) of the whole book had never been uttered by the lecturer and were added by the editors encourages one to pose a question whether it is justified to call Saussure a structuralist. Let us recall those words fraught with consequences: “The true and unique object of linguistics is language studied in and for itself” (de Saussure 1959: 232) (“La linguistique a pour unique et véritable objet de la langue envisagée en elle-même et pour elle-même”). The continuators interpreted those words as a

1 Few Saussure's achievements, although important for the history of language, which preceded the publication of the *Course* are not discussed here since the extent of their influence has been very narrow. The main one is the book *Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles dans les langues indo-européennes* (1879), with which a very young author before his PhD attracted the attention of the experts.

2 The next stage of radicalization was in structuralism (Bédouret-Larraburu 2012: 28).

3 It is worth mentioning that Engler called Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye *author-editors* (Engler 2004: 46).

4
 “Dernier legs de l’héritage saussurien à nous être parvenu, avec un retard de cent ans, le manuscrit De l’essence double du langage jette aujourd’hui une lumière plus vive sur l’écart qui sépare, à cet égard, le Pseudo-Saussure du véritable Ferdinand de Saussure.”

demand for the autonomy of linguistics and took the encouragement to absolutise the systemic relations (*langue*) at the expense of their update in specific utterances (*parole*), which became the hallmark of structuralism.

The third and the fourth Saussures left the manuscripts of the linguist which were not published in his own lifetime and which showed a wide spectrum of his interests and formed two different thematic units. The analyses of old poetry revealed by Jean Starobinski (Starobinski 1964; Starobinski 1971), surrounded by an air of scandal and mystery, started to live their own life and made a spectacular career in the theory of literature. Looking for theme-words (*mot-thème*), especially names, hidden in the sound tissue of Vedic, Saturnian and New Latin poems which, as it turned out, were the other life of Saussure, who at the same time delivered lectures on general linguistics, was so inspiring that many people followed (Piekarski 2016: 219–242).

The theoretical and linguistic potential of sketches included in the *Writings in General Linguistics* (*Écrits de linguistique générale*, 2002) is being discovered today. There are opinions that in order to appreciate the substantive content of those materials, especially the work *On the Dual Essence of Language* (*De l’essence double du langage*), a real “philological revolution” should be staged (Depecker 2012). According to the co-editor of the *Writings*, Simon Bouquet, only the total re-definition of the up-to-now saussurology, especially the rejection of the hegemony of the *Course*, which created Pseudo-Saussures (Bouquet 2010b: 31–48), gives a chance that we will finally meet the real Saussure:

The last Saussurean heritage which arrived with a one hundred years’ delay, the manuscript *On the Dual Essence of Language*, sheds today a more vivid light on the difference which separates a Pseudo-Saussure from the real Ferdinand de Saussure.⁴ (Bouquet 2010a: 52)

Not all of the “four Sausures” mentioned here were equally important for the development of the literary studies. While it is impossible to imagine a modern theory of literature without the *Course* (the founding text of structuralism) and anagrams (psychoanalysis and post-structuralism), the notes from the lectures and the manuscripts, so important from the perspective of the history of linguistics as they help to discover the authentic views on language of one of the most important linguists of all time, have not been so significant for the literary research so far.⁵

It so happened that the most effective propagators of Sausurre’s ideas among literary scholars were a linguist Roman Jakobson (Jakobson 1987: 393–436; Jakobson 1971: 272–279) and a philosopher Jacques Derrida (Derrida 1967), who imposed their own conception of this theory on the scientific world (Skubaczewska-Pniewska 2013: 94–153).

Starting from the first mention in the brochure *Novejšaja russkaja poëzija* in Prague in 1921, through the famous definition of poetic function as the projection of “the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection into the axis of combination” to the statements from the early 1980s, Jakobson (1896–1982) developed Saussure’s ideas which governed each of his scientific endeavour and determined the direction of development of all structuralist schools. A set of terms of each centre was based on binary oppositions propagated in the *Course*: signifier–signified (*signifiant i signifié*), language–speaking (*langue–parole*), synchrony – diachrony (*synchronie–diachronie*), syntagmatic–associative relations (*rappports syntagmatiques–rappports associatifs*). The most universal (and “monopolistic”) from Jakobson’s proposals is the idea of two aspects of language which developed into two types of aphasia

5 On the other hand, anagrams which are so fascinating for literary scientists are rather ignored by linguists.

6 Jakobson began his scientific career in pre-revolutionary Russia, where he co-founded the Russian formal school and where he first heard (probably from Siergiej Karczewski) of the *Course*. He received a copy of the book from the editor Albert Sechehaye himself in 1920 while he was in Prague. In years 1933–1938 the structuralist was a professor at the university in Brno, then he spent two years in Scandinavia, from where he left for America in the early 1940s to deliver a series of lectures on the Saussurean theory at École Libre des Hautes Études in New York and then to take the chair in Slavic Languages at Columbia University. After that, Jakobson was a professor at Harvard and then at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

and the opposition of metaphor (paradigmatic plane, i.e. the axis of selection) and metonymy (operation on the syntagmatic axis, i. e. the axis of combination), and which were grounded in the functioning of two cerebral hemispheres where one is responsible for the proper use of contiguity relations and the other for correct associations. Such dichotomies categorise all artistic phenomena and all signs of activity and human behaviour.

What is important, Jakobson was one of the first to appreciate the theoretical and literary potential of the notes on anagrams. He would publish and comment on the correspondence between Saussure and Antoine Meillet, which coincided with his own “anagrammatic” analyses of Wielimir Chlebnikow’s poetry.

Frequent changes of place of living and connections of the author of *Linguistics and Poetics* with various universities helped to disseminate Saussure’s ideas not only in the Eastern and Western Europe, but, in fact, across the whole world.⁶ Not without significance was Jakobson’s considerable standing. It was through Jakobson that Levi-Strauss, Barthes, Kristeva, Lacan and, last but not least, Derrida assimilated Saussure’s thought.

In the book suggestively entitled *What if Derrida was wrong about Saussure?* one can read that “structuralism, circa 1966, needed the radical reappraisal that Derrida’s intervention provides” (Daylight 2012: 186). The intervention came about through the deconstruction of structuralism conducted in *Of Grammatology* (*De la grammatologie*, 1967). It should, however, be borne in mind that it was a part of a large-scale philosophical project on the deconstruction of logocentrism, i.e. philosophical structure which recognises existence as presence. Opposing that tradition, Derrida put himself in the position of an initiator of a new scientific era. Structuralism with its conviction that

everything could be presented systematically and described with binary oppositions which was at that time in its heyday seemed to be a relic of the previous era. When attacking it, a deconstructionist would break the scientific paradigm and undermine the cognitive optimism of the metaphysics of presence. The selection of the *Course in General Linguistics* as the subject of the analysis and simultaneously the source of inspiration for Derrida's most important categories seems strategic. Writing a somewhat anti-*Course*, the author made *Of Grammatology* a founding text of deconstruction and at the same time anti-logocentrism and anti-phonocentrism (and, of course, post-structuralism).⁷

The influence of Jacques Derrida's philosophical programme created in confrontation with Saussure's theory on the literary research is hard to overestimate. The programme is fully accomplished in the methods of text reading used by the theoreticians of literature at Yale University, the late literary analyses of Roland Barthes as well as the works by Julia Kristeva.

Derrida infers from the *Course* both the theory of meaning as dissemination (*dissémination*) and (indirectly) interpretation as misreading, but above of all, the most important deconstruction tool, i.e. the category of *différance*. The philosopher found an ally in Saussure because of his solely "negative" understanding of language expressed in the assumption of language as the system of differences, "in language there are only differences without positive terms" (de Saussure 1959: 120). Derrida assigned significant philosophical functions to Saussure's difference that he further clarified. He wanted to see it as a condition for the existence of language and a chance to cross the metaphysics of presence. In terms of the functioning of language, a denial of identity and presence by differentiation which is both difference and deferral (according to the meaning of the French verb *différer*) means a constant

7 Derrida's famous paper *Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences* (*La structure, le signe et le jeu dans le discours des sciences humaines*) delivered in Baltimore in 1966, commonly thought of as the inauguration of post-structuralism, is, in fact, the announcement of paradigm change while *Of Grammatology* can be treated as a manifesto.

deferral of the balanced meaning. It is connected with the re-interpretation of the structure of linguistic sign. Derrida reduces Saussure's dyadic sign to the signifier which cannot indicate the presence of the signified, but only the presence of other signifiers which produce an undisturbed movement of traces. In other words, the signified is nothing more than a trace which is always in the position of the signifier. While *différance* (with a silent "a") is an alternative to Saussure's *différence* (with an "e"), Derrida's grammatology is a counter-proposal to Saussure's semiology, in which "sign" has been replaced with "trace".

Différance treated as the basic mechanism governing the language allowed Derrida to deny the idea of the presence of the sign, its meaning and existence itself. He says that nothing can be present in itself since there are only differences and traces of traces. Although the author of *Of Grammatology* focuses here on highlighting contradictions in the *Course*, there is no doubt that he also did his homework on anagrams (Derrida 1967: 57).

While discussing the reception of Saussure's anagrammatic analyses, it is impossible not to mention the name of Julia Kristeva. The French-Bulgarian scientist noticed that they offered an opportunity to go beyond the current linguistic and literary concepts (Kristeva 1974: 239). She took that opportunity and proposed "semanalysis" and formulated the concept of the unconscious of the text based on a non-linear transversal process of meaning. Such a perspective opens the text to unlimited context and releases it from the reign of the subject and the author. As a combination of voices and codes, the text somewhat "produces" its meaning by itself. According to Kristeva, it begins in the network of phonic differences transversely arranged and comes out as a consequence of non-linear reading, i.e. as the unconscious of the text. What is more, Kristeva also spread another Saussurean term,

namely paragrams (*paragrammes*). She made it the basis for her own “semiology of paragrams” which, in fact, was one of the versions of post-structuralist theory of intertextuality (Kristeva 1969: 113–146).

Fascination with anagrams, however fruitful, has diverted the attention of literary scholars from Saussure’s other achievements and the findings of contemporary Saussurology. Being preoccupied with the fight against “Saussurism” (Gasparov 2013: 8) and searching for the true Saussure, it has brought out innovation from the manuscripts, so far absent in the literary research. The near future will show how and to what extent also the latest findings of Saussurologists shall inspire literary researchers, but meanwhile, let us look at the one hundred-year-old reception of the theory of the Genevan scholar from the angle of literature.

Among numerous texts dedicated to Saussure and his ideas, artistic expressions seem to stand out. A starting point for further deliberations are two poetic texts: the poem *la folie de saussure* by Krešimir Bagić and the lyrics of Magnetic Fields song *The Death of Ferdinand de Saussure*, which can also be analysed as a poem. On the one hand, those works are a testimony of the highest rank which in the scientific world is assigned to the linguist; on the other hand, they are a manifestation of demythologisation of that figure.

In 1999, Merge Records released a triple-album *69 Love Songs* of the American rock (more precisely, indie rock⁸) group Magnetic Fields. As the title says, it contains sixty-nine pieces written by the group lead singer, Stephin Meritt, dealing with various aspects of love in an ironic way. What is important, all the lyrics make a somewhat poetic treatise

8 Indie rock, sometimes called independent rock (indie comes from independent), is considered a type of alternative music.

on how the term and subject of love function in the artistic discourse and pop culture, especially in love songs. On the third record there is a piece *The Death of Ferdinand de Saussure*, a mourning ballad in tone. Merritt sings and sometimes melorecites his own lyrics in his characteristic bass voice and already in the first part the text touches upon the theory and philosophy of language and exposes the weaknesses of structuralism, and even science in general.

*I met Ferdinand de Saussure
 On a night like this
 On love he said
 “I’m not so sure
 I even know what it is
 No understanding
 No closure
 It is a nemesis
 You can’t use a bulldozer
 To study orchids”*

Saussure, referred to in the lyrics, is an icon of linguistics, i.e. a researcher made famous by the *Course in general linguistics*. It was the book published by Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye under Saussure’s name (1857–1913) in 1916 that brought the assumed author posthumous fame, who soon became one of the most influential scholars of the century. It is said that Saussure’s impact on different scientific fields equalled in strength to that of Freud and Marx, and his innovativeness to that of Galileo or Copernicus. In fact, the influence of Saussurean concept of language, and more precisely, structuralism, out of which the theory was born, spread from philosophy, through ethnology,

history and sociology, to biology while the Genevan's breakthrough in thinking of language is often compared to Copernican revolution:⁹

For just as Copernicus had claimed that the Earth rotated about the Sun, instead of the Sun rotating about the Earth, Saussure claims something analogous in the case of language. [...] Instead of seeing words as mere adjuncts to our grasp of reality, Saussure saw our understanding of reality as depending essentially upon our social use of the verbal signs which constitute the language we use. Human existence is, by definition, a linguistically articulated existence. (Harris, Taylor 1994: 177).

⁹ And it is not the only scientific revolution (as defined by Thomas Kuhn) connected with the gradual discovering of Saussure's achievements (Aron 1970; Dziadek 2001; Skubaczewska-Pniewska 2017).

What is more, it should be remembered that structuralism aspired to belong to the sciences while the structuralist methodology, directly deriving from the *Course*, functioned as a reliable tool that could be used to systematize everything, starting from language, through literature and art to the structures of kinship. Semiology, on the other hand, also projected in the *Course* (with Peirce's semiotics), developed into a meta-language integrating different fields of knowledge. Semioticians of culture shared an assumption based on the *Course* that linguistic signs make a universal pattern which helps to understand the functioning of all other sign systems and the verbocentric view on culture where the natural language is the matrix and the linguistics is the scientific "base".

Therefore, Saussure's helplessness, who in the song by Magnetic Fields cannot answer what love is, and what is more, denies the sole possibility of explaining the essence of that feeling, is more meaningful than if there were any other scholar in his position.

It is the scientificity and systemicity of structuralism, the "bulldozer" of the humanities, that shuts it off from the delicate and

beautiful “orchid” of feelings. The sole existence of the escaping rationalisation and disambiguation (“No understanding” / “No closure”) of love seem to be gods’ revenge (“nemesis”), a punishment for the arrogance of the scientist, who achieved his success at the expense of simplifying the reality.

The lyrics of the refrain based on an anti-thesis, syntactic parallelism and numerous lexical and phonetic repetitions are assigned to Saussure and even more highlight the cognitive futility of artificial systems and formal schemes.

He said...
So we don't know anything
You don't know anything
I don't know anything
About love
But we are nothing
You are nothing
I am nothing
Without love

As far as the content plane is concerned, the refrain boils down to ascertaining ignorance about what is the most important and what makes us humans while formally (the expression plane) it resembles a grammar exercise (inflection system). There is no need to remind that the dichotomy of expression plane and content plane which is the basis of literary structuralism updates the Saussurean opposition of *signifiant-signifié*. According to the structuralist theory of language, the meaning as *signifié* is an intra-language element, words have meanings only because of structural relations, being mutually entangled.

Thus, there is no specified meaning, idea or content in the term “love”. Everything that can be said about love is closed in the structure of language, and in the language there are only differences after all.

The title death of Saussure mentioned in the next part of the song has – as it could be said – an ironic-autothematic dimension. Shooting at the linguist, the composer as if acts in the name of the whole music industry, here represented by the song-writing team Holland-Dozier-Holland,¹⁰ which created for the famous record company of Motown such hits of the group Supremes as *Baby Love* or *Stop! In the Name of Love*.

10
What is meant is
Lamont Dozier and
bothers Brian and
Eddie Holland

*I'm just a great composer
And not a violent man
But I lost my composure
And I shot Ferdinand
Crying "it's well and kosher
To say you don't understand
But this is for Holland-Dozier-Holland"*

Conspicuous in the lyrics are the phonetic efforts relating to Saussure which he called anagrams, but here the proper name is not so much coded as exposed. Merritt plays with Saussure's last name by rhyming composer/composure, but most of all by emphasizing sound similarity between Saussure and so sure as well as the name Ferdinand and the verb understand. As a lead singer, Merritt emphasises the sureness included in the name of the precursor of structuralism by saying, or rather signing, in English “Saussure” and “so sure”. To be more precise, the area of phonetic similarities in specific verses is bigger and includes contradictions as well: “I met Ferdinand de Saussure”/“I'm not so sure, „shot Ferdinand”/ “don't understand”. Similarly, the tension

between sureness and unsureness concerns the scientific direction of the Genevan. The *Course in General Linguistics*, signed with the name of Saussure, is an arbitrarily imposed set of rules and definitions which were long taken for granted. In the meantime, the manuscripts as well as the memories of the family and colleagues show a portrait of a scientist who carefully poses questions and is far from final conclusions (Joseph 2012: 361–362). Saussure’s fascination with anagrammatic poetry was also accompanied by hesitation about the status and extent of the phonetic repetitions he had noticed. As everybody knows, the linguist gave up his very advanced research on anagrams because he had not obtained any answer to the question on their usefulness and intentionality, and he was not sure if they were the basis of poetry or rather the outcome of coincidence. This unsureness is shared by many of his followers: “Unfortunately, I do not think there can be a definitive resolution to the question of the anagram’s reality” (Gronas 2009: 188).

A doubtful existence of anagrams together with the scientist’s determination in searching for them not only undermined his image of a serious scientist, but also gave rise to a legend “about an insane professor from Geneva” (Panas 2005: 46), vacillating “between knowledge and delirium” (“entre savoir et délire” [Pierssens 1979: 52]). The motif of the insanity of the structuralist, obsessed with identifying phonetic repetitions (“In his obsession Saussure found anagrams everywhere” [Gronas 2009: 162]) returned in the poem by Krešimir Bagić *la folie de Saussure* (Bagić 2013: 80). It returned literally as the Croatian writer and literary scholar decided to repeat the title of the essay which had given rise to the “psychiatric” way of speaking of the Genevan (Deguy 1969: 20–26). The poet also quoted a title formula from of a famous publication by Starobinski, “words below words” (*Les mots sous les mots*). As in Stephin Merritt’s lyrics, in Bagić’s poem we can

find anagrammatic puns with Saussure's last name, but they are very difficult to notice in translation. (Majdzik 2015: 101–102). In order not to risk a more detailed analysis, let me only quote one couplet which could be treated as the shortest summary possible of the up-to-now presence of the Swiss linguist in science.

words are below words
at the end de Saussure (Bagić 2013: 80)¹¹

History has gone full circles. At the beginning, there was the *Course*, the “Vulgate of Saussurim” (“vulgate du saussurisme”) (Rastier 2009), a text without the author which put linguistics on the pedestal of science, then anagrams showing that there is a secret behind every text. Today's saussurology promises to present the authentic Saussure and create perspectives for the development of the true Saussurean linguistics. Let us hope that this time it succeeds in eluding Saussure's “dead-ends” which “predict dead-ends in linguistics” (Todorov 2011: 302).✂

11
 „riječi su pod riječima” / „na koncu će de saussure”.

References

- ARON, THOMAS, 1970: Une seconde révolution saussurienne. *Langue française*. No 7.
- BAGIĆ, KREŠIMIR, 2013: la folie de Saussure. *Plaši li te moja boja*. Zagreb: Meandarmedia.
- BÉDOURET-LARRABURU, Sandrine, 2012: Littérature et linguistique: quelle place pour Saussure?. *En quoi Saussure peut-il nous aider à penser la littérature?* Eds. S. Bédouret-Larraburu, G. Prignitz. Pau: Presses de l'Université de Pau et des Pays de l'Adour.
- BOUQUET, SIMON, 2010a: D'une épistémologie néosaussurienne de la linguistique à la question de l'universalité des droits de l'homme. *RIFL*. No 3.
- BOUQUET, SIMON, 2010b: Du Pseudo-Saussure aux textes saussuriens originaux. Le projet de Ferdinand de Saussure. Eds. J.-P. Bronckart, E. Bulea, C. Bota, Genève : Droz.
- CALVET, LOUIS-JEAN, 1975: *Pour et contre Saussure: vers une linguistique sociale*. Paris: Payot.
- DAYLIGHT, RUSSELL, 2012: *What if Derrida was wrong about Saussure?* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- DEGUY, MICHEL, 1969: La folie de Saussure. *Critique*. No 260.
- DEPECKER, LOÏC, 2012: Les manuscrits de Saussure: une révolution philologique. *Langages*. No 185.
- DZIADEK, ADAM, 2001: Anagramy Ferdynanda de Saussure'a – historia pewnej rewolucji. *Teksty Drugie*. No 6.
- ENGLER, RUDOLF, (ED.), 1968–1974: Saussure, Ferdinand, de, *Cours de linguistique générale*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

- ENGLER, RUDOLF, 2004: The Making of the „Cours de linguistique générale”. Trans. M. Pires, C. Sanders. *The Cambridge Companion to Saussure*. Ed. C. Sanders. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GASPAROV, BORIS, 2013: *Beyond Pure Reason: Ferdinand de Saussure’s Philosophy of Language and Its Early Romantic Antecedents*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- GRONAS, MICHAIL, 2009: Just what word did Mandel’shtam forget? A mnemopoetic solution to the problem of Saussure’s anagrams. *Poetics Today*. Vol. 30. No 2.
- GRZEGORCZYK, ANNA, 2017: „Presemiotyczneraje” a koncepcja Ferdinanda de Saussure’a. *Kurs na Ferdinanda de Saussure’a*. Ed. A. Grzegorzcyk, A. Kaczmarek, K. Machtyl. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza.
- HARRIS, ROY, TAYLOR, Talbot J., 1994: *Landmarks in linguistic thought: the western tradition from Socrates to Saussure*, London: Routledge.
- JAKOBSON, ROMAN, 1971: Zeichen und System der Sprache. *Selected Writings*. Vol. 2. The Hague: Mouton & Co.
- JAKOBSON, ROMAN, 1987: La théorie saussurienne en retrospection. *Selected Writings*. Vol. 8. Ed. S. Rudy, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- JOSEPH, JOHN E., 2012: *Saussure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press,
- KOMATSU, EISUKE, (Ed.), 1993–1999: Saussure, Ferdinand, de, *Premier Cours de linguistique générale (1907): d’après les cahiers d’Albert Riedlinger*. Trans. G. Wolf; *Deuxieme Cours de linguistique générale (1908–1909)*. Trans. G. Wolf: d’après les cahiers d’Albert Riedlinger et Charles Patois; *Troisieme Cours de linguistique générale (1910–1911): d’après les cahiers d’Emile Constantin*. Trans. R. Harris, Oxford: Elsevier Science.

- KRISTEVA, JULIA, 1969: *Sēmēiōtiké. Recherches pour une sémanalyse*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- KRISTEVA, JULIA, 1974: *La révolution du langage poétique*, Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- LOTRINGER, SYLVÈRE (ED.), 1974: Les deux Saussure. *Recherches Sémiotexte*. No. 16.
- MAJDZIK, KATARZYNA, 2015: Lektura anagramatyczna a przekład (zmagania translatorskie z wierszem Krešimira Bagicia *la folie de saussure*). *Przekłady Literatur Słowiańskich*. Vol 6. Part 1.
- PANAS, WŁADYSŁAW, 2005: Lekcja profesora Arendta. *Tajemnica siódmego anioła. Cztery interpretacje*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- PIEKARSKI, IRENEUSZ, 2016: *Strategie lektury podejrzliwej*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- PIERSSENS, MICHEL, 1979: Le signe et sa folie. Le dispositif Mallarmé/Saussure. *Romantisme*. No 25-26.
- RASTIER, FRANÇOIS, 2009: Saussure et les textes. *Texto! Textes et cultures*. Vol. 14. [<http://www.revue-texto.net/10.03.2018>].
- SAUSSURE, FERDINAND, DE, 1959: *Course in general linguistics*. Eds. Ch. Bally and A. Sechehaye in collaboration with A. Riedlinger. Trans. Introduction and notes W. Baskin. New York: Philosophical Library.
- SKUBACZEWSKA-PNIEWSKA, ANNA, 2013: *W więzieniu systemu. Ferdinand de Saussure a teoria literatury*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika.
- SKUBACZEWSKA-PNIEWSKA, ANNA, 2017: „Mimesis” czy „semiosis”, czyli o potrzebie trzeciej rewolucji saussure’owskiej. *Kurs na Ferdinanda de Saussure’a*. Ed. A. Grzegorzcyk, A. Kaczmarek, K. Machtył. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza.

- STAROBINSKI, JEAN, 1964: Les anagrammes de Ferdinand de Saussure, textes inédites. *Mercure de France*. No 2.
- STAROBINSKI, JEAN, 1971: *Les mots sous les mots: Les anagrammes de Ferdinand de Saussure*. Paris: Gallimard.
- TODOROV, TZVETAN, 2011: *Teorie symbolu*. Trans. T. Stróżyński. Gdańsk: słowo/obraz terytoria.

Anna Skubaczewska-Pniewska

Anna Skubaczewska-Pniewska (Anna Skubachevska-Pnevskaja) – an assistant professor at the Institute of Polish Literature, Nicolaus Copernicus University in Torun (Poland), the head of the Literary Theory Unit. The author of the monographs in Polish: On Different Understanding of a Literary Work of art. Selected twentieth century literary theories versus factuality of a literary work of art (2006), In the Prison of System. Ferdinand de Saussure and theory of literature (2013); co-editor and co-author of the following books: The Theory of Carnivalization. Contexts and interpretations (1999, 2011), Literary Allusion. Theory – Interpretations – Contexts (2007), Self-Conscious Poetry. Interpretations of Authotematic Poems (2009), The Theory of Literature in the Light of Linguistics (2011), From Lem to Sienkiewicz (with Ingarden in the Background) (2017). Research interests: theoretical poetics, the methodology and history of literary criticism, the theory of the novel, intertextuality.



Das slowenische Gesicht:
Literarische Reportage über
Auswandereridentitäten
The Slovene Face: a Literary
Reportage on Emigrant Identities

Der Beitrag befasst sich mit dem Werk *Das slowenische Gesicht* (*Slovenski obraz*) der slowenischen Autorin Brina Svit. Einleitend wird auf die Problematik der hybriden Form des Werkes hingewiesen und das Werk als eine literarische Reportage definiert. Anschließend widmet sich der Beitrag dem Hauptthema der Auswandereridentität. Die Frage der Auswandereridentität, vor allem aber deren Bewahrung, wird im *Slowenischen Gesicht* aus drei Perspektiven dargestellt, und zwar aus der Perspektive der Erzählerin, der argentinischen Slowenen und des polnischen Schriftstellers Witold Gombrowicz. Dem letzteren weist die Erzählerin eine wichtige Rolle zu, da er als Außenstehender dem Slowenentum nicht unmittelbar verbunden ist, dafür aber das Emigrantenschicksal mit den ausgewanderten Slowenen teilt. Sie fasst die Gedanken aus Gombrowicz' Tagebüchern und dessen Briefwechsel zusammen und kommentiert sie, um abschließend ein polyphones Konzept von Identität hervorzuheben.

BRINA SVIT, DAS SLOWENISCHE GESICHT (*SLOVENSKI OBRAZ*), WITOLD GOMBROWICZ, ARGENTINISCHE SLOWENEN, EMIGRATION, IDENTITÄT, AUTOBIOGRAPHISCHER DISKURS, LITERARISCHE REPORTAGE

This contribution is focused on *The Slovene face* (*Slovenski obraz*), a literary reportage written by the Slovene writer Brina Svit. Having defined *Slovenski obraz* as “literary reportage”, this article especially takes into consideration the challenges of genre hybridity and focuses on emigrant identity as the main topic of Svit’s work. The reportage namely looks at the question of identity – especially the preservation of its components – from three different perspectives: the point of view of the narrator; of the Argentinians of Slovene descent; and that of the Polish writer Witold Gombrowicz. The latter is given an important role in the reader’s perception of the entire story. He is an “outsider”, not ravelled into web of the Slovene identity, yet still has the experience of emigrant life and can therefore relate to many of its aspects. The narrator quotes and comments on his thoughts – as he voiced them in his diaries and correspondence – in order to support a final realization about the polyphonic character of identity.

BRINA SVIT, *THE SLOVENE FACE* (*SLOVENSKI OBRAZ*), WITOLD GOMBROWICZ, ARGENTINES OF SLOVENE DESCENT, EMIGRANTS, IDENTITY, AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL DISCOURSE, LITERARY REPORTAGE

1
Der Roman wurde auch ins Deutsche übersetzt: *Con brio: ein Liebesroman*. Aus dem Slowenischen von Astrid Philippsen und Nadja Tomšič übersetzt. Wien: P. Zsolnay, 1998, Nachdruck 2002.

2
Der Roman wurde auch ins Deutsche übersetzt: *Moreno: eine richtige Liebesgeschichte*. Aus dem Französischen von Judith Klein übersetzt. München: C. H. Beck, 2005.

Die slowenische Schriftstellerin Brina Švigelj-Mérat (1954), die unter dem Pseudonym Brina Svit schreibt, lebt seit Anfang der 80er Jahren in Paris. Sie schreibt vor allem Romane wie *April* (1984), *Gewöhnliche Verhältnisse* (*Navadna razmerja*, 1998, in Koautorenschaft mit Peter Kolšek), *Con brio* (1998),¹ *Der Tod der slowenischen Primadonna* (*Smrt slovenske primadone*, 2000), *Moreno* (2003),² *Überflüssig das Herz* (*Odveč srce*, 2006), *Coco dias oder Goldene Tür* (*Coco dias ali Zlata vrata*, 2008), *Nacht in Reykjavik* (*Noč v Reykjaviku*, 2013), und Essays bzw. Kurzprosa, z. B. *Loblied auf die Trennung* (*Hvalnica ločitvi*, 2011) und *Das slowenische Gesicht* (*Slovenski obraz*, 2014). Silvija Borovnik (38–45) stellt in ihrer Analyse fest, dass die wiederkehrenden Hauptthemen der Prosawerke von Brina Svit Identität, Multikulturalität und Interkulturalität sind. Die Themen entspringen der eigenen Migrationserfahrung und den Übergängen zwischen den Kulturen und Sprachen. Das ist charakteristisch nicht nur für die biographische Realität (zwischen Frankreich und Slowenien) und ihre literarischen Topoi, sondern betrifft auch ihren Sprachgebrauch: Nach dem langjährigen Aufenthalt in Frankreich ist das Slowenische nicht mehr die ausschließliche Sprache, in der sie schreibt. Mit dem Roman *Tod der slowenischen Primadonna* (2000) beendete die Autorin die Phase, in der sie sich ausschließlich in der Muttersprache ausdrückte. Seit dem Jahre 2003, mit der Veröffentlichung des Romans *Moreno*, der sich auch inhaltlich mit dem Thema des Wechsels der Sprachidentität befasst (Rožič: 89–96), verfasst Brina Svit ihre Werke zuerst in Französisch und überträgt sie dann ins Slowenische.

Das Buch *Das slowenische Gesicht* ist das sechste Werk, das die Autorin in Französisch geschrieben und in Frankreich veröffentlicht hat (*Visage slovène*, 2013), um es dann erneut zu bearbeiten bzw. ins Slowenische zu übertragen (2014): „Was wiederum bedeutet, dasselbe

Buch noch einmal zu schreiben, es aus einer Sprache in die andere zu übertragen mit der Freiheit der Gestaltung, die die Autorenschaft bietet, die Dinge auf Slowenisch doch etwas anders auszudrücken, wie man es sonst auf Französisch zu tun pflegt” (Svit: 9).

HYBRIDE LITERARISCHE GATTUNG

Das *slowenische Gesicht* besteht aus 15 nicht nummerierten Kapiteln. Das erste Kapitel besteht aus dem Vorwort, im zweiten schildert die Autorin die Vorbereitungen und Begleitumstände des Schreibens, in den anschließenden dreizehn Kapiteln werden die literarisierten persönlichen Erzählungen der Slowenen über die Emigration nach Argentinien wiedergegeben. Jede Geschichte wird mit einem Porträtfoto des Informanten, der berichtenden Person oder deren Verwandten bzw. Freunden, ergänzt, die der Erzählerin von dem Lebensweg und der Lebenseinstellung berichten.

Die biographischen Ausschnitte in der Beschreibung der argentinischen Slowenen sind im *Slowenischen Gesicht* mit den Beobachtungen der Erzählerin und derer subjektiven Wahrnehmung der beschriebenen Personen und deren argentinischer Lebensräume sowie der Problematik von Emigration und Identität verflochten. Darüber hinaus enthält die Erzählung auch persönliche Erfahrungen der Erzählerin/Autorin (z. B. der Tod ihrer Mutter) und metanarrative Elemente: Im Vorwort (*Vorwort über die Treue*) und im ersten Kapitel (*Wo soll man beginnen?*) erläutert die Erzählerin die Idee zum Schreiben, das Zusammentragen des Materials und die Entstehung des Buches, das Hauptthema und die Struktur des Werkes. Einzelne Erzählungen werden mit Kommentaren über das Zusammentragen der Informationen, den Treffen mit den Informanten und der Schilderung der Entstehung

3

Wenn sich der Beitrag auf die außenliterarische Person Witold Gombrowicz bezieht, benutze ich den Nachnamen des Schriftstellers. Wo es sich um die innenliterarische Person handelt, wird die von der Erzählerin verwendete Bezeichnung Gombro benutzt.

der Porträtfotos ergänzt. Die dritte Erzählebene betrifft die Figur, die von der Erzählerin Gombro genannt wird, und bezieht sich auf die außenliterarische Persönlichkeit, den polnischen Schriftsteller Witold Gombrowicz (1904–1969).³

Alle drei narrativen Ebenen sind eng mit der außenliterarischen, historischen Realität der argentinischen Slowenen, die mit tatsächlichen Namen genannt und mit Porträtfotos gezeigt werden, der Bezugnahmen auf Gombrowicz' Tagebücher und dessen Korrespondenz sowie mit Tatsachen aus dem Leben der Autorin/Erzählerin verbunden. Allerdings wird dies alles nicht dokumentarisch und objektiv, sondern aus der Perspektive der Erzählerin dargeboten. Darum geht es auch nicht primär um eine (Auto)Biographie bzw. ein Werk, das auf dem sog. autobiographischen Pakt beruht. Die Geschichten der argentinischen Slowenen werden fragmentarisch und nicht chronologisch dargestellt; sie stellen Einträge der Erzählerin dar, die sich mit den einzelnen Personen zumeist nur einmal und auch nur für eine begrenzte Zeit traf. Die Erzählerin notiert deren persönliche Aussagen entsprechend ihrer subjektiven Perzeption und vermittelt sie in literarisierter Form, mit Gedankendigressionen bzw. essayistischen Einlagen, und kommentiert sie anhand ihrer eigenen Lebenserfahrungen oder übernimmt Ansichten aus Gombrowicz' Werken. Der Bezug auf die außenliterarische Realität auf allen drei narrativen Ebenen ordnet das Werk in den autobiografischen Diskurs ein, der in der Literaturwissenschaft als ein Geflecht von Realität und Fiktion definiert wird und auf keine bloße dokumentarische Präsentation der Tatsachen beschränkt bleibt (Čeh: 23–27; Zlatar Violać: 24–28). Im autobiografischen Diskurs gibt es keinen autobiographischen Pakt, der nach Philippe Lejeune (*On autobiography*, 1989) von der Identität des Erzählers bzw. Autors und des Protagonisten ausgeht.

Das slowenische Gesicht kann aus oben genannten Gründen nicht als (Auto)Biographie oder als eine traditionelle literarische Form wie z. B. Roman oder Kurzgeschichte bezeichnet werden. Ebenfalls unzutreffend ist die Bezeichnung als eine halbliterarische Form wie z. B. Essay, oder als nicht literarische Form, wie z. B. Reportage oder Reisebericht. Nach der Aussage von Brina Svit handelt es sich um ein Geflecht von literarisierten Zeugnissen, Geschichten, Essay und Fotoreportage (vgl. Interview, Šučur, 2015). Die Erzählerin des *Slowenischen Gesichts* bezeichnet das Werk als „ein Gruppenporträt mit Gombro“ und meint, dass es sich um einen „Text (handelt), bei dem das Genre schwierig zu bestimmen“ und der „im Entstehung begriffen sei“ und der „eine Geschichte der Vertriebenen und Auswanderer erzählt und über deren Identität nachdenkt“ (Svit: 113). In der Literaturkritik und Publizistik wird das Werk folgendermaßen bezeichnet: Eine Reisebeschreibung der Lebensgeschichten slowenischer Auswanderer in Argentinien, eine Porträtsammlung mit den Fotos der Autorin (Rugelj: 105, 106), ein Buch der Gesichter (vgl. Radaljac, 2015), ein Roman und Essay über die Identität (vgl. K. M., 2013), eine literarische Reportage mit essayistischen Elementen (Kolšek: 15), eine literarische Ethnobiographie (Potisk: 108). Die letzte Bezeichnung entstammt der Anthropologie und bezeichnet die Schreibform, in der der Forscher und/oder der Erzähler ein immanenter Teil der Erzählung ist, wobei er sich der Doppelrolle der Akteure, die er beschreibt, und seiner selbst als Forscher bewusst ist. Die Ethnobiographie bezieht sich im nichtliterarischen Sinne sowohl auf die autobiographische Erzählung des Ethnographen über seine eigene Arbeit als auch auf die Arbeit eines Anthropologen, der eine Gruppe erforscht, der auch er selbst angehört. Im literarischen Sinne schließlich stellt aber die Ethnobiographie einen Erinnerungstext dar, der auch ethnographische Elemente des Erzählerumfeldes

miteinbezieht (Reed-Danahay 2017: 145). Die Erzählerin des *Slowenischen Gesichts* erforscht die Gruppe, der sie zwar indirekt angehört (Slowenen, Auswanderer), obwohl sich ihr Emigrationsmotiv sehr von dem, das die slowenischen Emigranten nach Südamerika vertrieb, unterscheidet. Sie interessiert sich für die Menschen, ihre gesellschaftliche und geistige Kultur. Die Erzählung darüber vermittelt sie aber in literarisierter Form, die von Martina Potisk nach D. Reed-Danahay mit dem Terminus „literarische Ethnobiographie“ bezeichnet wird.

Im wissenschaftlichen Diskurs, z. B. in der Studie über die autobiographische Erfahrung in den Werken slowenischer Schriftstellerinnen (Rožič: 104), wird für *Das slowenische Gesicht* die literarische Form des Romans gewählt, während Niko Jež (2017) die Bezeichnung Essay mit Merkmalen der literarischen Reportage benutzt. Zmago Šmitek (377–381) gibt bei der Definition der literarischen Reportage folgende Merkmale an: In der literarischen Reportage werden der objektive Weg und die Ereignisse mit den subjektiven Erlebnissen konfrontiert; beide Bilder sind Spiegelungen der Subjekterlebnisse; genauso ist die Auswahl der beschriebenen Ereignisse und deren Rekonstruktion persönlich bedingt und durch die literarisierte Beschreibung widergegeben. Die Erzählerin des *Slowenischen Gesichts* fokussiert in ihrer Reportage auf die Problematik der Wahrung von Identität, sei es der slowenischen oder der polnischen, und versucht auf diese Weise einen übergeordneten Blick auf die verschiedenen Zugehörigkeiten zu gewinnen.

IDENTITÄT

Das Thema der Identität, vor allem deren Verständnis und Bewahrung bzw. Suche wird im *Slowenischen Gesicht* aus drei Perspektiven

beleuchtet: aus der Emigrantenperspektive der Slowenen in Argentinien, der Perspektive der Erzählerin und aus einer dritten Perspektive, die durch Gombrowicz' Identitäts- und Nationalitätsauffassung bestimmt ist, die in dessen *Tagebüchern* und dessen Briefwechsel zum Ausdruck kommt. Alle drei Perspektiven sind durch die persönliche Erfahrung der Emigration geprägt, allerdings sind die Erzählungen und Überzeugungen der argentinischen Slowenen und Gombrowicz nicht unmittelbar aus deren Sicht, sondern aus der Perspektive der Erzählerin wiedergegeben, die Akzente setzt und kommentiert.

Migrationen werden in theoretischen Studien als eine Ortsveränderung der Einzelpersonen oder Gruppen verstanden, wobei die Ortsveränderung dauerhaft oder vorübergehend sein kann. Impliziert sind dabei Veränderungen des sozialen Umfelds, der Gesellschaftsbeziehungen, der Kultur, Identität, zwischenmenschlicher Interaktion, der Normen, des Wertsystems, der Bedürfnisse, Institutionen usw. (Moric 2016: 36, 37; Klinar: 15–49). Die Gründe für die Ortsveränderung sind entweder extern (wirtschaftlich, politisch, sozial) oder entstammen innerer Entscheidung.⁴ Die Erzählerin des *Slowenischen Gesichts* entschied sich für Umsiedlung aus Slowenien nach Frankreich freiwillig. Sie hält Kontakte mit der Heimat weiterhin regelmäßig aufrecht. Zugleich aber hat sie das Leben in einer multikulturellen Stadt übernommen und sich in die neue Umgebung dermaßen integriert, dass sie bei ihrer Arbeit, dem literarischen Schaffen, nicht mehr nur die slowenische, sondern auch die französische Sprache benutzt. Während ihre Migration individuell und freiwillig ist, war die Umsiedlung der Slowenen, die im Werk auftreten, größtenteils erzwungen. Slowenen emigrierten nach Argentinien in größerer Zahl (Gruppenmigration) entweder zwischen den beiden Kriegen wegen der Armut und des Faschismus (vor allem aus der Region Primorska bzw. Küstenland) oder

4 Es bestehen verschiedene Klassifizierungen und Definitionen der Migration. Klinar (32–49) teilt die Migrationen z. B. in innere und internationale, und diese wiederum in wirtschaftliche, politische, permanente und temporäre, organisierte und nicht organisierte, freiwillige und erzwungene, konservative und innovative Migrationen und Braindrain. Die Haupttheorien der erzwungenen und freiwilligen Migrationen fasst z. B. Moric (2016: 38–46) zusammen

sie wanderten nach Südamerika nach dem zweiten Weltkrieg aus, weil sie wegen ihrer antikommunistischen Haltung in der Heimat verfolgt wurden. In Argentinien bauten sie ihr neues Zuhause auf, wenngleich sie weiterhin eine starke Zugehörigkeit zum Slowenentum bewahrten. Sie bilden eine sog. Diaspora, eine nationale Gemeinschaft, die sich auf dem Gebiet einer anderen Nation niedergelassen hat. Das wesentliche Element ihrer Identität bleibt dabei nach wie vor die starke Erinnerung an die „verlorene Heimat“ und folglich das Festhalten an der nationalen Identität. Während die traditionellen Definitionen der Diaspora voraussetzen, dass die Diaspora-Mitglieder sich nicht gänzlich in die neue Umgebung integrieren, schreiben die neuen Auffassungen der Diaspora eine Hybridität von Kultur zu, also eine Möglichkeit der Integration, bei der aber die ursprüngliche Kultur aufrechterhalten und immer wieder erneuert wird (Moric 2014: 83).

Die Art und Weise, wie die Identität der Angehörigen der slowenischen Diaspora in Argentinien bewahrt und verstanden wird, vermittelt die Erzählerin durch die Erzählungen der auftretenden Gestalten. Für die erste Generation der slowenischen Einwanderer in Südamerika ist die Identität einer der wichtigsten Werte, der bedingungslos bewahrt werden muss: „Denn man musste zusammenbleiben, sich helfen, die Ärmel hochkrempeln, in die Hände spucken. Gesangsschöre, Schulen, Klubs und Kirchen gründen. Sprache, Kultur, Religion bewahren und – sehr wichtig – ihre Wahrheit bezeugen, ihre Version der Geschichte. Sich nicht assimilieren lassen, ein Slowene bleiben, eine auf die andere Seite der Welt verpflanzte Linde, die neue Wurzeln schlägt, ergrünt, wächst, aufblüht...“ (Svit: 34). Mit dieser Absicht gründeten die Slowenen in Argentinien slowenische Gemeinschaften, ließen sich in den slowenischen Nachbarschaften nieder, wo es bereits slowenische (Samstags)Schulen, Geschäfte, Gasthäuser, Klubs gab, wo

also die slowenische Infrastruktur festen Bestand hatte. Sie sprachen mit den Kindern ausschließlich slowenisch und erwarteten später von ihnen die Bewahrung der „reinen“ slowenischen Abstammung, mit der Überzeugung, dass „die beste Argentinierin nicht besser als die schlechteste Slowenin ist“ (Svit: 90). Die Identität richtet sich bei ihnen großenteils nach dem sog. primordialistischen Konzept von Ethnizität. Dieses Konzept basiert auf den Natur- bzw. Verwandtschaftsverbindungen und meint, dass man in eine Ethnie hineingeboren wird, die etwas Unveränderliches und Geschlossenes für die Angehörigen anderer Ethnien darstellt (vergl. z. B. Van der Berghe 1991). In Unterschied zum Primordialismus behandeln die instrumentalistischen Konzepte die ethnische Identität als ein politisches und kulturelles Phänomen. Nach diesem Konzept ist die Ethnizität nicht angeboren, sondern wird von den Menschen entsprechend ihren politischen und wirtschaftlichen Zielen hervorgebracht (vergl. z. B. Cohen 1969). Das konstruktivistische Konzept berücksichtigt aber auch die psychologischen Aspekte, betont die Zufälligkeit und Fluidität der Ethnizität. Die Gemeinschaften stellen die Kriterien der Ethnizität selbst auf und haben als solche Bestand, so lange sie die Verschiedenheit gegenüber anderen umgebenden ethnischen Gruppen aufrechterhalten. Die Interaktionen mit anderen Gemeinschaften stellen für sie keine Bedrohung, sondern eine Existenzbedingung dar. Ihre Entscheidung für eine Ethnizität ist in hohem Maße freiwillig, voluntaristisch (vergl. z. B. Barth 1998). Der Erzählerin im *Slowenischen Gesicht* kann eine konstruktivistische Sicht der Ethnizität zugeschrieben werden; sie kommt besser mit Multikulturalität als mit hermetischen Gemeinschaften zurecht. Primordialistisches Verständnis der ethnischen Identität ist in der Erzählung vorwiegend den Vertretern der ersten Generation der Slowenen in Argentinien zu attestieren, den politischen bzw.

wirtschaftlichen Emigranten, den Eltern der Informanten, mit denen sich die Erzählerin getroffen hat, und die ihre Heimat unfreiwillig verlassen haben. In der neuen Umgebung wollen sie die Erinnerung an ihre Heimat, das Slowenentum und die Katholizität bewahren. Diese übertriebene Geschlossenheit der slowenischen Gemeinschaft konfrontierte deren Kinder mit erheblichen Problemen. So sprachen sie nur Slowenisch, was ihre Integration beim Eintritt in die argentinische Schule sehr erschwerte. Sie mussten „das Schicksal ihrer Väter teilen und deren hartnäckige und sture Träume von dem Slowenentum auf der anderen Seite der Erde verwirklichen. Sie wurden nicht gefragt, ob sie Fremde sein bzw. eine Sprache, die niemand versteht, sprechen wollen. Nicht mal, ob sie glühende Katholiken sein wollen, die Identität als einen Kult praktizieren, konservativ und politisch streng rechts sein wollen [...]“ (Svit: 94, 95). Eine offenere Sicht auf das Slowenentum wiesen die Emigranten auf, die nach Argentinien freiwillig kamen (z. B. Bojan Mozetič). Einige Vertreter der zweiten Generation der Slowenen in Argentinien (z. B. Tone Mizerit, Jani Gris) widersetzten sich ihren Eltern, der erzwungenen Identitätsbewahrung und dem Mythologisieren der Heimat. Sie verließen die slowenische Gemeinschaft, kommunizierten nicht mehr auf Slowenisch, heirateten die Partner anderer Nationalitäten, brachten ihren Kindern die slowenische Sprache nicht mehr bei. Sie wurden sich der Multikulturalität als eines Wertes erst nach Jahren des Lebens außerhalb der slowenischen Gemeinschaft bewusst, als sie sich erneut für das Slowenentum, die Sprache und Kultur zu interessieren begannen, einige (Andrej Rot) kehrten sogar in die Heimat zurück. Vor allem bei den Vertretern der dritten Generation (Fran Mozetič, Julia Sarachu) werden die Fluidität der Identität und Multikulturalität als Bereicherung begriffen.

Die Erzählerin beschreibt die Ansichten einzelner Auswanderer subjektiv und nimmt zur geschlossenen Identität der Slowenen in Argentinien keine neutrale Haltung ein. Ihr Verständnis der Nationalität nach der voluntaristischen Sichtweise als auch ihre persönliche Geschichte sind diametral entgegengesetzt zu den Geschichten der slowenischen politischen und wirtschaftlichen Emigranten in Argentinien: „Mein Vater war ein Partisane, seiner war ein Domobranec [Mitglied der slowenischen Heimwehr im 2. Weltkrieg; Bem. L. R.]. Ich wuchs im Schoß der Mutter Heimat auf, trug das rote Pionierhalstuch um den Hals, in der Schule grüßte ich mit »Für die Heimat, mit Tito vorwärts« und sang Partisanenlieder. Währenddessen lief er durch die Pampa, spielte Fußball und betete in der Kirche für den Gott und die Heimat, aber nicht für dieselbe, als es die meine war“ (Svit: 145).

Gegenüber diesen beiden Ansichten über Nationalität und Identität vermittelt die Erzählerin eine dritte Perspektive – die Geschichte des polnischen Schriftstellers Witold Gombrowicz bzw. Gombro, wie ihn die Erzählerin nennt. Gombro kommt bereits im *Vorwort über die Treue* und auch in allen vierzehn weiteren Kapiteln vor. Zentrale Informationsquellen über Gombro, die die Erzählerin anführt und die Grundlage für die Auseinandersetzung mit dem Hauptthema der Identität und Auswanderschaft bilden, sind Gombrowicz' *Tagebücher*, eine Sammlung von Briefen an seinen Freund Juan Carlos Gómez bzw. Goma und an Rita Gombrowicz, die Ehefrau des Schriftstellers. Sie vermittelte der Erzählerin wertvolle Informationen und übergab ihr das auf Spanisch selbst verfasste „Buch der Zeugnisse all jener Menschen, die Gombro in Buenos Aires traf“ (Svit: 31). Aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach handelt es sich um das Buch *Gombrowicz in Argentinien. Berichte und Dokumente* (Rita Gombrowicz: *Gombrowicz en Argentine. Témoignages et documents 1939–1963*). Die Erzählerin erwähnt die genannten Quellen,

fasst zusammen, interpretiert und zitiert den Schriftsteller, wobei die Zitate durch Anführungszeichen gekennzeichnet und mit Begleittext versehen sind.

Gombro, die Slowenen in Argentinien und die Erzählerin sind durch die Migrationserfahrung und die Problematik der Identitätsbewahrung verbunden, indirekt aber auch durch die Tatsache, dass man in Argentinien die Einwanderer, die aus Mitteleuropa immigrierten, *Polacos* nannte; also waren auch Slowenen für sie „Polen“ (Svit: 19). Jedoch unterschied sich Gombrowicz' Ankunft in Buenos Aires in mancher Hinsicht von der Ankunft der Slowenen: Gombro, Mitglied der polnischen Aristokratie, kam im Hafen von Buenos Aires mit einem Luxusschiff an, als „Ehregast der Eröffnung der neuen Schifflinie von Danzig nach Buenos Aires“ (Svit: 19). Bald danach brach der zweite Weltkrieg aus, das Schiff musste zurückkehren, Gombro entschied aber, in Argentinien zu bleiben, obwohl er nunmehr praktisch besitzlos war. Im Unterschied zu den Slowenen pflegte Gombro in Argentinien kaum Kontakte mit seinen Landsleuten: „Er blieb für sich allein als ein von der Herde getrenntes Schaf. Es befand sich keine Kirche, keine Gemeinschaft, kein nationaler oder nationalistischer Traum in seiner Kreislinie. In Buenos Aires [...] gönnte er sich vierundzwanzig Jahre Freiheit von der Geschichte“ (Svit: 81).

Wichtige Akzente (nach subjektiver Beurteilung der Erzählerin) aus dem Leben des Schriftstellers sind linear gesetzt, sie beziehen sich auf die außenliterarische Realität bzw. historische Tatsachen und werden durch die Jahreszahlen abgesichert: Im Jahre 1939 kommt Gombrowicz in Argentinien an und entscheidet sich nach dem Ausbruch des zweiten Weltkriegs in Europa, nicht mehr in seine Heimat zurückzukehren; er fristet in Buenos Aires sein Leben ohne ein gesichertes Einkommen; Ende des 1941 beginnt er das Kaffeehaus Rex zu besuchen, übersetzt

dort mit seinen Bekannten den Roman *Ferdydurke*, der im April 1947 veröffentlicht wird, allerdings ohne Erfolg; im August 1947 bereitet Gombrowicz den Vortrag *Gegen die Dichter* vor; im selben Jahr wird er in der Bank *Banco Polaco* angestellt, verfasst den Roman *Trans-Atlantik* und beginnt die *Tagebücher* zu schreiben; 1955 kündigt er die Stelle in der Bank; nach der Krankheit im Jahre 1957 zieht er sich in das Städtchen Tandil zurück, um vollständig zu genesen; hier schließt er sich der sog. *Gruppe aus Tandil* an; 1963 kehrt er nach Europa zurück, lebt zuerst in Berlin, zieht später nach Paris; 1964 lernt er seine künftige Ehefrau Rita Gombrowicz kennen, zieht zusammen mit ihr nach Vence in Südfrankreich, wo er nach fünf Jahren stirbt.

Gombrowicz als reale, außenliterarische Person wird zu einem immanenten Teil der Erzählung über die argentinischen Slowenen. Gombro spielt mit seinen Ansichten über Nationalität und Identität, die durch seine persönlichen Erfahrungen mit dem polnischen Nationalismus, Polentum und Antipolentum geprägt sind, die Rolle eines Vermittlers zwischen der primordialistischen Sicht der Ethnizität der ersten Generation der Slowenen in Argentinien einerseits und der offenen, konstruktivistischen Sicht der Erzählerin und einiger anderen Figuren andererseits. Auch bei Gombrowicz' Landsleuten aus Polen, vor allem bei den Bauern und weniger gebildeten Bevölkerungsschichten, die nach Argentinien am Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts nach den erfolglosen polnischen Aufständen und in den zwanziger Jahren des 20. Jahrhunderts während der Wirtschaftskrise (politische und wirtschaftliche Emigration) auswanderten, überwiegt die ethnonationalistische Sichtweise der Identität. Sie schließen sich zu Gemeinschaften zusammen (z. B. im Jahre 1940 gründen sie den Polnischen Klub in Buenos Aires), pflegen nationale und katholische Werte und fühlten sich überlegen gegenüber den Einheimischen (Margański:

116–122). Gombrowicz kann sich in einer solchen Gemeinschaft nicht assimilieren. Im Brief an Julian Tuwim schreibt er, dass „die hiesige polnische Kolonie ein trostloses Bild der Trivialität und Dummheit ohne Vergleich bietet“ (zit. n. Margański: 119). Erst nach 1945 emigrierten nach Argentinien auch Vertreter der polnischer Intelligenz, unter denen Gombrowicz auch nur wenige Leser finden konnte.

Die Erzählerin benutzt Gombrowicz' Ansichten, um die slowenische Diaspora in Argentinien zu kommentieren. So zielt sie z. B. mit Gombrowicz' Witz vom Unterschied zwischen Sardinenkonserve und Emigration und dessen Clou, dass „hermetische Konservierung schändlich für die Emigration sei“ (Svit: 90) auf die Isolation der slowenischen Diaspora, die die jüngere Generation erst recht von der slowenischen Identität abbracht hat. Gombro als eine „Außenfigur“ bewahrt im *Slowenischen Gesicht* im Verhältnis zu argentinischen Slowenen und Slowenentum eine neutrale Haltung. Er ist mit den Slowenen nicht direkt verbunden, seine Emigrationserfahrung und Ablehnung der geschlossenen Anschauung über die polnische Identität ermöglichen aber der Erzählerin, dass sie ihn als einen äußeren Kommentator einführt. Über die Rolle des polnischen Schriftstellers im *Slowenischen Gesicht* schreibt sie: „Er ist mein Spiegel, der besser als irgendjemand die Identitätsproblematik reflektiert: alles was er über die Polen sagt, gilt auch für die Slowenen“ (Svit: 146).

SCHLUSSFOLGERUNG

Das *Slowenisches Gesicht* thematisiert durch die Geschichten der argentinischen Slowenen die Problematik der Emigration und Identitätsbewahrung. Im Gegensatz zu den Autoren, wie z. B. Zorko Simčič in *Mensch an beiden Seiten der Wand*, der über die slowenische Diaspora

und deren Vertreter in Argentinien in Form eines Romans schreibt, aber auch im Unterschied zu anderen Werken von Brina Svit, berichtet das *Slowenische Gesicht* über das Leben der Emigranten faktografisch. Durch die Ich-Erzählung, die zudem mit den Porträtfotos der Angehörigen der slowenischen Diaspora in Argentinien versehen ist, verbindet die Erzählerin die Ereignisse aus dem Leben der slowenischen Diaspora mit der eigenen Lebensgeschichte und mit der Geschichte des dritten Emigranten, des polnischen Schriftstellers Witold Gombrowicz. Mit der Anbindungen an reale, außerliterarische Personen und Ereignisse befördert die Autorin eine (auto)biografische Rezeption des Textes. Gerade dies löste negative Reaktionen aus, vor allem bei der Behandlung problematischer Kapitel der slowenischen Geschichte (zweiter Weltkrieg, Emigration als Konsequenz der Feindschaft zwischen Domobrancen und Partisanen). So bezichtigte einer der Informatoren die Schriftstellerin, seine Geschichte nicht objektiv dargestellt und keine klare Grenze zwischen Realität und Fiktion gezogen zu haben, und dass darüber hinaus das Werk „eine Karikatur der argentinischen Slowenen“ sei (vgl. Eiletz, *Offener Brief an Brina Svit*). Gerade das Überschreiten der Grenzen zwischen Realität und Fiktion ordnet das Werk in den autobiografischen Diskurs ein, für den charakteristisch ist, dass der (auto)biografische Pakt nicht berücksichtigt wird und die objektiven Tatsachen mit den fiktiven Einlagen bzw. subjektivem Berichten vermengt werden. Fragmentarisches und episodenhaftes Geflecht von außenliterarischen Tatsachen, fotografischen Material, Paraphrasen von Texten anderer Autoren (vor allem Gombrowicz‘, stellenweise auch Hannah Arendt), essayistischen Überlegungen und metanarrativen Elementen lassen es nicht zu, das *Slowenische Gesicht* klassischen literarischen Formen, z. B. dem Roman, zuzuordnen. Das *Slowenisches Gesicht* ist eine literarische Reportage, eine in Gombrowicz‘ Heimat durchaus verbreitete literarische Form (z. B.

Ryszard Kapuściński), die faktographisches Material über ein Land, ihre Menschen und Kultur durch eine literarisierte Beschreibung subjektiv und durch fiktive Elemente angereichert präsentiert.

Im Rahmen der drei Erzählungsebenen befasst sich *Das Slowenische Gesicht* mit dem Thema der Identität und denkt über sie in zwei radikal gegensätzlichen Richtungen nach. Die Erzählerin, die aus Slowenien freiwillig auswanderte, sieht das Leben in einem anderen Land und unter anderen Menschen als eine Bereicherung, als eine Möglichkeit für die Multikulturalität und Mehrsprachigkeit, die der Einzelperson eine andere Sicht auf die eigene Herkunft und die Kultur vermittelt. Ihrer konstruktivistischen Perzeption der ethnischen Identität ist die im Werk dargestellte Ansicht der ersten slowenischen Einwanderer in Argentinien entgegengesetzt. Diese schöpfen die Identität aus der geschlossenen ethnonationalistischen Sichtweise, also aus einem primordialistischen Konzept von Ethnizität. Ihre Emigration war vorwiegend erzwungen. Sie begreifen ihre Auswanderung als etwas Tragisches und verleihen ihrer Heimat in der Erinnerung mythische Züge. Die dritte Ansicht und vermittelnde Position ist Gombrowicz' Sicht auf Identität. (Es ist interessant, dass Gombrowicz als Vermittler mit seinen ausgeprägten Überzeugungen auch noch im Werk eines weiteren slowenischen Autors, und zwar im philosophischen Essay von Ivo Urbančič über Dilemma des Europäertums, fungiert, vgl. Jež 2017). Letztlich macht die Erzählerin Gombro zu ihrem Verbündeten, er ist ihr „Alter Ego, Antiheld, graue Eminenz, Kontrapunkt“ (Svit: 31). Gombro ist es, der davon zeugt, dass „die Identität nichts mit dem reinen Blut zu tun hat“ (Svit: 111) und dass das »Gesicht«, wie die Erzählerin Identität metaphorisch nennt, ein Ausdruck von Umfeld, Kultur und Sprache ist, der Lebenserfahrungen, Geschichten und Überzeugungen wiedergibt, und der eben keine Maske darstellt, die durch Zwang bewahrt werden kann. ♡

Quellen und Literatur

- BARTH, FREDRIK, 1998. Introduction. *Ethnic groups and boundaries: the social organization of culture difference*. Red. Fredrik Barth. Illinois: Waveland press. 9–38.
- BERGHE VAN DEN, PIERRE L., 1991: Biologija nepotizma: etničnost kot sorodstvena selekcija. *Študije o etnonacionalizmu*. Red. Rudi Rizman. Ljubljana: Knjižnica revolucionarne teorije. 79–107.
- BOROVNIK, SILVIJA, 2016: Literarno-jezikovna polifonija in jezikovni pristop v literaturi Brine Svit. *Seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture: Drugačnost v slovenskem jeziku, literaturi in kulturi*. Red. Alojzija Zupan Sosič. Ljubljana: Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete. 38–45.
- COHEN, ABNER, 1969: *Custom and Politics in Urban Africa: A Study of Hausa Migrants in Yoruba Towns*. Berkley und Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- ČEH, JOŽICA, 2008: Med fikcijo in resničnostjo v avtobiografski prozi. *Jezik in slovstvo* 53, 3–4. 23–35.
- EILETZ, MARJAN, 2015: Odprto pismo Brini Svit. *Časnik. Spletni magazin z mero*. 27. 3. 2015. <http://www.casnik.si/index.php/2015/03/27/odprto-pismo-brini-svit/> (Zugriff 1. 3. 2017).
- GOMBROWICZ, WITOLD, 1998: *Dnevnik*. Ljubljana: Nova revija. Auswahl, Übersetzung und Nachwort Mladen Pavičić.
- JEŽ, NIKOLAJ, 2017: Tango z Mistrzem. *Polonistyka na początku XXI wieku. Diagnozy. Koncepcje. Perspektywy: VI Światowy Kongres Polonistów*, Uniwersytet Śląski, 22–25 VI 2016. Kattowitz. (Im Druck).

- KLINAR, PETER, 1976: *Mednarodne migracije: sociološki vidiki mednarodnih migracij v luči odnosov med imigrantsko družbo in imigrantskimi skupnostmi*. Maribor: Založba Obzorja.
- KOLŠEK, PETER, 2014: Slovenci, ki v Argentini niso zaradi tanga: *Slovenski obraz* Brine Svit: Literarna reportaža o emigraciji ali „živeti in umreti v svojem jeziku”. *Delo* 56, 297 (23. 12. 2014): 15.
- K., M., 2013: Brina Svit o identiteti tistih, ki se zanjo najbolj borijo: Založba Gallimard predstavila dve avtoričini deli. *MMC RTV SLO/STA*. <https://www.rtv slo.si/kultura/knjige/brina-svit-o-identiteti-tistih-ki-se-zanjo-najbolj-borijo/320685> (Zugriff 1. 3. 2017).
- LEJEUNE, PAUL, 1989: *On autobiography*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press (Theory and history of literature; vol. 52). Übersetzerin Katherine Leary.
- MARGAŃSKI, JANUSZ, 2005: *Geografia pragnień. Opowieść o Gombrowiczu*. Wydawnictwo Literackie, Krakau.
- MORIC, ANJA, 2014: *Domovina globoko v srcu. Kočevski Nemci v diaspori*. *Etnolog* 24, 75 (2014): 81–104.
- MORIC, ANJA, 2016: *Slovenski Nemci v diaspori*. Doktorarbeit. Univerza v Ljubljani, Fakulteta za družbene vede. Ljubljana. 18–87.
- Oficjalna strona Witolda Gombrowicza. *Ja jestem self made man literatury!* <http://www.gombrowicz.net/> (Zugriff 1. 3. 2017).
- POTISK, MARTINA, 2015: Literarna avtobiografija argentinskih Slovencev ali častni dvoboj med los partizani in los domobranci. *Dialogi* 51, 7–8. 107–113.
- RADALJAC, ANJA, 2015: *Na juriš! Brina Svit, Slovenski obraz*. *LUD Literatura*. 22. 5. 2015. <http://www.ludliteratura.si/kritika-komentar/na-juris/> (Zugriff 1. 3. 2017).

- REED-DANAHAY, DEBORAH, 1997: *Auto/Ethnography: Rewriting the Self and the Social*. Oxford und New York: Berg Publishers.
- REED-DANAHAY, DEBORAH, 2017: Bourdieu and Critical Autoethnography: Implications for Research, Writing and Teaching. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*. 19, 1. 144-154.
- ROŽIČ, MEGI, 2016: *The autobiographical experience of migration in the literary works of women writers of the Slovenian literary polysystem*. Doktorarbeit. Univerza v Novi Gorici, Fakulteta za podiplomski študij. <http://repozitorij.ung.si/IzpisGradiva.php?lang=slv&id=2638> (Zugriff 10. 8. 2017).
- RUGELJ, RENATE, 2014: Slovenski obraz. Recenzija. *Bukla*. http://www.bukla.si/?action=books&book_id=23051 (Zugriff 10. 8. 2017).
- SVIT, BRINA, 2014: *Slovenski obraz*. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.
- ŠMITEK, ZMAGO, 1988: *Poti do obzorja*. Ljubljana: Založba Borec. 377-422.
- ŠUČUR, MAJA, 2015: Brina Svit: Identiteta je vedno nekaj ironičnega. *Dnevnik*, 3. 1. 2015. <https://www.dnevnik.si/1042702056/kultura/knjiga/identiteta-je-vedno-nekaj-ironicnega> (Zugriff 10. 8. 2017).
- ZLATAR VIOLIĆ, ANDREA, 2011: *Avtobiografija: teoretski izzivi*. Übersetzerin Olga Vuković. *Avtobiografski diskurz*. Red. Koron, Alenka, und Leben, Andrej. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, ZRC SAZU (Studia litteraria). 23-33.

Povzetek

Delo *Slovenski obraz* slovenske avtorice Brine Svit skozi zgodbe argentinskih Slovencev tematizira problematiko migracij in ohranjanja identitete. V prvoosebni pripovedi, opremljeni s fotografskimi portreti pripadnikov slovenske diaspore v Argentini, pripovedovalka dogodke iz njihovega življenja prepleta s svojo življenjsko zgodbo ter življenjepisom tretjega emigranta, poljskega pisatelja Witolda Gombrowicza, imenovanega Gombro. Navezave na realne, zunajliterarne osebe in dogodke, hkrati pa prestopanje meje med resničnostjo in fiktivnostjo delo umešča v (avto)biografski diskurz, za katerega je značilno, da ne upošteva (avto)biografske pogodbe in objektivna dejstva meša s fiktivnimi inserti oziroma subjektivnim poročanjem. Fragmentarno prepletanje zunajliterarnih dejstev, fotografskega gradiva, parafraziranja besedil drugih avtorjev, esejističnih razmišljanj in metanarativnih elementov onemogoča žanrsko umestitev dela v okviru klasičnih literarnih vrst, na primer opredelitev z literarno vrsto romana. *Slovenski obraz* je literarna reportaža, v Gombrowiczevi domovini dobro poznana literarna vrsta (npr. Ryszard Kapuściński), ki objektivno pot in raziskovanje dežele ali ljudi in njihove kulture predstavi subjektivno, skozi literariziran opis, ta pa vsebuje tudi elemente fikcije. V okviru treh pripovednih ravni *Slovenski obraz* predstavlja in razmišlja o identiteti v dveh radikalno nasprotnih pogledih. Pripovedovalka, ki je emigrirala prostovoljno, življenje v drugi državi in med drugačnimi ljudmi vidi kot obogatitev, možnost za večkulturnost in večjezičnost. Njeni konstruktivistični percepciji etnične identitete je nasproten pogled v delu predstavljenih prvih slovenskih priseljencev v Argentini, ki identiteto pojmujejo z zaprtega etno-nacionalističnega vidika, torej po primordialistični teoriji etničnosti. Njihova emigracija je bila

neprostovoljna, dojemajo jo kot tragično, domovina v njihovem spominu dobiva mitske razsežnosti. Tretji pogled na vprašanje identitete je Gombrotov pogled. Slednji s pripovedovalko in Slovenci v Argentini ni neposredno povezan, njegovo razumevanje narodnosti pa je blizu pripovedovalkinemu. Zaprtost v skupnosti, kot je to v primeru Slovencev v Argentini, je podobna zaprtim skupnostim poljskih emigrantov v Argentini, te pa Gombro kritizira. Pripovedovalka iz Gombrowiczevih *Dnevnikov* in korespondence, ki jih bere kot avtobiografski dokument, izbira posamezne misli in jih interpretira v obliki razmislekov ali komentarjev ob zgodbah intervjuvancev. Z njimi podkrepljuje svoj pogled na identiteto, Gombro dobi vlogo posrednika, zunanje instance, ki ni vpletena v slovenstvo, zaradi česar njegovi argumenti delujejo verodostojneje. Gombrowiczev zunanji pogled in izkušnja z drugo identiteto kot je slovenska, torej s poljskostjo, univerzalizira pripoved *Slovenskega obraza* v sklep, da preveč nacionalizma ubija identiteto, ter podpira končno spoznanje o polifoničnem karakterju identitete.

Lidija Rezoničnik

Lidija Rezoničnik concluded study of German and Polish philology at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana. At the Department of Slavistics at the same Faculty she achieved her PhD with the dissertation The Polish and Slovenian Literary Canon from the Period of Modernism as Film Adaptation. In her researches, she mainly deals with Modernism in Polish and Slovenian literature, as well as interdisciplinary relations between literature and film (film adaptations). She presented results of her research at conferences for Slavists in Salzburg, Budapest, Basel and Ljubljana and in the articles published in the scientific journals Primerjalna književnost and Jezik in slovstvo.

**«Четыре жизни» Василия
Ивановича Чапаева
(об одном мифотворческом
феномене Гражданской
войны в России 1917-1923 гг).**

The „Four Lives“ of Vasily
Ivanovich Chapayev (about one
Myth-making Phenomenon of
the Russian Civil War 1917-1923)

В работе анализируются процессы преобразования идентичности в межвоенное время в Советской России на примере мифологизации образа Василия Ивановича Чапаева, командира дивизии в Гражданской войне 1917–1923 гг. В начале рассматриваются основные этапы биографии Чапаева как реальной исторической личности, а также различные оценки его деятельности в трудах ведущих историков Гражданской войны в России. Основная часть работы посвящена проблеме мифотворчества и мифологизации личности Чапаева, с помощью чего сторонники новой власти в Советской России пытались создать своеобразный противовес образу офицера как символу имперской власти. В статье прослеживается процесс отрыва образа Чапаева от контекста политической идеологии и его трансформации в практически фольклорный анекдотичный персонаж как свидетельство профанации коммунистической идеологии. В конце анализируется литературно-художественный образ Чапаева, связанный со всеми перечисленными мифологическими образами, но одновременно отличающийся от них.

ВАСИЛИЙ ИВАНОВИЧ
ЧАПАЕВ, ПРОПАГАНДА, МИФ,
НЕОМИФОЛОГИЗАЦИЯ, ФИЛЬМ

This paper analyzes the process of identity transformation of the inter-war period in Soviet Russia on the example of mythologization of Vasily Ivanovich Chapaev, division commander in the Russian Civil War of 1917–1923. In the beginning of the work main stages of Chapaev's biography as a real historical figure are considered, as well as various assessments of his activity in the works of leading historians of Civil War in Russia. The main segment of this paper is devoted to the problem of myth creation and mythologization of Chapaev's personality, with the help of which supporters of the new government in Soviet Russia tried to create a kind of counterbalance to the figure of officer as a symbol of earlier imperial power. The article also traces the process of separation of Chapaev's figure from the context of political ideology, and its transformation into a practically folklore anecdotal hero as evidence of the profanation of communist ideology. In the conclusion of the article an artistic and literary figure of Chapaev, related to all above mentioned mythological figures, but simultaneously different from them, is analyzed.

VASILY IVANOVICH CHAPAEV,
PROPAGANDA, MYTH,
NEOMYTHOLOGIZATION, FILM

Исторические процессы в XX веке, особенно в его последние десятилетия, и в начале XXI века выявили одну характерную черту развития событий – ведущую роль идентичности в судьбе каждого общества. На сегодняшний день мы сталкиваемся с крайне изощренными способами управления процессом преобразования идентичности, результаты которых можно наблюдать во многих горячих точках современного мира. Это не только действие массовой пропаганды, роль СМИ, утонченная техника политтехнологов – это в первую очередь работа с общественной памятью и коллективным бессознательным общества, с тем, что напрямую связано с системой ценностей данной культуры. Общеизвестно, что человек при принятии решений и осуществлении того или иного выбора опирается на систему ценностей, отражающую его картину мира. Основу этой системы образуют традиции, коллективные представления, поверья и мифы. Мифологическое мышление как зачаток более поздних эмпирических знаний в основном характерно для обществ с низким уровнем развития, но в современном мире оно приобретает новое качество. Это качество в первую очередь связано с тем, что посредством мифологического мышления человек может стать «объектом манипуляции других людей, партий, социальных групп» (Зорий 2013). Мифологизация сознания, таким образом, становится привлекательным инструментом воздействия на широкие массы со стороны различных групп и позволяет вносить изменения в ценностную систему общества.

Миф как основная ячейка мифологического сознания на современном этапе развития человечества отвечает не за обретение знаний о природе, жизни и мире, а за социальную и эмоциональную жизнь человека. Может быть, именно поэтому А.Ф. Лосев

выдвинул тезис о том, что «всякая живая личность есть так или иначе миф» (Лосев 1990: 99). Если связать с этим утверждением популярное в постмодернизме представление о человеческой личности как результате влияния разных источников информации, то можно говорить о том, что значение мифа в таком контексте приближается к юнговскому понятию «архетип».

Другой важный аспект мифа – его символичность и аллегоричность. Изначальная познавательная сущность мифологии как раз и состоит в аллегорическом повествовании о действительности и истине. В этом плане мифология преследует те же цели, что и литература и религия, и разделяет с ними задачу образования нравственных ориентиров общества. Однако на сегодняшний день миф не может быть средством описания действительности, и поэтому он преобразуется в элемент идеологического влияния на общество. Другими словами, каждая социальная группа как носитель определенной идеологии склонна к созданию своих мифов. Данное положение лучше всего можно проследить на примере идеологических противостояний первой половины XX века, когда в результате разрушения имперской системы власти в Европе произошел идеологический взрыв разных социальных группировок.

Рассмотрим ранний этап строительства так называемой социалистической идеологии и связанного с ним мифотворчества. На примере образования мифа о комдиве Чапаеве можно проанализировать все подконтрольные и неподконтрольные факторы бытования мифа в обществе, его влияние на коллективное сознание в целом и идентичность человека в частности. Социалистическая мифология была призвана воплотить идеалы Октябрьской революции, убедить людей в оправданности тех материальных и человеческих жертв, которые народы Советского союза принесли и

должны приносить в целях окончательной победы учения марксизма-ленинизма. История Российского государства до Октябрьской революции была неудобным наследием для новой власти, так как она могла породить ностальгию, тоску по былому величю Империи, отодвигая тем самым идеалы нового времени. Поэтому не удивляет тот факт, что процесс «производства» новой истории был запущен в кратчайшие сроки, и уже в 20-е и 30-е годы появляется в печати, в кинотеатрах, в литературе, в музыке и даже в фольклоре целый ряд сюжетов о великих деятелях революции и Гражданской войны в России. После похорон В.И. Ленина начинается мода на бальзамирование, свой мавзолей получает и такая противоречивая фигура, как революционер Григорий Котовский. Помимо легендарного образа Котовского, особое место в советской литературе и истории получают и военачальники Буденный, Троцкий, Фрунзе и др. Однако легенда, образовавшаяся вокруг всех упомянутых фигур, явно расходилась с реалиями исторических событий.

Особенно заметно это на примере Василия Ивановича Чапаева, командира 25-ой дивизии РККА в период Гражданской войны в России. Как историческая личность Чапаев являлся одним из многочисленных полевых командиров Красной Армии. По оценкам историков Революции и Гражданской войны, его действия не имели решающего значения для исхода войны (Веллер, Буровский 2007: 542–543). Косвенные подтверждения этому обнаруживаются и в биографических публикациях о жизни и деятельности командира, опубликованных как во время СССР, так и позднее (Кутяков 1969, Дайнес 2010). По мнению А. Ганина, причиной тому, что реальная личность Чапаева была отодвинута на второй план и впоследствии идеализирована, была как раз его

гибель, поставившая комдива в один ряд с такими военачальниками, как М.В. Фрунзе, Н.А. Щорс и др. Все они, по словам Ганина, были в политическом отношении безопасными для новой власти именно по причине своей гибели или болезни, и поэтому представляли собой идеальный материал для мифологизации в пропагандических целях (Ганин 2014). Работу над образами этих полководцев можно назвать первопроходческой в плане преобразования нравственных и ценностных ориентиров общества путем влияния средств массовой информации. Именно поэтому миф о Чапаеве стал намного важнее реального исторического образа полководца, так как последний стал предметом интересов историков лишь пятьдесят лет спустя после своей гибели.

Сразу после гибели Василия Ивановича в борьбе с белогвардейцами 5-го сентября 1919 года начинают появляться первые легенды, связанные с мистерией его гибели, вслед за которыми публикуется книга политического комиссара 25-ой дивизии Фурманова. Окончательная канонизация образа Чапаева происходит в 1934 году в фильме братьев Васильевых «Чапаев», снятом по мотивам Фурмановой книги. Огромная популярность этого фильма как раз и знаменует переход от исторической личности к мифу. Созданный в книгах и фильме образ Чапаева представлял собой отражение идеалов коммунистической революции: выходец из простого народа, представитель социальных низов без особого образования и специальной военной подготовки оказывается сверхталантливым военачальником, способным оказать решительное сопротивление любому офицеру царской армии. Именно на контрасте с образом царского офицера и строился чапаевский миф, так как для большевистской партии самым важным было придать Гражданской войне характер классового

противостояния, несмотря на множество примеров, опровергающих такую расстановку сил.

Однако сегодня достоверно известно, что какое-то образование в местной церковно-приходской школе Василий Иванович все-таки получил (Аптекарь 2017: 12–18), а также то, что до начала Первой мировой войны у него за плечами был полугодовой опыт военного обучения в Киеве в 1908–1909 гг. (21–24). Чапаевские успехи на театре военных действий Первой мировой войны достаточно известны, тем не менее официальные биографы в первое время не упоминали о том, что кроме Георгиевского креста 2-й степени, Василий Иванович дослужился до звания фельдфебеля, самого высокого звания среди унтер-офицерских чинов. Следовательно, за время своего пребывания на западных фронтах он вполне мог получить хорошую подготовку и в царской армии.

И Фурманов, и братья Василевы отмечали, что главной целью их работ было отступление от других произведений о Гражданской войне, которые они считали излишней идеализацией ее участников, за которой теряются живые герои. Авторы стремились описать реально жившего человека, которому не чужды трусость, ругательства, грабеж, курение и пр..

Ср. из дневников Фурманова в период написания романа:

Увлечен... Увлечен, как никогда... Я мечусь, мечусь. Ни одну форму не могу избрать окончательно. Дать ли Чапая действительно с грехами, со всей человеческой требухой или, как обычно, дать фигуру фантастическую, то есть хотя и яркую, но во многом кастрированную. Склоняюсь к первому. (Аптекарь 2017: 263–264)

Из произведения С. и Г. Васильевых «Чапаев. О фильме»:

Не желая копировать Чапаева, не желая давать его фотографически, мы воссоздали его, потому что образ соединил в себе все типические черты, которые неотъемлемо должны были быть присущи Чапаеву... Отказавшись от узкой биографичности, мы ходом всего художественного процесса были приведены к наиболее полному воссозданию действительного облика Чапаева. (Писаревский, 1981: 104)

Огромная популярность книги и фильма парадоксальным образом свидетельствует о том, что именно такой живой образ начальника дивизии способствовал укоренению мифа о Чапаеве. Как герой книги и кино Чапаев со всеми своими «изюминками» был намного человечнее других опозитизированных фигур большевиков. Таким образом, можно даже предположить, что преувеличение его роли в Гражданской войне не входило в планы официальной советской власти, а, скорее всего, стало косвенным результатом деятельности режиссеров, сценографов и личных друзей и знакомых полководца. Однако советское руководство быстро оценило качество новой мифологемы, в первую очередь фильма (не без влияния лучшего знатока возможностей кинематографа того времени Сергея Эйзенштейна), и стало всячески способствовать максимальному распространению проката фильма во всех кинотеатрах страны. Выделение Чапаева из массы других военнослужащих и деятелей октябрьского переворота в первую очередь связано с обнаружением новых возможностей влияния на коллективное сознание путем кино. Немаловажную роль в этом процессе сыграл тот факт, что «Чапаев» был первым звуковым фильмом, снятым в Советском союзе. Поэтому Эйзенштейн выделял фильм братьев Васильевых как один из первых и самых

ярких примеров звуко-зрительной поэзии, пришедшей на смену визуальной. Дальнейшее укоренение чапаевского мифа в массовом сознании в основном связано с популярностью самого фильма, так что можно смело говорить, что народным героем стал не исторический Василий Иванович, а главный герой фильма братьев Васильевых. Популярность, известность и узнаваемость изображенного персонажа были настолько велики, что накануне Второй мировой войны в некоторых провинциальных районах Советского союза местные жители не могли объяснить, какую роль в истории страны имел Владимир Ильич Ленин, но зато почти все знали, кем был Василий Иванович.

В чем причины такого распространения мифа о легендарном полководце? Для ответа на этот вопрос, надо сначала обратиться к мотивам создания мифа. Мы склоняемся к мнению, что мифологизация образа Чапаева не была управляемым процессом или, во всяком случае, не входила в приоритетные задачи идеологической пропаганды советской власти. В качестве подтверждения данной мысли приведем два аргумента. Во-первых, вслед за фильмом персонаж Чапаева попал в круг фольклорного творчества, о нем стали складываться анекдоты. Эти анекдоты уже в 30-ые годы XX века стали приобретать профанирующий характер по отношению к марксистско-ленинскому учению. В них Чапаев чаще всего выступал выразителем народного мнения о некоторых аспектах функционирования социалистического строя. Укрепление такого мифа о Чапаеве не могло входить в интересы официальной власти. Во-вторых, легендарный образ полководца напрямую связан с успехом фильма, с тем, что режиссерам и сценаристам действительно удалось создать произведение искусства, которое выделилось из массы других фильмов о Революции. Даже такие превосходные в техническом

плане фильма, как *Стачка* и *Броненосец Потемкин* Эйзенштейна, не привлекли такого внимания публики, как фильм Васильевых.

В чем же секрет этого фильма? Популярность фильма напрямую связана с тем, что зритель мог полностью отождествиться с изображаемыми персонажами. Это в первую очередь касается языка. Чапаевская речь в фильме отличается простотой. На простом народном языке главный герой общается с соратниками, врагами и гражданскими, а также выражает свое мнение о Революции, Гражданской войне, марксистско-ленинском учении и т.д. Искусно составленные сценаристами диалоги зачастую создавали ситуационную комичность, за счет чего фильм быстро разошелся на цитаты, которые запомнились на долгие годы, например, после выстрела Петьки из нагана «– Тихо, граждане! Чапай думать будет!» или «– Ранен? – Ранен, Василий Иванович. – Ну и дурак.» Именно сопереживание, юмор и возможность отождествления себя с киногероем способствовали укреплению мифа о Чапаеве в массовом сознании.

Чапаев в фильме был представлен не как официальный голос Революции, а как человек, умеющий говорить и думать на языке обычного народа. И мировоззрение Чапаева также представлено в упрощенном виде, чаще всего с акцентом на традиционные ценности и нравы русского народа, например: «– А вот, Василий Иванович, мужики сомневаются, ты за большевиков аль за коммунистов? – Я за интернационал! – Василий Иванович, а ты за второй или за третий? – Чего за второй? – Интернационал. – Ну, за тот, за который нужно. А Ленин в каком? – В Третьем, он его и создал, Третий Большевицкий. – Ну и я за Третий.»

В фильме братьев Васильевых образуется оппозиция «свой – чужой». Подобно тому, как Пьер становится «своим баринном» в

романе Л.Н. Толстого «Война и мир», в фильме «своими» выступают Чапаев и его ординарец Петька. «Чужими» по отношению к народу являются офицеры, каппелевцы и интеллигенция. В этом и есть причина включения фильма в разряд политической пропаганды и полной его поддержки со стороны советской власти.

Другим немаловажным фактором в распространении мифа о Чапаеве являлись повторы показа фильма. В газете «Правда» от 22 ноября 1934 года читаем: «Главное управление кинофотопромышленности сообщает нам о мерах, принятых для того, чтобы «Чапаева» посмотрела вся страна. Ленинградская фабрика массовой печати фильмов круглые сутки в три смены размножает только «Чапаева». Прошло 15 дней с тех пор, как «Чапаев» впервые появился на экране. За этот короткий срок картину смотрело свыше двух миллионов зрителей» («Мы идем смотреть «Чапаева»). На просмотр фильма организовано отправлялись целые колхозы, заводы, школы и другие учреждения. В некоторых кинотеатрах «Чапаева» не снимали с ежедневного репертуара несколько лет. Только в первом году проката, 1934-ом, фильм увидело 30 миллионов человек, а до конца года практически все население страны (Парфенов 2017). Такое присутствие фильма в советском быту 30-х годов и обеспечило Чапаеву место в коллективной памяти.

Однако побочный эффект новой «жизни» Чапаева для советского руководства, скорее всего, был неожиданным. Образ киногероя вдохновил народ на создание множества анекдотических сюжетов, в которых Чапаев выступает как своеобразный антипод официальным представлениям об идеальном советском человеке, носителе будущего коммунистического общества. Журналист Леонид Парфенов считает, что фольклорный образ Чапаева окончательно сформировался в период с 1967 по 1968 год, в связи с

шумным празднованием 50-летия Октябрьской революции (ibid.). Если принять его точку зрения, то такой датировкой можно объяснить и профанирующий характер этих анекдотов, учитывая наследие эпохи «оттепели» в советской культуре и искусстве. Однако анекдоты про Чапаева и Петьку появлялись и до, и после 60-ых годов и в основном отражали тот же характер простоватых народных героев со многими недостатками, что было целью и авторов фильма. Скорее всего, Чапаев стал народной легендой именно из-за его нравственных «недостатков», а не по причине романтичности биографии полководца.

В содержании анекдотов можно увидеть типологические особенности этих героев: так, в анекдотах с сексуальной подоплекой Чапаев выступает как аналог поручика Ржевского, героя более старых, дореволюционных анекдотов. Таким образом, в фольклоре произошла простая смена образов при сохранении типа героя и одновременно смена дореволюционной эстетики (офицер царской армии) постреволюционной (Чапаев). Однако изменение внешнего образа не повлияло на основной источник юмора этих анекдотов – смешение высокого и низкого. Чапаев в новых анекдотах приобретает все характеристики представителя социальных низов, противопоставленного всему высокому – интеллигенции, офицерству и даже «красному» начальству. Такое место Чапаева в коллективной памяти было обеспечено работой Фурманова и братьев Васильевых, но именно в анекдотах миф получил свою новую жизнь. Доказательством этого служит продолжение жизни этого мифа уже после распада Советского союза и окончательного развенчания марксистско-ленинского учения.

В связи со сказанным неудивительно, что миф о Чапаеве привлек внимание писателей-постмодернистов. В своем

произведении «Чапаев и Пустота» Виктор Пелевин использует образ как раз мифологического героя, воплощение коллективного бессознательного русского народа. Пелевинский Чапаев дается через восточное религиозное учение – тибетский буддизм, где ему присваивается роль бодхисаттвы, пробужденного существа, преодолевшего конечность бытия и вышедшего из бесконечности перерождения. Юмор такого повествования заключается в том, что фольклорный Чапаев, лишенный любых точных и достоверных данных о реальной деятельности исторической личности, теряет свою идентичность, одновременно сохраняя связь с образом самого Чапаева, что практически представляет собой суть буддистского учения: пробуждение (Нирвана) и освобождение от страдания достигается путем избавления от собственного «Я».

В общении с Петром/Петькой, главным героем Пелевинского романа, литературный Чапаев раскрывается как учитель, мудрец, раскрывающий истинный характер мира и роль отдельной человеческой личности в нем. Интересно то, что на страницах романа Чапаев сначала выступает как полная противоположность его фольклорному образу, в большей мере примыкая к высокому, чем к низкому. Такое введение персонажа обусловлено тем, что повествование в произведениях Виктора Пелевина опирается на описание процессов, происходящих в человеческом сознании – описывая пораженное шизофренией сознание пациента образцовой психиатрической клиники в Москве Петра Пустоты, писатель проводит шизоанализ не просто отдельного человеческого сознания, а коллективного бессознательного всего русского общества. Поэтому встреча главного героя с Чапаевым, происшедшая в условиях сновидений Петра, превращается во встречу бессознательного со своим содержанием, т.е. мифом. Оттуда и

позиционирование Чапаева как явления, которое в дихотомии высоко–низко занимает место первого. Такое построение сюжета позволило автору эффективное окончание своего произведения, когда главный герой осознает, что Чапаев из его снов был навеян анекдотами, которые рассказывали остальные пациенты клиники. Однако, в противостоянии с реалиями жизни 90-х годов в Москве, сознание героя делает выбор в пользу своего внутреннего фиктивного мира, отказываясь верить в жуткую действительность. Миф о Чапаеве отказывается умирать в сознании героя, он преодолевает даже самый сильный катарсис в виде лечения в психиатрической лечебнице, и таким способом остается частью идентичности не только героя пелевинского романа, но и русского общества в целом.

Сила коллективного бессознательного, сила идентичности и состояния сознания определенного общества лучше всего прослеживается на таких примерах. Без учета основных характеристик идентичности общества, вряд ли можно говорить о философии, социологии и психологии в рамках одной культуры. ♡

Литература


- АПТЕКАРЬ, П.А., 2017: *Чапаев*. Москва: «Молодая гвардия».
- ВЕЛЛЕР, М., БУРОВСКИЙ, А., 2007: *Гражданская история безумной войны*. Москва: «АСТ».
- ГАНИН, А.В., 2014: Ключевые моменты Гражданской войны. Часть I. *История.рф*. [<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dzbDsbDKvaY>]
- ДАЙНЕС, В.О., 2010: *Чапаев*. Москва: «Вече».
- ЗОРИЙ, Н.И., 2013: Мифологическое мышление в формировании психологической целостности личности на современном этапе развития общества. *Studia Humanitatis*, № 3. Москва. [<http://st-hum.ru/content/zoriy-ni-mifologicheskoe-myshlenie-v-formirovanii-psihologicheskoy-celostnosti-lichnosti-na>]
- КУТЯКОВ, И., 1969: *Боевой путь Чапаева*. Куйбышев.
- ЛОСЕВ, А.Ф., 2011: *Диалектика мифа*. Москва: «Мысль».
- ПАРФЕНОВ, Л.: Чапаев. *Намедни. Наша Эра*. [<https://namednibook.ru/chapaev.html>]
- ПИСАРЕВСКИЙ, Д.С., 1981: *Братья Васильевы*. Москва: «Искусство».
- Мы идем смотреть «Чапаева»! *Культура.РФ. Портал культурного наследия, традиций народов России*. [<https://www.culture.ru/materials/56142/-mi-idem-smotret-chapaeva>]

Резиме

У раду се анализира процес трансформације идентитета у међуратном периоду у Совјетској Русији на примеру митологизације Василија Ивановича Чапајева, командира дивизије у руском Грађанском рату 1917–1923. На почетку рада разматране су главни моменти из Чапајевљеве биографије као стварне историјске личности, као и различите процене његове делатности у радовима водећих историчара грађанског рата у Русији. Главни део рада посвећен је проблему стварања митова и митологизације Чапајевљеве личности, помоћу чега су присталице нове власти у совјетској Русији покушавале да створе неку врсту противтеже фигури официра као симбола раније империјалне моћи. У раду се такође прати процес одвајања Чапајевљевог лика од контекста политичке идеологије, и његова трансформација у практично фигуру јунака фолклора и вицева, што представља доказ својеврсне профанације комунистичке идеологије. На крају рада се анализира књижевни и уметнички лик Чапајева, који је повезан са свим поменутиим митолошким фигурама, али се истовремено разликује од њих. Тако је лик Чапајева почео да првенствено одржава мисли народа о рату и власти. Циљ овог рада је да открије специфичности сложеног и спонтаног процеса неомитологизације који је коришћен и још увек се користи у политичке пропагандне сврхе, али захваљујући семантичком богатству мита одржава пре поглед на свет једног друштва, него на њега пројектовану слику света.

Nenad Blagojevic

Nenad Blagojevic PhD is an Assistant Professor at the Department of Russian language and Literature at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Niš (Serbia). In his studies he focuses on contemporary Russian literature, as well as Russian literary science fiction of the 20th century. He has published a number of studies regarding works of contemporary Russian writer Victor Pelevin, the Strugatsky brothers science fiction, and connections between film and literature.



**(Еще раз) о перспективах
российской
лингвокультурологии**
Russian Lingvokulturologija:
Culturul Linguistics or
Linguistic Culturology?

В статье предлагается критический разбор современного состояния изучения взаимосвязи языка и культуры в российской науке и аргументируется точка зрения, состоящая в том, что научная и учебная дисциплина, именуемая в отечественной академической традиции лингвокультурологией, может развиваться более успешно в контексте не только лингвистического, но и собственно культурологического знания, ориентируясь на соответствующие теоретические и методологические установки и используя понятия, термины и исследовательские приемы, разработанные в науках о культуре.

ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРОЛОГИЯ,
КУЛЬТУРОЛОГИЯ, ВЗАИМОСВЯЗЬ
ЯЗЫКА И КУЛЬТУРЫ, АНАЛИЗ
ДИСКУРСОВ, КУЛЬТУРНЫЕ ЗНАЧЕНИЯ,
ЯЗЫКОВЫЕ ЯВЛЕНИЯ, ЯЗЫКОВЫЕ
СТРУКТУРЫ, РЕЧЕВАЯ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТЬ,
ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРНЫЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ

The article is intended to convince the reader that the scientific and educational discipline, called in the national academic tradition linguoculturologija, can make more progress in the context of not only linguistic, but also the actual culturological knowledge, focusing on the relevant theoretical and methodological guidelines and using the concepts, terms and research techniques developed in the sciences of culture.

LINGUISTIC CULTUROLOGY, CULTURAL
STUDIES, LANGUAGE-AND-CULTURE
RELATIONSHIP, DISCOURSE ANALYSIS,
CULTURAL VALUES, LINGUISTIC
PHENOMENA, LINGUISTIC STRUCTURES,
SPEECH ACTIVITIES, LINGUISTIC-
AND-CULTURAL STUDIES.

ВВЕДЕНИЕ

Предложенный в названии статьи подход подразумевает предварительный ответ на вопрос о том, что представляет из себя лингвокультурология сегодня, и почему нынешнее положение дел не является оптимальным. Данная проблема, да и оценка ситуации, не являются новыми (см. об этом: Лучинина, Павлова), однако, на наш взгляд, решение пока не найдено. Обращавшиеся к этой теме ранее авторы, хотя и существенно расходятся в степени своей критичности по отношению к лингвокультурологии, практически единодушны в определении путей поиска ее развития. «Продуктивным для развития лингвокультурологии направлением может стать обращение к анализу дискурса» – пишет Е.Н. Лучинина (242), и по сути продолжает ту же мысль в статье, вышедшей 11 лет спустя, Анна В.Павлова: «есть надежда, что хотя бы отдельные лингвокультурологи переключатся на более осмысленное занятие, чем изучение культурных концептов в отрыве от дискурсов, в которых их только и можно отыскать» (212). В настоящей статье я позволю высказать сомнение в том, что изучение дискурсов является единственной возможностью развития для лингвокультурологии, а также в том, что такой подход увеличит ее шансы стать самостоятельной дисциплиной, а не приведет к слиянию с методологически более развитой областью филологической критики, утвердившейся сегодня под именем дискурс-анализа, но восходящей в своих основаниях к богословско-экзегетической и философско-герменевтической традиции.

ЧТО ТАКОЕ ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРОЛОГИЯ

В своей уже пятнадцатилетней преподавательской практике на первом же занятии курса по лингвокультурологии я предлагаю студентам два рабочих определения этой дисциплины в качестве отправной точки для ее изучения. Оба они, в общем-то, лежат на поверхности. Первое я называю лингвокультурологией в узком смысле и подразумеваю под ним *всю совокупность текстов, представляемых их авторами как тексты по лингвокультурологии*, т.е. учебные пособия, монографии (из последних см.: Евсюкова; Зыкова) и статьи, содержащие слово «лингвокультурология» в названии или активно использующие его в самом тексте. В настоящее время в ряде российских вузов существуют кафедры, которые напрямую определяют себя как занимающиеся лингвокультурологией. Таковы кафедра общей лингвистики и лингвокультурологии в Казанском федеральном университете, кафедра иностранных языков и лингвокультурологии в Нижегородском госуниверситете им. Н.И. Лобачевского, кафедра английской филологии и лингвокультурологии Санкт-Петербургского государственного университета. Таким образом, кроме корпуса текстов лингвокультурологию «в узком смысле» составляют социальные институты и работающие в них люди, некоторые из которых, вероятно, согласятся назвать себя лингвокультурологами. Каких-либо свидетельств существования области знаний с аналогичным наименованием за пределами России нам найти не удалось, из чего можно заключить, что лингвокультурология в описанном выше смысле — явление в первую очередь отечественное¹. Второе из моих рабочих определений лингвокультурологии основано на прозрачной этимологии самого слова: перевод его составляющих дает нам науку о языке

1
Условное исключение составляют авторы, работающие в Республике Беларусь.

и культуре. Это – «широкое» понимание лингвокультурологии, позволяющее включать в нее любые тексты и имена, каким-либо образом затрагивающие проблемы взаимоотношения языка и культуры или отдельных их элементов независимо от места и времени создания этих текстов. Прием, при помощи которого мы получили оба рабочих определения — по сути своей вполне лингвистический, и состоит в поиске денотата слова, точнее его экстенционала, т. е. множества объектов, которые могут быть обозначены данной языковой единицей [9]. В первом случае мы устанавливаем экстенционал по самоидентификации объектов, во втором — опираясь на известные нам факты внеязыковой действительности (знание литературы по соответствующей тематике) и распространяя их на всю потенциально возможную совокупность объектов, способную удовлетворить тем же условиям (тексты «про язык-и-культуру»). На данный момент уже имеется значительное количество изданий, специально посвященных лингвокультурологии и озаглавленных соответственно. Они позиционируются авторами как учебные пособия и сами по себе относятся к лингвокультурологии «в узком смысле», представляя ее как учебную дисциплину. Однако ни одно из них не обходится без упоминания работ авторов, которых в академической традиции обычно относят к философам, лингвистам, антропологам и т.д. Таким образом, «узкая» лингвокультурология опирается на «широкую» как одна часть пирамиды на другую. Более адекватно ситуацию, однако, обозначит визуально с трудом представимая метафора, отсылающая к импоссибилистическим рисункам М.Эшера: «узкая» лингвокультурология как бы содержит в себе несопоставимо большее по объему знание, выдавая его за свое, но почти полностью игнорируя реальные контексты его получения и оформления.

СТАТУС ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРОЛОГИИ

Предложенные рабочие определения вполне позволяют ориентировать учащихся в проблематике дисциплины, но, разумеется, не решают проблему ее содержания и границ. Неоднократно встречавшиеся мне при личном общении скептические суждения весьма уважаемых лингвистов и филологов в отношении лингвокультурологии позволяют поднять и принципиальный вопрос о необходимости ее самостоятельного существования. Отдельного внимания заслуживает вопрос о том, где искать аналоги «лингвокультурологическому» знанию в зарубежной науке. Если достижения российских исследователей в этой области уникальны, то в каком формате знакомить с ними не читающих по-русски иностранных коллег? В каких зарубежных журналах публиковаться тем, кто занимается данной проблематикой? Как правильно обучать студентов, желающих специализироваться на «лингвокультурологических» темах, но не намеренных отказываться от возможностей, предоставляемых международной академической мобильностью? И так. если вновь воспользоваться лингвистической терминологией, то кроме экстенционала мы должны определить интенционал рассматриваемого понятия, параллельно обосновывая эвристическую ценность его (понятия) применения.

Обратимся к вопросу о самостоятельности, иначе говоря, о статусе лингвокультурологии. Гипотетически она может претендовать на звание отдельной науки, раздела какой-то науки, особого направления или подхода в рамках одной из наук, области или отрасли знания и т. п. Для познания «в чистом виде» определять место одной из «-логий» в иерархии других, вероятно, не важно.

2 Универсальная десятичная классификация (УДК) — система классификации информации, широко используемая сегодня во всем мире для систематизации произведений науки, литературы и искусства, периодической печати, различных видов документов и организации картотек.

3 Государственный рубрикатор научно-технической информации (ГРНТИ) используется для систематизации всего потока научно-технической информации в России и государствах СНГ учреждениями, связанными с управлением деятельностью в сфере науки и образования. Представляет собой универсальную иерархическую классификацию областей знания и связан в своей кодовой части с Номенклатурой специальностей научных работников.

4 Библиотечно-библиографическая классификация (ББК) — признанная зарубежными экспертами Национальная классификационная система маркировки изданий, используемая в научных (цифровой код) и массовых (буковный код) библиотеках Российской Федерации.

Однако, это важно с точки зрения современных социальных, точнее институциональных, и вследствие этого, экономических реалий. Иными словами, для организации и финансирования учебного процесса (школьное деление на предметы, учебные планы университетов) и собственно исследовательской деятельности такое разделение совершенно неизбежно. Не обойтись без него и в библиотеках. Любой продукт научной деятельности, будь то статья или монография, должен быть вписан в один из разделов предусмотренных существующими системами кодификации и рубрикации информации (УДК², ГРНТИ³, ББК⁴). Только в этом случае книга окажется в библиотеке (даже если эта библиотека — электронная) на «правильной» полке, а те, кому она действительно нужна, смогут отыскать ее среди огромного числа других. В классификаторе ГРНТИ лингвокультурологии как таковой нет ни под кодами, начинающимися с 13 («культура, культурология»), ни под кодами группы 16 («языкознание»). Не удалось обнаружить ее и в разделах областей знания! Получается, что лингвокультурологии «в узком смысле» *формально* не существует, а посвященные ей учебные пособия в соответствии с действующими сегодня в России универсальной десятичной и библиотечно-библиографической кодификациями маркированы 81 кодом — «Языкознание» (Красных:..2; Хроленко:..2). Авторы этих пособий, практически все — лингвисты и филологи, не оставив без внимания вопрос о месте лингвокультурологии среди других дисциплин, также пытались определить его с точки зрения науки о языке. Только у одного из авторов мы встречаем указание на то, что «участие языка в созидании духовной культуры» должна исследовать некая новая дисциплина или система дисциплин «с приоритетом культурологов» (Хроленко: 32).

Как с этимологической, так и с чисто логической точки зрения представляется очевидным, что лингвокультурологию возможно представлять в контексте как языкознания, так и наук о культуре. Попробуем сделать это, обратившись к уже упоминавшемуся официальному классификатору (ГРНТИ). На сегодняшний день он содержит достаточно подробную рубрикацию раздела 13.00.00 Культура. Культурология. Если ориентироваться на содержание существующих на данный момент пособий по лингвокультурологии и самое общее ее определение как дисциплины, изучающей взаимодействие языка и культуры, то она могла бы входить в следующие рубрики: 13.01.00. Общие вопросы культуры. 13.07.00. Теория, методология и философия культуры. 13.07.21. Отдельные направления и школы. 13.07.25. Отдельные философско-теоретические проблемы культуры. 13.07.77. Методология и методы изучения культуры. 13.09.00. История культуры. История изучения культуры. 13.11.22. Культура и идеология. 13.11.28. Культура и личность. 13.11.44. Национальное и интернациональное в культуре. Национальная идентичность и взаимодействие культур. 13.15.51. Культурная политика. Впрочем, ни в одну из них она в данный момент не входит! В разделе «Языкознание» перспективной представляется только рубрика 16.31.61. Приложение языкознания к другим наукам.

ОПРЕДЕЛЕНИЯ ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРОЛОГИИ

Выяснив, что никакого официально признанного статуса у лингвокультурологии пока нет, а значит, любая точка зрения на ее место в системе знания имеет право на существование, займемся, наконец, содержательным определением этой дисциплины и

рассмотрим некоторые из многочисленных вариантов, предлагаемых в уже существующих учебных пособиях. Пожалуй, самое подробное определение лингвокультурологии предлагает В.В. Воробьев: «комплексная научная дисциплина синтезирующего типа, изучающая взаимосвязь и взаимодействие культуры и языка в его функционировании и отражающая этот процесс как целостную структуру единиц в единстве их языкового и внеязыкового (культурного) содержания при помощи системных методов и с ориентацией на современные приоритеты и культурные установления (система норм и общечеловеческих ценностей)» (36–37). В учебном пособии В.А. Масловой лингвокультурология – «гуманитарная дисциплина, изучающая воплощённую в живой национальный язык и проявляющуюся в языковых процессах материальную и духовную культуру» (30) и вместе с тем – «отрасль лингвистики, возникшая на стыке лингвистики и культурологии» (9), «интегративная область знаний, вбирающая в себя результаты исследований в культурологии и языкознании, этнолингвистике и культурной антропологии» (32). В.В. Красных считает, что лингвокультурология изучает «проявление, отражение и фиксацию культуры в языке и дискурсе» и «непосредственно связана с изучением национальной картины мира, языкового сознания, особенностей ментально-лингвального комплекса» (12). Следующие определения принадлежат разным авторам, но оба отличаются от предыдущих своей лаконичностью: лингвокультурология – «комплексная область научного знания о взаимосвязи и взаимовлиянии языка и культуры» (Карасик: 87) и «философия языка и культуры» (Хроленко: 31). Второе следует рассматривать в контексте целой системы дисциплин, которую предлагает А.Т. Хроленко. По его мнению, лингвокультурология – теоретическая

надстройка над более общей наукой, называемой лингвокультуроведением. Правда, философией языка профессиональные философы чаще называют вполне конкретное направление в философии XX века (см. *Философская энциклопедия*), а под философией культуры уже достаточно давно также понимается нечто, явно не сводимое к предмету лингвокультурологии, как бы широко мы его не трактовали (фундаментальный обзор истории вопроса см., например, в *Философия культуры*).

Мотивы, присутствующие в цитированных определениях, в различных комбинациях встречаются и в других версиях, поэтому вышеприведенный список, хотя и не является исчерпывающим, вполне представителен. Практически у всех авторов присутствует и часто даже доминирует идея «комплексности», «синтеза», «интегративности», используются метафоры «вбирания» результатов других наук, «стыка» и т.п. Таким образом, обращается внимание на междисциплинарный характер, пограничное положение лингвокультурологии. Однако, этот мотив по отношению к научной дисциплине представляется нам в принципе не совсем уместным. Междисциплинарным, а лучше сказать поли- или мульти-дисциплинарным, поскольку «между» предполагает отсутствие локуса – нахождение «ни там, ни сям», может быть конкретное исследование, проводимое совместно специалистами из нескольких областей, с целью решения какой-либо практической задачи, которая по своему характеру не может быть решена в рамках одной науки. Что же касается научной дисциплины, претендующей на самостоятельность, то ее предмет и соответствующие ему методологические установки должны быть сформулированы как отличные от других, ранее оформившихся наук. В противном случае ее правильно считать исследовательским направлением

или научной школой. Другое дело – происхождение науки и дисциплинарная квалификация и идентификация ее лидеров. Еще одним недостатком существующих определений лингвокультурологии является использование их авторами других, также не устоявшихся еще в своих значениях слов и словосочетаний, более напоминающих «научные окказионализмы», нежели термины. Таков, безусловно, «ментально-лингвальный комплекс»; повсеместно встречаются в текстах о языке и культуре, но так и не получили четкого определения «национальная картина мира» и «языковое сознание», не совсем ясно, что понимается под «фиксацией культуры» в языке наряду с ее «проявлением» и «отражением».

Поскольку слово «лингвокультурология» очевидно не относится к словам общеупотребительным, т.е. используемым в повседневном общении, а является частью специального языка, назовем его условно языком гуманитарной науки, уместно надеяться, что это слово будет определено как термин. Одно из наиболее точных и емких, на наш взгляд, определений «термина» предложила *Большая советская энциклопедия*: «термин (позднелат. *terminus* — термин, от лат. *terminus* — предел, граница) 1) слово или словосочетание, призванное точно обозначить понятие и его соотношение с др. понятиями в пределах специальной сферы. Т. служат специализирующими, ограничительными обозначениями характерных для этой сферы предметов, явлений, их свойств и отношений. Они существуют лишь в рамках определённой терминологии. В отличие от слов общего языка, Т. не связаны с контекстом» (Термин). Ключевыми словами здесь являются «граница, ограничение» и «соотношение». Стало быть, искомого определение лингвокультурологии должно отграничивать

ее от других наук, дисциплин, областей знания и в то же время указывать на отношения с ними. С этой точки зрения, ни одно из известных нам на сегодня определений не может считаться удовлетворительным, поскольку не имеет терминологического характера, т.е. не отграничивает определяемое от сходных и смежных сущностей. Еще раз повторим, что важен не сам по себе вопрос определения лингвокультурологии ради утверждения ее самостоятельного статуса, а поиск такого предмета дисциплины, который позволил бы открыть новые пути развития знания, знания о языке и культуре, знания о человеке и обществе. На этом пути возможен и отрицательный результат: нельзя исключать, что вопросы, которые сегодня ставятся в рамках лингвокультурологии, могут решаться или уже успешно решаются другими дисциплинами.

Интересно отметить, что с точки зрения языка номинация наук может производиться при помощи одного простого слова («физика», «химия») или двусоставного слова, одна из частей которого соотносится с обозначением процесса получения или представления знания (-логия, -графия), а другая называет предмет познания (био-логия, этно-графия). Сравнительно успешно удается утвердиться дисциплинам, обозначение которых включает два содержательных компонента (социолингвистика, психолингвистика). Если же для обозначения нового направления используются три корня (лингвокультурология, этнопсихолингвистика), или словосочетание (психологическая антропология, историческая этнология), это свидетельствует о его минимальных шансах стать самостоятельной наукой: язык будто сам препятствует использованию чрезмерно усложненных инструментов познания.

ОБЪЕКТ И ПРЕДМЕТ ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРОЛОГИИ

Что является объектом и предметом лингвокультурологии по мнению авторов существующих учебных пособий? Для ответа на это вопрос воспользуемся формальным приемом, основанном на русской грамматике: если объект и предмет не указаны в тексте явно, то они могут быть представлены как объекты действия при переходных глаголах в конструкциях типа «наука/дисциплина изучает + Винительный. падеж», «исследует + Вин. Пад.» и т.п. Из пособия В.В. Воробьева мы извлекаем таким способом «взаимосвязь и взаимодействие культуры и языка» и, чуть далее, «национальные формы бытия общества, воспроизводимые в системе языковой коммуникации», а также «всё, что составляет языковую картину мира» (32). Мнения В.В. Красных и В.И. Карасика фактически совпадают с первым из этих определений. В тексте В.А. Масловой лингвокультурология изучает «материальную и духовную культуру», а вот ее предметы автор перечисляет подробно, указывая, впрочем, что этот список может быть дополнен: безэквивалентные языковые единицы – «лакуны на семантической карте языка»; мифологизированные языковые единицы: архетипы и мифологемы, обряды и поверья, ритуалы и обычаи, закрепленные в языке; паремиологический фонд языка; фразеологический фонд языка; эталоны, стереотипы, символы; метафоры и образы; стилистический уклад языков; речевое поведение; речевой этикет (Маслова: 37–47). Заметим, что феноменологический статус этих «предметов» обозначен не достаточно последовательно: большинство отнесены к языковым явлениям, некоторые – к поведенческим, а вот где и как позволяют обнаружить и соответственно изучать себя оставшиеся («эталоны,

стереотипы, символы», «метафоры и образы») не совсем ясно. А.Т. Хроленко называет объектом лингвокультурологии – «язык и культуру» (31), а ее предметом «фундаментальные вопросы, связанные с преобразующей стороной связи языка и культуры: изменения языка и его единиц, обусловленные динамикой культуры, а также преобразования в структуре и изменения в функционировании культуры, predetermined языковой реализацией культурных смыслов» (30). При этом описанием конкретных примеров взаимодействия отдельных явлений культуры с языковыми явлениями должны заниматься «более частные лингвокультуроведческие дисциплины» (этнолингвистика, лингвофольклористика). Цель же лингвокультурологии – «обобщение информации, накопленной этнолингвистикой (этнолингвистиками) и входящими в нее дисциплинами» и «выявление механизмов взаимодействия и взаимовлияния двух фундаментальных феноменов – языка и культуры, обуславливающих феномен человека» (Хроленко: 30). Н.Ф. Алефиренко считает объектом лингвокультурологии «продукты ценностно-смыслового познания, мир субъективных образов, смыслов и ценностей, порождаемых языковыми личностями, точнее, их смысловыми установками» или «языковую/дискурсивную деятельность, рассматриваемую с ценностно-смысловой точки зрения» (курсив Н.Ф. Алефиренко. – Ю.Ф.), а предметом – «репрезентацию в языке фактов культуры» (7-14). Вряд ли подробный критический разбор существующих определений позволит нам существенно продвинуться в понимании предмета анализа, поэтому обобщим наше мнение в образе, примерно так, как уже делали это ранее в отношении лингвокультурологии в «узком» и «широком» смыслах. Практически все приведенные определения производят впечатление винегрета из более или

менее одинаковых слов-ингредиентов (*культура, язык, человек, взаимосвязь, взаимовлияние, ценности, смыслы*), перемешанных практически произвольно и образующих смысловые единства исключительно благодаря синтаксической правильности их соединения во фразе, а не содержательной логике, в соответствии с которой такое соединение было получено. Взятые в совокупности имеющиеся определения лингвокультурологии представляют нам почти все теоретически возможные комбинации указанных ингредиентов, но ни одной последовательной теоретико-методологической позиции, на основании которой можно было бы развивать реальные исследования этой самой «взаимосвязи языка и культуры».

ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРОЛОГИЯ КАК ЧАСТЬ КУЛЬТУРОЛОГИИ

Попробуем теперь подойти к вопросу о предмете лингвокультурологии со второй стороны — рассмотреть ее как возможную часть культурологии. Не откроются ли нам в этом случае новые пути получения знания об окружающей действительности, о человеке и обществе, собственно о культуре и языке? Не будут ли перспективы развития нашей дисциплины выглядеть более привлекательными с этой точки зрения? Начнем, как всегда, *ab ovo* – с определения культурологии. Ввиду невозможности сколь-либо подробного анализа всех существующих определений в рамках статьи воспользуемся формулировкой соответствующей страницы Википедии, представляющейся нам вполне взвешенной: «наука, изучающая культуру, наиболее общие закономерности её развития. В задачи культурологии входит осмысление культуры как целостного явления, определение наиболее общих законов её

функционирования, а также анализ феномена культуры как системы» (Википедия. Культурология). Определение очевидно сциентистское («целостное явление», «законы функционирования», «системность»), но оставляющее каждому право понимать объект изучения, т.е. культуру, по-своему, а значит и свои исследования выстраивать в соответствии с самыми разными парадигмами, по сути, вокруг слова, а не понятия. Иными словами, предмет культурологии определяется содержанием понятия «культура». Если воспринимать лингвокультурологию как часть культурологии, то ее объектом логично также считать культуру, чтобы под ней не понималось.

Вместо того, чтобы в очередной раз пытаться хотя бы обозреть весь спектр существующих определений культуры, как это делается не только в учебниках по культурологии, но и практически во всех ранее упомянутых пособиях по лингвокультурологии (например, Алефиренко: 26–29, Маслова: 12–15) прибегнем вновь к приему рабочих определений. Попробуем называть культурой «систему значений (представлений, смыслов, ценностей, а также знаков и символов), разделяемых определенной группой индивидов». Слово «система» здесь предпочтительнее, чем, например, слова «набор» или «комплекс», но используется в «мягком» смысле, отражая лишь понимание взаимной и многомерной связанности разных представлений или значений, но отнюдь не их включенность в какую-то «жесткую» или неизменную структуру. Приведенные в скобках слова уточняют значение опорного слова в определении, а именно слова «значение». Такие значения отличаются от значений в лингвистическом смысле. Если языковое значение является означаемым некоторого знака или означающего, которым является звуковая форма, т.е. слово, то наши значения

5

В прилагательном настолько сильно актуализируется единственное понимание слова «культура» как уровня воспитания, что его почти невозможно применять к другим существующим и потенциально возможным смыслам того же слова. Того же рода сопротивление язык оказывает использованию в единственном числе прочно вошедшего в русский язык слова медиа (медиа-холдинг, медиа-исследования): все попытки назвать только один тип посредника при коммуникации медиумом (фотографию, печатное СМИ и т. д.) обрекаются на провал прочными ассоциациями русскоязычного сознания с героями спиритических сеансов.

сами являются означающими для тех ценностей и смыслов, которые получили распространение в обществе (или сообществе). Поскольку такого рода значения составляют культуру, мы будем называть их *культурными значениями*. Как означающие ценностей культурные значения ближе по смыслу слову *значимость*, чем слову *означать*. Предметом лингвокультурологии как раздела культурологии или «культурологической» лингвокультурологии можно назвать *культурные значения в языке*. Правильней было бы называть такую дисциплину *культурной лингвокультурологией* с очевидной для профессиональных культурологов отсылкой к пониманию культуры и исследовательской проблематики в британской школе культурных исследований. Однако, *культурный* как определение настолько прочно утвердилось в русском языке в качестве оценочного (культурный/некультурный), что даже в академическом дискурсе с трудом приживается как термин. Возможно, стоит остановиться на словосочетании «лингвокультурные исследования», в котором формант лингво- в значительной мере нейтрализует оценочные свойства основного прилагательного⁵. Под языком мы подразумеваем несколько совершенно определенных и отличающихся друг от друга вещей, а именно: *языковые явления, языковые структуры и речевую деятельность*. Словосочетание «языковые явления» можно понимать буквально и в то же время предельно широко: все, что *является* нам в языковых формах – от отдельного слова, морфемы или даже звука, если он воспринимается как означающий что-либо, до конкретного (в духе эстетики Б. Кроче) прочтения сколь угодно объемного, но все же представляющего некую целостность текста. В отличие от явлений языковые структуры не воспринимаются непосредственно органами чувств — они могут быть постулированы при помощи

аналитических операций и описаны в специальной литературе о языке (фонетические закономерности, морфологические и грамматические структуры, синтаксис, композиция или любая другая структура, иногда многоуровневая, обеспечивающая единство языковых явлений). Синонимами *речевой деятельности* можно считать словосочетания «речевое поведение» и «языковая деятельность», если обозначать таким способом всю совокупность действий человека, совершаемых при помощи естественного языка, как в устной, так и в письменной форме. Термин «речевое поведение» был бы самым удачным, если бы под ним не понимали чаще всего исключительно устную речь. «Языковая деятельность» вроде бы не имеет таких коннотаций и подразумевает более широкий диапазон человеческой деятельности. Впрочем, настолько широкий, что в сознании почти сразу возникает «языковое строительство», процессы формирования литературного языка, борьба с заимствованиями, диалектизмами, за всеобщую грамотность и т.п. В этой связи нельзя не упомянуть еще одно довольно близкое по значению словосочетание, предложенное некогда Б.М. Гаспаровым, – «языковое существование». В речевой деятельности лингвокультурные исследования будут интересовать не механизмами использования языковых форм и языка в принципе, а реализацией индивидами своей «социальности», процессами установления, поддержания и разрушения общественных отношений, осуществляемых при помощи конкретного языка в условиях конкретной ценностно-смысловой среды («системы значений»), называемой культурой. Таким образом, главным здесь является установка на понимание социальности как возможной только в культурно специфических формах, частью которых будут формы языковые. Формы же, например,

визуальные изучает другая часть культурологии — визуальные исследования и т.д. Отметим, что на данный момент наибольшие успехи достигнуты в деконструкции культурных значений (коллективных представлений) в речевых практиках, в первую очередь в письменных текстах (дискурс-анализ). Практически нет однозначно принимаемых научным сообществом результатов изучения роли языковых явлений (отдельных слов, выражений, речевых клише, грамматических явлений) и тем более языковых структур (отдельных связей, отношений, оппозиций и их системы в языке) в производстве и передаче культурных значений.

ЗАКЛЮЧЕНИЕ

Подводя итоги нашим пока конспективным размышлениям о лингвокультурологии как части культурологии, в несколько упрощенной с дидактическими целями форме предложим считать объектом этой дисциплины культуру, понимаемую как любые коллективные представления (значения), а предметом — взаимодействие языка (языковых явлений, языковых структур и практик речевой деятельности) и таких представлений.

В дальнейшем мы планируем подробнее объяснить свою точку зрения на то, какого рода исследования целесообразно называть лингвокультурологическими (или лингвокультурными), так чтобы они отличались от всех других подходов к изучению языка и культуры, и чему имеет смысл учить студентов в рамках учебного курса «Лингвокультурология» в зависимости от направления их профессиональной подготовки. Безусловно более подробно должен быть описан и наш взгляд на пока лишь обозначенные теоретические и методологические основания таких исследований. ♣

Библиография

- АЛЕФИРЕНКО, Н.Ф., 2010: *Лингвокультурология: ценностно-смысловое пространство языка*. Москва: Флинта, Наука.
- ТЕРМИН: ТЕРМИН. *Большая советская энциклопедия*. [<https://slovar.cc/enc/bse/2048084.html>]
- ВОРОБЬЕВ, В.В., 1997: *Лингвокультурология: теория и методы*. Москва: Издательство РУДН.
- ГАСПАРОВ, Б.М., 1996: *Язык, память, образ. Лингвистика языкового существования*. Москва, Новое литературное обозрение.
- ГРНТИ, 2018: *Культура. Культурология. Государственный рубрикатор научно-технической информации*. [<http://grnti.ru/?p1=13>]
- ЕВСЮКОВА, Т.В., БУТЕНКО, Е.Ю., 2016: *Лингвокультурология: учебник*. Москва: Флинта, Наука.
- ЗЫКОВА И.В., 2017: *Метаязык лингвокультурологии: константы и варианты*. Москва: Гнозис.
- КАРАСИК, В.И. 2002: *Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс*. Волгоград: Перемена.
- КРАСНЫХ, В.В., 2002: *Этнопсихолингвистика и лингвокультурология*. Москва: Гнозис.
- КУЛЬТУРОЛОГИЯ, 2014: *Культурология. Википедия*. [<http://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Культурология> (дата обращения 31.03.2014; к моменту завершения статьи определение было изменено)]
- ЛЭС, 1990: *Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь*. Москва, Советская энциклопедия. 128–129.
- ЛУЧИНИНА, Е.Н., 2004: *Лингвокультурология в системе гуманитарного знания. Критика и семиотика*. 7/2004. 238–243.

- МАСЛОВА, В.А., 2001: *Лингвокультурология*. Учебное пособие для студентов высших учебных заведений. Москва: Издательский центр «Академия»,
- ПАВЛОВА, А.В., 2015: Лингвокультурология в России: «за» и «против». *Przegląd Wschodnioeuropejski*. 6/2, 2015.201–221.
- ХРОЛЕНКО, А.Т., 2005: *Основы лингвокультурологии*: Учебное пособие. Москва: Флинта.
- ФИЛОСОФИЯ КУЛЬТУРЫ, 1998: *Философия культуры. Становление и развитие*. Санкт-Петербург: Издательство «Лань».
- ФИЛОСОФИЯ, 2018: *Философия. Философская энциклопедия*. [https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enc_philosophy/9326/Философия]

Summary

The subject of cultural studies (in Russian *kulturologija*) is determined by the concept of “culture”. Considering linguoculturology as a part of culturology or cultural sciences it is also logical to consider the culture as its main topic.

Let’s try to call culture “a *system* of values shared by a certain group of individuals as well as ideas, signs and symbols that express or represent these values”. The word *system* is used here in its “soft” sense reflecting mutual and multidimensional connections of different values and their representations but not a “rigid” and unchangeable structure of them. Such representations are like meanings in linguistic sense of the word but they are themselves signs for values of a certain society or community. Since these kinds of meanings make up culture we will call them *cultural meanings*. So the subject of cultural linguistics as a section of cultural studies can be defined as *cultural meanings* (or collective representations) *represented in the language*.

By *language* we mean here three very concrete things named *language phenomena, language structures and speech activity*. Language phenomena are to be understood literally and at the same time extremely widely: we call a *language phenomenon* every entity which we perceive in language forms (from a single word or even sound to voluminous texts) and which represents for us as members of a certain community a separate meaning.


Unlike phenomena *language structures* are not perceived directly by our senses — they should be deduced with the help of analytical operations and described in linguistic books as phonetic patterns, morphological, grammatical, syntactical or any other structure ensuring the unity of the linguistic phenomena of different levels.

Speech activity or “speech behavior” or “language activity” is the whole set of human acts and actions committed by means of language (both orally and in written form). Studying the speech activity we are interested not in mechanisms people uses the language forms but in ways individuals implement their “sociality” — in processes of establishment, maintenance and destruction of the public relations which are carried out by means of a concrete language in a concrete social environment organized by a “system of values” (otherwise called *culture*).

It should be noted that at the moment the greatest success has been achieved in the deconstruction of cultural meanings (or collective representations) in speech practices, primarily in written texts (discourse analysis) but there are practically no unanimously accepted by the scientific community results of studying the role of language phenomena (individual words, expressions, speech clichés, grammatical phenomena) and language structures in the production and transmission of cultural meanings.

Iurii V. Filippov

Iurii V. Filippov, Ph.D. in History is an associate professor at the Russian State University for Humanities (Российский государственный гуманитарный университет).



**Tendenze recenti nella
formazione delle parole
del russo contemporaneo**
Recent Trends in Contemporary
Russian Word-Formation

Nell'articolo vengono illustrati gli sviluppi più recenti nel sistema di formazione delle parole del russo contemporaneo, contestualizzandoli all'interno dell'attuale quadro sociolinguistico. Una particolare attenzione viene data a quei tratti linguistici periferici che affiorano nello standard a seguito del processo di democratizzazione della lingua, spesso veicolati dalla lingua dei mass-media, rappresentante del nuovo modello linguistico.

FORMAZIONE DELLE PAROLE,
RUSSO CONTEMPORANEO,
MUTAMENTO LINGUISTICO,
RISTANDARDIZZAZIONE, MORFOLOGIA

The paper discusses and contextualises recent trends in contemporary Russian word-formation system in relation to today's sociolinguistic context. Attention is devoted to peripheral linguistic traits emerging in standard varieties of contemporary Russian following the democratisation of the language, often spreading through mass-media, which represent the new linguistic model.

WORD-FORMATION,
CONTEMPORARY RUSSIAN,
LINGUISTIC CHANGE,
RESTANDARDIZATION, MORPHOLOGY

1

Sebbene il materiale lessicale che compone il dizionario non sia rappresentativo delle innovazioni nel lessico russo successive alla *perestrojka*, i risultati dell'indagine rimangono comunque significativi nell'attribuire un ruolo di primo piano ai processi di formazione delle parole nella creazione di nuovo lessico.

INTRODUZIONE

Il sistema di formazione delle parole è caratterizzato da una doppia natura, semantico-lessicale e morfologica, che determina la specificità dello sviluppo storico dei processi formativi (Zemskaja 2006: 9). Da una parte, le risorse derivazionali di natura morfologica sono tendenzialmente stabili: l'insieme dei morfemi derivazionali, la loro coesione con i morfemi flessivi e l'insieme dei procedimenti formativi non sono particolarmente influenzati dalla realtà extralinguistica e subiscono solo parzialmente le ripercussioni dei mutamenti storici. Dall'altra, la componente semantico-lessicale del sistema di formazione delle parole, così come il sistema del lessico nella sua totalità, mostra una particolare suscettibilità nei confronti della realtà extralinguistica; in essa si riflette la cultura di un determinato periodo storico e la sua evoluzione è molto più rapida e percepibile. Tuttavia, ciò non deve portare alla conclusione che lo studio del mutamento linguistico debba ridursi all'esclusiva analisi della sfera semantico-lessicale, in quanto i processi di formazione delle parole contribuiscono in modo determinante alla formazione di nuovo lessico. Esemplificativa a questo proposito è l'analisi lessicografica condotta da Kotelova (2015: 193) sulla base del dizionario *Novye slova i značeniya: Slovar'-spravočnik po materialam pressy i literatury 60-ch godov*, dalla quale risulta che ben l'85% delle neoformazioni presenti nella raccolta ha avuto origine da processi derivazionali e compositivi, mentre i neologismi semantici e i prestiti rappresentano rispettivamente solo l'8% e il 7,5% delle neoformazioni lessicali⁴.

Lo scopo di questo contributo è tratteggiare un quadro del sistema di formazione delle parole nella lingua russa contemporanea, dedicando una particolare attenzione ai fenomeni innovativi e di

ristandardizzazione. Naturalmente, il lavoro non ha pretese di esaustività: ci si limiterà a evidenziare le tendenze di sviluppo principali, che determinano la produttività di alcuni modelli rispetto ad altri, mettendole in relazione con il più generale quadro sociolinguistico. L'esposizione sarà così suddivisa: dopo un'introduzione al russo contemporaneo, verranno illustrate le principali tendenze innovative nel sistema di formazione nel suo complesso; in seguito, verranno analizzati i singoli tratti più significativi in due sezioni separate dedicate rispettivamente alla morfologia derivazionale e compositiva, per poi concludere con alcune osservazioni di carattere generale.

IL RUSSO CONTEMPORANEO

La lingua russa ha attraversato, a partire dalla *perestrojka*, una fase di tumultuoso mutamento, acceleratosi a seguito della caduta dell'Unione Sovietica nel corso della difficile transizione verso un regime democratico e un'economia di libero mercato. Tale sconvolgimento ha lasciato il proprio segno anche sulla lingua, in primo luogo a livello lessicale: la coniazione di nuove parole e l'assimilazione in massa di prestiti ha risposto all'esigenza di denominare tutta una serie di nuovi referenti nella società nata dalle ceneri del socialismo sovietico. Il passaggio a una società pluralista e la fine del controllo dell'autorità sulla lingua hanno determinato l'obsolescenza del paradigma comunicativo monologico sovietico (in cui 'uno parla, tutti ascoltano ed eseguono'; Lasorsa Siedina - Benigni 2002: 16), il rilassamento della norma linguistica e la rivalutazione in positivo del parlato. Da ciò è conseguito l'affioramento nello scritto di tratti linguistici non codificati nelle grammatiche oppure in esse etichettati come colloquiali e fino ad allora relegati alla sfera del parlato e ai registri meno sostenuti. L'uso più disinvolto della lingua è

anche però oggetto di critiche da parte di coloro che notano un generale abbassamento della ‘cultura del discorso’. D'altronde, fenomeni affini sono stati osservati anche in altre lingue occidentali (tra cui l'italiano), nelle quali sono stati riscontrati una tendenza alla desacralizzazione della scrittura e un innalzamento della soglia di tolleranza nei confronti degli usi linguistici in passato considerati substandard. Va oggi diffondendosi, specialmente in conseguenza dell'accelerazione imposta della scrittura telematica, un atteggiamento linguistico che è stato definito da Baron (2008: 169) ‘whateverismo linguistico’, che privilegia l'espressività e il contenuto a scapito della forma. La comunicazione si fa più spontanea e diretta, mentre i ritmi frenetici della modernità incentivano l'azione della ‘legge dell'economia discorsiva’ (*zakon rečevoj ekonomii*), che di per sé costituirebbe un fattore interno di cambiamento linguistico (Valgina 2003).

A una tendenza all'abbassamento della cultura del discorso e a ciò che viene talvolta percepito come una volgarizzazione della lingua – fenomeni che dipendono principalmente da motivazioni di natura extralinguistica – si affianca nel russo contemporaneo una seconda causa di mutamento linguistico, legata in misura maggiore alle leggi interne della lingua, vale a dire lo sviluppo di modalità analitiche e agglutinanti. Tra i fenomeni che testimoniano la tendenza all'analiticità nel russo contemporaneo si possono citare l'aumento di sostantivi indeclinabili e di composti troncati, l'inosservanza delle flessioni casuali e delle reggenze tradizionali, l'uniformazione delle reggenze di alcune preposizioni e l'espansione dell'accordo semantico a scapito di quello sintattico, della reggenza preposizionale e degli aggettivi analitici (per una rassegna si veda Benigni 2002: 50-72). Tra le principali manifestazioni della tendenza all'agglutinazione rientra l'indebolimento dell'alternanza consonantica in prossimità del confine morfematico.

TENDENZE PRINCIPALI NELLA FORMAZIONE DELLE PAROLE CONTEMPORANEA

Come si è detto, la formazione delle parole possiede una doppia natura: una morfologica e una semantico-lessicale; se la prima componente dimostra una certa stabilità, la seconda è soggetta a mutamenti relativamente più rapidi a causa della sua suscettibilità nei confronti realtà extralinguistica e dei mutamenti storici. Ne consegue che per parlare delle recenti tendenze nella formazione delle parole nella lingua russa contemporanea è necessario tenere in considerazione i mutamenti all'interno del dominio semantico-lessicale: particolarmente produttive come basi di derivazione sono, ad esempio, le cosiddette 'parole-chiave' dell'epoca, vale a dire quelle parole che in un determinato periodo storico sono impiegate con particolare frequenza e sono significative dal punto di vista sociale, tra cui rientrano anche i nomi delle personalità più celebri e influenti della contemporaneità.

Uno dei fenomeni innovativi più evidenti degli ultimi decenni è stata l'adozione in massa di prestiti, dovuta non esclusivamente a ragioni referenziali, ma anche di moda linguistica. A partire dal 1985 si osserva un enorme afflusso di neologismi, internazionalismi (ovvero parole appartenenti al 'lessico intellettuale europeo' di origine grecolatina) e di angloamericanismi, in particolare nei campi semantici della politica, dell'economia, della tecnologia, dell'informatica, della cultura di massa, della musica, dell'intrattenimento, dello sport e dell'alimentazione (per una rassegna si veda Lasorsa Siedina – Benigni 2002: 107–112). Si potrebbe disquisire sull'effettiva necessità di alcune acquisizioni, che talvolta costituiscono veri e propri doppioni: cfr. *transparentnyj – prozračnyj*, *prezentacija – predstavlenie*.

Come si è detto, all'internazionalizzazione del lessico si affianca il fenomeno di democratizzazione e liberalizzazione della lingua, con lo sdoganamento degli usi linguistici relegati precedentemente ai contesti comunicativi meno formali. Va progressivamente affermandosi una nuova norma, di natura più dinamica e descrittiva, che porta a una rivalutazione del parlato e un atteggiamento linguistico che privilegia il principio individuale ed espressivo a scapito della forma e della norma codificata. Come rilevato da Kostomarov (1999) nella delineazione del 'gusto linguistico' del russo contemporaneo, ciò costituisce un'apparente contraddizione con la parallela diffusione di un gusto per la letterarietà e la ricercatezza dello stile che determina non solo un recupero del lessico aulico e confessionale, ma appunto anche un'entusiasta assimilazione di forestierismi. Il contrasto, tuttavia, è solo apparente: tratto stilistico peculiare del russo contemporaneo è infatti la tendenza, tipicamente postmoderna, all'ecllettismo linguistico, alla commistione di stile alto e basso e all'invenzione linguistica. Tutto ciò si riflette anche nel sistema della formazione delle parole con l'attivazione di modelli letterari e internazionali e, allo stesso tempo, di altri più colloquiali (se non nettamente substandard), dando forma a neoformazioni di carattere talvolta ironico od occasionale.

L'azione dei fattori 'esterni' di mutamento linguistico interagisce e si rafforza a vicenda con l'azione di fattori 'interni' al sistema della lingua, come le leggi dell'analogia e dell'economia dei mezzi discorsivi (*ekonomija rečevyx sredstv*), stimulate da ragioni di natura sociale. L'accelerazione dei ritmi della vita, come accennato, impone l'uso di forme più flessibili e maneggevoli, mentre l'incremento del principio emotivo attiva corrispondenti modelli di formazione di natura espressiva e individuale (Valgina 2003: 131).

Alla luce di queste osservazioni, è possibile distinguere con Zemskaja (2006) quattro tendenze principali nella formazione delle parole del russo contemporaneo: colloquializzazione; internazionalizzazione; tendenza all'analiticità e all'agglutinazione; aumento del principio individuale ed espressivo.

Colloquializzazione

Nella sfera della formazione delle parole si osserva l'avvicinamento verso il centro del sistema di modelli derivazionali e compositivi periferici o in passato poco produttivi di pari passo con il coinvolgimento nei processi formativi di nuove basi di derivazione. Tra i modelli derivazionali più marcati che attraversano una fase di particolare attività vi sono le univerbazioni², solitamente mediante il suffisso $-k(a)$, e le retroformazioni; relativamente più innovativo è invece il fenomeno del troncamento. Si nota inoltre l'inclusione nella varietà standard della lingua da parte di elementi gergali e popolari connotati in senso espressivo e valutativo, come ad esempio i sostantivi in *-ucha* (*pornucha*, *černucha*, *peducha*). La maggiore accettabilità dei lessemi formati mediante il ricorso a questi affissi aumenta la produttività di quest'ultimi, ma è ancora dubbio il fatto che possano essere considerati a tutti gli effetti elementi della morfologia derivazionale standard.

Internazionalizzazione

Alla colloquializzazione del sistema derivazionale fa da contraltare un processo di internazionalizzazione dovuto all'assimilazione in massa di parole ed elementi di origine straniera, per i quali i processi di formazione delle parole costituiscono un fattore di integrazione. Questo processo si manifesta con fenomeni di tre tipi (Zemskaja 2006: 12):

2

Come in Benigni (2007), si è deciso di calcare l'etichetta russa *univerbacija* benché, nella terminologia linguistica italiana, il termine 'univerbazione' indichi un diverso fenomeno, di natura compositiva, e non di riduzione, ovvero la fusione di due parole originariamente autonome (ad es. *palcoscenico*, *addosso*, *invece*).

- 1) aumento del numero di morfemi di origine straniera capaci di combinarsi con basi russe;
- 2) acquisizione dello status di affisso da parte di una serie di elementi di origine straniera;
- 3) impiego di prestiti come base per la formazione di nuove parole.

Per quanto riguarda il primo fenomeno, è indicativo l'aumento della prefissazione nominale, che avviene specialmente (ma non esclusivamente) mediante prefissi di origine straniera. Ad essere particolarmente significativo non è solo il ricorso a quei prefissi già molto attivi in passato (come *anti-*, *super-* e *sverch-*), ma soprattutto l'inedita diffusione di prefissi di diversa semantica poco produttivi in passato.

Anche i suffissi d'origine straniera dimostrano un'elevata combinabilità con basi sia russe che allogene. Particolarmente intensa, ad esempio, è la produzione di sostantivi astratti deverbali mediante il suffisso con valore processuale *-izacij-* (*dollarizacija*, *fermerizacija*), impiegati per la denominazione di fenomeni significativi dal punto di vista sociale.

Per quanto riguarda l'ingresso nel sistema affissale russo di elementi di origine straniera, occorre premettere che l'acquisizione di nuovi morfemi derivazionali e compositivi costituisce un fenomeno abbastanza raro; tuttavia, nel corso della seconda metà del XX secolo si osserva la progressiva diffusione nel russo contemporaneo (così come in italiano e in altre lingue di cultura) di vari confissi di origine grecolatina impiegati per la formazione di vocaboli tecnico-scientifici e internazionalismi: ad es. *-drom*, *-teka*, *-vizor*, *-mobil'*, *-bus*, *-tron* (per una rassegna si veda Lasorsa Siedina - Benigni 2002: 123-126). La loro morfemizzazione non è stata però immediata:

inizialmente impiegati solamente nella terminologia, a partire dagli anni Settanta e Ottanta ottengono il pieno rango di affissi all'interno del sistema derivazionale della lingua russa (Zemskaja 2006: 13).

L'impiego di prestiti come basi per la formazione di nuove parole procede di pari passo con l'internazionalizzazione del lessico. È possibile valutare il grado di integrazione di un prestito nella struttura lessicale di una lingua osservandone la produttività come base per neoformazioni; tendenzialmente, le parole a cui si ricorre in misura maggiore appartengono al novero delle cosiddette 'parole-chiave' dell'epoca: ad esempio, da *vaučer* sono stati derivati *vaučerizacija*, *antivaučernyj*, *postvaučernyj*, *poslevaučernyj* ecc.

Tendenza all'analiticità e all'agglutinazione

La tendenza all'analiticità è incentivata dall'aumento delle parole invariabili, ossia quelle unità lessicali che esprimono rapporti grammaticali non con la forma della parola, ma con mezzi al di fuori di essa. Nell'ambito della formazione delle parole, il fenomeno si riscontra nell'espansione della classe degli aggettivi analitici e degli acronimi fonetici e alfabetici, in conseguenza del maggiore ricorso nella lingua d'oggi a modelli compositivi e di riduzione, come appunto gli acronimi, parole macedonia e composti troncati (Zemskaja 2017: 212). L'inedita frequenza di queste modalità di formazione, così come il ruolo più significativo della prefissazione (specialmente quella nominale e aggettivale³) è correlata allo sviluppo di modalità agglutinanti, che si riscontrano nella giustapposizione di elementi uscenti in consonante senza alcun adattamento fonologico al confine morfematico – spesso con l'ausilio di interfissi – incrementando il grado di riconoscibilità della base, in accordo con il principio di trasparenza morfotattica (Lasorsa Siedina – Benigni 2002: 53).

3 Rispetto ai suffissi, i prefissi sono caratterizzati da maggiore indipendenza dal punto di vista sia strutturale, sia semantico. Il loro significato tende a non cambiare a seconda della base con cui si combinano, su di essi cade spesso un accento secondario e non ammettono sovrapposizioni del proprio corpo fonico con quello della base, il che costituisce un tratto tipicamente agglutinante: cfr. *ul'tramerikancy* e *taksist*.

Aumento del principio individuale ed espressivo

È nella formazione delle parole che si manifesta in modo particolare il gusto stilistico del russo contemporaneo per la commistione di stili e per l'invenzione e il gioco linguistici, che si contrappone all'impersonalità, alla formalità e agli stereotipi dell'epoca precedente e privilegia l'impiego di una molteplicità di mezzi d'espressione e l'ampio ricorso a nomi propri di persona (politici, scrittori, attori, *vip* in genere) come basi di derivazione (ad es. *bušizm*, *berluskonizm*). Tratto tipico è la intensa creazione di parole di carattere occasionale, coniate per ragioni non solo referenziali, ma appunto anche espressive. Il ricorso a occasionalismi non è più limitato alla sfera colloquiale e artistica, ma si riscontra oggi anche nella pubblicistica e nella lingua dei mezzi di comunicazione di massa, che costituiscono ormai il modello linguistico principale. La stessa diffusione sui giornali e nei *mass-media* di tratti linguistici periferici, marcati diafasicamente e diastraticamente verso il basso, non è solamente una conseguenza della pressione del parlato sulla scrittura o dell'azione della legge dell'economia discorsiva, ma risponde anche ad esigenze di natura espressiva. Anche quelle che in russo vengono chiamate 'abbreviazioni' (acronimi, composti troncati, ecc.; si veda la sezione dedicata) sono spesso impiegate non solo come denominazione ufficiale di istituzioni e organizzazioni, ma anche come mezzo espressivo, spesso di carattere ironico.

MORFOLOGIA DERIVAZIONALE

Prefissazione

Una delle peculiarità della formazione delle parole del russo contemporaneo è la particolare produttività della prefissazione nominale e aggettivale, che si intensifica a partire dal XVIII secolo, ma diviene

un tratto peculiare della lingua russa a partire dalla seconda metà del Novecento. Zemskaja (2006: 12) nota come in passato sussistesse un peculiare contrasto tra verbo e sostantivo dal punto di vista derivazionale: la formazione di nuovi sostantivi e aggettivi avveniva prevalentemente tramite suffissazione, mentre la formazione di nuovi verbi avveniva soprattutto tramite prefissazione. Oggi si riscontra però una ripartizione dell'azione dei prefissi: la prefissazione verbale impiega in modo particolare prefissi di origine russa, mentre la prefissazione nominale e aggettivale fa ampio ricorso a prefissi di origine straniera, tra cui *super-*, *anti-*, *giper-*, *de-*, *psevdo-*, *kvazi-*, *re-*, *pro-*, *kontr-* ecc.

Di seguito viene presentata una rassegna delle categorie semantiche cui appartengono i prefissi più produttivi sulla base di Zemskaja (2000: 110-118; 2006: 13; 2017: 213-221) e Ryazanova-Clarke - Wade (1999: 187-202). Va da sé che i prefissi più produttivi sono quelli che riflettono significati di particolare attualità nel periodo storico preso in esame.

1) Corrispondenza temporale: *post-*, *posle-*, *do-*, *pred-*. Questi prefissi si rivelano particolarmente produttivi in un'epoca di brusco cambiamento proprio in virtù del fatto che indicano un 'prima' e un 'dopo' in relazione a un determinato fenomeno o evento. Particolarmente produttivi si rivelano *post-* e *posle-*, i quali hanno lo stesso significato e possono combinarsi con le stesse basi; tuttavia, il secondo si usa meno frequentemente rispetto al primo. Tra essi sussiste inoltre una sfumatura semantico-stilistica: *post-*, grazie anche alla sua particolare tendenza a combinarsi con parole di origine straniera, dà spesso forma a parole di registro letterario (non di rado a termini) dal significato più generalizzato e che si riferiscono a periodi temporali e ad eventi significativi: ad es. *posttotalitarizm*, *postkommunizm*. Con la fine dell'URSS, il prefisso *post-* conosce un inedito periodo di produttività e diviene uno dei tratti linguistici

peculiari di questo periodo, potendo indicare virtualmente ogni aspetto della società post-sovietica. Al contrario, *posle-* ha un significato quasi esclusivamente temporale e di conseguenza dà forma a parole in relazione a fatti di importanza relativamente minore: cfr. *posleputčevyj* e *posttotalitarnyj*.

- 2) Negazione, opposizione, rifiuto, superamento: *de(z)-*, *raz-*, *kontr-*, *anti-*, *ne-*, *bez-*, *neo-*, *eks-*. Prefissi con questo significato sono divenuti particolarmente produttivi a partire dal 1985 e dopo la caduta dell'URSS, in concomitanza con lo smantellamento dello stato totalitario e dell'economia socialista e la messa in discussione dei principi su cui si reggevano. Sono diffusissime a questo proposito le formazioni in *-izacija* derivate mediante il prefisso *de-* (*dekommunizacija*, *deètatizacija*). Dalla semantica simile, *kontr-*, a differenza di *de-*, può essere usato per derivare nomi d'agente (*kontrreguljator*, *kontrdemonstrant*), mentre *raz-* si combina preferibilmente, ma non esclusivamente, con temi russi (*razgosudarstvlenie*, *raskazënit'*). Anche le parole derivate in *anti-* rappresentano lo spirito del tempo e il rifiuto del passato sovietico; nel periodo post-gorbacioviano, il prefisso è stato impiegato anche per la derivazione di vocaboli afferenti a diversi campi semantici come, ad esempio, farmaci e prodotti casalinghi: ad es. *antichrap*, *antizagar*.

Il prefisso di origine grecolatina *neo-* è sovente impiegato nel russo contemporaneo per la formazione di parole che indicano ideologie e movimenti politici: negli anni Novanta, *neobol'shevizm*, *neostalinizm*, *neokommunizm*, si aggiungono a *neokapitalizm* e *neokolonializm*, coniati negli anni Cinquanta e anch'essi connotati negativamente (Zajceva – Dolgova 2011). *Eks-*, tradizionalmente impiegato anche in epoca sovietica in combinazione con titoli e posizioni (ad es. *eks-čempion*, *eks-ministr*) va oggi sempre più diffondendosi a

scapito di *byvšij*, probabilmente a causa dell'influenza dell'inglese 'ex-' (ad es. *eks-žena*, *eks-cuprug*, *eks-člen*, *eks-kinozvezda*).

Infine, continuano ad essere molto produttivi i modelli di derivazione parasintetici *bez-...-nyj* e, più raramente, *bez-...-ovyj*, che indicano 'assenza, mancanza di un carattere, di una proprietà' (Zemskaja 2000: 117), preferiti in molti ambiti tecnici rispetto al meno economico sintagma preposizionale 'bez + genitivo'. Il progresso tecnico-scientifico e la comparsa di nuove tecnologie e strumenti (ma anche di nuovi fenomeni politici ed economici) determinano la continua produttività del modello anche nel russo contemporaneo.

- 3) Si osserva un'inedita produttività del prefisso *pro-* nel suo significato di 'a vantaggio, negli interessi di qualcuno', dovuta alla deideologizzazione del prefisso, impiegato in epoca sovietica solo in combinazione con parole sulle quali gravava un giudizio ideologico negativo. In epoca sovietica, un aggettivo come *prokommunističeskij* poteva trovare posto solo all'interno di una terminologia anticomunista; al giorno d'oggi, invece, parole come *prorynočnyj*, *propravitel'stvennyj* possono essere utilizzati da sostenitori di partiti e schieramenti diversi in quanto hanno perso la propria connotazione valutativa di natura ideologica.
- 4) Falsità, mancanza di autenticità: *psevdo-*, *kvazi-*, *lže-*. Questa categoria semantica si dimostra particolarmente attuale in un'era di cambiamenti e di rottura con gli stereotipi dell'epoca precedente. *Psevdo-* è il più produttivo tra i prefissi elencati e può legarsi sia ad aggettivi che sostantivi, mentre *kvazi-* solamente a sostantivi. Tra i due prefissi sussiste una differenza dal punto di vista semantico: *psevdo-* suggerisce l'idea di 'inganno', 'falsità', e dà forma a parole derivate che esprimono un giudizio soggettivo; *kvazi-* suggerisce invece l'idea di 'mancato raggiungimento del limite necessario',

ed esprime una proprietà del referente (cfr. *psevdomokratija* e *kvazisinonimy*). Il prefisso *lže-* è il meno produttivo dei tre, probabilmente perché esprime una valutazione particolarmente brusca e diretta (Zemskaja 200: 116).

- 5) Superlatività, qualità superiore, intensità, eccesso: *super-*, *sverch-*. La particolare produttività di questi suffissi nel russo contemporaneo può essere spiegata secondo Zemskaja (2000: 117) da due ragioni: la tendenza all'espressività tipica della lingua contemporanea (particolarmente indicativo il ridondante *supersverchfestival'*) e la denominazione di fenomeni legati al processo scientifico e tecnologico (per questi ultimi si usa in particolare *super-*). L'aumentata produttività sia del prefisso allogeno che di quello autoctono non permette quindi di ridurre la questione alla sola influenza dell'inglese e del lessico internazionale (che ha comunque determinato una perdita di terreno del secondo nei confronti del primo), ma va ad "indicare un "rilassamento" dei limiti idiostilistici e psicologici della creatività dei singoli" (Denisova - Salmon 2002: 268). Indicativo, infine, il fatto che 'super' abbia acquisito lo status di parola indipendente e venga spesso usato, soprattutto nel linguaggio giovanile, come interiezione (*Kak dela? - Super!*), predicato (*Ty - super!*) e come base di derivazione per aggettivi e avverbi (*superskij, superski*) (Zemskaja 2017: 215-216).

Il prefisso *ul'tra-*, originariamente connotato soprattutto politicamente (ad es. *ul'trarusskij*), ha recentemente esteso la sua sfera di impiego oltre il campo semantico della politica ed è impiegato oggi anche in vari domini scientifici (analisi scientifica, metallurgia, fisica, medicina, psicologia). Meno produttivi altri prefissi di eccesso come *archi-* e *giper-*, la cui diffusione viene comunque incentivata dall'internazionalizzazione del lessico (*archimillioner, giperinfljacija*).

Una spiegazione di natura culturologica per la particolare produttività della prefissazione nominale nel russo contemporaneo è stata fornita da Zenkin (2012), il quale ritiene che la prefissazione costituisca la principale forma di autodefinizione della cultura del XX secolo, sviluppatasi secondo Zenkin mediante l'aggiunta di nuovi prefissi alle etichette che designavano i movimenti culturali precedenti, nei confronti dei quali si esprime un atteggiamento di negazione e superamento che si riflette nella semantica di prefissi come *sverch-*, *neo-*, *giper-*, *meta-* e, soprattutto, *post-* (che infatti, secondo Zenkin, potrebbero essere tutti ricondotti all'archiprefisso *ne-*). Si può concludere quindi che l'aumento della produttività della prefissazione nominale sembra essere determinato dalle tendenze della cultura contemporanea – verrebbe da dire postmoderna – il cui atteggiamento di negazione e superamento del passato si riflette nella semantica dei prefissi più impiegati e che sembra andare di pari passo, in Russia, con la contrapposizione con il passato sovietico. A ciò si aggiunge la preferenza accordata dal 'gusto linguistico' contemporaneo ad elementi di origine straniera o particolarmente connotati dal punto di vista espressivo (è il caso, ad esempio, di molte formazioni in *super-*).

Per quanto concerne la prefissazione verbale, sono particolarmente produttive le modalità di derivazione di nuovi verbi a partire da basi straniere, solitamente mediante prefissi dal valore quantitativo-temporale, che ne agevolano l'inclusione nel sistema aspettuale russo. Tra i prefissi più diffusi vi sono *ot-* ('conclusione dell'azione'), *pere-* ('di nuovo', 'ancora') e i prefissi *s-* e *pro-*, usati nel loro significato risultativo: *skorrektirovat'*, *proindeksirovat'*, *otrestavrirovat'*, *perefinansirovat'* (Zemskaja 2017: 224). La creazione di coppie aspettuale dei verbi di origine straniera, considerati tradizionalmente biaspettuale, è in linea

con lo sviluppo e generalizzazione della categoria dell'aspetto verbale (si veda Glovinskaja 2008).

Il fenomeno è osservabile sia nella lingua colloquiale, sia nello standard, in particolare nella lingua dei giornali, nella letteratura sportiva e nei testi tecnici (ad es. *Fosfor pereprofilirujut na metizy*). Nello standard, la maggior parte di questi nuovi verbi presenta il suffisso *-irova-*, *-izirova-* o, più raramente, *-ova-*: *dempingovat'*, *lobbировat'*, *komp'juterizirovat'* (Zemskaja 2000: 127); i verbi in *-izirovat'* sono correlati ai sostantivi in *-izacija*, rispetto ai quali sono però meno produttivi e spesso compaiono successivamente (si veda sopra). Nella varietà orale dello standard è molto attivo il suffisso *-it'*, in particolare per quelle formazioni nate a seguito di innovazioni tecnologiche e la diffusione di nuovi strumenti: *kserokc – kserit' – otkserit'*.

Interfissazione

L'espansione della classe degli interfissi nel russo contemporaneo è legata allo sviluppo di modalità agglutinanti nel sistema di formazione delle parole, a sua volta determinato dall'uso come basi di derivazione di un gran numero di prestiti e cognomi indeclinabili e 'parole composte abbreviate'. Condizione necessaria per l'ingresso di queste classi di parole nel sistema derivazionale è infatti l'integrità morfologica della base all'interno del derivato, resa possibile dall'uso di interfissi (Zemskaja 2015: 44). Benché si possa pensare che l'espansione dei processi di interfissazione possa aumentare la varietà di modelli derivazionali, essa in realtà contribuisce all'unificazione del sistema in quanto, complice la tendenza a impiegare per analogia solo gli interfissi più produttivi (che sostituiscono quelli meno impiegati), è possibile ricondurre agli stessi tipi derivazionali parole formatesi sia con l'ausilio di interfissi, sia senza, in quanto prima del suffisso

mostrano segmenti fonici coincidenti almeno in parte, a prescindere dal fatto che questi svolgano o meno il ruolo di interfisso: cfr. *šaumjanovec* e *suvorovec*, *mol'еровский* e *lermontovskij*, *spartakovec* e *dinamovec* (Zemskaja 2015: 37).

L'interfisso più attivo nel russo contemporaneo è *-ov-*, il cui impiego permette di evitare l'alternanza consonantica e combinarsi con un maggior numero di basi rispetto a *-ec* e *-skij*: *ogon'kovec*, *oonovec*, *èlektrosilovec* (Zemskaja 2015: 44). Esso viene impiegato in particolare per la derivazione di prestiti e sostantivi di origine straniera (spesso indeclinabili), acronimi e composti troncati: ad es. *pentagonovcy*, *adidasovskij*, *ritm-end-bljuzovskij*, *metrovskaja stancija*, *zekovskij*, *detsadovec*, *voenkomatovskoe piš'mo* (Ryazanova-Clarke – Wade 1999: 204). La sua particolare produttività è dimostrata dal fatto che l'interfisso sta uscendo dal suo tradizionale campo d'azione (vale a dire la formazione di vocaboli in *-ovec*, *-ovskij*, *-ovščina*, *-ovstvo*) per andare a legarsi anche a suffissi che, di norma, si uniscono direttamente alla base di derivazione: cfr. *ržišče* e *ricovišče*, *razdevalka* e *zabegalovka*, *sacharnica* e *fruktovnica* (Zemskaja 2015: 33).

Anche l'interfisso *-š-*, tradizionalmente impiegato per la formazione di aggettivi deaverbiali dal significato temporale o locativo (*sevodnjašnjij*, *tamošnjij*), viene spesso utilizzato nelle varietà colloquiali del russo contemporaneo anche per la derivazione di sostantivi indeclinabili (*kinošnik*, *metrošnye znakomstva*), nonché di acronimi uscenti in vocale (*èmgeušnik*, *kagebešnik*, *gaišnik*). Se negli anni Sessanta e Settanta parole derivate con l'ausilio dell'interfisso *-š-* si incontravano prevalentemente nella lingua colloquiale, negli anni Novanta iniziano a comparire anche nella lingua dei giornali (Zemskaja 2006: 18); ciononostante, questo interfisso rimane stilisticamente connotato data la sua origine popolare (Zemskaja 2015: 45).

Un altro interfisso che vede aumentare la propria produttività in relazione alla derivazione di sostantivi indeclinabili è *-in-*, tradizionalmente impiegato per la derivazione di numerosi toponimi di genere femminile (*jaltinskij*). Nello specifico, l'interfisso *-in-* sta progressivamente invadendo il campo d'azione dell'infisso concorrente *-n-* nella derivazione di aggettivi a partire da toponimi indeclinabili uscenti in vocale tonica, nonostante la caduta della vocale finale possa rendere meno trasparente la base di derivazione sottostante (costituendo quindi una violazione del principio di trasparenza morfotattica): cfr. *ulan-udenskij* con *alma-atinskij*, *dušanbinskij*, *bakinskij*; *karagandinskij* (Zemskaja 2015: 34).

Si osserva, infine, un maggiore ricorso all'interfisso *-č-*, impiegato in combinazione con il suffisso *-anin* nella formazione di numerosi etnici in relazioni a città. Al giorno d'oggi si riscontra una particolare tendenza, in special modo nella carta stampata, a preferire l'uso di sostantivi in *-anin*, e specialmente in *-čanin*, per riferirsi agli abitanti di una città anche quando già esiste una variante ben consolidata in *-ec*: cfr. *belgorodčanin* e *belgorodec* (Ryazanova-Clarke – Wade 1999: 208).

Suffissazione

Nell'ambito della formazione nominale nel russo contemporaneo, il gruppo più attivo è quello dei sostantivi astratti, impiegati per la denominazione dei fatti nuovi della realtà contemporanea (Zemskaja 2017: 224). Le classi di sostantivi astratti maggiormente in crescita sono quelle in *-ost'*, *-ščina* e *-izm* e i *nomina actionis* in *-fikacija* e *-izacija*; meno frequente è il ricorso a *-stvo* (Zemskaja 2017: 231). Questi modelli si collocano all'interno della tradizione derivazionale russa; l'elemento di novità è costituito dall'aumento delle basi che possono essere così derivate. Ad esempio, il suffisso *-ost'* vede aumentare la

sua combinabilità, potendosi oggi legare anche con aggettivi in *-skij*: *russkost'*, *sovetskost'*, *detskost'* (Zemskaja 2017: 231). La sempre maggiore frequenza di neoformazioni in *-ost'* derivate da aggettivi e participi passivi in *-myj*, indicanti possibilità dell'azione (*smotrimost'*, *samooku-paemost'*, *konvertiruemost'*) è stata biasimata da parte di alcuni linguisti (si veda Ryazanova-Clarke – Wade 1999: 211; Kostomarov 1999: 191).

I suffissi *-ščina* e *-izm* sono ampiamente utilizzati per la formazione di sostantivi astratti che indicano tendenze e movimenti sociopolitici e culturali: *frankizm*, *rejganizm*, *atlantizm*, *menedžerizm*, *veščizm*, *chippizm*. Rispetto alle proprie controparti in *-izm*, le forme in *-ščina* sono connotate sia negativamente che dal punto di vista espressivo, in quanto esprimono solitamente un giudizio negativo del concetto o della personalità a cui si fa riferimento (Zemskaja 2000: 101). Una connotazione negativa è riscontrabile anche nei vocaboli in *-ščina* che indicano deficienze organizzative: *šturmovščina*, *avral'ščina*, *dogonjaevščina*, *črezvyčajščina* e *zastojščina*, variante colloquiale di *zastoj* (Ryazanova-Clarke – Wade 1999: 214). Relativamente recente è l'assunzione da parte di queste forme del significato di 'predisposizione': *inter'erščina*, *mitingovščina*, *službizm*, *vas'kizm*, *našizm*, *voždizm*, *imidžizm* (Ryazanova-Clarke – Wade 1999: 213, 216).

Il suffisso *-izacij-* è uno dei più produttivi nella formazione di sostantivi astratti nel russo contemporaneo (Zemskaja 2017: 225), spesso, come si è visto, in combinazione con il prefisso *de-*. Ogni fenomeno significativo dal punto di vista sociale (parola-chiave) dà vita a un sostantivo astratto corrispondente: ad es. *vaučerizacija* (Zemskaja 2000: 107). Se molte neoformazioni in *-izacij-* derivano da prestiti, fatto indicativo dell'alta produttività di questo modello derivazionale è la formazione di nuove parole a partire da base russe (ad es. *zarplatizacija*). L'ampia diffusione di sostantivi in *-izacija* (e *-fjkacija*) è stata notata già a partire

dagli anni Sessanta; la novità per la lingua russa consiste nel fatto che, nonostante si trattino di *nomina actionis*, essi non abbiano origine deverbale e, spesso, non possiedono neppure un corrispondente verbale (manca, ad esempio, il verbo *vaučerizovat'*, che esiste solo in potenza). Ciò è dovuto al fatto che i mutamenti sociali richiedono innanzitutto la formazione di nuove denominazioni in riferimento ai fatti sociali nuovi (tant'è che molte delle basi hanno origine straniera), il che determina nel russo contemporaneo il primato tra le neoformazioni della classe dei sostantivi su quella dei verbi (e degli aggettivi).

Meno interessanti sono gli sviluppi nel sistema dei modelli di formazione di nuovi nomi d'agente, per la quale il russo dispone di un vasto arsenale di suffissi. Tra questi, i più produttivi nel russo contemporaneo sono *-nik* e *-(š)čik*, impiegati per denominare le professioni della nuova realtà socioeconomica russa (*komp'juterščik*, *piarščik*) e l'appartenenza alla molteplicità di collettivi, schieramenti politici e ideologie sorta con il passaggio a una società pluralista (*deržavnik*, *rynočnik*). Secondo Zemskaja (2017: 234), negli ultimi venti e trent'anni un'intera serie di vocaboli in *-ščik*, etichettati come inusuali o colloquiali, sono ormai entrati stabilmente nell'uso: *komp'juterščik*, *oboronščik*, *informacionščik*, *kaveňščik*, *piarščik*, *strachovščik*, *reklamščik*, *detektivščik* ecc. I sostantivi in *-(š)čik* che indicano appartenenza a una collettività o un raggruppamento possono assumere una sfumatura negativa nel caso in cui esista un'altra variante con stessa radice: cfr. *perestrojčnik* e *antiperestrojščik*, *kooperator* e *kooperatorščik* (Zemskaja 2000: 103).

Molto produttivi sono anche i suffissi *-ec* e *-ist*, impiegati per la formazione di nomi d'agente che si riferiscono ai sostenitori di un leader politico o ai simpatizzanti di altri personaggi pubblici. Alla diffusione di *-ist* ha contribuito l'assimilazione di molti angloamericanismi e internazionalismi; tuttavia, *-ist* non si lega ai cognomi russi

in *-ov*, i quali danno forma a nomi d'agente esclusivamente tramite *-ec* (Zemskaja 2000: 99).

Sia la formazione di sostantivi in *-nik* e *-(š)čik*, sia la formazione di sostantivi in *-ec* e *-ist* costituiscono modelli derivazionali tradizionali; la loro particolare produttività non rappresenta quindi un significativo elemento d'innovazione. Molto più interessante è il caso del suffisso *-ovik/-evik*, i cui derivati sono spesso rivestiti da una patina di ufficialità, formalità e professionalità (*nalogovik*, *vachtovik*). Questo suffisso viene impiegato soprattutto in combinazione con radici uscenti in consonante velare, andando a sostituire i suffissi più produttivi *-nik* e *-ščik*, i quali richiederebbero un adattamento di natura fonologica: cfr. *nalogovik* e *naložnik* (Zemskaja 2017: 235).

Al netto dello sviluppo di modalità agglutinanti, la formazione di nomi d'agente non sembra presentare tratti particolarmente innovativi; un aspetto che però meriterebbe ulteriori e più approfonditi studi, date le sue implicazioni prettamente sociolinguistiche, è quello della formazione di nomi d'agente femminili. Nella lingua russa, così come d'altronde in italiano (si veda Fusco 2012), sussistono asimmetrie grammaticali e semantiche legate al genere. Rispetto ai corrispettivi di genere maschile, i nomi di persona femminili sono connotati diafasicamente verso il basso (cfr. *doktor* e *doktorša*, *professor* – *professorša*), il che ne limita la diffusione nella varietà standard della lingua e spiega i numerosi casi di assenza di corrispondenti femminili a nomi d'agente maschili, dovuti in verità anche a ragioni strutturali (ad esempio, per le difficoltà combinatorie con basi di derivazione monosillabiche o uscenti in velare: *chirurg*, *mèr*, *šef*; Zemskaja 2017: 239–240). Ciononostante, nel russo contemporaneo si osserva un livellamento quantomeno parziale di alcune asimmetrie: se all'accordo sintattico viene sempre più spesso preferito quello semantico, quantomeno nei registri non

particolarmente sorvegliati (Lasorsa Siedina – Benigni 2002: 71-72), nel sistema derivazionale viene riscontrato un aumento del numero di corrispondenti femminili a nomi d'agente maschili. I suffissi più impiegati per la formazione di nuovi nomi di persona femminile sono *-k(a)* e, in misura minore, *-ša*; poco produttivi si dimostrano invece i suffissi *-nica*, l'antico *-inja* e i suffissi di origine straniera *-isa* e *-essa* (Zemskaja 2017: 240-241).

Nella formazione degli aggettivi si osserva l'espansione della classe degli aggettivi di relazione. I suffissi più utilizzati per la formazione di aggettivi di relazione sono *-n-*, *-ov-* e *-sk-*, eventualmente legati a un interfisso; in particolare, è aumentata la produttività del modello in *-ovskij*, impiegato per derivare nuovi aggettivi di relazione a partire da acronimi e composti troncati: *SNGovskij*, *specnazovskij* (Zemskaja 2000: 125).

In molte neoformazioni si avverte una 'compressione derivativa' che risponde all'esigenza di 'condensazione e velocizzazione' della lingua d'oggi, in particolare di quella dei mezzi di comunicazione di massa: *cennostnyj*, *vlastnyj*, *stranovyj*, *novorusskij* (Lasorsa Siedina 2007: 261); non a caso, molte neoformazioni aggettivali hanno carattere terminologico: *barternaja sdelka*, *institut marketingovyč issledovanij*, *komp'juternoje obespečenie*. Per gli stessi motivi è diffusa la tendenza a sostituire il genitivo di specificazione con un corrispondente aggettivo di relazione: ad es. *cenovaja politika*, *rublevoe prostranstvo*, *vlastnye struktury* (Lasorsa Siedina – Benigni 2002: 21-22).

Parallelamente all'espansione della classe degli aggettivi di relazione, si osserva la scarsa produttività della classe degli aggettivi qualificativi. Tuttavia, ciò non significa che la categoria degli aggettivi qualificativi vada esaurendosi; significati qualificativi emergono infatti continuamente tra gli aggettivi di relazione, compensando

il calo nella formazione di nuovi aggettivi qualificativi (Zemskaja 2015: 206). L'acquisizione di un significato qualificativo comporta l'acquisizione di alcune caratteristiche morfologiche esclusive degli aggettivi qualificativi, come la possibilità di essere graduati e la realizzazione in posizione predicativa.

Fenomeni di riduzione

Nella morfologia derivazionale costituiscono modelli di particolare successo quelli che consistono nella riduzione del corpo fonico di una parola o di un sintagma. Fenomeno evidente è la proliferazione delle univerbazioni di unità lessicali del tipo 'aggettivo+sostantivo', con eliminazione del sostantivo e aggiunta di un suffisso derivazionale alla radice dell'aggettivo. Il suffisso più impiegato per la formazione di univerbazioni è *-k(a)* (ad es. *črezvyčajnaja situacija - črezvyčajka*), ma non è raro il ricorso ad altri suffissi alterativi, come ad esempio *-ša, -ik, -ucha* e *-uška*: *kontrol'naja rabota - kontroša, obmennyj punkt - obmennik, černyj chleb - černucha, duchovoj pistol - duchovuška*. Attive fin dagli anni Sessanta del Novecento (Benigni 2007: 120), le univerbazioni in *-k(a)* si sono diffuse nel corso dell'ultimo decennio del XX secolo nella lingua della stampa periodica e nel discorso pubblico orale, in linea con la traslazione di altri fenomeni periferici verso il centro del sistema. La proliferazione di questo modello è determinata dalla sua economicità, in risposta alle esigenze di condensazione della lingua d'oggi, ma anche da ragioni espressive; inoltre, l'univerbazione soddisfa inoltre il principio dell'isomorfismo (Benigni 2007: 123-124). Sebbene molte forme univerbate rimangano circoscritte ai gerghi sociali e professionali in cui sono state coniate (ad es. *sinchronka*, ovvero l'interpretazione simultanea), la produttività del modello è testimoniata dal fatto che molte formazioni sono uscite

dall'ambito gergale in cui sono comparse e vengono impiegate anche per la derivazione di denominazioni ridotte in relazione all'apparato statale e alla sfera professionale: ad es. *oboronka* – *oboronnaja promyšlennost'*, *piščevka* – *piščevaja promyšlennost'*, *otečka* – *otečestvennaja produkcija*. Il successo di questo modello derivazionale non sembra essere inoltre scalfito della polisemia o della scarsa trasparenza di alcune formazioni: ad esempio, *personalka* può essere il prodotto dell'univerbazione di *personal'noe delo*, *personal'naja avtomobil'*, e *personal'nyj komp'juter*.

Anche le retroformazioni, così come le univerbazioni, rappresentano un modello derivazionale periferico già attivo nello standard, ma che attraversa oggi una fase di particolare attività (Benigni 2007: 106). Esso consiste nella formazione di nuovi lessemi a partire da una base – prevalentemente aggettivale o verbale – attraverso l'eliminazione di elementi suffissali (a differenza delle forme tronche, dove il processo di riduzione ha carattere fonologico e può compromettere l'integrità della radice; si veda sotto); ciò determina un mutamento di categoria rispetto alla base da cui derivano: ad es. *intimnyj* – *intim*, *kriminal* – *kriminal'nyj*; *prikidyvat'sja* – *prikid*, *oblomat'sja* – *oblom*. In particolare, la retroformazione deverbale, sebbene rappresenti un modello derivazionale tipicamente russo, mostra una particolare produttività nelle varietà non standard, specialmente nel linguaggio giovanile e nel gergo dei *biznesmeny* (Benigni 2007: 117–118). Altro tratto in comune con le univerbazioni è la polisemia di molte formazioni; ad esempio, *oblom*, che nello standard significa 'schianto, rottura', assume nel linguaggio giovanile il significato di 'insuccesso', 'stato depressivo', 'contrattempo improvviso che manda a monte un piano', mentre nel gergo dei *biznesmeny* assume il significato più generico di 'flop', 'fallimento' (Benigni 2007: 119).

MORFOLOGIA COMPOSIZIONALE

Se da una parte la prefissazione e la suffissazione si confermano come i meccanismi di formazione più produttivi, dall'altra un tratto peculiare del russo contemporaneo è rappresentato certamente da una maggiore intensità dei processi abbreviativi e compositivi.

Una delle conseguenze più evidenti dell'influenza dell'inglese sulla morfologia compositiva russa è la mutazione di composti 'nome+-nome' in cui il modificatore precede il nome modificato (Kapatsinski, Vakareliyska 2013). Calcando la struttura dell'equivalente inglese, in queste formazioni il modificatore viene anteposto alla testa del sintagma nominale, contrariamente alle consuete norme compositive della lingua russa: cfr. *prajs-list*, *biznes-plan* con *divan-krovat'*, *ženščina-vrač* (Straniero Sergio 2006: 64). L'ampia diffusione e la produttività di questa modalità combinatoria, così come il fenomeno affine dell'espansione degli aggettivi analitici in relazione ai composti troncati (si veda sotto), costituiscono un ulteriore indizio della tendenza all'analiticità della lingua russa contemporanea.

Un secondo tratto caratteristico della morfologia compositiva russa contemporanea è l'espansione della classe delle 'abbreviazioni'. Occorre precisare che il termine russo *abbreviacija* ha un significato più ampio rispetto all'equivalente letterale italiano 'abbreviazione' e comprende i processi impiegati per la formazione delle cosiddette 'parole composte abbreviate' (*složno-sokraščennye slova*), un'etichetta che comprende acronimi fonetici (OON) e alfabetici (SSSR), acronimi formati dalle iniziali di alcune parole e segmenti di altre (*IMLI - Institut mirovoj literatury*), forme tronche (*zam per zamestitel'*), composti troncati (*kolchoz*) e altri tipi di 'parole macedonia' (ad es. *zavuč - zaveduščij učebnoj čast'ju*). Sebbene le *abbreviatury* abbiano origine antica,

è la rivoluzione del 1917 che svolge un ruolo di catalizzatore per questa modalità di formazione delle parole, fino ad allora non particolarmente produttiva. Nel corso degli anni Cinquanta, questo meccanismo di formazione è ormai attivo in diversi sottosistemi della lingua, specialmente nella terminologia, nella lingua degli affari e nella pubblicistica (Zemskaja 2006: 15). A cavallo fra i secoli XX e XXI si osserva uno sviluppo senza precedenti di abbreviazioni di ogni tipo, in particolare di acronimi alfabetici e fonetici, solitamente indeclinabili. Anche agli inizi del nuovo secolo continua la tendenza, già osservata da Panov negli anni Sessanta, a camuffare gli acronimi sotto l'aspetto di parole consuete come, ad esempio, nel caso del nome di molti partiti politici: *SLON* – *Sojuz ljudej za obrazovanie i nauku*, *JABLOKO* – *Javlinskij, Boldyrev, Lukin*, *PARNAS* – *Partija narodnoj svobody*, *ČESTNO* – *Čelovek. Spravedlivost'. Otvetstvennost'* (Zemskaja 2000: 121).

Il camuffamento degli acronimi rende evidente come le abbreviazioni svolgano non solo una funzione condensativa, particolarmente attuale in un'epoca dai ritmi accelerati come quella contemporanea, ma anche una funzione espressiva e ludica, riscontrabile nei seguenti usi (Zemskaja 2000: 121-124):

- formazione di acronimi che ricordano parole comuni, se non veri e propri camuffamenti, dando agli acronimi una connotazione aggiuntiva che altrimenti non avrebbero (ad es. *MIF* – *Moskovskij investicionnyj fond*, *BiDe* – *Belyj Dom*);
- interpretazione degli acronimi in senso ludico (ad es. *NEP* – *navedenie èlementarnogo porjadka*, *ČP* – *častnaja praktika, četvërtaja polosa*);
- uso di composti troncati marcati diafasicamente verso il basso, che possiedono una carica beffarda e spregiativa che la locuzione non troncata non possiede (ad es. *nadrep* – *narodnyj deputat*);

- derivazione di aggettivi a partire da acronimi alfabetici o fonetici di carattere ufficiale, connotate diafasicamente verso il basso (ad es. *èšèngovskij, ièbèšnyj, OGPUšnyj*).

Fenomeno particolarmente evidente è la spesso biasimata ibridazione grafica tra alfabeto latino e cirillico (ad es. *DVD-плеер, SOS-новый бор*), segno della tendenza al gioco linguistico, ma anche dell'espansione della cultura angloamericana (Lasorsa Siedina 2014: 440).

Anche la produttività dei composti troncati aumenta considerevolmente a partire dal 1917, così come per tutti gli altri tipi di abbreviazioni, in risposta all'esigenza di dare un nome alle istituzioni e agli organismi del neonato stato sovietico. Il legame semantico con la sfera pubblica rimane costante fino ai giorni nostri, il che influisce sulla loro produttività: nuovi composti vengono creati in relazione a nuove istituzioni, mentre altri sono caduti in disuso con la scomparsa del proprio referente, in particolare a seguito della dissoluzione dell'Unione Sovietica. Gli avvenimenti sociopolitici influenzano la produttività delle forme tronche: ad esempio, modificatori come *sov-* (*sovetskij*) e *soc-* (*socialističeskij*) escono dall'uso dopo il 1991, sostituiti da *ros-* (*rossijskij*). Altri campi semantici piuttosto produttivi risultano essere quelli legati alla sfera militare, medica e delle cariche pubbliche e private.

Nell'indagine sull'uso dei composti troncati condotta da Isabella Milan Albertin (2015) su un *corpus* giornalistico, la tipologia di composto troncato maggiormente diffusa è quella costituita da un aggettivo troncato unito ad un sostantivo intero (ad es. *gosbank*). Nel periodo successivo alla *perestrojka* è effettivamente aumentato il numero di elementi troncati che si trovano in inizio di parola, sui quali spesso cade un accento secondario, che possono essere separati dalla parola successiva da una leggera pausa, nei quali il suono vocalico non viene

ridotto, e che svolgono il ruolo di aggettivi analitici, e si comportano quindi come elementi invariabili, privi di marche flessive, mostrando la loro relazione col nome testa solamente attraverso la posizione immediatamente antecedente o successiva al nome cui si riferiscono. Oltre agli aggettivi tronchi sono osservabili anche altri tipi di modificatori analitici – prefissi, prefissoidi, nomi di origine straniera – dallo status grammaticale ambiguo, la cui espansione, assieme a quella della classe degli aggettivi analitici propriamente detti, rientra nella più generale tendenza all’analiticità della lingua russa contemporanea (per una classificazione si veda Benigni 2007: 54-105).

Un fenomeno di relativa innovazione è costituito dall’uso di forme tronche isolate, la cui base è costituita da un sostantivo (*prepod – prepodavatel’*) o, più raramente, da un sintagma nominale (*nal – naličnye den’gi, vichi – vychodnye dni*). Questo modello di formazione è tipico della lingua colloquiale e delle varietà substandard della lingua (in particolare dello *slang* giovanile) ed è quindi marcato diafasicamente e diafasicamente verso il basso (tanto da essere spesso inserite tra virgolette); tuttavia, la diffusione di queste forme è ormai tale da non compromettere la comprensione del testo (Benigni 2007: 111). Alla loro circolazione contribuisce la loro economicità e praticità, che ben si adatta alla necessità di sintesi della lingua dei mass-media, e la loro connotazione espressiva, specialmente in presenza dei suffissi alterativi come *-ik, -ak* (*televizor – telik, videomagnitofon – vidak*).

Occorre distinguere le forme troncate, che costituiscono un fenomeno di relativa innovazione, dalle retroformazioni, che rappresentano un modello già attivo nello standard, ma che presenta una particolare produttività nella lingua d’oggi (Benigni 2007: 106). Le prime derivano da basi nominali e si differenziano da queste solo dal punto di vista stilistico; le retroformazioni hanno invece origine deaggettivale e deverbale

e, di conseguenza, comportano un mutamento di categoria rispetto alla base da cui derivano. Un'ulteriore differenza consiste nel fatto che, nel caso dei troncamenti, la parte della parola eliminata non coincide con un suffisso; nelle retroformazioni, invece, la radice rimane intatta (ad es. *komp* – *komp'juter*, *intim* – *intimnyj*). Se le retroformazioni sono quindi il risultato di un processo morfologico, le forme tronche sono il risultato di un processo fonologico (Benigni 2007: 120).

La diffusione di modalità di formazione delle parole come il troncamento e la retroformazione, così come gli acronimi, risponde al principio di economia dei mezzi linguistici e alla tendenza alla condensazione della lingua d'oggi. Occorre inoltre osservare la relazione tra forme tronche e frequenza d'uso: ad essere troncate sono le forme impiegate per la denominazione di referenti a cui si fa riferimento più frequentemente; le forme tronche infatti sono più maneggevoli, soprattutto se impiegate con elevata frequenza (Benigni 2007: 125). A ciò si aggiunge la carica espressiva di queste forme, che trovano un'inedita accoglienza nella lingua dei media, orientata verso un atteggiamento più disinvolto e, appunto, espressivo. Il successo delle forme tronche può essere inoltre imputato all'influenza straniera, in particolare del modello angloamericano; alcune formazioni hanno infatti ottenuto lo status di veri e propri internazionalismi (ad es. *demo*, *prof*, *info*). D'altronde, il veicolo con cui questi usi entrano nello standard sono i gerghi professionali e sociali, come i gerghi dell'informatica, della musica e lo *slang* giovanile, varietà particolarmente permeabili all'influenza dell'inglese (Benigni 2007: 135).

OSSERVAZIONI CONCLUSIVE

In questo contributo si è cercato di tratteggiare le principali tendenze nella formazione delle parole nel russo contemporaneo,

contestualizzandole all'interno del più ampio quadro sociolinguistico attuale. La democratizzazione e liberalizzazione della lingua, da una parte, e la sua internazionalizzazione, dall'altra, incentivano l'assimilazione di prestiti interni ed esterni sia di natura lessicale, sia morfologica. Nella lingua dei mezzi di comunicazione di massa, modello del neostandard linguistico, si privilegia il ricorso a tratti linguistici stilisticamente connotati, marcati diastraticamente e diafasicamente verso il basso, accostandoli ad altri che sono invece di registro più elevato – prestiti di origine angloamericana e grecolatina, lessico aulico ed ecclesiastico – alla ricerca di uno stile originale, brillante ed espressivo, in affinità con le istanze poetiche e stilistiche postmoderne e la dinamicità del linguaggio telematico e di internet, all'insegna della contaminazione di generi e stili diversi e del *remix* libero.

I ritmi frenetici della società odierna, l'immediatezza della comunicazione in una società sempre più iperconnessa e lo sviluppo tecnico-scientifico determinano la preferenza per gli usi linguistici più economici e sintetici, privilegiando la trasmissione del contenuto a scapito della forma. Con ciò si spiega la produttività di forme composizionali e ridotte come acronimi, forme tronche e composti troncati, retroformazioni e univernazioni, nonché l'espansione della classe degli aggettivi di relazione.

Alle cause extralinguistiche di mutamento linguistico si affianca l'azione di due leggi interne della lingua, vale a dire la tendenza all'analisi e all'agglutinazione. Nell'ambito della formazione delle parole, costituiscono tratti analitici in espansione la proliferazione della classe dei modificatori analitici e degli acronimi, spesso indeclinabili. Il maggior ricorso alla morfologia composizionale e alla formazione di 'parole composte abbreviate' permettono lo sviluppo di modalità agglutinanti consistenti nella giustapposizione di morfemi senza il ricorso ad adattamenti di natura fonologica – in linea con il principio della trasparenza

morfotattica – privilegiando così il ricorso ad alcune classi di affissi rispetto che ad altre. A ciò si deve l'aumentata produttività dei modelli d'interfissazione, che permettono di evitare l'alternanza consonantica, aumentando le possibilità combinatorie dei suffissi.

Grande rilevanza hanno inoltre i modelli derivazionali e composizionali impiegati per la formazione di occasionalismi, impiegati non solo per ragioni referenziali, ma anche a scopo ironico ed espressivo o per esprimere un giudizio; essi meriterebbero un discorso a parte, e perciò vi è stato fatto solamente un accenno. In generale, l'invenzione linguistica è un tratto tipico della lingua d'oggi; parlanti e scriventi sembrano mettersi continuamente in gioco nel tentativo di sfoggiare il proprio estro creativo. Anche in questo caso, il modello è costituito dalla lingua dei giornali e degli altri mezzi di comunicazione di massa, nella quale l'adozione di uno stile disinvolto e brillante e il ricorso al gioco linguistico e ad altri mezzi espressivi costituiscono il contrasto più netto con l'epoca sovietica.

In conclusione, viene da chiedersi quali siano le conseguenze per la lingua russa alla luce dei cambiamenti in atto qui evidenziati. Una considerazione sullo stato generale della lingua non può prescindere dall'analisi di tutti i suoi livelli (lessico, morfologia, sintassi, testualità); ci si limita quindi ad osservare che i cambiamenti in atto nella sfera della formazione delle parole sono determinati dagli stessi fattori linguistici ed extralinguistici che influenzano il mutamento linguistico del russo contemporaneo nel suo complesso. Per quanto riguarda segnatamente il sistema di formazione delle parole, la maggior parte dei fenomeni innovativi non è costituita da tratti linguistici inediti, ma da modelli derivazionali e composizionali periferici che si diffondono progressivamente nello standard, incentivati dalla democratizzazione della lingua e dalla desacralizzazione della norma, in special modo nel russo digitato; la novità non è quindi tanto di natura linguistica, quanto sociolinguistica. ♡

Bibliografia

- BARON, NAOMI, 2008: *Always On: Language in an Online and Mobile World*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- BENIGNI, VALENTINA, 2007: *Il mutamento linguistico nel russo contemporaneo*. Roma: Aracne.
- BENIGNI, VALENTINA, MASINI, FRANCESCA, 2009: Compounds in Russian. *Lingue e linguaggio* 8, 2. 171–194.
- FUSCO, FABIANA, 2012: *La lingua e il femminile nella lessicografia italiana fra stereotipi e (in)visibilità*, Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso.
- GLOVINSKAJA, MARINA J. 2008: Aktivnye processy v grammatike. *Sovremennyj russkij jazyk. Aktivnye processy na rubeže XX–XXI vekov*. ED. KRYSIN L.P. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskich kul’tur.
- KAPATSINSKI, VSEVOLOD, VAKARELIYSKA, CYNTHIA, 2013: [N[N]] compounds in Russian: A growing family of constructions. *Constructions and frames* 5, 1. 69–87.
- KOSTOMAROV, VITALIJ G., 1999: *Jazykovej vkus epochi*. Sankt-Peterburg: Zlatoust
- KOTELOVA, NADEŽDA Z., 2015: Pervyj opyt leksikografičeskogo opisanija russkich neologizmov. *Izbrannye raboty*, Sankt-Peterburg: Nestor-Istorija. 181–199.
- MILAN ALBERTIN, ISABELLA, 2015: *Analisi linguistica dei composti troncati in russo e del loro utilizzo nel linguaggio giornalistico*. Venezia: Università Ca’ Foscari.
- LASORSA SIEDINA, CLAUDIA, 1992: Note sul lessico della pubblicistica russa contemporanea. *Slavia* 1, 2. 21–30.
- LASORSA SIEDINA, CLAUDIA, 2004: L’evoluzione del russo attuale e la prassi glottodidattica. *Studi Slavistici* 1. 223–233

- LASORSA SIEDINA, CLAUDIA, 2007: Variabilità della norma e standard linguistico del russo attuale. *Gli studi slavistici in Italia oggi*. Ed. De Giorgi R. et al. Udine: Forum. 257–268.
- LASORSA SIEDINA, CLAUDIA, 2014: L'accelerazione del russo attuale e i mass-media. *Linee di confine. Separazioni e processi di integrazione nello spazio culturale slavo*. Ed. Moracci G. et al. Firenze: Firenze University Press. 437–447.
- LASORSA SIEDINA, CLAUDIA, BENIGNI, VALENTINA, 2002: *Il russo in movimento. Un'indagine sociolinguistica*. Roma: Bulzoni Editore.
- RYAZANOVA-CLARKE, LARISSA, WADE, TERENCE, 1999: *The Russian Language Today*. London: Routledge.
- DENISOVA, GALINA, SALMON, LAURA, 2002: Il russo 'della Pepsi e della libertà': moda linguistica, ideologia o nuovi referenti? *L'inglese e le altre lingue europee: studi sull'interferenza linguistica*. Ed. San Vicente, F. Bologna: CLUEB. 256–274.
- STRANIERO SERGIO, FRANCESCO, 2006: Aspetti morfosintattici e sociolinguistici dell'influenza dell'inglese sulla lingua russa. *Rivista internazionale di tecnica della traduzione* 9. 63–73.
- VALGINA, NINA S. et al. 2002: *Sovremennyj russkij jazyk*. Moskva: Logos.
- VALGINA, NINA S., 2003: *Aktivnye processy v sovremennom russkom jazyke*. Moskva: Logos.
- ZAJCEVA, ELENA A., DOLGOVA, ELENA J., 2011: Prefiksal'nye imena suščestvitel'nye v russkom jazyke načala XXI stoletija: osobennosti obrazovanija i značenija. *Vestnik Volžskogo universiteta im. V.N. Tatiščeva* 7. 23–27.
- ZEMSKAJA, ELENA A., 2000: *Aktivnye processy sovremennogo slovooproizvodstva. Russkij jazyk konca XX stoletija (1985–1995)*. Ed. Zemskaja E.A. Moskva: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury.

- ZEMSKAJA, ELENA A., 2006: Aktivnye processy v russkom slovoobrazovanii našego vremeni. *Acta Neophilologica* 8. 9–21
- ZEMSKAJA, ELENA A., 2015: *Jazyk kak dejatel'nost'*, Mosca: Flinta.
- ZEMSKAJA, ELENA A., 2016: *Sovremennyj russkij jazyk. Slovoobrazovanie*, Mosca: Flinta.
- ZEMSKAJA, ELENA A., 2017: Literaturnaja norma i neuzual'noe slovoobrazovanie. *Sovremennyj russkij jazyk*. Ed. Krysin L.P. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskich kul'tur.
- ZENKIN, SERGEJ 2012: Kul'turologija prefiksov. *Raboty o teorii: Stat'i* Moskva: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie. 137–147.
- ŠVEDOVA, NATALIJA J. (ed.), 1980: *Russkaja grammatika v dvux tomax*. 1. Moskva: Nauka.

Summary

The word-formation system is made up of two components: morphology and lexicon. While the first is relatively stable over time, the latter evolves more rapidly according to social changes. However, studying linguistic variation cannot be exclusively devoted to changes in the lexical-semantic system of the language, as most new words are created through word-formation processes.

The transition to pluralism and a free-market economy has led to the democratisation and liberalisation of the language, the relaxation of stylistic norms and the adoption of a great number of loanwords, which serve as root for many new derivatives. The new standard is represented by the language of newspapers and mass-media, which employs colloquial, informal and non-standard elements for expressive and ludic purposes. As the pace of life and writing speed up, preference is given to economical and synthetic elements, such as abbreviations, truncated forms, acronyms, ‘univerbations’ and relative adjectives. As a result, non-standard word-formation types and procedures infiltrate the standard usage. Moreover, analytical and agglutinative trends are growing stronger, and one of the typical features of contemporary Russian is the growth of analytical adjectives, abbreviations and complex words. As a consequence of the agglutinative trend, the morphemes employed in creating these words often do not undergo phonetic changes.

Lorenzo Penta

Lorenzo Penta is a student at the Department of Language, Translation and Interpreting Studies of the University of Trieste. His main area of interest is language variation and change in contemporary Italian and Russian language.

Reviews



Ritorno alla filologia

Return to Philology

RECENSIONE DI

Studia Litterarum. Научный филологический журнал
Института мировой литературы имени А.М. Горького
Российской академии наук.

Nel 2016 è uscito il primo numero della rivista *Studia Litterarum*, edita dall'Istituto A.M. Gor'kij di Letteratura mondiale dell'Accademia delle Scienze Russa (*Institut mirovoj literatury imeni A.M. Gor'kogo RAN*). È disponibile sia a stampa (Issn: 2500-4247), sia on-line (e-Issn: 2541-8564). L'accesso al sito (<http://www.studlit.ru>) è gratuito. La rivista, a scadenza trimestrale, è *peer-reviewed* ed è indicizzata in *Doaj*, *ErihPlus*, *CiteFactor*, *EuroPub*, *Ulrich*, *Electronic Journals Library* e *Slavic Humanities Index*. La direzione è affidata ad Aleksandr B. Kudelin (membro della RAN), il comitato scientifico ed editoriale è internazionale. Vengono accettati contributi in lingua russa, inglese, francese, tedesco, spagnolo e italiano. In questa sede passeremo in rassegna gli otto numeri (più di 2300 pagine), pubblicati nei primi due volumi (2016/vol. 1, nn. 1-4; 2017/vol. 2, nn. 1-4).¹

L'orientamento metodologico della rivista emerge dal saggio introduttivo di Vadim V. Polonskij (I/1-2), dove viene affrontato il problema dell'interpretazione come categoria dominante degli studi letterari della seconda metà del XX secolo. Tale orientamento metodologico sarebbe stato fortemente condizionato dalla filosofia. È una considerazione condivisibile, già sottolineata da Gianni Vattimo nella prefazione alla seconda edizione di *Verità e metodo* di Hans-Georg Gadamer (1983). Il filosofo italiano notava, con una punta di rammarico, come la categoria della realtà come "orizzonte linguistico" fosse stata applicata maggiormente agli studi letterari che non alla filosofia. Polonskij affronta il problema della correlazione tra le due discipline, presente sin dall'antichità classica. In seguito, essa si sarebbe dipanata lungo una continua oscillazione (Schlegel, Schleiermacher, Nietzsche, Heidegger) tra l'orientamento filologico della filosofia (*filologizacija filosofii*) e l'orientamento filosofico della filologia (*filosofizacija filologii*). In considerazione della crisi contemporanea delle teorie letterarie

1
In seguito indicheremo il volume con numeri romani e il fascicolo con numeri arabi.

“interpretative”, lo studioso auspica un ritorno alla filologia “classica”, com’era stata fondata nel XIX secolo (storia della letteratura, critica testuale, studi biografici, poetica testuale). A parere di Polonskij, un ritorno alla filologia propriamente detta sarebbe in grado di superare la non sempre feconda contaminazione tra filosofia e filologia.

L’indirizzo generale della rivista, anche nella sua divisione in sezioni, sembra seguire la strada indicata da Polonskij (teoria della letteratura, letteratura straniera, letteratura russa, letterature dei popoli della Federazione russa, folcloristica, critica testuale). In realtà, gli articoli, pubblicati nei primi due volumi, possono essere raggruppati secondo studi metodologicamente e tematicamente omogenei, trasversali rispetto allo loro collocazione nelle singole sezioni.

EVOLUZIONE LETTERARIA

Più di un terzo degli articoli è orientato verso la ricerca di ciò che Tynjanov aveva definito come *evoluzione letteraria*, come piccoli e grandi spostamenti (*sdvig*) che aprono la strada al rinnovamento di uno specifico genere letterario o di una poetica storicamente consolidata. In linea generale, seguendo le riflessioni di Michail Bachtin sulla “memoria di genere” nel “tempo grande”, si può affermare, come fa Irina L. Popova (I/1-2), che “memoria” e “oblio” sono categorie dominanti nell’evoluzione della letteratura. La maggior parte degli studi, che nella rivista segue questo percorso, riguarda, oltre la letteratura russa, la letteratura inglese, francese e tedesca, a dimostrazione del fatto che l’evoluzione letteraria è un processo generale che si sviluppa indipendentemente dai limiti imposti dalla lingua, dalla nazione e dalla cultura di riferimento. Nelle singole letterature nazionali l’evoluzione si differenzia solo per i tempi del suo manifestarsi.

Evoluzione dei generi. Nelle opere di John Gibson Lockhart (1794–1854) e Thomas Moore (1779–1852) il *romanzo storico* evolve, rispetto al canone di Walter Scott, verso un principio di continuità tra l'azione del singolo e il contesto generale (Elena Somova, II/1). Nina Ljachovskaja (II/1) affronta il problema della verità storica nella letteratura africana francofona, dalla quale emerge la differenza tra la narrazione di un'Africa storica (sognata, desiderata) e quella reale. Uno spostamento della narrazione storica nella letteratura araba (Aleksandr Kudelin, I/1–2 e II/4) si realizza, da un lato, grazie all'intrecciarsi tra elementi documentari e *fiction*, presenti nella *Vita del profeta* di Ibn Ishāq – Ibn Hishām (767–828 d.C.), mentre, dall'altra, l'incrocio tra discorsi diversi (discorso diretto, linguaggio della vita pubblica siriana) funge da genesi per un nuovo materiale narrativo. Piccoli e grandi spostamenti si hanno nel genere della *letteratura di viaggio*. Se per la scrittrice contemporanea africana Véronique Tadjo il viaggio porta a una dolorosa “biforcazione” tra l'attaccamento alla tradizione tribale e la modernità (Nina Ljachovskaja, II/4), per il portoghese Camilho Pessanha (1867–1926) il viaggio (in Cina), alla scoperta dell'altro da sé, si risolve nel suo opposto, ovvero all'affermazione del sé (Gérard M. M. Siary, I/3–4). Dell'evoluzione del genere della *commedia* si occupa Michail L. Andreev, che in due articoli (I/3–4 e II/3) affronta il classico problema del superamento dei personaggi a ruoli “finiti” della commedia dell'arte nel teatro di Goldoni, mentre in quello di Corneille l'attenzione viene posta sulla nascita di un genere intermedio, dove i rigidi confini tra tragicità e comicità si attenuano. L'evoluzione del *genere epico* nella letteratura russa antica viene affrontata da Vladimir M. Kirillin (II/1), che in alcuni elementi della *povest'* e dello *skazanie* scorge il nucleo di un successivo sviluppo della norma letteraria, mentre il contributo di Anatolij S. Demin (I/1–2) introduce nelle riflessioni sulla letteratura russa antica non solo la

presenza di una costante interferenza di vari generi, dal didattico al filosofico, bensì, in primo luogo, la presenza di un autore che, pur anonimo, risulta fortemente ancorato alla contemporaneità. In ambiti diversi, Elena S. Kotljar (II/4) studia il processo evolutivo che, a causa del dominio coloniale e dell'inevitabile interculturalità, conduce l'eroe "eroico" della narrazione epica africana verso una figura meno monolitica, a tratti anche divertente. Uno spostamento significativo nel *genere delle memorie* viene individuato da Svetlana Ju. Pavlova (II/2), che nell'opera di Mademoiselle de Montpensier (1627–1693) trova la conferma di una lunga tradizione mitologica e letteraria della donna "forte", orientata verso l'autoaffermazione. Grande autonomia di giudizio rispetto alla cultura maschile del tempo si riscontra nella corrispondenze e nei diari di Rahel Varnhagen, donna dei salotti letterari in Germania, tra la fine del XVIII e gli anni '30 del XIX secolo, sensibile alle tendenze artistiche del tempo. Attraverso la lettura delle sue memorie, Džul'etta L. Čavčanidze (II/4) ricostruisce le dispute culturali e letterarie del tempo, dal crepuscolo dell'età illuministica alla nascita del movimento romantico. All'evoluzione del genere delle memorie è dedicato anche lo studio di Ekaterina A. Esenina (II/4). Gli scritti autobiografici di Anastasija Cvetaeva, sorella di Marina, passano, da un iniziale indirizzo filosofico (*Korolevskie razmyšlenija*, 1915), al romanzo di genere, per concludersi, infine, in un'autorappresentazione, volta alla costruzione di una propria immagine autonoma (*Vospominanija*, 1971, 2008). Anche nel *romanzo d'avventura* la figura di Fantômas, il "male" per definizione, subisce non poche trasformazioni nei 32 volumi, pubblicati a partire dal 1911 da Pierre Souvestre and Marcel Allain (alcuni dopo la morte di Souvestre nel 1914). Il personaggio si adegua ai segni culturali della Belle époque, ai modelli letterari coevi, alle cronache giornalistiche e ai nascenti canoni della letteratura di massa, antesignani delle serie

televisive “noir” e perfino dei fumetti (Kirill A. Čekalov e Natal’ja T. Pačsar’jan, II/4). Di *romanzo erotico* tratta lo studio di Andrej V. Golubkov (II/2) che individua nel romanzo *Gamiani, ovvero Due notti di eccessi* di Alfred de Musset (1830) un superamento della tradizione romantica e della tradizione francese del libertinaggio e delle perversioni sessuali, codificata dal marchese De Sade. Specialmente nella figura della lesbica Gamiani, Musset apre al personaggio decadente che precorre i *Fiori del male* di Baudelaire. L’articolo di Natal’ja Smirnova (II/1) esamina l’evoluzione del *genere biografico* attraverso la lettura dei romanzi di Paul Auster, poi raccolti in *The New York Trilogy* (1985–1986), dove biografia e autobiografia si intrecciano in una doppia narrazione: l’autore traccia la biografia del personaggio principale (un ispettore di polizia) che, a sua volta, viene descritto dal personaggio indagato dallo stesso ispettore. Alla tradizione del genere nella letteratura russa rivolge la sua attenzione Evgenija V. Ivanova (I/3–4). Se le biografie di Plutarco (*Vite parallele*) hanno influenzato il genere nella letteratura inglese (James Boswell, Lytton Strachey) e il successivo canone biografico di Thomas Carlyle (*The Heroic in History*, 1841), il “diritto alla biografia”, in virtù di un riconoscimento agli uomini di scienza (e non agli eroi), evolve, sia nella letteratura francese (Gaston Tissandier, *Les Martyrs de la science*, 1879), sia in quella tedesca (Wilhelm Dilthey, Georg Simmel), verso la valorizzazione della grandezza spirituale dell’uomo. È l’orientamento di maggior successo nel genere biografico in Russia (G.O. Vinokur). Già Tynjanov aveva individuato nel *genere parodico* il segno inconfondibile di un’evoluzione letteraria in atto. Ekaterina V. Kuznecova (II/1) esamina nella poesia iniziale di Igor’ Severnjanin le allusioni parodiche al primo simbolismo (Brjusov, Bal’mont), presenti anche nelle opere di S. Gornyj, K. Čukovskij e A. Blok. Per Severnjanin la parodia si manifesta come “testo ambivalente”, come *sdvig* necessario per approdare a un

proprio percorso estetico. Sulle *trasformazioni endotestuali di una stessa forma poetica*, il sonetto, si interroga Elena V. Chaltrin-Chalturina (II/3), mettendo a confronto i sonetti del conte Paride (atto I, 3) e di Romeo (atto I, 5) nella tragedia di Shakespeare *Romeo e Giulietta*. Dall'analisi, anche in comparazione con i sonetti 126 e 128 di Shakespeare nell'edizione del 1609, emerge la dinamicità e l'integrazione "drammatica" del sonetto di Romeo, mentre il sonetto di Paride sembra estraneo alla trama della tragedia. Sull'*intertestualità dei generi* si sofferma Jurij Ja. Barabaš (II/3), analizzando il ciclo di Taras Ševčenko *I salmi di Davide*. La comparazione con il *Libro dei salmi* del Vecchio testamento dimostra il processo di *adattamento e di trasformazione rispetto all'opera sacrale*. Il "dialogo delle interpretazioni", come chiave per la comprensione del ciclo di Ševčenko, trasforma il testo sacrale dalle componenti poetiche in un testo poetico dalle componenti sacrali. La trasformazione di un'opera, da tempo codificata, in "testo" si risolve in due ipostasi di uno stesso fenomeno di natura spirituale e poetica.

Evoluzione delle poetiche. Tre articoli sono dedicati all'*evoluzione letteraria nel periodo rococò*, ovvero alla figura di Claude Prosper Jolyot de Crébillon (1707-1777), detto Crébillon fils. Natal'ja V. Lidergos (I/3-4) individua nello scetticismo e nell'ironia dei romanzi *L'Écumoire ou Tanzaï et Néadarné* (1734), *Le Sopha* (1742) e *Les Égarements du cœur et de l'esprit* (1736-1738) una narrazione aperta, capace di offrire diversi piani di lettura (dalla cronaca mondana alla riflessione filosofica). Natal'ja T. Pachasar'jan (II/1) propone un'analisi comparativa tra l'organizzazione cronotopica dei romanzi di Crébillon e i romanzi *L'Astrée* di Honoré d'Urfé (1607-1627) e *La Princesse de Clèves* di Madame de La Fayette (1678). L'evoluzione nel periodo rococò si manifesta come rifiuto dell'ostentata retorica teatrale dello spazio barocco, che approda, infine, alla de-teatralizzazione e all'astrazione topografica dell'ambiente narrativo.

Ricostruendo il consolidarsi della conversazione salottiera come rito sociale dell'aristocrazia francese del XVII e XVIII secolo, Veronika D. Altašina (I/1-2) trova nella narrativa di Crébillon fils alcune anticipazioni del “principio dialogico” (il dialogo del personaggio con se stesso, il dialogo dell'autore con il lettore, il dialogo mediato dalle citazioni con altri autori, l'autoreferenzialità dell'autore). *L'evoluzione del primo romanticismo* è il tema degli studi di Ljudmila G. Šakirova (II/1; II/2), che parte dalle iniziali esperienze poetiche di Lermontov, inserite a suo tempo come *Dubia* nelle opere complete ma successivamente tolte. A dimostrazione della paternità delle sue poesie giovanili, la studiosa traccia il percorso che porta Lermontov dall'almanacco *Cefej*, edito dal circolo di Semen E. Raič, fautore della scuola preromantica di Jena (in opposizione al “neo petrarchismo” di tradizione italiana), all'Istituto moscovita dei nobili (*Moskovskij blagorodnyj pansion*) negli anni 1829-1832. In questo periodo le dispute tra i seguaci della scuola di Jena e del neoclassicismo petrarchesco influenzano la sua poesia, anche se risulta evidente l'eco delle idee di Wilhelm Heinrich Wackenroder, teorico con i fratelli Schlegel della scuola di Vienna. Solo nell'ambito dell'Istituto Lermontov si sarebbe potuto confrontare con le diverse tendenze (neo)romantiche, dalle quali avrebbe in seguito elaborato una propria poetica, autonoma rispetto alle dispute in atto. *L'influenza della filosofia come motore evolutivo* nella poesia di Coleridge viene indagata da Eka-terina P. Zyкова (I/3-4) che, tracciato il percorso del poeta inglese da Locke e Spinoza a Kant e Schelling, conduce Coleridge a una feconda conciliazione tra il mondo spiritualizzato della natura (Spinoza) e la libertà morale dell'individuo (Kant). *L'evoluzione del concetto di stile poetico* è al centro dell'attenzione del saggio di Irina I. Burova e Zhang Zizhu (II/2), dove la categoria letteraria dello stile (magistralmente studiata, a suo tempo, da Viktor V. Vinogradov) viene raffrontata con

l'opera *The Arte of English Poesie* (1589), attribuita a G. Puttenham, e con il trattato-poema *Epithalamion* (1595) di Edmund Spenser. In entrambi, lo stile è inteso come armoniosa combinazione di elementi eterogenei (letteratura, musica, pittura, architettura), tratto specifico decisivo anche per la fortuna delle traduzioni russe e cinesi del poema di Spenser. Elena V. Chaltrin-Chalturina (I/3-4) esamina le figure allegoriche del poema *The Faerie Queene* (1590-1596) di Edmund Spenser secondo le interpretazioni più recenti su "simbolo" e "allegoria" di A.F. Losev e S.S. Averincev. Anche in questo caso la funzione di dire qualcosa "in altro modo" (allegoria, personificazioni, immagine, metafora e mito) si diversifica in una combinazione omogenea che solo molti secoli dopo verrà superata dalla poetica del romanticismo. Il *mutare di uno stesso tema dominante* emerge dal confronto, proposto da Tat'jana Krasavčenko (II/3), tra la poesia di Edward James Hughes (1930-1998) e di Thomas Stearns Eliot (1888-1965) nel loro rapporto con il tema della natura. Solo Huges (poeta inglese) mantiene intatto fino alla fine tale rapporto, mentre l'anglo-americano Eliot sembra orientarsi verso la modernità "urbana". Del *passaggio dalla letteratura didattica alla letteratura d'invenzione* si occupa Irina Karlovna Staf (II/4), che analizza il trattato *L'Archiloge Sophie, qui parle de l'amour de sapience* (ca. 1400) di Jacques Legrand nel suo rapporto con la narrativa didattico-morale, rappresentata da Boccaccio (*Genealogia degli dei*) e da Ovidio (*Le metamorfosi*). Nella *poetrie* di Legrand lo spazio autonomo dell'invenzione favorisce il distacco dai modelli educativi di tradizione biblica. *L'evoluzione della letteratura tedesca e austriaca nei periodi di transizione* è trattata da V. Kudravceva (II/3), che individua alcuni spostamenti significativi nel periodo transitorio tra la fine del XIX e l'inizio del XX secolo, mentre Vasilij M. Tolmačev (II/3) legge i *Buddenbrook* di Thomas Mann come romanzo sulla fine del rinascimento letterario tedesco e i racconti *Tonio*

Kröger (1903) e *Morte a Venezia* (1912) come movimento verso l'ambivalenza dell'artista contemporaneo. Alla A. Strel'nikova dedica due articoli (I/3-4, II/2) all'evoluzione del teatro austriaco nello stesso periodo di transizione. Attorno al gruppo della "Giovane Vienna" (H. Bahr, Schnitzler, Hofmannsthal), il teatro, che suscitò molto interesse anche in Russia (Blok, Tairov), si manifesta come evento culturale e artistico, come metafora della vita, in opposizione agli ipocriti salotti viennesi. Già negli autori austriaci del XIX secolo (A. Stifter, F. von Saar, P. Rosegger, M. G. Saphir) le forme del teatro (maschere, palcoscenico, sipario) sono costitutive del mondo della finzione letteraria. In virtù del rinnovato ruolo della cultura teatrale nella Vienna di fine e inizio secolo sarà resa possibile anche la transizione verso la letteratura austriaca moderna. La *riscoperta del ruolo dell'infanzia* come fonte originale del futuro artista nella letteratura austriaca moderna è il tema dell'articolo di Vera V. Kotelevskaja (II/4). Lo sviluppo dell'idea neo-romantica dell'infanzia e la sua concettualizzazione come "altro" perduto, che solo l'arte può recuperare, trova piena espressione nel romanzo *Die Aufzeichnungen des Malte Laurids Brigge* (1910) di Rainer Maria Rilke. Anastasija V. Golubcova (I/1-2) offre una riflessione sul *periodo di transizione della letteratura italiana* a cavallo dei secoli XIX e XX°, riscontrando nelle opere degli scapigliati, dei veristi, di D'Annunzio, Pirandello, Carducci, Capuana e dei futuristi un fine comune: il tentativo di superare l'arretratezza culturale italiana per riportarla nell'alveo europeo. Della *transizione tra tradizione e modernità* nella poesia del poeta tataro R. Achmetzjanov (1935-2008) tratta l'articolo di Venera R. Amineva (I/3-4). L'analisi delle sue poesie (anni '60 e '80), avvalendosi anche degli studi di studiosi e teorici della poesia, come Anna Han e Aage A. Hansen-Löwe, rivela un diverso rapporto tra l'io lirico e l'oggetto della rappresentazione poetica. Anche in considerazione del ruolo

fondamentale della poesia russa del Novecento, viene alla luce un nuovo rapporto tra uomo e donna, dialogico (Bachtin), diverso dalla tradizione tatarea. Secondo Jurij Girin (I/3-4), la *transizione tra modernità e avanguardia* non segnerebbe un'insanabile rottura tra le opposte tendenze, perché la ricerca dell'Assoluto, a parere del ricercatore, sembrerebbe essere il filo conduttore di tutta l'esperienza dell'avanguardia europea dei primi decenni del XX secolo. Infine, la *trasformazione della cultura popolare* in vari periodi della storia russa viene trattata da Ekaterina A. Dorochova (II/4). La cultura popolare, per sua natura conservativa, si adatta al pragmatismo della storia (collettivizzazione degli anni '20 e '30, il periodo sovietico, la seconda guerra mondiale, la fine dei kolchoz, la tragedia di Černobyl', il risveglio della sensibilità ecologica), recuperando, di volta in volta, i propri elementi fondativi.

LETTERATURA, SOCIETÀ E POTERE POLITICO

Tra i temi classici degli studi filologici un posto particolare spetta alle ricerche sul rapporto tra letteratura, società e potere politico. Tale rapporto può essere conflittuale con conseguenti interventi *censori e autocensori*, può essere mascherato e riportato alla luce con *ricerche d'archivio* e può essere fonte di *letture alternative* rispetto ai processi storici in atto. Anche se il conflitto tra potere e letteratura si riscontra in diversi momenti della storia russa, il maggior numero di articoli riguarda il periodo sovietico.

Censure e autocensure. Il contributo di Ol'ga A. Krašeninnikova (I/1-2) si occupa della pubblicazione di un *pamphlet* anonimo del 1732 (*Podmetnoe pis'mo 1732 goda*), che durante il regno (1730-1740) della zarina Anna Ivanovna ebbe grande risonanza per le critiche mosse alla politica della Chiesa e all'eccessiva influenza straniera. Fu istituita un'apposita

commissione d'inchiesta (*Rešilovskoe delo*) che portò alla condanna di molte persone innocenti. Igor' A. Vinogradov (I/1-2) indaga sui rapporti tra Nicola I e N.V. Gogol'. Lo zar fu suo lettore, sostenitore e censore, passando da padre benevolo (con elargizioni, premi e favori) a padre critico (per esempio, nei confronti de *Il matrimonio*). Gogol' si rivolse spesso a lui per avere il sostegno alla pubblicazione delle sue opere, prima che queste passassero il vaglio della censura. Dopo la morte di Gogol', Nicola I diede pieno appoggio alla pubblicazione delle sue opere. Maksim L. Fedorov (II/3) osserva il mutare degli interventi censori in merito alla pièce di Dem'jan Bednyj *Bogatyri*. Inizialmente in perfetta sintonia con la tendenza "atea" della cultura ufficiale del tempo, la sua satira nei confronti del cristianesimo, dei *bogatyri* e del principe Vladimir fu in seguito considerata poco opportuna dalla censura sovietica. Negli anni '30 lo spettacolo fu tolto dalle scene e il regista Tairov e Dem'jan Bednyj persero il sostegno politico. Ogni nuova congiuntura storica doveva applicarsi anche ai testi scritti in precedenza. Così, per esempio, Anna S. Akimova (I/3-4) indaga sulle correzioni che nel 1944-1945 Aleksej Tolstoj fece sul I volume del romanzo *Pietro il Grande* (successivamente inserite nelle *Opere complete* del 1946-1953). Nella versione "rivista" furono tolti alcuni "momenti sbagliati" (riferimenti positivi ai tedeschi, l'eccessivo carattere violento di Pietro, trasformato, per l'occasione, in *milostivij car*). Le vicissitudini del progetto di Gor'kij (1931) di pubblicare una collana sui presunti cambiamenti, avvenuti nelle singole realtà urbane, sono il tema del contributo di Dar'ja S. Moskovskaja (I/1-2). Le "brigade degli scrittori" avrebbero dovuto magnificare la dissoluzione della vita urbana borghese e mercantile, ma il tutto si risolse nel suo opposto, ovvero in una rinnovata coscienza "provinciale", poco adatta alle necessità del tempo. Ciò che emergeva dagli scritti delle "brigade" (Anciferov, Zolotarev) era decisamente diverso rispetto alle attese e il

progetto fu annullato. Il vero volto delle “città” usciva dalle pagine dei testi censurati (Bulgakov, *Il maestro e Margherita*; Platonov, *Lo sterro*; Dobyčĭn, *La città di Enne*; Vaginov, *Garpagoniada*). Dar’ja S. Moskovskaja (II/3) ricostruisce le fortune dell’opera teatrale *Vysokoe naprjaženie* di Andrej Platonov. Dopo la stroncatura di *Vprok*, scritto nello stesso anno (1931), Platonov tenta di adeguarsi ai dettami della “letteratura produttiva”, trasferendo una storia d’amore in una fabbrica metallurgica. In sintonia con le direttive della RAPP, che invitava gli scrittori a superare (*dognat’ i peregnat’*) non un “qualunque Pil’njak”, ma Shakespeare, dagli operai sovietici “concreti e vivi” della *pièce* emergono le figure delle tragedie shakespeariane (un Otello proletario, un Amleto sovietico, un *komsomolec* Romeo, un *intelligent* Laerte). La “shakespearizzazione” dei lavoratori d’assalto (*udarniki*) del primo piano quinquennale non fu apprezzata e la *pièce* fu pubblicata solo negli anni ’80 (come gran parte delle sue opere). Sempre con una “brigata di scrittori” Platonov fu mandato da Gor’kij in Asia centrale (1934 e 1935) per preparare una pubblicazione collettiva in occasione del X anniversario della costituzione della Turkmenia sovietica. Da questa esperienza nacque il racconto *Džan*, anch’esso pubblicato solo negli anni ’60. Delle sue tematiche e delle difficoltà della traduzione (sottolineate già da Brodskij), si occupa Robert Chandler (II/1), suo traduttore in inglese.

Ricerche d’archivio. Dalle carte del *Vserossijskoe obščestvo krest’janskich pistelej* (1925-1930) emergono le direttive del Partito in merito alla necessità di “decontadinizzare” la società rurale del tempo. Elena A. Papkova (I/3-4) osserva come, da un primo invito di tipo “pedagogico”, si passi velocemente alla condanna di poeti come Esenin (cantore della *Rus’*, suicida nel 1925) e Kljuev (fucilato nel 1937), colpevole, secondo il pensiero dominante, di opporsi alle politiche agricole del tempo (la collettivizzazione forzata). La stessa studiosa (II/4), sulla base di

un'analisi comparativa e su materiali d'archivio, ricostruisce il rapporto ambivalente di Vsevolod Ivanov nei confronti delle forze straniere in aiuto alle forze antibolsceviche del generale Kolčak nella guerra civile. Con l'intento di restituire alla nuova Russia-Urss il ruolo di potenza mondiale e memore dell'alleanza nella prima guerra mondiale, Ivanov tende a non inimicarsi troppo le potenze americane, inglesi, francesi e giapponesi. Da questi giudizi oscillanti derivano anche le modifiche alla stesura iniziale del *Treno blindato 14-69* (1922) e alle successive sceneggiature. Su materiali d'archivio Galina Voroncova (II/4) ricostruisce la storia del gruppo di Nestor Machno nella guerra civile e l'episodio della fucilazione dell'atamano A. Grigor'ev da parte del suo gruppo nel 1919. Dalla ricerca emergono le incongruenze tra la verità storica e quanto descritto da Aleksej Tolstoj nella trilogia *Choždenie po mukam* (1921-1941). Ol'ga V. Bystrova (II/4) studia la storia del progetto di Gork'ij per una collana sulla *Storia della guerra civile* (1929-1930). La collana, concepita per un'ampia platea di lettori, avrebbe dovuto avvalersi della collaborazione di scrittori professionisti, attivi nella guerra civile. Dai materiali d'archivio risulta che solo il primo volume (1935) corrisponde all'impostazione iniziale di Gor'kij, mentre gli altri quattro, usciti dopo la sua morte, si discostano dal progetto iniziale. Rafael Carrión Arias (I/3-4) ha ritrovato negli archivi dell'Istituto Gor'kij un saggio del poeta spagnolo antifascista Manuel Altolaguirre sulla figura di Federico Garcia Lorca. Altolaguirre scrisse in realtà due varianti del saggio (1937), una per il lettore spagnolo e l'altra per il lettore sovietico. Sempre dall'archivio Gor'kij, Marina A. Arias-Vichil' (II/1) recupera un articolo del 1924 del giornalista Michail Pervuchin (*Russkie na Kapri*), dove viene ricostruita la storia dell'emigrazione russa sull'isola di Capri dal 1906 al 1913. La ricercatrice pone l'accento sul fatto che Gor'kij, al suo arrivo, trasformò la colonia russa in un circolo esclusivamente

politico, trascurando completamente l'aspetto ambientale e la cultura umanistica dell'isola. Alle ricerche d'archivio di Alessandro Farsetti (I/1-2) è dovuta la pubblicazione di un'inedita poesia-acrostico di I.A. Aksenov (1918). Dall'analisi del linguaggio poetico e dall'intertestualità emergono lo smarrimento di fronte al "terrore rosso" del 1918 e la speranza di un ritorno alla vita normale. Negli anni '30 e '40 l'Istituto per le Letterature del mondo (*Institut mirovoj literatury*) cercò di risistemare e trasferire in sedi diverse i molti *manoscritti arabi, persiani e turchi* (anche in funzione del costituirsi delle repubbliche sovietiche), provenienti dai depositi della società *Meždunarodnaja kniga*, istituita nel 1923. Il'ja V. Zajcev (I/1-2) propone una sistemazione definitiva dei materiali, collocati in sedi diverse.

Lecture alternative. Negli anni dal 1914 al 1920 O.E. Mandel'stam aveva tradotto il drammaturgo francese Jean Racine. Marija Ju. Ignat'eva (II/3) pone l'accento sull'analogia tra il "sole nero" di *Fedra* e la morte dell'artista di fronte ai tragici cambiamenti in atto. Ol'ga A. Bogdanova (II/2) legge il romanzo di D.S. Merežkovskij *14 dicembre* (1918) come riflessione speculare tra la rivoluzione decabrista e quella bolscevica. La "bestia" è diventato il popolo russo (*narod*), spaccato dalla rivoluzione del 1917, mentre il seme fecondo della rinascita va ricercato nella "terra" (*zemlja*), intesa come Russia in sé. I dubbi di Gor'kij in merito a una nuova visione umanistica dopo la rivoluzione e la guerra civile vengono trattati da Natal'ja N. Primočkina (I/1-2). Il saggio A.A. Blok (1923) di Gor'kij trae origine dalla relazione di Blok *Heine in Russia* (1919), letta durante una riunione della redazione della casa editrice *Vsemirnaja literatura*, dove Gor'kij organizzò un seminario apposito sul tema. Da quelle discussioni ebbe origine il famoso articolo *Krušenie gumanizma* di Blok dello stesso anno.

LETTERATURA RUSSA PRIMA E DOPO L'URSS

I non molti studi sulla letteratura russa in periodi non-sovietici sono dedicati ai *circoli letterari* e al *pensiero massonico* del XVIII secolo, a *Nikolaj V. Gogol'* e a *Lev N. Tolstoj*, al *simbolismo* russo e, in un unico caso, alla *letteratura contemporanea*.

Circoli letterari e pensiero massonico. Natal'ja D. Bludilina (I/1-2) indaga sui rapporti di M.M. Cheraskov con il pensiero massonico, con i poeti del tempo (Sumarokov, Nartov, Rževskij, A. e S. Naryškin, Aničkov, Bulgakov, Majkov, Bogdanovič), con il circolo letterario moscovita e, in modo particolare, con i giornali letterari del 1760, dove vengono pubblicate anche le traduzioni di importanti pensatori coevi (Montaigne, Fontenelle, Voltaire, Dodsley, Gellert). Per il circolo moscovita l'illuminismo e il "cammino della ragione" (*putešestvie razuma*) furono intesi in primo luogo come realizzazione della massima "conosci te stesso" (*samopoznanie*) e come percorso verso l'autoperfezionamento (*samosoveršenstvovanie*).

Gogol'. Igor' A. Vinogradov (2/4) studia la distanza di Gogol' dalla corrente occidentalista dello slavofilismo. Le varie posizioni slavofile (il decreto del ministro Uvarov sull'obbligo dell'insegnamento universitario della storia e della letteratura dei popoli slavi, la conferenza di Mickiewicz a Parigi al Collège de France, la posizione polacca sull'origine "turantica" dei russi) sono il "filo rosso" che lega in una continuità omogenea gli scritti di Gogol'. Ekaterina G. Paderina (II/2) ritorna sulla datazione della commedia *Il processo* (incompiuta) come parte dell'opera teatrale *Il Vladimiro di terzo grado*, pubblicata nelle *Opere* del 1842. La studiosa data *Il processo* nel marzo del 1840, basandosi sulla diversità del discorso pragmatico nelle memorie di Sergej T. Aksakov e Ivan I. Panaev (fonte primaria per la datazione). Jurij V. Mann (I/1-2) pone il

problema di un'edizione rivista e ampliata delle *Opere complete* di Gogol' (*Polnoe sobranie sočinenij i pisem v 23 tt.* Moskva, IMLI RAN 2003), in considerazione della necessità di inserire anche ciò che, in altri tempi, non veniva considerato come materiale pertinente all'opera di Gogol'.

Tolstoj. Irina I. Sizova (I/3-4) ricostruisce le ragioni per le quali la prima opera per il teatro popolare di Lev Tolstoj, *Il primo distillatore* (*Pervyj vinokur*, 1886), non ebbe repliche dopo l'iniziale rappresentazione nel villaggio di Aleksandrovskoe. Le rappresentazioni, dirette da V.G. Čertkov nei teatri provvisori delle piazze (*balagan*), fallirono per motivi tecnici, dovuti alla difficoltà della messa in scena degli elementi simbolici (il diavolo, l'inferno).

Il simbolismo russo. Magnus Ljunggren (II/3) si occupa della conversione al cattolicesimo di Lev L. Kobylinskij (Ellis). Dopo la sua emigrazione a Locarno nel 1911, Ellis è alla ricerca di una conciliazione tra cattolicesimo e ortodossia, cultura e religione, oriente e occidente. La sua conversione va ascritta, secondo il ricercatore, all'influenza che sulla scelta ebbe la medium olandese Johanna van der Meulen, incontrata nei circoli steineriani. Ljunggren (II/1) tratta anche del tema della morte e della resurrezione in A. Belyj e fa risalire il suo anti-urbanesimo (le immagini negative di Mosca e Pietroburgo) non solo all'Apocalisse di Giovanni, ma anche alla Grande Apocalisse di Isaia, con particolare riferimento alla distruzione della città depravata. La visione spirituale del mondo è al centro dello studio di Andrej L. Toporkov (I/3-4). Nell'ambito dei *duchovnye stichi* di Vjačeslav Ivanov, egli si sofferma sulla poesia *Stich o Svjatoj Gore* (1910) e sul ruolo dei lemmi *svet/svjat* e *videt'/vedat'*, fondanti per la sua produzione successiva. Del simbolismo floreale di Innokentij F. Annenskij scrive Natal'ja V. Nalegač (II/2). Le diverse combinazioni, legate alla semantica floreale e allo spazio comune del simbolismo russo ed europeo, consentono al poeta

lo sviluppo di diversi temi poetici (dalla realtà del quotidiano all'arte e alla trascendenza). Lena Szilard (I/3-4) analizza la natura mistica dei simboli nel dramma *Roza i krest'* (1912-1913) di A. Blok e sposta la scelta cronotopica del testo dal periodo tedesco del luteranesimo (come indicato in molti lavori specialistici) all'eresia catara degli Albiges, più consona all'aspetto contrappuntistico, ambivalente e bipolare del dramma. Al "giovane simbolista" (*mladosimvolist*, secondo Vjač. Ivanov) Nikolaj V. Nedobrovo (1882-1919) e alla reciproca stima e affetto per Anna Achmatova (della quale, in un lungo articolo del 1915, recensì le raccolte *Večer e Četki*) è dedicato lo studio di Aleksandr V. Markov (II/4). Nell'ultimo verso della poesia *E.M.M.* (1913), Nedobrovo inserisce il nome del pittore della scuola senese Giovanni Antonio Bazzi, detto Il Sodoma (1477-1539). Markov interpreta questo dettaglio come conferma dell'ambivalenza dell'immagine della Achmatova e della stessa relazione con Nedobrovo (seria e auto-ironica). Nedobrovo riprende il racconto del Vasari (oggi contestato) sul soprannome del Bazzi, volutamente e orgogliosamente portato dal pittore presumibilmente omosessuale, che però poco avrebbe a che fare con la "sodomia" (sarebbe solo la toscanizzazione di un modo di dire piemontese: *su, 'nduma!* = orsù, andiamo!). Si trattava, in sostanza, di uno "scherzo", ironia e parodia di se stesso, di un riferimento a una realtà "oltre lo specchio" (*zazerkal'e*) che contraddistingue l'esistenza di Anna Achmatova.

Letteratura russa contemporanea. Un solo articolo si confronta con la letteratura russa contemporanea. Zsófia Kalavszky (II/3) pone l'attenzione su due saggi di Andrej Bitov (*Poslednij tekst e Špaga ščekotlivogo dvorjanina*), nei quali il culto di Puškin viene osservato attraverso il mutamento di meccanismi narrativi e retorici. La storia della ricezione puškiniana è, per Bitov, la storia del continuo intrecciarsi tra il discorso "storico-scientifico" e quello letterario.

MEMORIA, LETTERATURA E IDENTITÀ NAZIONALE

Il ruolo della memoria e della letteratura nel costituirsi dell'identità, sia personale che collettiva (nazionale), viene affrontato da diversi punti di vista. L'autoidentificazione è un processo che richiede riflessione e rapporto critico con il passato. Può essere contraddittorio e non omologabile nei parametri classici dell'identità nazionale e può fungere da stimolo per il recupero di una tradizione dimenticata.

Letteratura, identità e memoria. Kazbek K. Sultanov (I/1-2) si dissocia dai parallelismi tra l'interpretazione del passato, fattore dominante del processo di autoidentificazione, e il tradizionalismo nostalgico. Il "passato non vissuto" (*neizžitoe prošloe*) e l'"uomo che ricorda" (*čelovek vospominajuščij*) hanno assunto una funzione dominante nelle *letterature dei popoli della Federazione russa*. Se, da un lato, la memoria recupera i segni culturali del passato, dall'altro corre il rischio di tramutarsi in una "retrospettiva massimalista" (*retrospektivnyj maksimalizm*), orientata più verso i traumi del passato che non verso una proiezione sul futuro. Julija G. Hazankovič (II/2) utilizza il "cronotopo" di Bachtin come chiave di lettura per "aprire la porta" alla comprensione delle identità culturali delle *letterature dei popoli della Siberia settentrionale*. Pur in contatto con la letteratura russa, le differenze nella cronotopia riguardano la vita nomade, il rapporto uomo/donna, la strada, il cacciatore, il vecchio. La visione mitologica del mondo si configura come base della creazione artistica. *L'identità nazionale e culturale buriata* è il tema del saggio di Elizaveta E. Baldanmaksarova (II/4). La conoscenza e la valorizzazione del poema in forma di epistola *Il testamento* (1927), scritto in lingua antico-mongola e indirizzato agli uomini del XXI secolo dal filosofo e scienziato XII Pandito Hambo-Lama Dashidorzhi Itigelov (guida spirituale dei buriati prima del 1917), può essere per il popolo buriato un passo importante per il recupero

della propria tradizione religiosa (buddista) e culturale. A cavallo tra il XIX e XX secolo, nelle letterature delle *popolazioni turca e tatara*, inserite nell'impero russo, emerge un evidente conflitto tra vecchio e nuovo. Al'fina T. Sibgatullina (II/2) studia lo scontro tra occidentalizzazione e tradizione negli scrittori del tempo. Entrano in gioco principi morali e valoriali, la religione e il rapporto uomo/donna. I personaggi letterari sono ambivalenti, non pienamente inseriti nel modello culturale occidentale, ma nemmeno del tutto esclusi dal modello di tradizione islamica.

Letteratura e contraddizioni dell'identità nazionale. Essere "inglese" o "anglofono", "francese" o "francofono", "italiano" o "italofono" (come pure "russo" o "russofono") sono cose diverse. Al problema è dedicato l'articolo di Vladimir D. Sedel'nik (I/1-2). Basandosi sugli studi del comparatista D. Đurišin, egli propone un'indagine sul concetto di identità nelle letterature della Svizzera. Dallo studio emerge non solo un positivo interagire tra le culture presenti sul territorio, ma anche una situazione conflittuale con le rispettive letterature nazionali (francese, tedesca e italiana) e, spesso, un senso di dolorosa estraneità degli scrittori "svizzeri" alle letterature cosiddette "nazionali". Un simile senso di estraneità alla cultura nazionale fu percepito anche dai tedeschi del Volga che, dopo la dissoluzione dell'Urss, si trasferirono in massa in Germania (la popolazione dei tedeschi del Volga diminuì di 7 volte). Lo studio di Tat'jana V. Goven'ko (I/1-2), dopo una panoramica sulla loro storia, dal Manifesto della zarina Elisabetta II (1762) alle discriminazioni in relazione alla prima e alla seconda guerra mondiale ("nemici interni"), si sofferma sul problema dell'identità nazionale che, secondo parametri consolidati (ottocenteschi), dovrebbe basarsi sulla lingua. L'estraneità dei tedeschi del Volga rispetto all'identità nazionale in Germania deriva da un'identità linguistica solo "ereditata" e avulsa dal suo sviluppo nella patria d'origine.

Letteratura e identità nazionale ucraina e bielorusa. Dello scrittore ucraino Jaroslav Mel'nik si occupa Jurij Ja. Barabaš (I/1-2). Dopo una lunga emigrazione, Mel'nik si è completamente inserito nella nuova letteratura ucraina. Il rapporto con l'identità nazionale viene subordinato dallo scrittore a un principio umanistico generale, dove non c'è posto né per totalitarismi, né per passive accettazioni di fattori esterni, spesso inconsapevolmente importati. Il sentimento di appartenenza nazionale e i valori della tradizione umanistica europea sono per Mel'nik due facce della stessa medaglia. Le tendenze all'autoriflessione letteraria come momento fondante per l'affermazione di una coscienza sociale e nazionale bielorusa dell'inizio del XX secolo viene descritta da Evgenij A. Gorodnickij (II/1). Di particolare interesse è la risposta, in forma di parabola (*Apokrif*, 1913), che il poeta bielorusso Maksim Bogdanovič (1891-1917) diede in merito a una celebre disputa del 1913 sul rapporto tra vita e arte. In molti autori bielorusi dell'inizio secolo (Janka Kupala, 1882-1942; Jakub Kolas, 1882-1956; lo stesso Bogdanovič) tale rapporto risulta inscindibile.

Letteratura e identità nazionale in altri paesi europei. Elena Ju. Sapyrykina (II/1) legge *Le ultime lettere di Jacopo Ortis* di Ugo Foscolo e *Le mie prigioni* di Silvio Pellico come risposta individuale alle tendenze risorgimentali italiane collettive. A partire dalle potenzialità insiste nell'animo, nella ragione, nella fede nella Provvidenza e, non ultimo, nella scelta consapevole della morte, l'individuo sofferente (Pellico) e infelice (Foscolo) si rivela come campo fecondo per l'affermazione dell'orgoglio personale e collettivo (nazionale). A partire dall'anno 1000 le identità nazionali danesi, norvegesi e svedesi presentano molte affinità. Nello studio di Al'fred A. Macevič (I/1-2) viene trattato il tentativo danese di costituire una supremazia politica sul territorio scandinavo e la progressiva riscoperta, a cavallo tra il XIX e il XX secolo, delle singole

tradizioni culturali autoctone, in risposta, specie nelle zone rurali, alla crescente industrializzazione e urbanizzazione della regione. Il problema dell'*identità nazionale islandese* viene studiata da Andrej V. Korovin (I/1-2), sia come produzione letteraria autoctona, sia come letteratura, prodotta da scrittori islandesi, emigrati negli U.S.A. La lingua, parametro imprescindibile dell'identità nazionale, risulta secondaria rispetto al sentimento di appartenenza culturale alla tradizione autoctona islandese. Il lettore islandese dell'isola considera i testi, scritti in lingua inglese, come parte integrante ("inclusiva") della letteratura islandese nel suo complesso. Di tipo "esclusivo" è invece il concetto di *identità nazionale francese* nello scrittore Maurice Barrès, del quale Vera V. Šervašidze (I/1-2) percorre la vita artistica e politica. Da un iniziale individualismo (*Le Culte du moi*, 1888-1891), Barrès passa su posizioni nazionalistiche e antisemite (affare Dreyfus), specialmente durante la prima guerra mondiale (fu soprannominato "l'usignolo dei massacri"). Secondo la ricercatrice, il culto della tradizione ancestrale va visto come negazione del culto individualista giovanile e come tensione collettiva verso la rinascita morale di una nazione.

LA RUSSIA E GLI ALTRI

Gli altri con gli occhi della Russia. Nel trattato *Lo spirito delle leggi* (1748) Montesquieu parla di una Russia dispotica e servile. Ekaterina Vasil'eva (II/4) mette a confronto alcune reazioni russe al giudizio di *Montesquieu*: Frederic Henri Strube de Piermont, tedesco di origine, già segretario di Biron, favorito della zarina Anna Ivanovna e reggente dopo la sua morte, pubblica nel 1760 le *Lettres russiennes*, dove polemizza con il filosofo francese per il suo giudizio sprezzante; Michail M. Ščerbatov, da storico, auspica una riflessione sulla reale situazione della Russia; Caterina

Il si pone in una posizione ambivalente tra gli ideali illuministici e il ruolo di governo del monarca. A dimostrazione che la lettura è, di norma, subordinata all'orizzonta d'attesa del lettore (ufficiale e non), Ekaterina A. Stačenko (II/2; II/3) studia la ricezione dello scrittore americano *Mark Twain* nella Russia negli anni 1872–1916. Si passa dal “puro umorista” al “grande scrittore” e “moralista”, fino alla censura dei suoi testi anti-monarchici e anti-imperialisti.

La Russia con gli occhi degli altri. Lo studio di Marianna V. Kaplun (II/4) restituisce alla memoria uno spaccato di vita russa dell'ultimo terzo del XVII secolo, come emerge da una composizione in versi (1667) di *Johann Gottfried Gregory*, pastore luterano, maestro, coordinatore e regista del primo teatro di corte russo (1672). Nel testo, scritto in tedesco, la prima parte è dedicata alla quotidianità della vita russa e riprende in buona parte il lavoro di Adam Olearius (Ölschläger) *Ausführliche Beschreibung der kundbaren Reyse Nach Muscow und Persien* (1663), mentre la seconda è un omaggio allo zar Alessio I, suo sostenitore e protettore. Significativo il fatto che il componimento fu pubblicato per la prima volta nel 1898 in un volume sugli “stranieri amici” del XVII secolo (*Inostranec-dobroželatel' v Rossii v XVII stoletii*). Iwona Sakovicz (I/1–2) si occupa delle memorie e degli appunti di viaggio dei pochi *visitatori britannici* in Russia nel periodo di Alessandro II (1855–1881). Da un lato viene moderatamente apprezzato il livello culturale della nobiltà, dall'altro, invece, si insiste molto sull'arretratezza di un paese dispotico e barbaro. La convinzione del carattere “pigro e servile” della popolazione russa, specialmente negli strati sociali più bassi, non cambierà fino alla fine del secolo (ma di carattere “passivo” e “servile” dei russi, all'inizio del XX secolo, parleranno anche Rozanov e Berdjaev). Il ruolo subalterno della ricezione all'orizzonte d'attesa viene confermato da Anastasija V. Golubcova (II/3), che indaga sulla *ricezione di*

Puškin in Italia nel XIX secolo. La lettura italiana è strumentale (poeta nazionale), finalizzata alle necessità della cultura italiana di trovare un'identità comune. Dopo l'unità d'Italia, due opere (Valentino Carrera, *Alessandro Pouchkine*, 1865; Pietro Cossa, *Puschin*, 1876) orientano la ricezione di Puškin verso il byronismo romantico. Nell'articolo di Natal'ja Ju. Charitonova (I/3-4) viene trattata la ricezione del libro *Retour de l'U.R.S.S.* di André Gide (1937). La sua pubblicazione in Francia fu accompagnata da una serie di pubbliche accuse sui giornali sovietici e da molte discussioni all'interno del partito (il testo fu tradotto ad esclusivo uso interno), ma il successo del libro, non solo in Francia, dimostra il fallimento della diplomazia culturale sovietica fuori dai propri confini statali. Tat'jana Jukić (II/2) studia il film *Ninočka* di Ernst Lubitsch (1939) e il ruolo della sovietica rivoluzionaria, assegnato a Greta Garbo. Anche se il modello, al quale Lubitsch si ispira, è Anna Karenina, l'aggiunta di una patina affettiva e melanconica si piega ai canoni del cinema hollywoodiano. Negli ultimi decenni, una fortuna particolare ha avuto negli U.S.A. il reportage di viaggio *L'isola di Sachalin* di Anton P. Čechov (1895). L'articolo di Evgenija M. Butenina (II/4) si sofferma sulla sua ricezione e diffusione nella formazione deontologica dei futuri medici statunitensi, diventando non solo un testo di riferimento etico, ma anche modello per chi volesse intraprendere la strada del medico-scrittore.

TEORIA E STORIA LETTERARIA

Il dialogo, a tutt'oggi fecondo, tra *teoria letteraria e filosofia*, trova conferma in due articoli che, in vario modo, affrontano il problema del rapporto tra l'io e l'altro. Aleksandr Belarev (II/4) confronta il concetto di lico in Aleksej A. Uchtomskij (1875-1942) e di *visage* in Emmanuel

Lèvinas (1906–1995). Il filosofo francese utilizza la polisemia del lemma francese (viso, faccia, apparenza, sguardo), mentre Uchtomskij si interroga sul doppio significato del lemma russo (volto, persona). In entrambi i filosofi la semantica dei rispettivi lemmi va rapportata direttamente alla dimensione etica, fondamento filosofico primo della personalità. Per Lèvinas *visage* è un evento unico, asimmetrico, imprescindibile nel rapporto io/altro, per Uchtomskij *lico* racchiude in sé, con la fisionomia individuale, il carattere di una personalità unica e irripetibile. L'incontro con l'altro è per entrambi la manifestazione quotidiana, non scontata, dell'incontro con Dio come Primo e Ultimo interlocutore. Sergej V. Sandler (I/3–4) si interroga sulla compatibilità in Bachtin tra il carnevale e la diversità tra l'io e l'altro. Per il ricercatore, Bachtin non considerava queste due posizioni (folla vs. individuo) come inconciliabili. Attraverso l'analisi del percorso filosofico ed estetico di Bachtin, Sander giunge alla conclusione che, particolarmente nel trattato *L'autore e l'eroe nell'attività estetica*, centrale risulti il concetto di "io per me stesso", ovvero il costituirsi dell'immagine di una personalità libera e creativa. Queste posizioni, non sempre omogenee, troverebbero conferma in tutti gli scritti di Bachtin. Dei concetti di *autore* e *opera* come categorie storiche della letterarietà, tratta Stéphane Pujol (II/1). Già in Diderot (1713–1784) il concetto di "opera" è in primo luogo "lavoro" (ing. *work*), che trasforma non solo le categorie di "autore" e "lettore", "testo" e "paratesto", "centro" e "periferia", ma introduce anche il parametro della "soglia", intesa come ciò che precede e circonda i confini del testo. Ancora in ambito filosofico-letterario, Aleksej L. Nalepin dedica due studi sulla possibilità di unire in una riflessione omogenea letteratura e tradizione popolare. Nel primo (I/1–2) viene riproposto il pensiero filosofico e religioso di Boris P. Vyšeslavec (1877–1954), per il quale il

superamento della crisi spirituale della letteratura russa dell'inizio secolo sarebbe potuta avvenire solo attraverso la valorizzazione della tradizione popolare russa come riflesso del suo carattere nazionale. Nel secondo (I/3-4) viene esaminato il lascito intellettuale e filosofico di Ivan Il'yn (1883-1954), primo pensatore russo che ha tentato di trovare una sintesi tra il pensiero filosofico dell'emigrazione e la tradizione folclorica russa come sua parte integrante. Sulle differenze tra *fatto* e *fiction* si sofferma Françoise Lavocat (I/3-4). In una prospettiva diacronica, comparativa e interdisciplinare (letteratura, cinema, media, giochi informatici, fumetti), la *fiction*, fin dal XVII secolo, non si manifesta come necessariamente avulsa dal mondo reale. Nelle sue varie manifestazioni è un fenomeno trans-storico, trans-culturale e trans-mediale. La tensione verso il "mondo possibile" ha una precisa strutturazione interna e una base ontologica. All'*archeologia dei media*, nuova disciplina che studia i modi della comunicazione, è dedicato lo studio di Estelle Doudet (II/1), dove vengono presentate le possibilità che il nuovo metodo d'indagine potrebbe offrire per un diverso approccio alla storia letteraria come produzione e ricezione del testo. Così, per esempio, nel dramma allegorico francese del XV°-XVI secolo, le opere morali di orientamento didattico-religioso, grazie alle conoscenze tecniche della rappresentazione visuale, si presentano, allo stesso tempo, come mezzo e messaggio della comunicazione. Andrej F. Kofman (I/1-2) propone infine la realizzazione di un *Dizionario delle correnti letterarie del XX secolo*. Il problema da superare è trovare una definizione condivisa per il sintagma "corrente letteraria", contraddittoria negli studi russi e pragmatica nelle trattazioni occidentali. Kofman introduce il concetto di "comunità artistica", che dovrebbe porsi aldilà delle singole voci poetiche, sapendo distinguere tra le auto-affermazioni e le definizioni dei critici letterari.

PROBLEMI DELLA TRADUZIONE

Michail Ju. Ljuströv (I/3-4) mette a confronto *la ricezione della letteratura francese in Russia e in Svezia* nel XVII secolo. Mentre le traduzioni svedesi di Étienne Pavillon (1632-1705) e di Roger de Bussy-Rabutin (1618-1693) incontrano molto interesse, in Russia la letteratura francese è praticamente assente. Ciò sarebbe dovuto all'estraneità della cultura russa nei confronti dei generi più diffusi nella letteratura francese. Il successo della letteratura francese in Svezia va attribuita invece all'alleanza franco-svedese nella guerra dei Trent'anni e alla visita della regina Cristina a Parigi. Elena A. Gurevič (I/3-4) studia i problemi della *traduzione in lingua russa della poesia scaldica* del periodo dal IX alla fine del XIV° secolo. L'antica poesia norvegese (eddisca o scaldica) si contraddistingue per le rigide norme (allitterazioni) e un ricco bagaglio lessicale. La tradizione eddisca tende alla semplicità, quella scaldica alla complessità. Per rendere evidente la differenza, i traduttori russi hanno dovuto in primo luogo risolvere il problema della metrica ("metro corto"), dei *kenning* singoli e multipli (perifrasi) e della composizione in *vísa* (stanze). Alle dispute sulla *traduzione source-oriented* e *target-oriented* è dedicato l'articolo di Nathalie R. Neiman (II/2). Le teorie traduttive del pietroburghese Vladimir E. Šor (1917-1971), sostenitore della *traduzione source-oriented*, in contrasto con le teorie della scuola di Mosca (Ivan A. Kaškin, 1899-1963) e, indirettamente, con il pietroburghese B.B. Vachtin (1930-1981), vennero respinte dalle maggiori riviste specializzate degli anni '60. Neiman fa risalire l'ostracismo nei confronti di Šor al predominio della scuola di Mosca nell'ambito della *traduttologia sovietica* degli anni '60. Il problema della *traduzione filologica* si era presentato già negli anni '30. Marija E. Malikova (II/3) prende in esame le traduzioni di Adrian A. Frankovskij dei romanzi inglesi del

XVIII secolo, dove la pratica traduttiva, in opposizione alla traduzione “idealistica” (marxista), rivela il tentativo di individuare nella lingua russa non solo le particolarità sintattiche dell’inglese, ma anche una resa adeguata del discorso diretto improprio, teorizzato in Germania dal linguista Carl Vossler e in Russia da Michail M. Bachtin. Vladislav A. Rezvyj (II/3) tratta il problema della *traduzione “poetica”*. Nel 1945 Georgij A. Šengeli, nell’articolo *Lo Shakespeare di Pasternak* (inedito), sottopone a severa critica le traduzioni di Pasternak. Anche sulla base di analisi statistiche, Shengeli considera la traduzione di Pasternak una “falsificazione” (anche se egli stesso incorre in interpretazioni errate del testo originale), ma non considera il fine ultimo di Pasternak, quello di produrre un testo tradotto come se fosse un originale in lingua russa.

L’ARTE DELLA PAROLA E LE ALTRE ARTI

La tendenza a convogliare in un’unica espressione artistica forme diverse (testo, immagine, musica) non è una prerogativa del mondo contemporaneo. Aleksandr E. Machov (I/1-2) studia le funzioni di alcune *specifiche figure retoriche* (diafora, apostrofo) nelle *Passioni* di Johann Sebastian Bach, che trasformano il dramma in un’espressione di gioia, mentre Nadège Langbour (I/3-4) si sofferma sugli scritti di Denis Diderot nella rivista *Correspondance littéraire* in merito alle *esposizioni parigine* (i *Salons*), riprese in seguito nel saggio *Paradoxe sur le comédien* (1783-1784). Come lo spettatore di fronte a un quadro, l’attore deve saper distinguere tra “emozione” e “razionalità” critica, distinzione tutt’ora alla base delle moderne teorie sul lavoro dell’attore. Una feconda *collaborazione tra letteratura e pittura* si ebbe a cavallo tra il XIX e il XX secolo. Del libro, inteso come oggetto estetico in sé, si occupa Natal’ja A. Drovalëva (II/2). Tra le molte edizioni dell’Angelo di fuoco (*Ognennyj*

angel) di Valerij Ja. Brjusov, particolare attenzione viene rivolta all'edizione del 1909, dove le incisioni medioevali (Faust, Mefistofele, la strega Renata, l'angelo Madiel) sono a sostegno dei ritratti verbali e sottolineano il carattere multimediale e pittoresco dei personaggi del romanzo, in contrapposizione ad alcuni stereotipi letterari e pittorici. Il confronto tra rappresentazione verbale (*autobiografia, memorie*) e immagine (*fotografia, caricatura*) incide anche sulla ricezione del lettore. Sulla base degli studi di Žinkin, Lotman, Tynjanov, Sontag e Roland Barthes, questo aspetto particolare viene affrontato da Aleksej A. Cholikov (II/1). Nella ricezione dello scrittore D. Merežkovskij, la presunta veridicità storico-culturale del genere autobiografico e della fotografia viene distinta dalla soggettività interpretativa delle memorie e della caricatura, più sottoposte a un processo selettivo, all'individuazione di un "spazio" preciso della memoria. Al contributo fondamentale del materiale iconografico (fotografie, riproduzioni) nella *Letopis' žizni i tvorčestva S.A. Esenina* (voll. I-V), per una migliore conoscenza della vita e delle opere di Esenin, è dedicato anche l'articolo di Maksim V. Skorochodov (II/3).

CULTURA POPOLARE

Natal'ja V. Zacharova, Vladimir L. Kljaus e Ljudmila P. Machova (II/4) analizzano il canto alla dea della fertilità nella cultura cinese, interpretato da un cantore cieco (registrato nel 2011) al tempio dello Spirito della montagna di Tanshan Dong Yue, nella regione Puxian. Il testo, in originale cinese nelle tre varianti di scrittura e in traduzione russa, predice il futuro di un bambino e si basa sulla tradizione del confucianesimo. Ljudmila V. Fadeeva (II/2) studia l'influenza dell'iconografia cristiana sull'immaginario collettivo russo, ucraino e bielorusso. Con

la frequentazione del rito liturgico della messa (sia cattolica, sia ortodossa), il motivo della tomba nella chiesa incide anche sulla composizione dei versi spirituali *Choždenie Bogorodicy* (*O trech grobnicach*). Elena A. Samodelova (II/3) pubblica i testi apocrifi *Son Bogorodicy* e *Molitva archangelu Michailu*, annotati negli anni 1914–1915 dal celebre etnografo Petr G. Bogatyrev (1893–1971). Egli segnalò la cospicua presenza della tradizione folclorica anche nei luoghi più vicini ai centri industriali del tempo. Aleksandr V. Pigin (II/4) esamina la critica del vecchio credente Dionisij V. Batov (1825–1910) alla visione dell'aldilà durante il sonno letargico (*obmiranie*), conosciuta grazie a un racconto sulla “donna rinata” (*oživšaja ženščina*), annotato negli anni '30 del XIX secolo dall'archimandrita Makarij. A conferma dei danni perpetrati dalla Chiesa ufficiale, il vecchio credente, confortato dai testi canonici, considera il racconto una pura invenzione (*vymysel*), che non corrisponde a nessuno dei canoni ortodossi sul *mytarstvo* (travagli e tormenti che l'anima soffre per 40 giorni prima di essere giudicata).

VARIA

Jörg Schulte (I/3–4) propone una nuova interpretazione del mito della porta di corno (per i sogni veri) e d'avorio (per i sogni falsi) nel XIX libro dell'*Odissea*. Dall'analisi dei materiali (corno e avorio), legati ai miti astronomici dei tempi di Omero, viene suggerita l'ipotesi che essi rappresentino il punto più settentrionale e quello più meridionale del cielo. Stephen Rachman (II/2) studia la relazione tra lo scrittore e naturalista Henry David Thoreau (1817–1862) e lo scrittore “romantico” Nathaniel Hawthorne (1804–1864), considerato con Edgar Allan Poe, Hermann Melville e Mark Twain tra i maggiori scrittori statunitensi dell'Ottocento. Nonostante una certa rivalità tra Thoreau e Hawthorne


(entrambi vicini alla cerchia dei *transcendentalisti americani*), dalle pagine dei diari di Thoreau e dalla corrispondenza di Hawthorne emerge un proficuo dialogo di reciproca stima.

Gli articoli, qui raggruppati per aree di ricerca omogenee, dimostrano la vitalità degli studi sulla letteratura in Russia e la continuità di una ricchissima tradizione, recuperata e affrontata con spirito critico. Era prevedibile, dopo tanto *botat' po Derride*, un ritorno all'indagine filologica, anche se nessuna metodologia (pre-, post- o proto-) ha in realtà mai perso di vista l'oggetto primo della propria ricerca (la parola, ovvero la letteratura nelle sue manifestazioni sincroniche e diacroniche). L'ha fatto solo in modi diversi. Poteva occuparsi di come un testo "funzioni", di come si "trasformi" e di come "anticipi" lo sviluppo successivo, ma, in un modo o nell'altro, si occupava di *evoluzione* letteraria, poteva indagare sulla memoria, sull'identità o sul rapporto tra il sé e l'altro, ma l'oggetto della ricerca rimaneva pur sempre la *cultura*, l'*etica* e perfino la *traduzione* o poteva occuparsi della "ricezione" e della connessione tra le diverse forme della rappresentazione, indirizzando la ricerca verso la comprensione dei sistemi della *comunicazione*. Non a caso, le bibliografie di riferimento degli articoli, oltre la letteratura specialistica, ci riportano alla filosofia (Bachtin, Vološinov, Ricoeur, Špet, Florenskij, Foucault, Gadamer), ai pre-formalisti russi (Potebnja, Veselovskij), a chi li ha superati (Jakobson, Šklovskij, Tynjanov, Tomaševskij, Ejchenbaum) e a chi, lungo percorsi diversi, ne ha raccolta la memoria: strutturalisti e semiologi (Lotman, Barthes, Eco, Genette, Jauss, Hansen-Lëwe), narratologi (Schmidt), grandi studiosi di poetica e di storia culturale (Lichačev, Toporov, Frejdenberg, Gurevič). Il ritorno

alla filologia non contempla l'oblio delle esperienze precedenti, è solo una memoria rivisitata. È ciò che la nuova rivista russa *Studia litteraria* propone ai suoi lettori. ♡

Ivan Verč

Ivan Verč (born in Trieste, Italy, 1950), essayist and specialist of Slavic studies, full professor of Russian Language and Russian Literature at the University of Trieste (retired). The main field of his researches are theory of literature and the figure of the subject in the historical, poetological and ethical dimensions of literary works, with particular attention to Russian literature. Last works: Razumevanje jezikov književnosti, 2010; Kornevye morfemy v Evgenii Onegine A.S. Puškina, 2013; Verifiche. Preverjanja. Proverki, I-IV, 2016. He also published many articles in specialist reviews in U.S.A., Russia, Hungary, France, Italy and Slovenia. In 1994 he founded at the University of Trieste (Italy) the series Slavica tergestina (since 2011 published in collaboration with the University of Ljubljana, Slovenia and Konstanz, Germany). Member of the Editorial Board of the journal Slavica tergestina and of the Advisory Council of the journals Primerjalna književnost (Slovenia) and Europa Orientalis (Italy).



Monografija o pesnici
Anni A. Ahmatovi
Monograph about Poet
Anna A. Akhmatova

RECENZ IJA K N J I G E

NEŽA ZAJC: *Uvod v poetiko Anne A. Ahmatove.*
Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, 2015.

Kako je mogoče določiti in estetsko ovrednotiti kritične točke, ki predstavljajo v njenem obsežnem pesniškem opusu ne samo stalnice zapletene poetike, ampak tudi precizno zasnovane poetične prostore, iz katerih se ruska literatura odpira v evropski prostor in obratno? Je sploh mogoče razumeti vse globine njene poetične izpovedi, genialnega spoja intelektualne ostrine in čustvene senzibilnosti, ki se je oblikovala na nešteti presečiščih osebnih stisk in kolektivnih katastrof, s katerimi je bila zaznamovana njena domovina? Čeprav ni doživela tistega, kar je skušalo kakšnih 600 drugih ruskih literatov, ki so končali v stalinističnih temnicah in gulagih, pa je bila ves čas na robu, nadzorovana, njena poezija iz nerazumnih vzrokov večkrat prepovedana, ljudje, ki so se z njo družili, pa so marsikdaj doživljali represije, ki jih ni mogoče razumeti, a jih je Ahmatova upesnila na poseben, človeško pretresljiv način? A morda je prav zato poezija Anne Ahmatove tako univerzalna, ustvarjena izven ozkih časovnih determinant in ves čas kozmopolitska, intelektualno izbrušena, a tudi zapisana ruski poetični tradiciji in vsemu, kar je ruski duh ustvaril od srednjega veka naprej. Zato se smemo vprašati zakaj je njena poezija, posebej ko jo spremljamo in doživljamo v njenem razvoju ali pa opazujemo samo njene časovno omejene plasti, nekaj, kar nago-varja tako ljudi z izostrenim poetičnim okusom in občutkom za intelektualno bogastvo njenih verzov ter poznavanjem kulturnega, političnega, zgodovinskega in poetološkega ozadja njene poetike, ki je generator njenih izpovedi, kakor tudi povsem navadne ljudi, brez zapletenih teoretičnih in zgodovinskih vedenj o Anni Ahmatovi in njenem času. O tako zapletenem in nemalokrat tudi enigmatičnem poetičnem obnebu, kot je tisto, ki nam ga je zapustila Anna A. Ahmatova, ni lahko govoriti, še težje ga je strniti v znanstvene okvire, ki metodološko oblikujejo kar se da objektivno, a vendar ne suhoparno in zgolj akribično pisanje. Zdi se, da je študija Neže Zajc primer take dobre znanstvene prakse.

Njena monografija, *Uvod v poetiko Anne A. Ahmatove*, je izšla v zbirki *Življenja in dela/Biografske študije* pri Založbi ZRC 2015, in je v vseh pogledih celovito in premišljeno zasnovano znanstveno delo, ki skuša odgovoriti na naša zastavljena vprašanja in tudi na tista nezapisana, ki se oblikujejo kot podmnožice v raziskovanju razmerja med pesnico, nje-no poezijo in poetiko ter zgodovinskim in socialnim svetom, v katerem se je gibala, ne vedno po svoji volji, nemalokrat igrača samopašnega, zločinskega stalinizma, ki je brezobzirno uničeval tisto, kar je v času sovjetizacije nastajalo kot najboljše v ruski umetnosti in kulturi. Vendar pa monografija ni samo znanstveno delo, ki bi kopicilo, razporejalo, primerjalo in vrednotilo dejstva ter argumente, ampak je zasnovano na izrazitem osebnem pristopu, ki za plastmi znanstvene eksaktnosti in empirične kavzalnosti odkriva še druge, skrite plasti, skozi katere popotuje humanistična misel, da lahko prodre v samo jedro umetniškega ustvarjanja in hkrati podoživi in rekonstruira prostor, v katerem sta se oblikovala tako ustvarjalec kot tudi ustvarjena umetnina. Pri tem je treba takoj dodati: Zajčeva nikakor ne uporablja biografske metode zato, da bi preko raziskave dejstev o pesničinem življenju, njenih stikih z drugimi umetniki, s podatki o osebnem življenju, njenih prostovoljnih in prisilnih popotovanjih, reakcijah na prepovedi objavljanja, skušala interpretirati poezijo kot globinsko mentalno strukturo in estetski organizem v presečišču med jezikom in njegovimi simboli, ki so bili, kot lahko razberemo iz monografije, za Ahmatovo izjemno pomembni in so v kritičnih trenutkih njenega življenja določali njeno poetično resonanco in razmerje do drugih ljudi. Nasprotno: globinsko branje poezije, če ga smem tako imenovati, je temeljno izhodišče njene metode; biografika je zgolj ilustracija tistega gradiva, tistih mnemotehničnih in čustvenih vzgibov, ki jih Zajčeva odkriva v poeziji Anne Ahmatove. V središču njene raziskave je poezija, ta (p)osebna izpoved, ki človeka

spremlja od pradavnine in ki se zmeraj znova obnavlja iz lastnih energij, iz lasnega izničenja in ponovnega vstajenja. O ničemer v literarnovednem opusu ni bilo napisanega toliko kot o teh vprašanjih, a zdi se, da v razumevanju poezije nismo prišli prav nič dlj kot naši predniki, da samo ponavljamo in obnavljamo stare vzorce, jih poskušamo prilagajati novim pogojem in drugačnim kulturnim danostim. A resnična poezija, ki raste iz zavesti, da je njena »moč« pravzaprav v njeni »nemoči«, njeno edino spoznanje pa je skrito v samorefleksiji, da ni mogoče sveta spremeniti ali izboljšati, se zaveda tudi svoje izvirne silovitosti, svojega »orfejsstva«, ki jo ohranja tudi v najbolj mračnih in nepoetičnih časih. Nemalo takih časov je doživela tudi Ahmatova, pravzaprav smemo reči, še posebej, ko zapremo monografijo Neže Zajc, da je tako potekalo vse zrelo življenje pesnice, katere delo danes predstavlja enega največjih poetičnih »zakladov« ruske literature v dvajsetem stoletju.

Prepričan sem, da je težavnost »dešifriranja« poetičnih besedil premosorazmerna z njihovo estetsko, idejno in zgodovinsko kompleksnostjo. Bolj ko je besedilo »potopljeno« v svoj čas, bolj je tudi del nekega univerzalnega sistema vrednot in spoznanj ter tradicije, segajoče do samih začetkov evropske civilizacije. Tako pesniško besedilo se napaja iz prvinskih poetičnih izpovedi, elementarnih drobcev zgodb in mitov, opisov arhetipskih situacij in njihovih simbolov, ki jih prevaja in spreminja v konkretne pesmi in pesnitve, s tem pa jim podeljuje nove pomene in nagovarja svoje sodobnike.

Sama avtorica v Predgovoru označi svojo znansveno metodo »z dvema načeloma: 1. verodostojno vrednost nosijo predvsem najožji dokumenti same avtorice. 2. vrednotenje je zavestno zamejeno z avtoričinim pogledom na zgodovinsko obdobje (sekundarna obravnava je drugotna in sledi podrobni analizi opisanega gradiva). Preučevanje zajema rokopisno gradivo, osebna pričevanja, avtorsko korespondenco

in upošteva ruske kritične izdaje rokopisnega gradiva, ki so v tem pogledu edine veljavne, čeprav tudi to zahteva dopolnilno raziskovalčevo delo in previdnost. Upoštevala sem tiste obravnave, za katere je Anna A. Ahmatova trdila, da so nastale izpod peresa ljudi, ki so njeno poezijo dobro poznali, jo razumeli in cenili.«

S temi izhodišči in znansvenimi principi, ki so vgrajeni v tristo strani dolgo monografijo, se seveda lahko strinjamo, vendar jih velja vseeno nekoliko kritično osvetliti. Ne zato, ker ne bi »delovali« pri prikazu in podrobni interpretaciji pesničinega življenja, ki je vsekakor z neštetimi vidnimi in nevidnimi vezmi povezano s pesniškim opusom in vsako pesmijo (in pesnitvijo) posebej, ampak zato, ker se postavlja načelno vprašanje: je torej mogoče veljavno (zanesljivo, skladno z vsebinami, idejami in ne nazadnje tudi recepcijskimi učinki pesmi) intrpretirati samo opus pesnika ali pesnice, ki je zapustil tako obsežno (bibliografsko in biografsko) zapuščino in o katerem je napisanih na desetine študij, razprav in esejev? Je torej poezija ustvarjalcev, ki so brez takega »zaledja« interpretaciji manj dostopna, le-ta pa je zaradi tega, ker se ne more kar naprej sklicevati na veljavne vire in pričevanja, bolj nezanesljiva ali celo napačna? O tem, da je Zajčeva temeljito, tako rekoč do zadnje biografske podrobnosti, izkoristila možnost proučevanja dostopnega gradiva, govori ne samo zgradba monografije, ampak tudi o njenem prizadevanju, da bi stvarjem prišla do dna in jih ustrezno podkrepila s podatki in navedki, O tem priča skoraj devetsto (!) opomb pod črto, ki ilustrirajo in/ali potrjujejo trditve, ki jih je zapisala avtorica monografije o Ahmatovi ali jih je povzela po relevantnih avtorjih in pričevalcih. Seveda se nujno zastavlja vrsta načelnih vprašanj, a poskušali bomo osvetliti samo nakatera, v prvi vrsti tisto, ki se sprašuje o veljavnosti avtointerpretativnih izjav same pesnice in ki jih Zajčeva najbolj pogosto uporablja pri svoji interpretaciji posameznih pesemskih besedil.

Izven slehernega dvoma je, da je pesnica (in to velja za vse pesnike in pesnice) tista, ki najbolje »pozna« svojo poezijo in lahko o njej, njeni genezi, učinkih in še o čem, pove največ in na najbolj neposreden način. Toda ali vseeno: niso vse kasnejše interpretacije, tudi tiste, ki nimajo dostopa do primarnih virov in se morajo zadovoljiti zgolj s »pesemskim izdelkom«, ki vstopi v recepcijski prostor brez dodatnih razlag, opomb in pojasnil, prav tako veljavne in lahko odkrijejo še druge pomenske razsežnosti (neke) pesmi, ki so jih intrpreti, sodobniki pesnice ali sama pesnica Ahmatova prezrli in to iz najrazličnejših vzrokov, izpostavimo samo enega: Če namreč pesem, postane »univerzalno besedilo«, ne more biti razložena samo na nekaj načinov, za katere so bili sodobniki in sama pesnica prepričani, da so edini pomembni in torej tudi dominantni, ampak ustvarja iz svoje kompleksnosti vedno nove in nove intrpretacijske modele, tudi glede na spreminjajoče se razmerje pesmi do zunajliterarne resničnosti, na katero prejšnje interpretacije nimajo in ne morejo imeti odločujočega vpliva. Prav pesniški opus Anne Ahmatove je dokaz za to trditev: v času svojega nastanka in pesničnega življenja je bil nekajkrat grobo problematiziran, nerazumljen, odklonjen, ideološko zavržen in postavljen v izolacijo, da bi šele v spremenjenih zgodovinskih razmerah in že po pesnični smrti začel dobivati pomen in veljavo na recepcijskem horizontu, ki ni bil več v (ob)lasti ideologije, svojo avtentično vrednost izvirajočo iz univerzalnih humanističnih vrednot. To izjemno pomembno lastnost poezije Anne Ahmatove, ki tudi po smrti dobiva vse večjo veljavo, v svoji monografiji razgrinja in utemnjuje tudi Neža Zajc. A ni bistvena kanonizacija pesnice, pač pa tisto, kar je tudi osnovni namen monografije. Z dokumenti, pričevanji, predvsem pa z natančnim analitičnim branjem poezije na njeni sinhroni in diahroni osi je avtorici monografije uspelo razgrniti bistvene značilnosti pesnične poetike, a hkrati tudi zelo natančno

osvetliti njeno življenjsko pot. Malo je pesniških osebnosti v moderni evropski literaturi od Rimbauda naprej, katerih življenjska usoda in pesniški razvoj sta tako tesno povezana, prepletena in soodvisna; Anna A. Ahmatova vsekakor sodi mednje in to je avtorica monografije izpostavila na ustrezen, pregleden in tudi (za bralca brez predznanja) informativen način.

Monografija tako vzporeja dva svetova, dve vzoporedni realnosti. Prva realnost je pesniški svet, ki je, kot smo omenili, vedno bolj prisoten, recepcijsko izzivalen, univerzalen v svojem sporočilu, ki je nastalo v nekem stesnjem času represije, strahu, negotovosti in preganjanja drugače mislečih, a je ta čas preseglo in danes nagovarja svoje bralce še bolj intenzivno kot v času anstanka ali kmalu po njem. Druga realnost je pesničino življenje, njene (intimne) zveze z drugimi umetniki, njene izkušnje z represivnim aparatom sovjetske, pravzaprav stalinistične družbe, a tudi »predzgodba tega časa, pesničino rojstvo in odraščanje v carski Rusiji, kulturni in politični kontekst, ki ga grobo prekinja boljševisistična revolucija. Oba svetova se ves čas njenega življenja zadirata drug v drugega, poskušata preglasiti drug drugega, a se vedno znova vračata k temeljni razsežnosti, ki jo predstavlja poezija, ali z besedami Neže Zajc: »Čeprav pesnica ni hotela preveč natančno povezati nekaterih pesmi z biografsko realnostjo, se je vse življenje ukvarjala z nezmotljivim pomnjenjem lastne duševne preteklosti.«

Če se vrnemo k izhodiščnemu vprašanju o vrednosti avtointerpretativnih izjav pesnice o lastnih besedilih, če te izjave primerjamo s tem, kaj so o njenem pesniškem opus (in posameznih, izpostavljenih pesmih) sodili njeni sodobniki, potem moramo priznati, da je Neža Zajc s svojimi komentarji in analizami tega gradiva opravila izjemno delo in pesnico postavila v edini možni prostor, to je v zgodovinsko perspektivo, s katero se, kot predstavniki različnih humanističnih

strok, soočamo danes. Vendar pa pri tem nikakor ne smemo spregledati pomembnega dejstva: vsaka interpretacija nekega literarnega dela, vsak pogled v kulturo nekega časa se ne more izogniti determinantam tega časa. Zato seveda avtorica monografije ne govori in tudi ne more govoriti o pesmih kot da so »zamrznjene« v času svojega nastanka, ampak jih lahko presvetli le s svetlobo časa, v katerem je nastala njena monografija. Če neko literarno delo, posebej pesem omogoča toliko interpretacij, kolikor je interpretov, pa je res tudi, da vsaka nova interpretacija na poseben način povzema vse prejšnje, a je z njimi tudi v latentnem sporu: »novo branje« literarnega besedila je mogoče le, če »ukinja« vsa prejšnja in pričinja s točke nič. Pri tem pa ji je v veliko pomoč, kot je to mogoče opaziti pri branju monografije Neže Zajec, vse tisto, kar je mogoče razumeti kot neizpodbitne in verodostojne vire in vse druge preverljive podatke o pesnici, njenem življenju in delu. Tako monografija o Anni Ahmatovi ni samo analiza njenega življenja in poetične ustvarjalnosti, ampak prikaz prostora in časa carske Rusije in komunistične Sovjetske zveze, ki je od konca devetnajstega stoletja pa vse do druge polovice dvajsetega krojil usodo toliko ljudi različnih narodnosti kot noben režim pred in po njem. ♡

Denis Poniž

Denis Poniž je diplomirani komparativist, upokojeni redni profesor za zgodovino slovenske in evropske dramatike, poučeval na Akademiji za gledališče, radio, film in televizijo Univerze v Ljubljani. Gostujoči profesor na evropskih univerzah, avtor več stokovnih del s področja dramatike, dramaturgije, zgodovine in teorije poezije, semantike in digitalne humanistike.

SLAVICA TER
СЛАВИКА ТЕР