

Australian Slavonic and East European Studies

(Formerly *Melbourne Slavonic Studies*)

Journal of the
Australia and New Zealand Slavists' Association
and of the
Australian Association of Communist and Post-Communist Studies

Volume 32, Nos. 1-2

2018

Australian Slavonic and East European Studies

Editor:	Dr Robert Lagerberg, University of Melbourne
Deputy Editor:	Assoc. Prof. Stefan Auer, University of Hong Kong
Reviews Editor:	Dr John Cook, University of Melbourne
Editorial Board	Assoc. Prof. Judith Armstrong, University of Melbourne Dr Julie Fedor, University of Melbourne Dr John McNair, University of Queensland Dr Lyndall Morgan, University of Queensland Prof. Marko Pavlyshyn, Monash University Dr Alexandra Smith, University of Edinburgh Dr Ludmila Stern, University of New South Wales Dr David N. Wells, Curtin University Assoc. Prof. Kevin Windle, Australian National University

ASEES is a refereed journal which publishes scholarly articles, review articles and short reviews on all aspects of Slavonic and East European Studies, in particular, language, literature, history and political science, and also art and social science. Articles should have a maximum length of 8,500 words and review articles 4,000; they should be submitted to the editor electronically, preferably in .doc (Microsoft Word) format. All articles submitted for consideration should conform to the style guidelines set out in the *ASEES* web page.

ASEES replaces *Melbourne Slavonic Studies*, founded in 1967 by the late Nina Christesen, which ceased publication with Volume 19, 1985.

Back issues of most volumes are available for A\$20.00 per issue plus GST.

Recent volumes of *ASEES* are available online at:

<http://arts.unimelb.edu.au/soll/research/research-publications/european-studies/asees-journal> and <http://miskinhill.com.au/journals/asees/>

Indexes to all volumes of *MSS* and *ASEES* are available at <http://www.arts.uq.edu/slccs/> - follow the links to Publications, *ASEES* and Indexes.

ASEES is normally published in one combined issue per year: the current subscription price is A\$35.

ISSN-0818 8149

Published by the School of Languages and Linguistics,
The University of Melbourne, Australia.

Telephone: +61 3 8344 5187

E-mail: robertjl@unimelb.edu.au

Web: <http://arts.unimelb.edu.au/soll/research/research-publications/european-studies/asees-journal>

ASEES © The Publishers and each contributor, 2018

We are currently accepting articles for Volume 33 (2019). An electronic copy (in Microsoft Word format) should be sent to the editor by 31 August 2019. Papers received after this time will not be considered for publication in Volume 33. *ASEES* Volume 33 (2019) will appear towards the end of 2019.

ANZSA

Office bearers of the Australia and New Zealand Slavists' Association are:

President: Dr Marika Kalyuga, Macquarie University
Vice-Presidents: (Australia) Dr David N. Wells, Curtin University
(New Zealand) Dr Evgeny Pavlov, University of Canterbury
Secretary-Treasurer Dr John Cook, University of Melbourne

AACPCS

Office bearers of the Australian Association of Communist and Post-Communist Studies are:

President: Assoc. Prof. Roderic Pitty, University of Western Australia
Secretary/Treasurer: Dr Anna Taitlin, University of Canberra
Executive members: Prof. Leslie Holmes, University of Melbourne
Mr Tony Phillips, University of Melbourne
Assoc. Prof. Hans Hendrichke, University of New South
Wales
Assoc. Prof. Slobodanka Vladiv-Glover, Monash University
Dr Lynne Alice, Deakin University

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

IVANA GULIC

- Through Bakhtin's Lens: Music and Authorship in Krzysztof
Kieślowski's *Three Colours: Blue* 1

HENRIETTA MONDRY

- Daughter Writing Famous Mother's Biography: Dagmara Kimele
on Asja Lacis's Adventurous Life 27

KEVIN WINDLE

- Listok Gruppy rossiiskikh rabochikh*: a 1918 Brisbane Russian
Newspaper, its Origins and Orientation 53

PETER M. HILL

- Sex and Gender in Serbian and Bulgarian: A Comparative Study..... 79

REVIEWS

Giovanna Brogi Bercoff, Marko Pavlyshyn, Serhii Plokhy (eds). <i>Ukraine and Europe: Cultural Encounters and Negotiations</i> (Alessandro Achilli)	107
Michael S. Flier, Valerie Kivelson, Erika Monahan & Daniel Rowland (eds). <i>Seeing Muscovy Anew: Politics — Institutions — Culture: Essays in Honor of Nancy Shields Kollmann</i> (Adrian Jones)	110
Karin Hyldal Christensen, <i>The Making of the New Martyrs of Russia: Soviet Repression in Orthodox Memory</i> (Duncan Reid)	116
M.N. Epstein, A.A. Genis, S.M. Vladiv-Glover, <i>Russian Postmodernism: New Perspectives on Post-Soviet Culture</i> (John Cook)	119
A.B. McMillin, <i>Breaking with Tradition: Belarusian Short Prose in the Early Twenty-First Century</i> (Palina Urban)	122
Dennis Ioffe, Marcus Levitt, Joe Peschio, and Igor Pilshchikov (eds), <i>A/Z: Essays in Honor of Alexander Zholkovsky</i> (Natalia Batova)	126
Michael C. Finke and Michael Holquist (eds), <i>Approaches to Teaching the Works of Anton Chekhov</i> (Judith Armstrong)	129
F. Dostoevsky, <i>The Russian Soul: Selections from A Writer's Diary</i> (John Cook)	135
Books Received	139
Notes on Contributors	141

IVANA GULIC

THROUGH BAKHTIN'S LENS: MUSIC AND AUTHORSHIP IN
KRZYSZTOF KIEŚLÓWSKI'S *THREE COLOURS: BLUE*

Three Colours: Blue and Kieślowski

The dominant concern in the critical discourse that has emerged in regard to Kieślowski's *Three Colours* trilogy emphasises his mastery in representing the inner experience and emotions of his protagonists when faced with, and entangled in, human dramas. While Kieślowski's complex artistry has instigated a rich critical discussion on the interplay between his cinematic style and themes centred on metaphysical questions of choice, fate and coincidence, as well as various explanations of his artistic vision (see Kickasola, 2004; Haltof, 2004; Kenhr, 1994; Insdorf, 1999; Coates, 2002; Santili, 2006; Saverino, 2006; Wilson, 2000), opinion among his critics has remained divided. Kieślowski's trilogy, and his move to international co-productions in general, were received negatively by some of his Polish critics who argue that his abandonment of political and social issues (explored in his early documentaries and films that belong to the Cinema of Distrust movement) marks a decline in the quality of his cinema. These critics claim that the director's late films are pretentious, feature improbable characters, promote the religion of blind chance and employ a cinematic style that borders on kitsch sensibility (see, for example, Jankun-Dopartowa and Przyłipiak, 1996; Sobolewski, 1995).

Blue, *White* and *Red* derive from the three colours of the French flag and correspond to the French revolutionary themes of liberty, equality and fraternity. Blue is the colour corresponding to the theme of liberty in the French flag. In *Blue*, the concept of liberty is meant in a non-political sense, and Kieślowski implies this when he

says: “We’re talking about individual freedom, a profound freedom, freedom of life” (as cited in Romney, 1993, 3). The film examines the meaning of liberty, but in a very specific way, by focusing on the theme of loss that is presented through the inner struggle of the main protagonist, Julie Bouinon, to overcome the emotions of grief brought about by the sudden loss of her family – her daughter, Anna, and her husband, Patrice de Corcey, who is also a famous composer. Ostensibly, the preoccupation with the inner life of Julie emerges as a primary concern that Kieślowski traces in *Blue*: that is, how Julie perceives the world cognitively and emotionally, her experience of being in the world, and in what particular ways audiences are able to understand distinct cinematic strategies for conveying the realm of her inner life. However, as the following analysis will demonstrate, the film also transcends metaphysical speculations and the realm of experiential reality – that is, the dramatised immediacy of emotion – by foregrounding the ethics of responsibility towards others. In doing so, the film encompasses not only the personal, but also the ethical discourse of society.

Julie’s process of composing the *Concerto for the Unification of Europe* can be configured along Bakhtin’s architectonic axis of aesthetic acts vis-à-vis the relationship between the author and a work, and, by extension, between viewers and a work of art. Exploring the narrative interplay between Julie and music, this analysis of *Blue* will demonstrate how the film portrays the acts of musical composition in a way that promotes the ethic of responsibility or answerability to Otherness, articulated in the Bakhtinian argument that an artist must bring back to life what is experienced in the work of art.

Towards the Ethic of Responsibility

The development of phenomenological architectonics and aesthetics stems from Bakhtin’s attempts to formulate a general conception of human existence through a coher-

KIEŚLOWSKI'S *THREE COLOURS: BLUE*

ent aesthetic theory in which the meaning of one's self is constructed through the interaction between self and other. 'Architectonics' for Bakhtin signifies the realm of the phenomenological, embodied experience in which humans organise themselves into the master categories of 'I' and 'another'. Each individual occupies a spatio-temporal place, and has moral responsibility to acknowledge this uniqueness (or what Bakhtin calls 'the non-alibi in Being') through participative thinking in concrete human situations by performing answerable acts.¹ This moral responsibility or answerability, as Bakhtin refers to it, is made possible through the emotional-volitional and axiological orientation that anchors the position of self toward others, and is realised through various stages of the self-other relationship.

The emotional-volitional tone is an attitude of consciousness, which is not something subjectively fortuitous, but a conscious and rational decision of the subject to participate in the event of being and to be axiologically orientated towards the Other: "Emotional-volitional tone [...] is not a passive psychic reaction, but is a certain ought-to-be attitude of consciousness" (Bakhtin, 1993, 36). In other words, the emotional-volitional tone is what sets in motion the turn towards answerability. However, its realisation depends on the different positions that the self occupies in relation to others, of which 'outsideness' represents a precondition for wholeness that one achieves through the interaction with the Other.

Bakhtin conceptualises outsideness also in phenomenological terms, as an embodied consciousness of the self, incarnated in the gaze of the Other whose 'surplus of seeing' allows the subject to finalise or, to use Bakhtin's term, 'consummate' itself in the event of being. However, the consummation of an event is something other than

¹ According to Bakhtin, "I occupy a place in once-occurrent being that is unique [...] that which can be done by me can never be done by anyone else. The uniqueness or singularity of present-on-hand being is completely obligatory" (1993, 40).

closure and stasis: it is, as Bakhtin conceives it, an architectonic closure that is always subject to renewal. He uses the ideas of ‘unfinalisability’ or ‘unconsummatedness’ to explain the open-ended unity as the *coincidentia oppositorum* of human existence: “In order to live and act, I need to be unconsummated, I need to be [...] someone who does not coincide with his already existing makeup” (AA, 1990, 12-13). The event, through architectonics, enables detachment from the open event of being and the consummation of human experiences into a meaningful whole. This wholeness enriches self-consciousness through the finalising moment of the answerable act when the consciousness of Other bestows its gift of vision upon the subject. Seeing life as an event, Bakhtin’s aesthetic project celebrates ‘the fullness of time’ that renders life incomplete, always connected to what has come before, yet, at the same, time looking forward to a future exchange between the self and the Other.

Bakhtin’s epistemological model, which is developed through the above-mentioned architectonic process of achieving aesthetic wholeness, is inextricably linked to his ethical project, both of which foreground the complex manner in which difference is at the heart of the knowing subject. This constitutive role of difference in the formation of the self places Bakhtin’s ethical philosophy in line with Emmanuel Levinas and thinkers such as Maurice Blanchot, Jacques Derrida and Maurice Merleau-Ponty, whose theories have been widely extrapolated to film studies. More precisely, the work of these thinkers has contributed to an emerging interdisciplinary field of cinematic ethics, which is substantially based on the ethic underpinned by notions of otherness and difference, the ethic that is distinct from ethical universalism as generally understood in terms of the Western rationality and its meta-narratives of religious, scientific and societal dogmatisms (which are predicated on a belief that human beings operate from a divine or a rational moral centre – the assumption of which reduces the Other to the same).

KIEŚLOWSKI'S *THREE COLOURS: BLUE*

While the work of these theorists presents more obvious filters through which to consider the potential of cinema as a medium of ethical experience – whether within the context of film viewing or within the film form – the usefulness of Bakhtin's theories for studying cinematic ethics has not been explored. Yet Bakhtin's reconciliation of epistemology, ethics, and aesthetics into what is essentially a humanist project based on the conception of the self as forming through its interrelation with the Other, has much to offer contemporary dialogue between cinema and ethics. The crux of Bakhtin's entire project is based upon the idea that we are obliged to respond to others at the deepest level of interaction, and any attempt to understand ourselves and how we experience reality cannot be achieved by a purely unilateral introspection. As such, his ethical model can elucidate the specific sense in which Kieślowski articulates the ethic of responsibility towards Otherness in *Blue*. Yet, as this article also seeks to demonstrate, it is not only the re-reading of Kieślowski's film as a particular mode of Bakhtin's aesthetic that brings forth its ethical dimension, but also the engagement of his theories in thinking about cinema in ethical terms.

As already mentioned, Kieślowski's use of distinctive aesthetic strategies for expressing the emotional states of his characters has been explored by numerous film critics and theorists, most of whom acknowledge, albeit in different ways, the director's endeavour to push the limits of the cinematic medium in representing inner life, an endeavour that ultimately reaches its climax in the *Three Colours* trilogy. For instance, Janina Falkowska observes that Kieślowski's trilogy reveals "strong emotions that seem about to burst through the surface of the elegantly composed images" (1995, 137). Furthermore, the narrative and the aesthetic that frame these late films hinge on metaphysical questions of choice, fate and coincidence, all of which can be construed as aiming to universalise human experience. Kieślowski himself discusses this tendency: "It doesn't matter who you are or who I am, if your tooth aches or mine, it's

still the same pain. Feelings are what link people together, because the word ‘love’ has the same meaning for everybody” (as cited in Abrahamson, 1995). And while Kieślowski’s propensity to valorise metaphysical reality via cinematic means, whether on a thematic (by creating narrative events and situations that bring people together so that they can recognise their commonality and universal human qualities) or formal level (by innovatively using cinematic techniques, such as close-ups, slow camera movements, angles, music and colors to convey the sense of ineffable),² does not need to be downplayed for the sake of advancing the argument of this article, it is also Kieślowski’s insistence on communality and mutual interdependence that brings forth the very notion of sociality, the sociality that, at the very least, must be open to Otherness. It is thus apposite that Kieślowski tells us that the idea behind the trilogy was to explore the manner in which liberty, equality and fraternity, the ideals so firmly upheld by Western civilisation, function on a personal plane; he also affirms that the moral universe in his films “has nothing to do with any descriptions of exact definitions of right and wrong. It has to do with concrete, everyday decisions” (as cited in Kieślowski and Stok, 1993, 149). As such, Kieślowski’s exploration of these ideals from the characters’ personal points of view, rather than through epic narratives that make sweeping statements, reveals something contrary to the previously men-

² Kickasola’s *The Films of Krzysztof Kieślowski: The Liminal Image* (2004) provides a detailed study of Kieślowski’s cinema in terms of its thematic and formal metaphysical manifestations. His theory of Kieślowski’s style in his late films, explained in his chapter entitled ‘Immediacy, Abstraction, and Transcendence’, is based on a theological and transcendental reading. Drawing on the philosophical theology of Mircea Eliade and Thomas Aquinas, and on the work of theorists such as Edmund Husserl and Martin Buber, Kickasola promotes a three-tiered analysis of Kieślowski’s late films. First, using Buber’s and Husserl’s phenomenological mode, he argues that when watching the films, as an act of embodied perception, the spectator reacts through an immediate response to a recognisable reality, which he calls ‘immediacy’. Second, abstract images and mental abstractions of artistic forms can be used to provoke visual immediacy, as well as to extend the immediate emotional and imaginative encounters, to imply a transcendental level of meaning.

KIEŚLOWSKI'S *THREE COLOURS: BLUE*

tioned universalising tendencies: it suggests, intuitively at least, Kieślowski's doubts concerning the existence of any fixed meanings and abstract concepts such as truth, freedom or justice, and an awareness that ethical concerns and principles are sensitive to the nuances of individual context and can only be unveiled through an acknowledgement of Otherness. Such an ethical subjectivity and its complexities, the ontological and epistemological values of which are predicated on acknowledging Otherness and its irreducibility, marks Bakhtin's philosophical project. Though the aim here is not to explore Bakhtin's philosophy independently, the extent to which his aesthetic-ethical project can be interpreted in direct relation to its visual and thematic manifestations in *Three Colours: Blue* will be explored.

Authorship: The Architectonic of Aesthetic Events

The manifestation of Otherness in Bakhtin's texts is manifold: from its signification of a human being through the object (in aesthetic activity) and the hero (in the novel) to the world in polyphony. Relevant for this study is the rendering of Otherness through the modality of authorship. Authorship – as a dynamic rationality between self and object – is set in architectonics. It is an activity of creating a text, which, as Holquist and Clark (1984, 64) clarify, parallels the activity within life of building a self. The only difference between these creative activities is that the act of authorship leaves a physical trace, while the other is an invisible and latent process.³ Bakhtin's concept of

³ Among the first group of Bakhtin's are his shortest piece 'Art and Answerability', 'Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity', and 'The Problem of Content, Material, and Form in Verbal Art', all published in English in the volume titled *Art and Answerability*, and *Toward the Philosophy of the Act*. These early essays are organised around three central ideas: the relation between self and other, stipulated through the architectonic of the deed; the relationship of author to hero, couched in terms of the architectonic of aesthetic events; and, the ethical question of responsibility (answerability) implicated in the aesthetic. Bakhtin uses his concept of architectonics of the deed or act to explain the 'eventness' of particular situations that form a finished whole. In order for an event to be

‘architectonics of aesthetic events’ relates to the author-hero relation as well as the study of characters themselves, the former of which will be relevant for this study.

Such an aesthetically productive relationship can be traced in *Blue* through Julie’s acts of musical authorship. While the temptation of reducing the semiotic of the film to a strictly Bakhtinian reading should be avoided, it is nevertheless important in the context of this study to vivify its philosophical instantiations through the philosopher’s aesthetic-ethical project, in order to show how the film offers the possibility of being interpreted as ethically instructive in thinking about the Other as an ontological precondition for the ethical formation of the subject. As I show in what follows, the presence of Otherness depicted through an aesthetic object (the *Concerto*) and the process of its creation foreground the ethic of responsibility and answerability articulated in the Bakhtinian argument that an artist (Julie) must bring back to life what is experienced in the work of art – an assertion that is embodied in Julie’s relationship with the musical form. This obligation is integral to the process of aesthetic activity. As such, the *Concerto* can be conceptualised as a form of aesthetic object, outsideness and Otherness, whose process of creation enables Julie to escape her solipsistic relation with the world (brought about by the loss of her husband and daughter in a car accident) through the creation of an aesthetic relationship between mind and world, art and life.

The view that the aesthetic event of artistic creation has to be initiated by the artist’s ethical awareness as the ought-to-reality that entails his or her answerable and intentional acts, becomes expressed in *Blue* through the textual events that signify Julie’s relationship to music. Exploring the narrative interplay between Julie and mu-

complete, there needs to be a three-way dynamic between individuals: ‘I-for-myself’, ‘the other-for-me’, and ‘I-for-the-other’. ‘I-for-myself’ alone is fragmentary and fluid, and only a relation inclusive of others who are outside me can bestow security and stability, because they occupy the position of outsideness, which is the structural necessity for wholeness.

KIEŚLOWSKI'S *THREE COLOURS: BLUE*

sic, the following analysis will demonstrate how the film portrays the acts of musical composition in a complex way. Some scenes which show Julie composing represent a genuine process of aesthetic activity; others do not, as they show her lacking the conscious and volitional aspect of artistic activity that are necessary for the realisation of the ethical component in aesthetic activity. The analysis of the content in terms of both cognitive and ethical parts is important for understanding the compositional process in the film; however, it is also Bakhtin's concept of form, as an actuality of formally organised structures through which humans can make sense of their experience, that allows for mapping out the ethico-aesthetical structuring of Julie's subjectivity.

Aesthetic Finalisation: Content, Material and Form

Specifically with regard to the creation of artistic acts, Bakhtin identifies their cognitive and ethical components. Cognitive and ethical aspects of human activity epitomise the impartial evaluation of a given person and a given event from the standpoint of a value that is held to be universally valid. The content of any work of art encompasses cognitive values, which represent the gnoseological realm, that is, the limitless field of knowledge and ethics. Bakhtin explains the act of cognition as 'prescientific thinking', which is established, evaluated and ordered by different ethical action, such as practical, quotidian, political or social action. The ethical act is expressed as the relation of the ought-to-reality, while aesthetic form identifies and evaluates cognised reality and transposes it to another axiological level, "subordinates it to a new unity and orders it in a new way: it individualizes, concretizes, isolates, and consummates it" (Bakhtin, 1990, 278).

The content of the aesthetic object stems from the reality of cognition and ethical action, which, through the form, is removed from the 'open event of being'

and transferred to the realm of culture. Furthermore, because of its axiological relationship to the content, the form enables the consummation of the content. Only from an aesthetic distance can the author bestow upon himself or herself a finalised and consummated form:

In form I find myself, find my own productive, axiologically form-giving activity; *I feel intensely my own movement that is creating the object*, and I do so not only in primary creation, not only during my own performance, but also during the contemplation of a work of art. *I must to some extent experience myself as the creator of form, in order to actualize the artistic form as such* (Bakhtin, 1990, 304).

Thus, the form enables the author to establish the axiological relationship with the content, and also with the recipient of the content, the audience or the reader, through the contemplation of the aesthetic object, which is consummated through form – inaugurating the axiological relationship with the form. In other words, the purpose of form is twofold: it enables the author to finalise the content of the aesthetic object and it foregrounds an aesthetic exchange between the viewer or contemplator and the artwork.

The development of aesthetic consciousness in *Blue*

These connected, aesthetic and ethical facets of the theory can provide us with an understanding of the thematic role of music in *Blue*. In addition to the theme of the struggle of the main protagonist to cultivate an indifference to life in order to find disconnection from past and painful memories, *Blue* also deals with Julie's husband's unfinished composition. With the progression of the narrative – which depicts the

KIEŚLOWSKI'S *THREE COLOURS: BLUE*

events surrounding the accident, Julie's isolation and gradual reconnection with reality – a parallel progression appears in the film: the creation of the musical work. Her composition of the *Concerto for the Unification of Europe* can be interpreted as the process of creation of the aesthetic object where the accident and her inner struggle to come to terms with the tragedy signify the content of the aesthetic activity, while the *Concerto* represents a form of the aesthetic object. Although the following exploration of the formation of ethical subjectivity in *Blue* through Bakhtin's aesthetic model will seek to demonstrate what, at least, seems to be a curious relation between the two, the analysis does not propose in any way to arrive at some kind of 'ultimate truth' about the identity of the film.

In *Blue*, the importance of the music is twofold. Firstly, meta-diegetically, it serves to show the shifting aspects of subjectivity, since Julie moves through various states of intensely inward experience. The music in the early scenes plays an important part in conveying Julie's inner life. The film begins in silence, and for the first 8 minutes and 52 seconds, music is completely absent from the film. The scene in which Olivier comes to visit Julie and she is watching the funeral of her husband and daughter is the first time music is heard. It is here that the film reveals that Julie's husband was Patrice de Courcy, a famous composer who was composing the *Concert for the Unification of Europe*, intended for the Council of Europe, and which was commissioned to be played by twelve symphony orchestras in twelve cities of the new United Europe. The music is introduced in a peculiar way. The film's score consists of two major compositions: the first is the *Funeral March* and the second is the *Concerto for the Unification of Europe*. The *Concerto* is comprised of individual themes: 'The Memento', 'Julie's Theme', 'Olivier's Theme' and 'The Busker's Theme'. It is the melody of the *Funeral March* that introduces the music into the film's diegesis through the funeral scene where Julie watches on television the farewell to her family

accompanied by the ensemble performing the composition. While the *Funeral March* is thus introduced diegetically, it is only through the meta-diegetic sound that the theme will be heard henceforth. The theme is connected with Julie's blackouts, and is used to render her innermost feelings and the overwhelming depth of her suffering.

In addition, the film itself is about the music and in this regard the compositional process fulfils the thematic role of the film. Zbigniew Preisner (Kieślowski's sound producer) comments on the particular treatment of the music in the film: "It was not conceived only to underline atmosphere and ambivalence. Krzysztof wanted it to have strength, to be an element of the film's narrative" (as cited in Macnab & Drake, 1996, 20). Thus, as one of the organising themes of *Blue's* narrative structure, Julie's complex and shifting relationship with music creates a narrative split between the first part of the film, which portrays Julie's forceful suppression of music, and the second half, which dramatises her new found passion for composing and completing the *Concerto*.

The first part of *Blue* develops the themes of Julie's isolation and her deliberate self-exile from others: giving her house to her husband's mistress or taking a flat in a child-free building are some examples of Julie's attempts to annihilate the longings of life and sustain her cocooned existence. Yet, most relevant for this study is her complicated and agonising connection to music. In the early scenes, just after being released from hospital, Julie enters the music room, looks at scores and then turns them over as if searching for something. For the first time, part of the *Concerto* is heard in the film as the sound in Julie's head. She takes a piece of paper from the piano and looks at it. The theme, which is played on piano, suggests that it follows the score while Julie is reading it. The music ends when she folds the piece of paper. Later Julie returns to the music room and reads the score, but this time a subjective shot frames the paper very closely, the content of which becomes clearly visible, and

KIEŚLOWSKI'S *THREE COLOURS: BLUE*

follows it while alternating with a foreground shot of her face. This alternation ends when the last note on the paper is played. The scene progresses with a continuous shot of Julie's face following the empty paper with her eyes, while the music still goes on in her head – clearly showing that Julie is composing.

This act of composing, as shown at this point in the film, would not qualify for genuine artistic creativity in Bakhtin's philosophy, because it lacks the conscious, volitional aspect which is necessary for the realisation of the ethical component in aesthetic activity. The compositional process in this scene rather evokes the Freudian interpretation of the creative impulse in art, which results from a lack of wish fulfilment and serves as a fantasy of a perfect reality, and that was highly criticised by Bakhtin.⁴ The final part of the scene, in which the music from the notated score ends abruptly when Julie slams the piano lid shut, strongly contributes to the narrative logic in the film of Julie's internal struggle to live without memories and emotions. These sudden reactions in the moments when Julia finds herself drawn to life's situations that demand emotional investment indicate her internal struggle to suppress feelings. For example, when the boy who has the crucifix, Julie's gift from Patrice, and who has witnessed the accident, says to her, "If you want to ask me something, I got there just after", Julie stridently replies, "No".⁵ Similarly, the initial engagement with music and composing after the accident brings out the emotional connection with her past and induces a desire for her absent family. Both these moments – the slamming shut of the piano and her refusal to communicate with the boy who witnessed the accident – show her rejecting her emotions and anything that will bring back the memories of her

⁴ Freudian psychoanalysis presented a significant challenge to members of the Bakhtin circle to popularise the role of the other and society against the psychoanalytic idea of introspection as the only path for psychic development (see Voloshinov 1987).

⁵ Later, Julie will discover that Olivier's girlfriend is wearing a necklace similar to the one Antoine tried to return to Julie.

IVANA GULIC

loved ones. The next scene, in which Julie goes to Olivier's copyist to collect and destroy what she thinks is the last copy of the unfinished score of the *Concerto for the Unification of Europe*, reinforces her decision to live without music as well as memory.⁶ An assistant is impressed with the music and expresses her admiration by saying, "I love this chorus." She points with her finger at the first bar and a chorus of voices starts to sing. The spellbinding sound continues after the finger of the assistant has stopped following the notes. The assistant accompanies Julie as she walks outside and throws the score into a garbage truck; gradually the beautiful sound of the score transforms into a shredding sound from the truck.

In the middle of the night, after receiving a call for help from Lucile, Julie ventures down the dark streets of Paris and walks into a sex club to meet her distressed friend, whose father has by chance just visited the club where she works as a prostitute. The scene in the sex club awakens something new in Julie, specifically in relation to music – the desire to complete the *Concerto*. At the club she sees a television interview featuring Olivier and learns that he has a copy of the score that she thought she had destroyed, and that the European Council has asked him to complete the *Concerto*. During the interview, Olivier also shows photos of Patrice with another woman, Sandrine, a mistress whom he loved. Julie tracks the mistress down and finds out that she is pregnant with Patrice's child. Julie learns from this revelation that Patrice was able to experience happiness and fulfilment outside his family, in this other life that he had created with Sandrine. Like Patrice, who had created a new life in which Anna and Julie did not belong, she too could build a new life free from the denial of human contacts and isolation.

⁶ It will be revealed, later in the film, that Olivier has asked for the second copy of the score, knowing that Julie would try to destroy it.

KIEŚLOWSKI'S *THREE COLOURS: BLUE*

As mentioned above, her knowledge of the score and Patrice's relationship with Sandrine engenders in Julie the desire to complete the *Concerto*. Having contacted Olivier in order to find out about Sandrine and having decided that she must meet her, she learns that Sandrine is a lawyer and is often found at the courts. Julie goes to the courthouse and follows Sandrine out to a restaurant where she confronts her in a bathroom. It is at this point that she sees on Sandrine the same crucifix necklace that she had (the necklace that Antoine tried to return to Julie, as mentioned previously), which suggests that Patrice loved her, and she learns that Sandrine is pregnant with Patrice's child.

Julie's next meeting with Olivier in his apartment represents the first act of genuine compositional process. This time, as opposed to the fragments of fortuitous composing previously mentioned, Julie's encounter with music symbolises this genuine act of creation as it represents her voluntary participation in the world through responsible actions, which enables the confluence of the two worlds – the world of art and the world of life. This voluntary participation encompasses an emotional-volitional attitude, which mobilises the ethical dimension of artistic creativity. After the scene in the sex club, Julie undergoes the cultivation of an attitude of consciousness that leads to a deeper understanding of music in general, and the *Concerto* in particular, and the sense of an obligation to search for freedom through the responsibility to attend to the uniqueness of irrevocable musical acts. Firstly, in terms of responsibility, Julie's understanding of music in general relates to her role as an artist who has a significant role and responsibility in society. Her distinctive relation to music is represented, albeit in shifting and evolving ways, throughout the film by her acts of composing and editing. Moreover, her role as the composer of Patrice's music is highlighted early in the film when a journalist asks her if she composed the music for her

husband. Later, in the copyist's office, a secretary comments that the score contains a lot of corrections, suggesting Julie's role in the score's composition.

The act of finishing the *Concerto* stems from Julie's recovering sense of responsibility as an artist to express her felt experience in the art itself. However, it must be re-emphasised that the completed concerto as an aesthetic object is secondary to the importance of the process of creation, which engages a dimension of consciousness that is of an aesthetic order. In other words, answerability as the ethical constituent of the content of the aesthetic object (the *Concerto*) is animated by Julie's responsibility and obligation that lead to the action or deed. As an artist she is responsible for embodying her experience through the art form: "To answer with my own life for what I have experienced and understood in art, so that everything I have experienced and understood would not remain ineffectual in my life" (Bakhtin, 1990, 1). In addition, responsibility towards others, expressed as an individual's concrete response to actual persons in concrete situations, is present in Julie's desire to complete the *Concerto*. The concrete situation concerns the interview where she realises that Olivier has undertaken the job of finishing the *Concerto*. Indeed, Julie could choose to renounce her responsibility, but she does not. She chooses to recognise the fact of her unique position and accept responsibility for her existence, as, ultimately, she is the only person who understands Patrice's score and knows how to finish it. Therefore, Julie's acknowledgment of this unique place, her affirmation of the non-alibi in being, is the prime mover that enables her to complete the score, thus to perform the answerable and creative deed. This dramatic development in the film is highly reminiscent of Bakhtin's apprehension that the ethical action, the answerable deed, is the important part of the content of the aesthetic object which allows the actualisation of the aesthetic consciousness. The creative act is not simply an intuitive or emotional impulse or urge, but a form of elevated awareness of being.

KIEŚLOWSKI'S *THREE COLOURS: BLUE*

The creation of the architectonic form is the matter of consummation of a person or event, and, in this case, the architectonic form of the *Concerto* creates boundaries that designate the axiological position of the content, and enable Julie's consummation of the event. Form, as an axiological category of the Other, enables the creator or author to adopt a new relation towards reality. Julie's process of creating the *Concerto for the Unification of Europe*, as the creation of aesthetic form, invites interpretation of the realisation of architectonic form in two ways. The final scene in the film reflects the twofold importance of architectonic form in aesthetic consummation; the first aspect relates to the author's aesthetic experience, the other to the reader's involvement in aesthetic consummation. For Julie, the *Concerto*, occupying the position of Otherness, enables the axiological consummatedness of her inner life. Through the music she hears herself in the Other, with others and for others. Bakhtin explains that in order to translate the inner life from the plane of being purely factual and unproductive, to the axiological plane that is confirmed from outside, we need to see and hear ourselves from within with the emotional eyes of the Other and in the emotional voice of the Other:

I embody myself in the voice of the Other who sings of me ... I sing of myself through the lips of other ... This other voice [which organises my inner life] is heard from outside ... I need to feel in my lived experience not my solitary answerability ... I need to feel the Other in myself, my own passiveness in the possible chorus of others – in the chorus which has closed around me on all sides and has screened off, as it were, the *immediate* and urgent task constituted by the unitary and unique event of being (Bakhtin, 1990, 170).

Right until the end of the film, none of the themes develop uninterruptedly, but appear as fragments, as melodies, which are usually halted in mid-phrase. These themes manifest Julie's inner life as fragmented representations of the experience of excruciating grief that wells up from within her. The process of composition enables her to connect these fragments together and transpose her pain into a musical form endowed with the spirit of Otherness that can create the possibility for aesthetic consummation. But how is the transformation of the self through aesthetic consummation portrayed in the last scene?

The final scene opens with Julie and Olivier making love in what appears to be a womblike space – it shows the image of the two lovers who, even though they are behind glass, seem to be under water. The accompaniment of the sound of the fully realised *Concerto*, heard for the first time with the final images, signals the completion of the aesthetic activity and transformation that Julie undergoes as a result of it. The aquatic surrounding evokes Julie's fluidity, which is consummated in the more stable forms of the Other. The score's status as the Other in the final scene is re-accentuated through the foregrounding of the sound over images, but in a very subtle way. The music of the score is played in full at the end of the film over a montage of the different people shown to have populated Julie's life. Through a continuous long shot the camera pans across the still faces of Antonio, the boy with the crucifix; Julie's mother; Lucille, the stripper; and Sandrine, bearing Patrice's unborn child and touching her belly. The assemblage is brought to a close with a close-up of Olivier's eye in which the viewer perceives naked Julie, followed by a shot of Julie's contemplative face as her tears begin to fall. The tears suggest that Julie can start the process of mourning, because her pain is invested into the contours of the Other and, through the form of music, becomes trammelled, capable of being experienced and also presented to the public. As such, the score also embodies the architectonic form through the evaluative

KIEŚLOWSKI'S *THREE COLOURS: BLUE*

position of the public. The sequence of shots of different people affected by Julie's actions might be interpreted as a community audience listening to the final version of the symphony. Moreover, as they listen to the *Concert*, they look radiant, as if they were enlightened with some kind of nascent spiritual and emotional afflatus and inner metamorphoses: Antonio gets up from the bed, and after touching the necklace with the crucifix, turns his head in amazement; Julie's mother with wide-open eyes looks up as if awakened by some new insights; the contemplative face of Lucille is juxtaposed with the rotating stage where she works, suggesting self-reflection as her image looks distant from the stage; and, finally, the montage of the audience is brought to a close with Sandrine smiling while looking at the ultra-sound image of her unborn child.

This collective experience of transformation and reunification of the characters through the melody of the *Concerto* can be interpreted as resulting from the aesthetic grace created through the architectonic form. Bakhtin writes that evaluation and contemplation of such forms by a creator or observer or, in our case, a listener, create kindness and tolerance: "I must experience form as my own activity, the axiological relationship to content, in order to experience form aesthetically: in form and through form, I sing, recount, and depict; through form, I express my love, my affirmation, my acceptance" (Bakhtin, 1990, 305). Thus, the architectonic form creates an aesthetic whole with *kindness* and *mercifulness* (ibid., 279) which "does not, divide, reject, or choose; it invites all inside" (Emerson, 1997, 246).

The edited version of St. Paul's letters incorporated in the final version of the *Concerto* strengthens the sense of emotional and spiritual concord between the characters, because it reasserts the indispensable experience of generosity and kindness created through the aesthetic whole. The text for this choral portion is written in New Testament Greek and the word stressed is 'love'. Kieślowski uses the Greek version

of St. Paul's letters in order to accentuate the importance of 'agape', the Koine Greek word translated into English as 'love'. Although the etymological roots of the word 'agape' derive from the Socratic-Platonic tradition, the meaning of 'agape' had undergone a slight semantic shift from the Hellenic philosophical tradition where it was used to denote divine, unconditional and self-sacrificing love. A more contemporary usage of the word encompasses the Christian concept of love promoted by St. Augustine who used the Latin word 'caritas' (loving-kindness) to unify the two great commandments, 'love thy God' and 'love the neighbour'.⁷ Despite its variations in philosophical studies, for the purpose of the argument being made here, it suffices to assert that the practice of 'agape' is animated through communal values and based on the acts of kindness, self-sacrifice and love.

The importance of 'agape' in the film's narrative is manifold. It is symbolised through Julie's transition from extreme isolation to a gradual re-enfoldment into society. It is also manifested through her act of composing which creates the aesthetic whole marked by the possibility for transfiguration, as it creates a community in which every participant can become an author and undergo a process of ennobling spiritual change. Finally, the ascendancy of 'agape' is reasserted literally through the choral part of the *Concerto*.⁸

In the final comments, I will return to the previous analysis of the scene, which shows Julie and Olivier in the aquatic surrounding, and propose an additional interpretation that focuses on the relationship between Julie and all the people that have populated her life. Some critics, such as Emma Wilson and Kelly Gross, recognise the theme of transformation adumbrated in the last scenes of the film. Wilson (1998, 362)

⁷ For example, see Augustine (1963) and Vardy (1999).

⁸ As Bakhtin (1990, 279) says, when contemplating such a whole, we ourselves become generous and kind, "we recognize everything and remember everything."

KIEŚLOWSKI'S *THREE COLOURS: BLUE*

focuses her analysis on Olivier as a signifier of Julie's transformation marked by her break with the past:

Julie does not re-stage her past [...] Instead she always moves forward. Even where it might be said that she creates a link to her past, for example in taking Olivier as her lover, in fact Olivier functions as the agent who helps Julie to bury the past. He brings her the miniature television set so she can see her husband and daughter buried. Further, he destroys any idyll of the past by making Julie aware of Patrice's infidelity and the existence of Sandrine. Olivier anchors Julie in the present and aids her process of expiation.

Integral to Wilson's argument is the idea that only through the absence of the past can the main character envision new possibilities. Kelly Gross (2006, 47-52) connects the themes of female subjectivity and disability to argue that Julie uses music to negotiate her identity and achieve discursive power. Her analysis of *Blue* concentrates on curative powers and the healing properties of music, which open a terrain for female empowerment

These interpretations tend to unify a *disjecta membra* of Julie's subjectivity through artistic production and, consequently, construct their arguments through the prism of elegiac theory, which predicates the engendering of subjectivity on 'the mourning model'. In this context, the elegiac tradition reduces subjectivity to the discourse of a mourner (invested in loss and grief as a source of creative impulse through

which an individual can overcome a lost sense of self-unity) and does not take into account multiple positions from which the subject perceives and experiences itself.⁹

By unifying in the last scene all the characters shown to have entered Julie's life, Kieślowski connects past, present and future and, therefore, refuses to transcend and substitute her loss through artistic production (the composition of the *Concerto*). Moreover, as Tammy Clewell (2000, 205) emphasises, the symbolism of the solo cadenza that concludes the *Concerto* further reinforces Julie's indebtedness to the past:

During the intense period of her mourning isolation, Julie lingered in a café where she heard the flute player perform in the street. She recognised one of his tunes, the very same unpublished score composed by her husband. Consequently, when she concludes the concerto with a flute solo, Julie does not neutralize but renews the pain of loss.

The film blocks any thought of subjectivity as encapsulated in the vacuum of the present, but affirms its wholeness through the fullness of time, thus illustrating further the relevance of Bakhtin's thought for understanding the ideas embedded in *Blue*. As for Bakhtin, each act of artistic activity represents eventness connected with the fullness of time. Morson (1994, 22) describes this eventness in the situation in which it is absent: "When the present simply actualizes what had to happen as in the transcendent world view of metaphysics, events lack eventness" Thus, the past is not an abstract category for the present experience to transcend, but, rather, past, present and future are interrelated and equally present as an endlessly transforming movement. Moreover,

⁹ This is a rather simplified version of the elegy; nevertheless it reflects the criticism of recent critical and literary studies, most noticeably psychoanalysis, through the exploration of loss, mourning, and trauma, and post-structuralism through the theorisations of absence as the origin of all cultural construction (Zeiger, 1997).

KIEŚLOWSKI'S *THREE COLOURS: BLUE*

subjectivity is not transformed by some big events as in the elegiac model of subjectivity in which art transcends the 'mourning man', but deeds or events enter life on a small scale. Therefore, we can conclude that, while *Blue* foregrounds the gendering of aesthetic consciousness through artistic practices, which enables consummation of an event through the architectonic form of the aesthetic object, it, nevertheless, refuses to redeem Julie's sense of self-unity through a purely single artistic act that will somehow compensate for the loss. It connects past and present to a boundless future, and, in doing so, encompasses also the wider Bakhtinian project that celebrates "[the] ambivalent wholeness" (Bakhtin, 1984, 123).

REFERENCES

- Abrahamson, Patrick, 1995: 'Kieślowski's Many Colours', *Oxford University Student*. Retrieved from http://www.musicolog.com/Kieślowski_manycolours.asp.
- Augustine (of Hippo), Saint, 1963: *The Confessions of Saint Augustine*, (Rex Warner, trans.), New York: New American Library.
- Bakhtin, M. M., 1984: *Rabelais and his World*, (E. A. Izvol'skaja, trans.), Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M., 1986: *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (eds.), (Vern W. McGee, trans.), Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M., 1990: *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays*, Michael Holquist and Vadim Liapunov (eds.), (Vadim Liapunov, trans.), Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M., 1993: *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*, Vadim Liapunov and Michael Holquist (eds.), Austin: University of Texas Press.

IVANA GULIC

- Clark, Katerina and Michael Holquist, 1984: *Mikhail Bakhtin*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Clewell, Tammy, 2000: 'The Shades of Modern Mourning in Three Colours Trilogy', *Literature/Film Quarterly*, 28 (3), 203-209.
- Coates, Paul, 2002: 'Kieślowski and the Antipolitics of Colour: A Reading of the "Three Colours Trilogy"', *Cinema Journal*, 41(2), 41-46.
- Emerson, Caryl, 1997: *The First Hundred Years of Mikhail Bakhtin*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Falkowska, Janina, 1995: 'The Political in the Films of Andrej Wajda and Krzysztof Kieślowski', *Cinema Journal*, 34(2), 37-50.
- Gross, Kelly, 2006: 'Female Subjectivity, Disability and Musical Authorship in Krzysztof Kieślowski's *Blue*', *Sounding Off: Theorizing Disability in Music*, Neil Lerner and Joseph Straus (eds.), New York: Routledge Press.
- Haltof, Marek, 2004: *The Cinema of Krzysztof Kieślowski: Variations on Destiny and Chance*, London: Wallflower Press.
- Insdorf, Annette, 1999: *Double Lives, Second Chances: The Cinema of Krzysztof Kieślowski*, New York: Hyperion.
- Jankun-Dopartowa, Mariola and Przyłipiak, Mirosław (eds.), 1996: *Człowiek z ekranu: Z antropologii postaci filmowej*, Kraków: Arcana.
- Kehr, Dave, 1994: 'To Save the World: Kieślowski's "Three Colours Trilogy"', *Film Comment*, 30(6), p. 10.
- Kickasola, Joseph, 2004: *The Films of Krzysztof Kieślowski: The Liminal Image*, New York: Continuum.
- Kieślowski, Krzysztof and Stok, Danusia, 1993: *Kieślowski on Kieślowski*, London: Faber.

KIEŚLOWSKI'S *THREE COLOURS: BLUE*

- Macnab, Geoffrey and Chris Drake, 1996: 'Working with Kieślowski', *Sight and Sound*, 6(5), 1-16.
- Morson, Gary Saul, 1994: *Narrative and Freedom: The Shadows of Time*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Romney, Jonathan, 1993: 'Krzysztof Kieślowski: interview for Three Colours: *Blue*', *The Guardian*, 15 October.
- Santili, Paul C., 2006: 'Cinema and Subjectivity in Krzysztof Kieślowski', *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 64(1), 147-156.
- Saverino, Anastasia, 2006: 'The Films Of Krzysztof Kieślowski: The Liminal Image', *Journal of Film And Video*, 58(1/2), 108-109.
- Sobolewski, Tadeusz, 1995: 'Peace and Rebellion: Some Remarks on the Creative Output of Krzysztof Kieślowski', *Bulletin de la Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Łódź*, 45(6), 123-137.
- Vardy, Peter, 1990: *Great Christian Thinkers: The Spiritual Heritage of Six Key Theologians*, London: Fount.
- Voloshinov, Valentin Nikolaevich, 1987: *Freudianism: A Critical Sketch*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Wesling, Donald, 2003: *Bakhtin and the Social Moorings of Poetry*, Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press.
- Wilson, Emma, 1998: 'Three Colours: *Blue*: Kieślowski, Colour and the Postmodern Subject', *Screen*, 39(4), 349-62.
- Wilson, Emma, 2000: *Memory and Survival: The French Cinema of Krzysztof Kieślowski*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zeiger, Melissa, 1997: *Beyond Consolation: Death, Sexuality, and the Changing Shapes of Elegy*, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

HENRIETTA MONDRY

DAUGHTER WRITING FAMOUS MOTHER'S BIOGRAPHY: DAGMARA KIMELE ON ASJA LACIS'S ADVENTUROUS LIFE

Scholars of life-writing have noted that in daughters' biographies of their mothers two life stories intertwine. My investigation focuses on the complex intersections in the biography of Latvian-born theatre director Anna (Asja) Lacis (1891-1979) written by her daughter Dagmara Kimele in 1996. Lacis is one of the most intriguing transcultural personalities of the twentieth century. Multilingual and multinational, she worked in Latvia, interwar Germany and Soviet Russia, and was associated with such leading European intellectuals as Berthold Brecht and Walter Benjamin. While a staunch Marxist, she was a victim of Stalinist purges, and after her return from the gulag managed to make a successful career as a stage director in Soviet Latvia. Her ideological association with Soviet power makes her an uneasy person in post-Soviet Latvia, a country eager to reclaim its historical personalities.¹ At the same time, she emerges as a role model for gender-conscious audiences in Latvia today (Ingram 2015, 34). With the rise of interest in Asja's life, there developed a need to know more about her life, and Dagmara Kimele's biography *Asja: Režisores Annas Lacis dekainā dzīve (Asja: the Adventurous Life of Stage Director Anna Lacis)* (1996/7) is one of the most valuable sources. Written in Latvian, it has not yet been translated into other European languages and remains largely unstudied. The biography has features of the ideological and personal tensions surrounding the biographies of personalities in diverse political systems. While it has been mentioned as a scathing account of Asja's

¹ The conference 'Kreisuma ideja. Kultura. Parole-Asja' (The Left Idea. Culture. Parole-Asja) took place on 6 March, 2015, organised by the Latvian Academy of Culture.

life (Ingram 2003), the work has not yet received scholarly attention as an example of women's biographical writing and as a case of daughters writing their mothers' biographies (Karkla 2015).² Moreover, it has not been studied as biography underpinned by expressions of generational differences in political views, including issues of gender and body politics. My task is to fill this lacuna and to explicate and contextualise the biography's features and characteristics. In particular, given the historical circumstances of the biography and the lives it describes, I identify and interpret intersections between the psychological and societal domains.

Approaching daughters' writing

In *The Voice of the Mother* Jo Malin states that in many texts written by daughters it is impossible to separate the autobiography of the daughter from the biography of the mother (Malin 2000). The two life stories overlap, and it is for this reason that Dagmara and Asja are two important players in my analysis of Dagmara's biography of Asja. Adalgisa Giorgio in *Writing Mother and Daughters*, a volume that aims to "re-negotiate mothers" (Giorgio 2002, 11) in Western European narratives, notes the importance of both psychological and socio-cultural factors in narratives by daughters. While writing often "acts as a therapy aimed at unravelling a variety of mother-daughter knots, mostly after the mother's death" (ibid, 31), contextualising mother-daughter relationships in culture and society is important. In Dagmara's writing of Asja's life, the mother-daughter axis embodies intersections between cultures and political formations which are particularly complex, because they include multinational and multicultural factors intertwined with socio-political events of cataclysmic proportions: post-Revolutionary turmoil, Stalin's purges, the Nazi occupation of Latvia in

² Karkla briefly mentions the book as an example of Latvian women's writing on mother-daughter relations which is dominated by mother blaming.

DAGMARA KIMELE'S BIOGRAPHY OF ASJA LACIS

the Second World War, and the disintegration of the Soviet Union and Latvia's independence. The political history of Latvia forms a complex context for the dynamics in Dagmara's biography. Although Asja died in the Soviet era, Dagmara's biography was written in the Post-Soviet period with its heightened anti-Soviet and anti-Russian nationalistic political discourse. Latvia's twentieth-century history was punctuated by periods of independence (1918-1940), incorporation into the Soviet Union in 1940, Nazi occupation (1942-1945), Soviet occupation (1945-1990) and 'restoration' of independence in 1991. Both mother's and daughter's varied political and multicultural experiences contribute to the complexity of the relationships and the daughter's representation of her mother's life and self.

When more famous daughters write biographies of their ordinary mothers, they tend to authorise their mothers' life and show paternal care and understanding of their lives, often dominated by the institutions of patriarchy (Chevigny 1983). Janet Beizer in *Thinking Through the Mothers: Reimagining Women's Biographies* (2009) suggests that when famous women write their life story and mention their mothers, there are issues linked to women's place in history because women have not been allocated the same place of importance in history as men. My investigation concerns a case when a daughter writes a biography of her famous, more successful and 'adventurous' mother, one who *has* a place in history. When a daughter becomes a product of a new social formation, ideologically separated from her mother's dominant cultural script, then, I suggest, the predominant evaluative mechanism is based on antagonisms that are not exclusively linked to the domain of psychology. I am interested in the situation when a daughter is formed by sets of normative values conflicting with those of her mother's generation. In particular, the paradox of such a historical situation is that the newly formed society and its generation become more conservative than the radicalised generation of 'mothers'. The scheme of mother-daughter relation-

ships is inverted in such a relationship, where daughters become disciplinarians and harsh critics of their mothers' carefree liberated behaviour. Both the daughters and the society which has formed them are far from the planned result which their radical revolutionary mothers hoped for.

Regarding the typology of antagonistic daughter-mother relationships in life-writing in the context of conflicting political systems, Klages's study of women's writing in Germany in the 1960s and 1970s shows the prevalence of "the accusatory attitude" (Klages 1995, 82) towards parents who lived in the Third Reich. This political narrative is inseparable from psychologically driven laments about the parents' emotional distance. The child strikes out against the system, but concurrently targets the parent who lacked love and attention. In Dagmara's case the personal drivers might be primary, yet the political and psychological spheres intersect. While I do not suggest comparisons between the Soviet system and the Third Reich, Dagmara's composition of a biography in the first decade of Latvia's independence from Soviet occupation places her work among life-writings expressing personal trauma and re-evaluating a previous epoch.

Creating Life Extraordinary

Asja Lacis has attracted scholarly attention comparatively recently because of her association with the German-Jewish philosopher Walter Benjamin (McGill 2008), who himself came to prominence at the end of the twentieth century during the rise of postmodernist theorising. Asja was Benjamin's Marxist muse who allegedly inspired his interest in Soviet Russia between the two World Wars. In his autobiography *Moscow Diary* Benjamin described his friendship with Asja who, by that time, was also a friend of the Austrian-Jewish drama theoretician and stage director Bernhard Reich (1892/4-1972). Asja's writing and life have been studied by Susan Ingram who, in her

DAGMARA KIMELE'S BIOGRAPHY OF ASJA LACIS

study of women's autobiography of European modernism, dubbed Asja one of 'Zarathustra's Sisters' (Ingram 2003, 159). Ingram sees Asja and other well-known women personalities of Russian modernism as an example of the 'life-creation' trend in Russian modernism, when life is invented creatively and not lived by inertia and habits (Ingram 2003, 124).

Asja's life, which was indeed extraordinary, was shaped not only by self-styling in line with the trends of her youth years, but also by cataclysmic historical events. The Bolshevik Revolution opened doors to Asja's migration to the Russian capital, St Petersburg, where she attended Komissarzhevsky's Theatre Studio. After the Revolution, from 1918-1919 she worked at the experimental children's theatre in Orel, Russia. She worked as a stage director for Bertolt Brecht in Berlin in the 1920s where she met German Marxist intellectuals. Her partnership with Reich lasted from the 1920s to his death in 1972 in Soviet Latvia. Importantly, this partnership helped her financially through the 1920s both in Germany, Latvia and Russia; it gave her a privileged status in Russia in the 1930s as a foreign émigré who had escaped from capitalist Europe. All these privileged situations ended abruptly with her arrest in 1938 which resulted in ten years of exile to Kazakhstan labour camps. When she returned to Soviet Latvia after the Second World War in 1948, both she and Reich had to start their lives anew.³ In Soviet Latvia Asja made a career as a children's theatre director and had a comfortable life by Soviet standards. In 1955 she received a high state award and the title of 'Zasluzhennyj deiatel' iskusstv Latviiskoi SSR' (Honoured Art Worker of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic). She was much respected in professional and artistic circles, and had many friends who remained dedicated to her and looked after her in the last years of her long life. She authored a memoir, *Red Carna-*

³ With Asja's arrest and Reich's refusal to sign papers denouncing her as a spy, Reich lost his position as Dean of Drama studies at the Moscow Theatre Institute (GITIS), a comfortable apartment and a good salary.

HENRIETTA MONDRY

tion: Reminiscences published posthumously in the Soviet Union in 1984,⁴ was interviewed in 1971 by German film makers on Brecht, and retained the status of an important figure among Latvian cultural élites. Her life, therefore, was as self-styled and self-created as it was shaped by historical events. Her extraordinary ability not only to survive any circumstances, but also to turn them to her advantage, is clearly apparent. Her daughter Dagmara's biography of Asja makes this point clear, but does not articulate it in historicist terms as a feature of the time, as a necessary mechanism to survive for women of her mother's generation. Rather, Dagmara holds this ability against her, and characterises it as part of her 'nature'. The personal and the historical continuously intersect in Asja's life; they also intersect in Dagmara's biography of her mother, yet Dagmara only selectively contextualises Asja's behaviour in history and society, most of the time negatively evaluating Asja's ability to survive as a feature of her manipulative character. She even considers Asja's unfailing Marxist position as a matter of convenience.

Dagmara does not make it clear what motivated her to write a biography of her mother. The book came out in 1996, six years after Latvia became independent and at a time of increased interest in Latvia's own cultural past. Latvia's now open borders attracted the attention of western scholars. Dagmara states in her book that she was interviewed by Evgenii Bershtein in 1993 on aspects of Asja's relations with Walter Benjamin. Since the autobiography was dictated by Dagmara and written down and edited by writer Gunta Strautmane, the motivation most likely came from Strautmane.⁵ In her introduction Strautmane states that little is known about Asja Lacis' life

⁴ The genre of *Red Carnation* (*Krasnaia gvozdika*) is a dictated autobiography written by a Russian journalist Jurii Karagach in the mid-1970s and published after Asja's death without her being able to edit the text.

⁵ The dictated autobiography can be a case study in its own right – something that is outside of the scope of my investigation. Strautmane translated passages from Walter Benjamin's *Moscow Diaries* and Asja's own *Red Carnation* which are the inserts into Dagmara's narratives in cursive.

DAGMARA KIMELE'S BIOGRAPHY OF ASJA LACIS

and work, and that there is a need to fill the lacunae in the history of Latvian cultural personalities. In addition, Dagmara's father, Julijs Lacis, the first husband of Asja, was an important cultural and political personality of Latvia before the Second World War, who perished during Stalin's purges in 1940. This detail is significant because the book can be seen as a project to understand Latvia's cultural past and also as a venture with a developing market. And while all these factors play a role, Dagmara's passionate personal narrative illustrates that she had a burning need to express her anxiety and to understand her mother's cold and allegedly unloving attitude to her.

Dagmara explains that she writes with the hope of better understanding her mother's behaviour towards her. This quest is a recurring motif and, as such, structures the narrative. Dagmara identifies, defines and exposes what she considers to be bad features of Asja's character, and these sets of characteristics drive the story. Dagmara notes such features of Asja as egotism, selfishness, greed, a sense of adventure, the ability to manipulate people, especially men, and use them for her professional and personal gains. Importantly, all these characteristics and traits of behaviour culminate in the underlying quest of Dagmara's story – to show Asja as bad M/other. All of Asja's negative characteristics contrast with Dagmara's own persona, both as a daughter and a mother of her own two daughters. The juxtaposition never changes: Dagmara was a caring and submissive daughter to her mother all her life, she had a strong sense of family and remained married to one man. The constancy of her own character in the matters of family responsibilities thus forms one of the main motifs, and speaks of the primary trauma of a child who did not receive enough attention from her mother. But the family theme, at the same time, also relates to the political and cultural construct of the family.

The fantasy of the perfect motherhood and conflicting political discourses

Feminist critics have noted that in daughters' evaluation of their mothers 'the fantasy of the perfect mother' plays a significant part. The dark side of this 'fantasy of the perfect motherhood', as outlined by Chodorow and Contratto (1982, 55), is disappointment in one's own imperfect mother: "Belief in the all-powerful mother spawns a recurrent tendency to blame the mother on the one hand, and a fantasy of a perfect maternal perfectability on the other". Such a model is central to Dagmara's biographical account of her mother. Dagmara sees her mother's faults and patterns of behaviour often in essentialised characteristics, presenting them as traits of character. Objectively, however, they can be viewed as patterns of behaviour influenced by society and culture. Desire for education, joining professional classes, making a career, having a full and cultured life, dedication to work, a quest for a better financial situation – all such elements have distinct feminist features and could be evaluated positively, but are treated negatively in Dagmara's biography. The reason for this seems to be the fantasy of the perfect mother. Ideologically and historically, however, the negative evaluation of all these characteristics is, I argue, embedded in society's revisionist rejection of the early Soviet epoch's feminist trends. The revisionism took place starting from the mid-1930s and continued in the Khrushchev and Brezhnev eras. In post-Soviet Latvia it took an anti-Soviet and Latvian ethnocentric character.

Asja was formed by a new Bolshevik vision of the family, which, according to Wendy Goldman, assumed that women would be free only if they entered the world of wage labour (Goldman 1993, 11). They did not consider the value attached to the tasks women performed at home and viewed domestic labour as the progenitor of political backwardness. Importantly, the Bolsheviks attached little importance to the power of emotional bonds between parents and children. They tended to slight the

role of mother-child bond in childhood development. Children would grow up in the state-run nurseries and schools, and the family would wither under socialism.

Dagmara, as a product of a different generation, valued patterns of behaviour of the *actual* Soviet society of high Stalinism through to the developed socialism in Soviet Latvia of the 1960s and 1980s. This later period was characterised by a more conservative turn towards divorce and marriage, and the government's understanding the importance of the family as a socially stabilising and economically efficient unit. Goldman notes that from the mid-1930s laws were introduced on the responsibility among parents and guardians for the upbringing of their children. "Far from withering away, the family was becoming an indispensable unit in the state's control of its citizenry" (Goldman 1993, 327). This attitude was characteristic not only for the Soviet Republics, but also for the rest of the socialist block after the Second World War. In the opinion of Lauren Kaminsky (2011, 91), "Official and unofficial attitudes towards sex, gender, and the family in central and eastern Europe had their roots in the tension between the utopian sexuality and conservative morality that shaped family life in the Stalin-era Soviet Union". Dagmara's views were shaped by this conservative morality. The Soviet Government liberalised divorce procedures in the mid-1960s, but introduced new limitations in 1968 – the years when Dagmara functioned in society as a professionally active woman.

Revolutionary sexualities and Asja's marriage

The axis with intersections of the personal childhood trauma of being (supposedly) unloved by one's mother and societal behavioural norms in relation to women is evident in Dagmara's description of the year of her birth. She writes that she was born in 1919 and her parents divorced in the same year. Marking this event as the beginning of tragedy in her life, she describes the circumstances that led to the divorce by juxtaposing her mother's account of the situation in her own biography, *Red Carnation*, to

HENRIETTA MONDRY

what she later heard from an eye-witness, her mother's friend. Asja describes her husband's possessive behaviour, omitting the real reason for them falling apart – her infidelity. Dagmara writes that Asja went so far as not to come home one night and, on returning, told her husband openly that she had spent a night with another man.

It would be a mistake to suppose that Dagmara was unable of understanding her mother's behaviour as typical for her time. Thus, when describing the episode with Asja's infidelity that broke her marriage with Dagmara's father, Julijs Lacis, she makes a comment that typifies her mother's behaviour in the context of her time. The comment, however, also shows that Dagmara distorts historical details regarding the attitudes to sex and love in the first years of post-Revolutionary Russia. Thus, Dagmara writes:

In this respect she [Asja] was absolutely free from any conventions and, it seems, followed Lenin's famous 'theory of the glass with water', because for her to sleep with a man was as easy as to drink a glass of water. Many of her problems Asja solved in this kind of way, because she learned how easy and convenient it was (Kimele and Straumane, 1996, 23).⁶

This statement deserves critical attention for a number of reasons. Dagmara makes a number of historical mistakes and intentional subterfuges in this statement. 'The theory of glass of water' occupies an important place in the history of sexuality and love as new a construct in post-Revolutionary Russia. It was, however, not Lenin's theory, but the theory inspired by the important feminist figure of the time, Alexandra Kollontai, the head of the Communist Party's Women's Division until 1922, who also earlier

⁶ All translations from Latvian are mine [HM].

DAGMARA KIMELE'S BIOGRAPHY OF ASJA LACIS

authored feminist works and called for a re-evaluation of bourgeois values in the relationships between the sexes. The notion of 'a sip of water' or 'a glass of water' was a metaphor for the parallelism between a physiological need to quench the thirst and the idea that sexual urge is nothing more than another physiological urge that needs to be satisfied in an easy and convenient manner. The separation of love from sex was driven by the understanding of love as a construct, as the product of the societal system based on the notion of property. Women, the new trend maintained, should not be the sole private property of their husbands, and should be allowed to choose their partners and to have as many encounters as their physiological needs demanded. Lenin himself was quite critical of such extremist views on the relationships between sexes and suggested that it was not Marxist behaviour, famously coming up with an alternative image: drinking water from a dirty puddle on the street. The debate however was raging and was familiar to Marxists and revolutionaries internationally, as the German Marxist Klara Zetkin's memoirs *About Lenin* (1925) attest:

The question arises: what was the tactic pursued by Dagmara in distorting the notion of 'the glass of water'? The fact that she assigns the authorship to Lenin can be a case of ignorance. More symptomatic is Dagmara's distortion of the whole notion of sexual encounters which she presents not as a manifestation of a programmatic ideological position on free love either by her mother or her men. Symptomatically, Dagmara makes the comment at the juncture in the biography that caused her parents' divorce. Her own life was affected by this split. She explains that her father broke up with Asja because of her act of infidelity. Dagmara chooses to evaluate this particular Asja's extramarital encounter with a man as a case of her mother's calculative and exploitative behaviour towards men in general. She writes that Jurijs, the man with whom she spent that night, was an important functionary

HENRIETTA MONDRY

in the professional delegation that came to evaluate Asja's activities as a theatre director. Dagmara chooses to explain her mother's spending the night with him as a way to secure his professional support of her position in the theatre. Instead of conceptualising her mother's attitude to marriage, love and sexuality as an ideological position,⁷ Dagmara presents her mother as an amoral exploiter of men. She achieves two important goals at this axis of the personal and the societal, blaming her mother and justifying her father's decision to break up with Asja. Typologically, she at the same time distorts both her mother's position and the historical context in which it was embedded.

In reality, by simply stating that she had spent a night with a friend, Asja had operated within the latest discourse on marriage and sexual freedoms, contemporary to that moment in time. In fact 1919, when the episode happened, was the year when the most radical theories and ideas about sexual behaviour and new communal living were raging (Naiman 1997). Asja's act was experimental and trendy, as was her experimental theatre work. By telling her husband Julijs 'the truth', she most likely invited him to share those latest trends in behaviour, in the same way as she guided him in his reading when they first met in Riga as young people. She then radicalised and modernised him by suggesting that he read such works as Nietzsche's *Zarathustra*, and liberated him sexually by sleeping with him before they could get married. Now, in 1919, being married to Asja, Julijs did not want to participate in the 'trendy' arrangement, and it is arguably his attitude towards marriage that broke it. Dagmara seems to be oblivious to the equally possible scenario that Julijs could have saved

⁷ Bershtein rightly writes that Benjamin was drawn to Russia in the 1920s as a place where a new discourse of sexuality was being coined.

their family by reconceptualising what family is. Importantly, the new debates about the opening-up of the family included the idea of sharing children's education, making collective nurseries where children born from new, open sexual arrangements would be brought up. Dagmara's parents' divorce happened as an historical event, one that cannot be separated from the ideological trends of the time. By making it her personal tragedy, Dagmara ignores the whole historical layer, constructing the event as part of her personal biography.

The dream of HOME and home as a cultural construct

After the divorce Asja took Dagmara to Riga and put her up with Julij's parents. Dagmara remembers this period of her life with them as the sunniest period of her childhood. The little house and the garden with its colourful and fragrant flowers create the backdrop of this idyllic environment, showing that she fitted into the family as naturally as the beautiful surroundings. This atmosphere celebrates domesticity and the family unit – something that her mother held in contempt as bourgeois values. Home and house become the site of intersections of psychological needs and societal constructs. Malin notes that in twentieth-century women's biographies the image of house and home has a strong presence. She explains that intimate experiences of the unconscious are located within interior domestic spaces (Malin, 16-17). Memory is often housed in space rather than in time. Dagmara's attachment to her grandparent's house is paralleled by her desire for home, which will form a recurring motif in her biography. It is symptomatic that at this juncture she makes a statement which separates her own personality from her mother's, explaining that as a child she was not happy to go through adventures, because her own nature was different from her "adventurous mother's" (Kimele, 27). She notes that already at this time she understood the difference in their characters. Her life between 1920 and 1926 was full of events while she travelled with her mother abroad. Importantly, she suggests that, as part of

HENRIETTA MONDRY

the divorce proceedings, Asja kept her only out of spite, because she did not want to give her to Julijs who wanted Dagmara to stay with him. The resentment of the bad mother here is clearly juxtaposed with the dream of the ideal and loving father. Father becomes associated with home.

Dagmara's return home to Latvia is linked to certain important political events in the history of the country and her family. She reunited with her father in 1940 when Latvia and the other Baltic states became socialist republics. Julijs Lacis came to Moscow as one of the dignitaries from the three states on the invitation of the Soviet government. As a journalist and political activist, Julijs became minister in the first Soviet government in Latvia. This period of his life came to a tragic end when he was arrested and taken to Russia where he died in prison, having been unjustly accused of anti-government activities. In Moscow Julijs tried to intervene on Asja's behalf, talking to the influential Andrei Vyshinsky (1883-1954), the Procurator-General of the Soviet Union. Julijs knew Vyshinsky personally, as Vyshinsky was assigned to supervise the establishment of the new government in Latvia in 1940. For Dagmara, Julijs's arrival in Moscow came at a difficult time for her, as Asja was in exile and she had quarrelled with Reich and was barely on speaking terms with him. She described her meeting with her father as feeling that she was finally at "HOME" (Kimele 156).

After Julijs's return to Latvia, Dagmara decided to join him. Although she was motivated by a longing to join her father and his side of the family, at the same time she had to arrange the trip to Latvia as a political act. In order to be allowed to go to Latvia, she tried to arrange being sent there on a professional assignment, since no free movement to Latvia was allowed at the time, in spite of the fact that in August 1940 Latvia joined the Soviet Union. In order to arrange her departure, she showed considerable political acumen, thus demonstrating that she was quite mature when it came to matters of politics. She remembered her father's meeting with Vyshinsky and

DAGMARA KIMELE'S BIOGRAPHY OF ASJA LACIS

decided to write Vyshinsky a letter laying out the reasons for her desire to go to Latvia. And while her real motivation was linked to her personal quest, in her letter to Vyshinsky she stated that she wished to go to this newly formed Soviet state as a propagandist of Soviet ideology. As a member of the Young Communist League, the Komsomol organisation, she was qualified to do so. Vyshinsky personally authorised her trip to Latvia, well aware that she was Julijs Lacis's daughter. In this case Dagmara was instrumental in organising this intersection of the personal and political in her own life. Moreover, in doing this, she showed an adventurous side to her personality which she so vehemently denied in her biography by ascribing it to Asja. She left Moscow on false pretences to pursue her dream of "being at HOME".

Dagmara's quest for "HOME" on her return to Latvia did not materialise in the way she had dreamed of. It is perhaps for this reason that she describes her father's house in a leafy part of Riga in detail. She stresses that she stayed in the house with his father's new family – his wife Ruta and their two small children – for ten days only. Julijs and Ruta found a room for her in the centre of town, most likely in order to give her independence, understanding that a twenty-one-year-old woman should have privacy and start a life of her own. Julijs and Ruta were generous financially to her: Ruta accompanied her and helped her to choose a whole new wardrobe which Julijs paid for. Not being allowed to stay for longer in her father's house, however, was a disappointment, and she may well be concealing the real psychological reasons for it. When Julijs and Ruta started looking for a separate place for her to live, Dagmara was not unaware of the advantages of having a place of one's own for a young person of her age. The testimony to this is the fact that a few months after she moved out to live on her own, she met a young actor, Vilis Kimelis, whom she married in the same year.

HENRIETTA MONDRY

On the psychological level, Dagmara's complaints that it was Julijs's second wife Ruta who was instrumental in arranging her to be moved out so soon testify that Dagmara in part created competition around Julijs. When describing Ruta's personality after Julijs's arrest in 1940, as Ruta was now left with two children to take care of, Dagmara makes a telling evaluation of Ruta. She compares her to Asja and maintains that she has the same bad character traits as her mother. Symptomatically, she characterises her as two or more persons coexisting in Ruta – because she could be kind and ruthless at the same time. Such a judgment testifies to Dagmara's own infantile 'fantasy of the perfect mother' – a kind of image that is impossible to realise in reality. "No human being can be perfect", state Chodorow and Contratto (1982, 65) in defining the origins of idealisation of mothers as an infantile fantasy.

The obstacle on both the psychological and cultural-political levels evolves around the notion of the family and its metaphor, identified by Dagmara so markedly in her biography as HOME. So strong was her desire to have an idealised 'HOME', that it culminated in her descriptions of the final years of her mother's life in a story about a real house. Asja had a summer house, a dacha half way between Riga and Valmiera, where she worked. When she became old and could no longer use it, she decided to sell it. Dagmara describes this decision with great resentment, suggesting that it was a selfish act on the part of her mother who could have left it to her family. Asja's sale of the house, I suggest, shows that she attached little value to the construct of HOME, its symbolic meaning, and looked at it practically as a financial investment. For most early feminists the construct of the *domus* was underpinned by patriarchal structures of hierarchies. Domestication is linked to subjugation, discipline and conditioning, and *domus* is the enclosed locus of controlling structures. Asja ran away from home when she was sixteen years old, and this event epitomises her attitude to the stifling sphere of control which house and home represent.

DAGMARA KIMELE'S BIOGRAPHY OF ASJA LACIS

Dagmara, on the other hand, adheres to a different, later Soviet discourse of home. Scholars have demonstrated that, starting with High Stalinism, the discourse of private sphere marked a shift from the notions of revolutionary asceticism. From the 1950s the notion of home and interior become part of the urban, everyday socialism which developed further in the Khrushchev and Brezhnev era. From the 1960s to the 1980s Soviet discourse identified home as a necessary resting place separated from the public sphere, and it had almost 'bourgeois' overtones of comfort and privacy (Reid 2006, 147). This discourse was informed by the cultivation of domestic spaces and private experience associated with the regime's new emphasis on individual family housing, and what was described as an increase in prosperity and improvements in everyday living conditions for urban citizens.

In view of Asja's pragmatism and de-sentimentalisation of the house, she continued to care about the financial well-being of her daughter and granddaughter. She left them a significant amount of money – three thousand roubles – at the time of her death in 1979. She sold the dacha for the same amount of money. Dagmara wanted to have the dacha passed on to her and her daughter. Her comments that it could be easily converted from a summer house to a proper house in which one could live all year round is a telling testimony that house for her was synonymous with HOME, a dwelling central to the family. Ironically, at the same time, thinking that the real value of the house was much higher than the amount her mother sold it for, Dagmara showed herself as a true daughter of her mother, one who was as concerned with the material side of life as her mother (supposedly) was.

The discourse of happy childhood and personal trauma

The myth of perfect motherhood is intrinsically linked to the construct of a happy childhood. At this junction again historical and societal constructs intersect and interplay with personal and psychological experiences. The notion of a happy childhood is a modern construct, and the Soviet Union had developed its own discourse of the happy Soviet childhood. During Dagmara's own very young years, Asja was participating in this discourse, which put an emphasis on the role of the collective in child development rather than the mother-daughter bond. Later, when Dagmara herself became a mother of two daughters, the historical and political situation was very different: her daughters were born during the Nazi occupation of Latvia and the Second World War. Dagmara stayed at home with her children looking after their safety and, at the same time, worrying about her own and her husband's safety, as she was under police surveillance as the daughter of Communist parents. Moreover, Dagmara's notion of childhood was informed by the later Soviet discourse of childhood that assigned a strong role to the family in child development. The strong, moral Soviet family that worked in harmonious tandem with various government children's institutions, mainly school, was viewed as a contributing force in childhood experience and an integral part of happy childhood. As an ideological construct, it was juxtaposed with childhood in non-socialist, capitalist societies. This new notion at a time of developed socialism and economic prosperity was fundamentally different from Asja's times in the 1920s when she worked with children who were left without parents in the aftermath of the First World War, the Bolshevik Revolution and the Civil War.⁸ In Asja's eyes, her daughter Dagmara had a happy childhood in the 1920s in contrast with hundreds of thousands of unfortunate lice-covered, homeless and or-

⁸ When Asja worked in Orel with homeless children in 1919 there were 125,000 *besprizornye* in Russia. The figure reached an astounding 6 million in 1921 (Geiger 1968, 278-283).

phaned *besprizornye* children. Moreover, the collectivist discourse of the early to mid-1920s regarding children's upbringing in its most radical form suggested the possibility of a mother giving her own children to an orphanage in order to dedicate herself to the upbringing of collectives of children. Asja belonged to circles which were familiar with such tendencies and were interested in problematising them in theatre and literature.⁹ Yet she ensured that Dagmara as a child during difficult times for Asja was looked after either by Dagmara's paternal grandparents in Riga, or Reich's well-to-do family in Vienna. She even took her to Capri in order to strengthen her fragile health – all this in the 1920s when the new discourse of childhood was forming and intense public debates were raging on the role of the collective and private in children's upbringing.

Denied and real benefits of upbringing

Being the product of a different cultural formation, one that saw family as a social unit that underpins society's stability, Dagmara was critical of her mother's behaviour which she conflated with her character rather than saw as a cultural formation. She did not want to see manifestations of care and positive aspects of her upbringing. Among these are many important decisions made by Asja which helped Dagmara in her life. Dagmara complained in the biography that Asja insisted that she attend a Russian-speaking school rather than a Latvian one. Dagmara is here expressing a sentiment which would appeal to Latvian readers in the 1990s with the rise of Latvian ethnocentrism which was a reaction to the Soviet politics of Russian and Latvian bilingualism

⁹ Of note is the fact that Sergei Tret'iakov's play *I Want a Child!* (1927) had a Latvian born communist woman Milda as a protagonist who wants to contribute a healthy child to Soviet society and chooses a short-term partner to conceive a child. Asja knew Meyerhold who wanted to stage this play. The fact that the play had a Latvian woman attests to the visibility of Latvian émigrés in post-Revolutionary capital cities. On the play see Naiman, 1997.

HENRIETTA MONDRY

in the Republic.¹⁰ In reality, Asja's insistence on Dagmara's learning Russian turned out to be a wise decision which allowed Dagmara to integrate into society and learn the language which helped her in her working life in Soviet Latvia. Living with Asja and Reich contributed to Dagmara's good command of German – something that helped her to save her life during the time of the Nazi occupation. It was this good knowledge of German that impressed the interrogating Nazi officer and helped her to free her husband from arrest. Asja and Reich's professional activities helped Dagmara to find a profession, to lecture on the new socialist theatre and the Stanislavsky method when she returned to Riga in 1940. Her Komsomol experience in Moscow helped her to integrate into Soviet Latvian society, while her German connection helped her to survive the year of the Nazi occupation of Latvia. Finally, after Asja's return to Latvia in 1948 and re-establishing her career, Asja's position among the cultural élites helped Dagmara and her children to hold a high status in society. It was not by chance that Dagmara's daughter became a film director.

There is both a concealed and overt line of continuity between Asja, her daughter Dagmara and Asja's granddaughters, Gundega and Mara, a line that testifies that both Asja's daughter and granddaughter were empowered by her 'adventurous life' and personality. Notably, Dagmara states that in critical events in her life she made bold moves that would be characteristic of Asja's behaviour. Among such acts she mentions writing a letter to a Nazi official asking him to release her from work at the factory when she became pregnant in 1942, during the Nazi occupation of Latvia.

¹⁰ The post-Soviet Latvian Parliament denigrated the status of the Russian language from the official state language to a minority language. See Baltaiskalna 2001. While many members of Latvian-speaking élites resisted the imposition of Russian, knowledge of Russian was essential for career advancement in privileged positions.

It is clear that such bold acts were dictated by the need for physical survival, and women in Asja's generation had to resort to survival tactics more often than Dagmara's generation.

Diminishing mother's achievements

Dagmara's biography has major gaps which have to do with the creative and professional life of her mother. She writes that her mother's work was more important to her than family, that she was successful in her work with children in experimental theatre in the 1920s, but does not write what the experiments were about, nor about her plays. Rather, she explains that her work with children was more important for her than spending life with her own daughter because it was part of her public life and kept her at the centre of attention and admiration. Similarly, she does not describe Asja's experiences in the labour camps of Kazakhstan, but instead mentions that she survived these camps largely because of her ability to manipulate people, especially men. There is condemnation of Asja having had a younger man as a friend and lover when she was in her late fifties – a symptomatic restrictive script establishing hierarchical and normative age for relationships between men and women.

Asja's professional life in post-1945 Soviet Latvia is similarly not discussed in detail. This is particularly surprising because Dagmara's husband was an actor at the Riga Children's Theatre and she was close to professional theatrical circles in Latvia. Her silence on this part of Asja's oeuvre is symptomatic and, perhaps, strategic. Feminist writing on women's biography notes that women's lives have not been extensively documented throughout history because their stories have not been deemed sufficiently significant. This particular daughter's biography of her famous mother continues this trend by diminishing her mother's contribution to the profession of theatre director. Dagmara states that Asja was most of all "a practitioner" and not "a

theorist” (Kimele 136), and that all her ideas on theatre she borrowed from Bernhard Reich. According to Dagmara, Reich was happy to pass on his knowledge, information and ideas to Asja and for her to publish them under her authorship – such as Dagmara’s version of the history of publication of the *Revolutionary Theatre in Germany* (*Revoliutsionnyi teatr Germanii*) in Russian in Moscow in 1935. Dagmara acts as a historical eye-witness who, as a child, saw how Reich dictated the book’s content to Asja in the evenings in their Moscow apartment. Asja’s later books, *Drama and Theatre* (*Dramaturgija un teatris*) published in Riga in 1962 in Latvian and *Revolutionary Profession. Notes on Proletarian Theatre, Meyerhold, Brecht, Benjamin and Pescator*, written in German and published in Munich in 1971, were also, according to Dagmara, largely the result of Reich’s ideas. Reich continued to read, research and think about the theatre in the 1960s and 1970s, after his return from the labour camps, when he stayed with Asja until his death in 1972. The question of authorship is emblematic of Dagmara’s own embedding in the dominant cultural script based on gender hierarchies, which ascribe intellectual powers to men and allocate spaces of practice and skill to women. It is in this sphere that Asja succeeded as a woman, but failed to be a perfect mother by not living up to the powerful construct of perfect motherhood and the changing societal constructs of a happy childhood.

Conclusion

Dagmara’s biography is a distinctly non-feminist narrative about herself and her mother. The discourse of motherly sacrifice is a component of the myth of the ideal mother, and Dagmara could not forgive her mother for not sacrificing her personal life and oeuvre in order to meet the expectations of her notions of the ideal mother. Feminist scholars have noted that writing biographies of their ‘foremothers’ allows women to assert female authority. By doing this, women “subtly authorize their own auton-

DAGMARA KIMELE'S BIOGRAPHY OF ASJA LACIS

omy at the same time” (Chevigny 1983, 96). Female autonomy, in the opinion of Chodorow, cannot be experienced without a sense of abandoning the mother and even aspects of the self (Chodorow 1987, 100-105). While Dagmara authorised her own autonomy, she also showed her ability to be both aware and oblivious of the points of similarity with her mother – those aspects of the self that she preferred not to notice.

Dagmara dedicated her book to her husband for always standing not only by her side, but also by the side of her daughters and grandchildren, thus challenging her mother on the importance and centrality of the notion of family. This dedication points to a dual psychological need to be supported and to provide support. Dagmara positioned herself as the Other of her mother, often unwillingly showing that their differences were grounded in conflicting societal constructs of motherhood and family. By authoring her mother's biography, Dagmara may have asserted her autonomy, yet, at the same time, her auto/biography shows trauma in negotiating multiple boundaries in the mother-and-daughter dyad. It also shows that notions of women's liberation do not evolve in linear progression, but have twists and turns that are as unpredictable as historical developments and individual lives. While in today's Latvia Asja emerges as a model of gender equality, Dagmara's biography promotes a different ideal of womanhood.

On a broader level, the biography represents a post-Soviet critical evaluation of the heritage of the USSR. It falls into the typology of biographies shaped by younger generations 'looking back in anger' at the lives of their parents in politically compromised regimes. Within this typology it forms a paradoxical category of the child consciously targeting not the system, but the mother who was the system's enthusiastic participant. Looking back from the vantage point of the present decade, the 2015 Conference in Riga on Asja's oeuvre as part of the 'Left Idea in Culture' shows the new generation's need to contextualise historically Asja's life and work. At that

HENRIETTA MONDRY

time Asja's granddaughter and Dagmara's daughter, Mara, posted a video clip of her visiting the place of Asja's former summer house. She shows the place to her son, demonstrating that private memories are housed in space more than in time. It is perhaps for this reason that Dagmara's biography both conceals and reveals the signs of the times of both her life and her mother's.

REFERENCES

- Baltaiskalna, D. 2001: *Language Attitudes of the Inhabitants of Latvia*. Riga: Latvian University.
- Beizer, Janet, 2009: *Thinking Through the Mothers: Reimagining Women's Biographies*. Ithaca: Cornell UP.
- Benjamin, Walter, 1986: *Moscow Diary*. Trans. Richard Sieburth, Harvard UP.
- Bershtein, Evgenii, 2006: 'The Withering of Private Life', in *Everyday Life in Early Soviet Russia*. Edited by Christina Kiaer and Eric Naiman, Bloomington: Indiana UP, pp. 217-229.
- Chevigny, Bell Gale, 1983: 'Daughters Writing: Towards a Theory of Women's Biography'. *Feminist Studies*, 9(1), 79-102.
- Chodorow, Nancy and Contratto, Susan, 1978: *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chodorow, Nancy and Contratto, Susan, 1982: 'The Fantasy of Perfect Mother', in *Rethinking the Family: Some Feminist Questions*, edited by Barrie Thorne and Marilyn Yalom, NY: Lagman, pp. 55-80.
- Geiger, Kent, 1968: *The Family in Soviet Russia*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.

DAGMARA KIMELE'S BIOGRAPHY OF ASJA LACIS

- Giorgio, Adalgisa, 2002: 'Writing the Mother-Daughter Relationships: Psychoanalysis, Culture, and Literary Criticism', in *Writing Mother and Daughters: Renegotiating the Mother in Western European Narratives by Women*, edited by Adalgisa Giorgio, NY: Berghahn Books, pp. 11-46.
- Goldman, Wendy, 1993: *Women, The State and Revolution: Soviet Family Policy and Soviet Life, 1917-1936*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Ingram, Susan, 2002: "The Writing of Asja Lacis". *New German Critique*. 86, n. 2, 159-177.
- Ingram, Susan, 2003: *Zarathustra's Sisters: Women's Autobiography and the Shaping of Cultural History*. Toronto: Toronto UP.
- Ingram, Susan, 2015: 'Anna/Asja Lacis and the Multilingualism of the Other', in *Kulturas Krustpunkti 8*, edited by Inga Perkone-Redovica, Riga: Latvijas Kulturas Akademija, pp. 24-37.
- Kaminsky, Lauren, 2011: 'Utopian Visions of Family Life in the Stalin-era Soviet Union'. *Central European History*, 44, 63-91.
- Karkla, Zita, 2014: 'Representation of Female Identity: Contemporary Latvian Prose and Female Tradition'. *Res Humanitariae*, 14, 242-259.
- Kimele, Dagmara and Strautmane, Gunta, 1996/97: *Asja: Rezisores Annas Laces dekaina dzive*, Riga: Liktenstasti.
- Klages, Norgard, 1995: *Look Back in Anger: Mother-daughter and Father-daughter Relations in Women's Autobiographical Writing of the 1960s and 1970s*. NY: Peter Lang.
- Lacis, Asja, 1984: *Krasnaia gvozdika: Vospominaniia*. [Lit. zapis' Iurii Karagach]. Riga: Liesma.
- McGill, Justine, 2008: 'The Porous Coupling of Walter Benjamin and Asja Lacis'. *Angelaki* 13(2): 59-72.

HENRIETTA MONDRY

Naiman, Eric, 1997: *Sex in Public: The Incarnation of Early Soviet Ideology*. Princeton: Princeton UP.

Reid, Susan, 2006: 'The Meaning of Home', in *Borders of Socialism: Private Spheres of Soviet Russia*, edited by Lewis Siegelbaum, London: Palgrave, pp. 145-170.

Tsetkin, Klara, 1925: *O Lenine. Vospominaniia i vstrechi*, Moscow: Moskovskii rabochii.

KEVIN WINDLE

LISTOK GRUPPY ROSSIISKIKH RABOCHIKH:

A 1918 BRISBANE RUSSIAN NEWSPAPER, ITS ORIGINS AND ORIENTATION¹

«Не будет богов, ни земных, ни небесных, а только личность.»

“There will be no gods, either on Earth or in Heaven, only the personality.”

Konstantin Klushin, *Listok*, No. 1, p. 2

Among many notable centenaries marked in the year 2018, one of the less momentous was that of a small fortnightly Russian newspaper produced in Brisbane for a period of some three months in mid-1918, under the title *Listok Gruppy rossiiskikh rabochikh* (Newspaper/Newsletter of the Group of Russian Workers). It first appeared on 23 June, and what may have been its last issue, the sixth, came out on 15 September. It was neither the first Russian-language newspaper to appear in Brisbane, nor the only one to be published in 1918. The pages which follow attempt to situate it in its historical context and offer a brief account of its genesis, its contents and the parent body behind it, while also providing brief biographical profiles of the personalities involved in its production and others featured in its pages.

In the decade 1912-1921, no fewer than seven Russian-language newspapers, most of them weekly or fortnightly, appeared in Australia, all of them in Brisbane, the principal centre of Russian settlement in pre-revolutionary times. If the figures cited in 1914 by the last imperial consul, Alexander Abaza, are soundly based, they catered to a potential audience throughout Australia of approximately 11,000, of whom 5,000

¹ This article is an expanded version of a paper delivered at the conference of the Australia and New Zealand Slavists' Association in Perth on 5 July, 2018.

were in Queensland.² The pioneer of the field was the celebrated Bolshevik Fedor Sergeeff ('Artem'), whose *Ekho Avstralii* (Echo of Australia) ran from June to September 1912.³ It was followed by *Izvestiia soiuza russkikh emigrantov* (News of the Union of Russian Emigrants), later renamed *Izvestiia soiuza rossiiskikh rabochikh* (News of the Union of Russian Workers, November 1913 to February 1916), and *Rabochaia zhizn'* (The Worker's Life, February 1916 to December 1917), edited by Sergeeff and others. After Sergeeff's return to Russia in April 1917, the editorship of *Rabochaia zhizn'* passed to Peter Simonoff, whose name will figure prominently below. That newspaper was closed down in December 1917, but a new one was launched in May 1918, with the title *Znanie i edinenie* (Knowledge and Unity), in which Nikolai Lagutin and Alexander Zuzenko would play key roles. *Listok Gruppy rossiiskikh rabochikh* made its appearance at almost the same time, as the voice of opposition to *Znanie i edinenie* and the organisation behind it. Both these newspapers were defunct by 1919; in that year the illegal *Deviaty val* (The Ninth Wave) ran for two months (four issues), and *Nabat* (The Tocsin), also illegal, the work of Zuzenko and Herman Bykoff (Rezanoff), managed two issues, of which the second may not have gone into circulation.

By 1920 there appear to have been no home-grown Russian newspapers in circulation in Australia. However, *Znanie i edinenie*, proscribed in December 1918, was soon resurrected in English as *Knowledge and Unity* and continued to appear until

² Abaza to Bentkovskii, 13 June 1914, in A. Ia. Massov and M. Pollard, *Rossiiskaia konsul'skaia sluzhba v Avstralii*, Moscow: RAN, 2014, 296. In English in A. Massov, M. Pollard and K. Windle, *A New Rival State? Australia in Tsarist Diplomatic Communications*, Canberra: ANU Press, 2018, 313. Abaza's estimate of 12,000 for Australasia includes 1,000 in New Zealand.

³ Here and below, with the exception of bibliographical references, personal names are given in the form used by their owners in Australia and Britain at the time: Alexander Abaza (not Aleksandr), Maxim Litvinoff, Klushin (not Kliushin), Herman Bykoff (not German Bykov), Peter Simonoff, etc.

LISTOK: A 1918 BRISBANE RUSSIAN NEWSPAPER

July 1921, but no longer as the property of the Russian community. Incomplete runs of some of the above newspapers, including the English-language *Knowledge and Unity*, have survived in various libraries and archives. Others appear to have been irretrievably lost. No copies of *Deviatyi val* or *Znanie i edinenie* in Russian have yet come to light.

Listok Gruppy rossiiskikh rabochikh (hereafter *Listok*) also appeared to have been lost without a trace, its brief existence marked only by occasional references in intercepted correspondence and the censor's notes. However, in 2010 Natalia Samokhina, then working in the Oxley Library (State Library of Queensland), came upon some issues in the Beckingham and Lane family papers, and kindly provided copies to the present author, with the permission of the librarian.⁴ There appear to have been six issues, of which three survived in that collection: No. 1 (23 June 1918), No. 5 (24 August), and No. 6 (15 September). A larger number cannot be ruled out, but there cannot have been many because the 'Group' in question declined quickly and soon folded.⁵ The surviving copies are in poor condition and there are few signposts in the form of headlines or by-lines. Its appearance, lay-out and masthead suggest a degree of amateurism in practical matters of journalism, compared to, say, *Izvestiia SRE* or *Rabochaia zhizn'*.

⁴ State Library of Queensland: TR2035 Beckingham Family and Lane Family Papers, Box 7044. Thanks are due to Ms Samokhina and the SLQ for making copies available. The Beckingham and Lane Collection holds material on the early history of the labour movement in Australia, and the co-operative settlement founded in Paraguay by William Lane in 1893, Colonia Nueva Australia.

⁵ A fourth document, held with the three surviving issues and in the same format, is K. Kliushin, 'Okonchanie pis'ma k ipsvichanam' (hereafter 'Letter to Ipswich'), dated 1/12/18, and apparently an appendix to the newspaper. It bears the title 'Conclusion ...' and ends 'To be concluded', but any earlier and later parts are missing.

KEVIN WINDLE

The masthead tells us that *Listok* was the organ of the Group of Russian Workers (GRW), or Russian Group of Workers,⁶ which is not to be confused with the Brisbane Union of Russian Workers (URW), also known as the Russian Association. The paper's Russian title appears in parallel with an English title: *The Paper of the Russian Group of Workers*. The editor and primary author was Konstantin Klushin, of whom more anon.

The GRW was a breakaway faction of the Union of Russian Workers, which had been in existence since 1911, originally called *Soiuz russkikh emigrantov* but in January 1916 renamed *Soiuz rossiiskikh rabochikh*. The URW had become more radical under the tutelage of Sergeeff and his successors, and by 1917 a focus for sedition and what the police and military authorities termed disloyalism: it opposed the war effort and the referenda on conscription, and was often involved in industrial unrest, which in wartime was viewed as but a short step from treason. As revolution swept Russia in February and October 1917, the mood of disaffection could be seen to swell in the URW, and was reflected in its newspapers. This was the body responsible for *Izvestiia SRE*, *Izvestiia SRR*, *Rabochaia zhizn'* and *Znanie i edinenie*, but not for *Listok*.

The Brisbane URW was prone to violent dissension and rifts, as was its branch in nearby Ipswich. The 'Group' broke away in early 1918, also with an Ipswich branch, and it too was prone to rifts. The censor perusing Russian correspondence observed in June 1918, 'The Bolsheviks in Australia are not a happy family',⁷ and meetings of the various bodies were not staid affairs: animated exchanges such as '*Vresh'! Net, ty vresh'!*' (You're lying! No, you're lying!) figure in the records. The minutes of one meeting in May 1920 in Ipswich record that a certain Comrade Kulakoff (aptly

⁶ In English, both forms appear; in Russian only 'Gruppa rossiiskikh rabochikh'.

⁷ National Archives of Australia (NAA): Intelligence Report, 1st Military District, 6/6/18, QF1229.

LISTOK: A 1918 BRISBANE RUSSIAN NEWSPAPER

named) «ударил тов. Слюсарева в лицо без всяких предупреждений, но драка была устранена» (punched Comrade Sliusareff in the face without any warning, but a fight was averted).⁸ URW meetings in late January and early February 1918, which would later give birth to the GRW, were also heated: the *Daily Standard* reported ‘riotous scenes’, to which the police were called.⁹

The cause of the commotion was the news that Peter Simonoff, a well-known member of the URW and only recently its secretary, had been appointed to the post of consul-general representing the new Bolshevik regime in Australia. The dissenters, soon to form the GRW, were united, at least at first, in their refusal to accept him as consul. The Russian Foreign Policy Archive preserves letters from its leading members, making their views known to Chicherin, the People’s Commissar for Foreign Affairs and demanding that a new envoy be sent from Russia.¹⁰ The mainstream URW either supported Simonoff or were prepared to tolerate him, and these remained the clear majority – the GRW at its height claimed about 80 members, but its strength would soon diminish. A founding member would write only a few months later: «Оппозиция оказалась аляповато организованной, пестрой и разношерстной. Можно было предвидеть [*sic*] что она потерпит фиаско» (The opposition [to Simonoff’s appointment] turned out to be a badly organised, ill-assorted, motley bunch.

⁸ Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv sotsial’noi i politicheskoi istorii (RGASPI): *fond 495, opis’ 95, delo 6, f. 37*; see K. Uindl [Kevin Windle], ‘K rannei istorii russkoi obshchiny v avstraliiskom gorode Ipsvich (1913-1924 gg.)’, *Berega*, 2017, vypusk 21, 21.

⁹ ‘Russian Disorder: Local Residents Disagree’, *Daily Standard*, 14/2/18, 5. See also ‘Trotsky’s Consul: Mr Simonoff Interviewed’, *Daily Standard*, 29/1/18, 1, and Kevin Windle, ‘“Trotsky’s Consul”: Peter Simonoff’s account of his years as Soviet representative in Australia (1918-1921)’, *Slavonic and East European Review*, 93 (2015), 3, 498.

¹⁰ Iurii Artemov, *Russkaia revoliutsiia v Avstralii i seti shpionazha*, St Petersburg: Aleteiia, 2017, 44. The letters were written by Klushin and Bykoff.

KEVIN WINDLE

That it would founder was predictable.)¹¹ An opponent of the GRW wrote at the end of September that its numbers had fallen to six or seven, and that *Listok*'s editor was leaving Brisbane for the North, 'so the Group will die a natural death'.¹²

The figure of Peter Simonoff is central to the story of *Listok* and may need a few words of introduction.¹³ He was born in 1883 in a village near Saratov to a family of modest means, and received sufficient education to find work as a book-keeper in an oil company in Baku. In the first decade of the new century he served in the army, achieving junior officer's rank (ensign), and then took up a position in a bank in the Russian Far East (Khabarovsk). From there he moved to Harbin and thence to Brisbane in March 1912. His motives for emigration to Australia are not known; he appears never to have set them down. Like many other Russian immigrants, he earned his living by itinerant work, in mines and smelters, building railway lines, and in the sugar-cane plantations of North Queensland. Soon he became active in the growing Russian community, published letters and reports in *Rabochaia zhizn'*, and in 1917 took over that newspaper as editor and secretary of the URW. As Russian consul from 1918 to 1921, he would be a highly visible and controversial figure, distrusted by many in the Russian diaspora, and the focus of much animus in the wider Australian community. In 1920 he would have a key role, though a clandestine one, in the founding of the Communist Party of Australia.¹⁴

¹¹ NAA: BP4/1, 66/4/2165, 'Rus' avstraliiskaia, iz zapisnoi knizhki 'trampera', vii; in English in Kevin Windle, 'Hades or Eden? Herman Bykoff's *Russian Australia*', *Australian Slavonic and East European Studies*, 2012, Vol. 26, Nos. 1-2, 20.

¹² NAA: A6286 1/68, Intelligence Report, Zuzenko to Tyutin, 29/9/18, QF2019.

¹³ The fullest account of Simonoff's early life is in Artemov, *Russkaia revoliutsiia v Avstralii*, 18-20.

¹⁴ See Windle, 'Trotskii's Consul'; idem, 'A Troika of Agitators', *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, Vol. 52, No. 1, 2006, 30-47; and Uindl, K. [Kevin Windle], 'Pervyi konsul Sovetskoi Rossii v Avstralii P. F. Simonov i ego druž'ia i nedrugii', *Klio*, No. 6 (114), June 2016, 176-188.

LISTOK: A 1918 BRISBANE RUSSIAN NEWSPAPER

Simonoff had, it is clear, engineered his diplomatic appointment through contacts. A recommendation had reached Trotsky, who was briefly in charge of foreign affairs before Chicherin took over, and in late January 1918 word came from Moscow via Maxim Litvinoff in London that Simonoff had been selected.¹⁵ The office of consul-general proved a mixed blessing. Simonoff found himself labouring under considerable responsibilities and facing serious obstacles: the host country would not recognise his status, because Australia and Britain did not recognise the Soviet regime.¹⁶ Rarely if ever receiving payment or directions from Moscow, he nevertheless threw himself into his duties with enthusiasm and determination, and continued to do so until mid-1921, when the Soviet diplomatic service ordered that his office be closed. He left for Russia in September 1921.

As stated above, a body of opinion in the Russian community in Australia, especially in Queensland, where he was best known, felt that Simonoff was not equal to the task. The principal public voice of that opinion was the GRW's *Listok*. That paper did, however, have broader aims: one of its founders wrote in July that its account of the 'Simonoff affair' would be followed by 'a series of articles of a philosophical nature explaining Bolshevism and spreading the understanding of its practical application'. This would be 'a preliminary step which will prepare the reader for the liberation of the human individuality, for which that individuality is now striving.'¹⁷ This is a theme to which much space is devoted in the extant copies.

¹⁵ Windle, 'Trotskii's Consul', 495f.; 'Pervyi konsul', 180.

¹⁶ The situation of Maxim Litvinoff in London was very similar. Litvinoff's expulsion in late 1918 did nothing to ease Simonoff's position.

¹⁷ NAA: A6286 1/46, A. Lenin to Zuzenko 15/7/18, QF1473. The English wording of intercepts such as this is as preserved in the censor's records. The Russian originals were forwarded to the addressee and no copies were retained. On the censorship of Russian mail at this period see Louise Ann Curtis, 'Red Criminals: Censorship,

Listok did not enjoy the luxury of a large editorial and production team or staff of correspondents. In fact it had a staff of two: a note on its last page states that it was ‘published by K. Klushin’, and ‘printed by Alexei Lenin’ (the pseudonym of A. Ar-machev), who did not write any contributions or reports in the issues to hand. Vasily Pikunoff put his name to the first editorial (No. 1, 23/6/18), or, rather, to the English version of it which appeared in the *Daily Standard*,¹⁸ but it is unsigned in *Listok*, and internal evidence strongly suggests that it was actually written by Klushin, the editor. Some other contributions bear his signature, while yet others are unsigned, but unmistakably by Klushin. There is a substantial article by Simonoff, with by-line (No. 6, pp. 2-3), but it is reprinted from a late 1917 issue of *Rabochaia zhizn’*,¹⁹ reproduced only so that Klushin can rebut it. No. 6 (p. 8) contains a short letter from Pikunoff, first published in the *Daily Standard* on 20 February (before *Listok* was founded), retracting his congratulations to Simonoff on his appointment as consul. The writer has since (i.e. in the first three weeks of February), he says, learned of Simonoff’s «неподготовленность ... беспринципность и полное политическое уродство» (unpreparedness ... lack of principle, and total political deformity). It is worth noting that the published English version contained no comparable terms,²⁰ and these three closely echo terms repeatedly used elsewhere by Klushin.

It should perhaps be made clear that *Listok* is a newspaper with little in the way of news content. The greater part of its material consists of editorialising by the editor, or principal columnist, who found in the paper an ideal vehicle in which to ex-

surveillance and suppression of the radical Russian community in Brisbane during World War I’, Ph.D. dissertation, Griffith University, 2010.

¹⁸ ‘Russian Affairs: Cause of New Group in Brisbane’, *Daily Standard*, 27/6/18, 6.

¹⁹ P.S. [Petr Simonov], ‘My, Rossiia i voina’, *Rabochaia zhizn’*, No. 89, 14/11/17, 1.

²⁰ V. Pikunoff, ‘The Simonoff Dispute’, *Daily Standard*, 20/2/18, 8.

LISTOK: A 1918 BRISBANE RUSSIAN NEWSPAPER

patiate on themes dear to his heart, and few were dearer than the ‘Simonoff affair’ and individual autonomy.

Some further information is in order concerning the personalities named above, and some others – though our knowledge of them before and after their Brisbane years is in most cases limited. The prime movers in the GRW were Klushin, Bykoff, A. Lenin (Armachev) and Pikunoff. Konstantin Klushin (b. 1885), described in Queensland government records as a cabinet-maker by trade,²¹ was known in the community as something of an intellectual. He was clearly a worldly man with a high level of education, which he liked to display in prolix historical excursions and literary allusions and analogies. He wrote with flair, confidence and feeling, though with occasional faults in syntax and spelling. He gave lectures in the community and was sometimes referred to as a ‘professor’. Resident in Australia since early 1913, he could claim a history of revolutionary activity in Russia going back to the revolution of 1905, and of time served in the notorious Siberian prison of Akatui, of which the censor commented that it was ‘reserved for life-sentenced criminals of the blackest type’.²² His dedication to the cause seemed beyond doubt, but in late 1918 it was called into question: rumours were put about that he was a *provokator* (informer).²³ This he hotly denied, and others stoutly supported him in his denials. There seems to have been no truth in the rumours, but the allegation and the reaction are characteristic

²¹ Queensland State Archives (QSA): ID862699 PRE/A639, List G, Russians in Queensland. Dates of birth and arrival in Australia given in this list cannot be authoritatively confirmed, and sometimes differ from those given in other police and intelligence documents. In most cases, dates of death are unknown.

²² NAA: A6286 1/104, 1st MD, Intelligence Report, Timms to Rezanoff, 6/2/19, QF3075. Akatui figured prominently in a classic work on the Tsarist penal system by the *Narodnik* L. Men’shin (pseudonym of Petr Iakubovich), *V mire otverzhennykh*, first published in 1899.

²³ NAA: A6286 1/104, 1st MD, Intelligence Report, Timms to Rezanoff, 6/2/19, QF3075. A moment of confusion between the censor and his interpreter resulted in *provokator* being rendered in the record as ‘prevaricator’. Further discussion, however, clarified the interpreter’s meaning.

KEVIN WINDLE

of the perfervid atmosphere in the community at the time. He was deported to Soviet Russia on September 1919, a fact which itself tends to disprove the charge.

Another opponent of Simonoff and temporary ally of Klushin was Herman Bykoff (b. 1891), who often used the name A. Rezanoff,²⁴ a sailor and former Socialist Revolutionary, in Australia since 1916, and a self-proclaimed Bolshevnik by October 1917. Like Klushin, he was a man of some education and extremely well read, as his prolific writings show. Two unpublished documents by Bykoff constitute a valuable, though far from objective, source of background information on the URW, the GRW, their leaders and their newspapers during the period in question. These are a brief history of the Russian community in Queensland from pre-war times to early 1919, entitled 'Russian Australia: Notes of a Swagman', and a farcical short play, 'How We are Learning Self-Management and Control'.²⁵ Both of these titles are drawn on below.

In early 1918 Bykoff was among those strongly opposed to Simonoff as consul, and in league with Klushin; the censor's reports tell us that Bykoff as secretary of the GRW was planning a newspaper in May 1918, as a 'set-off' against the new pro-Simonoff paper *Znanie i edinienie*, of which Nikolai Lagutin was to be editor.²⁶ It would, a GRW resolution stated, aim to 'attract the attention of all Russian workers to our young and active group',²⁷ cover the Simonoff affair, and the causes of the 'recent

²⁴ Bykoff sometimes reduced his *nom de guerre* to 'A. R-ov', and thence to 'Arov'. Scribal errors also produced the forms 'Resanoff', 'Rozaanoff' and 'Rosanoff'.

²⁵ NAA: BP4/1, 66/4/2165, 'Rus' avstraliiskaia'; 'O tom, kak my uchimsia samoupravleniiu i kontroliu: Zapiski russkogo kluba.' For more detail on this play, see Kevin Windle, "'Unmajestic Bombast': The Brisbane Union of Russian Workers as Shown in a 1919 Play', *Australian Slavonic and East European Studies*, 2005, Vol. 19, Nos. 1-2, 29-51.

²⁶ NAA: A6286 1/27, Intelligence Report, 1st MD, Rezanoff to Lyubimoff, 20/5/18, QF1020.

²⁷ NAA: A6286 1/23, Intelligence Report, 1st MD, Rezanoff to Lyubimoff, Week ending 8/5/18, QF927.

LISTOK: A 1918 BRISBANE RUSSIAN NEWSPAPER

split amongst the Russians and the formation of our new Group'.²⁸ However, in late May 1918 Bykoff announced in *Znanie i edinenie* that he was stepping down as secretary of the GRW – apparently even then his relations with Klushin were strained.²⁹ In a sentence which he deleted from a draft of his 'Russian Australia', he set out his motive:

Видя, что в такой группе я рискую дискредитировать свою общественную репутацию социалиста я счел нужным покинуть группу националистов-индивидуалистов да в придачу «без всяких определенных политических убеждений».

Realising that if I remained in such a group I would risk compromising my public reputation as a socialist, I deemed it necessary to leave a group of nationalist individualists, and one, moreover, 'with no definite political convictions'.³⁰

By early 1919, Bykoff was preparing to publish two newspapers: he succeeded in launching only one, *Nabat*, and that with some delay. The other, *Fakel*, did not get off the ground. In March 1919 he allied himself with Zuzenko, despite their past differences, and with him headed the Red Flag procession of 23 March, which led to the arrest of both men (and others) and their subsequent deportation to Russia. Clearly,

²⁸ NAA: A6286 1/29, Intelligence Report, 1st MD, A. Lenin to Lyubimoff, 27/5/18, QF1092.

²⁹ NAA: A6286 1/29; Rezanoff quoted in Intelligence Report, 1st MD, week ending 29/5/18, QF1091. A. Lenin wrote in a letter to Zuzenko that Bykoff was compelled to resign by a no-confidence motion in the GRW. NAA: A6286 1/46, Lenin to Zuzenko 15/7/18, QF1473.

³⁰ NAA: BP4/1, 66/4/2165, 'Rus' avstraliiskaia', viii, and Windle, 'Hades or Eden', 20.

this also disrupted any publishing plans, although the first issue of *Nabat* did achieve limited circulation.³¹

Information about Aleksei Lenin (Armachev) is scarce. He figures occasionally in the records of URW activities and the correspondence monitored by the military censor. He was active in anarchist circles from 1915.³² He contributed to *Rabochaia zhizn'* and sometimes gave lectures: a talk on natural history (*estestvoznanie*), announced in *Rabochaia zhizn'* on 25 July 1916, may have prompted Bykoff's ironic portrait, in which Lenin lectures on 'bio-psycho-physio-morphology' and how to resuscitate dead rats.³³ In 1918 he was allied to Klushin against Simonoff, and *Listok* names him as its printer.³⁴ Later, in April 1922, according to the records of the Ipswich community, he was local secretary of the Committee of Aid to the Starving in Russia, and absconded, 'taking with him £3 – 12s. – 5d.' from the aid fund.³⁵

Nikolai Lagutin (b. 1885, in Australia since 1913),³⁶ according to intelligence reports 'a waiter and hawker',³⁷ developed a reputation as an anarchist and is known to have attended the same anarchist meeting as A. Lenin in December 1915. He 'came

³¹ On *Nabat* No. 1, see Kevin Windle, 'Nabat and its Editors: the 1919 Swansong of the Brisbane Russian Socialist Press, or *Нас еще судьбы безвестные ждут*', *Australian Slavonic and East European Studies*, 2007, Vol. 21, Nos. 1-2, 143-63. On *Nabat* No. 2, see Windle, 'A Crude Orgy of Drunken Violence', *Labour History*, 99, November 2010, 165-178; idem, 'An Anarchist's Farewell: Alexander Zuzenko's correspondence on his deportation in 1919', *Australian Slavonic and East European Studies*, 2016, Vol. 30, Nos. 1-2, 87-111.

³² NAA: BP4/1, 66/4/2165, 'Pervaia obshche-kvinslenskaia konferentsiia Bezgosudarstvennikov' (28-29/12/15).

³³ NAA: BP4/1, 66/4/2165, 'O tom...', 12.

³⁴ See also NAA: A6286 1/46, Lenin to Zuzenko 15/7/18, QF1473.

³⁵ Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv sotsial'noi i politicheskoi istorii (RGASPI): *fond 495, opis' 95, delo 5*, ff. 41-45; see K. Uindl [Kevin Windle], 'K rannei istorii russkoi obshchiny v avstraliiskom gorode Ipsvich (1913-1924 gg.)', *Berega* 2017, vypusk 21, 21.

³⁶ QSA: ID862699 PRE/A639, List G.

³⁷ See the vivid profile in NAA: A6122/40 111, Summary of Communism, f. 59ff.

LISTOK: A 1918 BRISBANE RUSSIAN NEWSPAPER

under notice' at an early stage, and the files of the law-enforcement agencies show him to be the subject of much interest and concern. He was regarded by the security services as a 'self-appointed recruiting sergeant for the Communist Party', guilty of 'flagrant and gross disloyalty', and alleged to have a predilection for arson, incendiary rhetoric and home-made high explosives.³⁸ He was not, however, *pace* Artemov,³⁹ a member of the GRW or an opponent of Simonoff; on the contrary, for four months in 1918 he was editor of the URW's *Znanie i edinienie* (launched in May), with Simonoff's strong support. His editorship and his public lectures may be what qualified him for Klushin's ironic short list of holders of the chair of 'professoriate of knowledge': Simonoff, Lagutin, Rezanoff (Bykoff) and 'Zuzenko the Crusher' (Zuzenki-drobilovy) ('Letter to Ipswich', p. 4). He was not deported, and appears to have spent the rest of his life in Queensland.

Vasily Pikunoff (b. 1884, in Australia since 1910), described in January 1914 as a wharf labourer,⁴⁰ took over as secretary of the GRW when Bykoff resigned. He had some history of activism in Russia and Australia, had published in the URW's papers and in 1916 was an active member of a Russian workers' group at Canungra, in South-East Queensland. The military censor in Brisbane, having made the personal acquaintance of Pikunoff and his companion Willner in May 1918, recorded that these men were of 'lower caste than Lagutin', and the 'waiter and hawker' Lagutin was no aristocrat. The censor added that they were 'Russian Serf in type – and cut-throat looking individuals at that'.⁴¹ In March 1919, he was quoted as wishing to see estab-

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ Artemov, 43.

⁴⁰ QSA: A45328 ID318868, Inspector O'Sullivan to Commissioner of Police, 5.1.14.

⁴¹ NAA: A6286 1/27, Intelligence Report, 1st MD, Rezanoff to Lyubimoff, 20/5/18, Censor's Notes, QF1020. No further information has come to light concerning Willner.

KEVIN WINDLE

lished in Australia ‘a free Socialist Republic which our comrades in Russia enjoy now’.⁴² Pikunoff was one of the few who stayed in Australia for most of his life. He returned to Russia in 1959, and published some rather unreliable memoirs of earlier times in Brisbane.⁴³

Alexander Zuzenko (1884-1938, in Australia since 1911, also known as Sania Mamin, Matulichenko, Alexandrov, and Nargen) has featured in numerous previous studies of the period. For present purposes it suffices to say that he was a militant anarchist, agitator, journalist and community leader. In August 1918 he took over from Lagutin as URW secretary and editor of *Znanie i edinienie*, and was therefore opposed to Klushin and the GRW. Swiftly arrested and deported to Russia for his leading role in the Red Flag demonstration, he would return as an agent of the Comintern in 1922 – having been converted from anarchism to Bolshevism – and be deported a second time.⁴⁴

Most of the personalities named above are treated in Bykoff’s ‘Russian Australia’ and appear in caricatured form in his play-script, in which ‘the Bald Philosopher’ is identified by a footnote that reads ‘K. K-n-Or-ff’.⁴⁵ The ‘Eternal Abscess’ is his anarchist comrade Lenin/Armachev, and ‘Rip-the-Sails’, alias ‘the Great Destroyer’, alias the spirit of destruction, would be immediately recognisable as Zuzenko, even if the playwright did not make that explicit. The author himself appears as ‘Squeaky-Creaky’ (Pili-skripi), the voice of the down-to-earth Bolshevik worker. This cast of characters is of direct relevance to the content of *Listok*. The playwright, who

⁴² NAA: A6286 1/114, Pikunoff quoted in Intelligence Report, 1st MD, 19/3/19, QF3440.

⁴³ V. I. Pikunov, ‘Soiuz russkikh rabochikh v Avstralii’, *Voprosy istorii KPSS*, No. 1, 1960, 167-174.

⁴⁴ See in particular Kevin Windle, *Undesirable: Captain Zuzenko and the Workers of Australia and the World* (Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing, 2012).

⁴⁵ NAA: BP4/1, 66/4/2165, ‘O tom ...’, 1. Konstantin Klushin-Orloff. ‘Orloff’ was a pseudonym sometimes used by Klushin.

LISTOK: A 1918 BRISBANE RUSSIAN NEWSPAPER

signs his work ‘the immortal Pimen Iuvenalovich-Satirikon-Nestorov’, further describes the Bald Philosopher as follows:

[...] из «бывших» политических, только что давший лекцию о том сколько клопов в нерчинской каторге и какая холодная вода на Лене и что в якутской тундре ничего кроме мха, брусники, клюквы, мошки и оленей, их кушающих нету. (Смотри лекции Клуна.)

[...] a ‘former’ political, who has just delivered a lecture about how many bedbugs there are in Nerchinsk hard-labour jail and how cold the waters of the River Lena are and how there is nothing at all in the tundra of Yakutia except moss, bilberries, cranberries, midges and the reindeer which eat them. (See Kl-n’s lectures.)⁴⁶

In this play, and in ‘Russian Australia’, Bykoff cites, with only slight distortions, statements by Klushin in *Listok*. Klushin had written that he and his allies had ‘formed their own organisation with principles of complete autonomy of the personality’, and that anybody ‘with no definite political convictions’ could join (*Listok*, No. 1, p. 4). To Bykoff, such an organisation was ‘simply a group of good people, bereft of any political convictions “with complete personal autonomy and free will”, that is, individualism shared by socialists and monarchists alike.’⁴⁷

Bykoff’s play derives much of its comic effect, of course, from its exuberant use of hyperbole. His Bald Philosopher is portrayed as one who sees himself as an

⁴⁶ NAA: BP4/1, 66/4/2165, ‘O tom ...’, 1.

⁴⁷ NAA: BP4/1, 66/4/2165, ‘Rus’ avstraliiskaia’, vii-viii; Windle, ‘Hades or Eden’, 20. A ‘group of good people’ also figures in ‘O tom ...’ and NAA: A6286 2/37, Lagutin to Russian Association, 16/7/18, RE1073.

KEVIN WINDLE

intellectual leader, upholding the freedom of the individual personality and placing himself above the inferior masses:

Вас надо учить. Вы - стадо баранов. [...] Не нужно целоваться с толпою. ... Массу надо оскорблять! У нее каменные мозги [...] Мой идеал – индивидуализм ... Мой бог – личность. Я стою выше Вас и плюю на баранов.

You have to be taught. You're a flock of sheep [...] We must not cosy up to the crowd. The masses have to be insulted! Their brains are made of stone [...] My ideal is individualism. My god is the personality. I stand above you and spit on the sheep.⁴⁸

While this sounds somewhat improbable in a parody of a dedicated revolutionary, Bykoff is not exaggerating as much as one might suspect. He did not have to look far for material: the frequency in *Listok's* pages of *tolpa* (crowd), *stado* (herd), *massy* (masses), *individualizm* (individualism) and *lichnost'* (personality, individual; this word sometimes in full capitals) is immediately apparent, for example:

Всю историю красной нитью проходит тупость и дикость толпы. [...] Все время казнила того, кто не подчинялся ее узко-животной жизни.

The dull-wittedness and savagery of the crowd runs right through history [...] It has always punished those who would not bow to its narrowly animal mode of life. ('Raby', *Listok*, No. 6, p. 1)

⁴⁸ NAA: BP4/1, 66/4/2165, 'O tom ...', 2-3. See also Windle, 'Unmajestic Bombast'.

LISTOK: A 1918 BRISBANE RUSSIAN NEWSPAPER

Вся масса русского населения не знает о политических партиях и их программных разногласиях и о Большевизме ничего.

The whole mass of the Russian population knows nothing of political parties, of the differences in their programmes, or of Bolshevism. ('Letter to Ipswich', 1/12/18, p. 4)

The phraseology of masses, herds, and majorities opposed to small élites came to be Klushin's trademark and widely recognised as such. Thus he could easily be represented as voicing contempt for the very constituency whose interests he purported to represent, providing rich material for the caricaturist.

More than one article in *Listok* showed that Klushin had his own personal and highly idiosyncratic view of the Bolshevik revolution. His unsigned piece entitled 'Raby' (Slaves) states that in Russia the peasants (*krest'iane-raby*) have seized their freedom, so long a dream:

крестьяне-рабы разрушили все, что стояло тормозом для развития личности.

The peasant-slaves have destroyed everything that served as a brake on the development of the personality. ('Raby', *Listok*, No. 6, p. 1)

The editorial in the inaugural issue, four foolscap pages long, interprets the Bolshevik seizure of power as follows:

Появился большевизм. Он сказал, что рабочий всего мира будет сам устраивать географию земного шара. Не будет богов, ни земных, ни небесных, а только личность. [...] Личность должна

KEVIN WINDLE

быть автономна в своей жизни, в проявлении своего духа и мира.
[...] Общество для индивидуума, а не индивидуум для общества.

Bolshevism arose. It stated that the workers of the whole world would themselves arrange the geography of the globe. There will be no gods, either on Earth or in Heaven, only the personality. [...] The personality must be autonomous in its life, and in the way it manifests its spirit and its world. [...] Society for the individual, rather than the individual for society. (*Listok*, No. 1, p. 2)

This was a motif which Klushin would rephrase in December 1918 in his ‘Letter to Ipswich’:

Смысл жизни в мире человечества – совершенствование человека; цель прогресса – создание всего лучшего для человека. Бога-мифа не будет, бога с седой бородой, сидящего где-то там-то, а будет жить здесь, на земле, с человечеством и назовется ЛИЧНОСТЬЮ.

The purpose of life in the world of mankind is the perfection of man; the aim of progress is to create the best conditions for man. There will be no mythical God, a god with a grey beard sitting up there somewhere; he will live here on earth, among mankind, and be called ‘the PERSONALITY’. (‘Letter to Ipswich’, p. 2)

Не забудьте, чем разностороннее, богаче мир личности, тем сильнее и красивее общество. Личность все.

LISTOK: A 1918 BRISBANE RUSSIAN NEWSPAPER

Do not forget that the more varied and rich the life of the personality, the stronger and more beautiful is society. The personality is all. ('Letter to Ipswich', p. 4)

In the first editorial (the only article in No. 1) and elsewhere, the editor wrote emphatically against *nasilie nad mysl'iu* (coercion over thought). He held to the view that the October revolution had delivered individual freedom and freedom of thought, while the leadership of the URW in Queensland, heedless of this, was stifling both: «насилие над свободной мыслью заставила нас создать свою новую организацию» (Coercion over free thought has compelled us to establish our own organisation) (*Listok*, No. 1, p. 3).

In similar vein, a long article in English about the funding of the *Daily Standard* by means of a levy, which Klushin opposed, contained this statement about 'the conscious worker': 'he wants to have fully expressed his own definite interests of the universe – the individual [*sic*]. ... How can a paper which fought against conscription of man be in favor of conscription of thought?'⁴⁹

Thus the URW leadership style, along with the 'Simonoff affair', lay at the root of the founding of the GRW. The office-bearers of the URW, the editorial maintains, behaved towards the membership in a high-handed, dictatorial manner, which brooked no independent thought. (And the man in charge of the URW and its newspaper only recently was Simonoff.)

Here Klushin and Bykoff were in broad agreement, which may explain their earlier alliance. Seven months later, when Zuzenko dominated the URW, Bykoff would describe him in a postscript to 'Russian Australia' as a 'Bakuninist', one of a 'handful of demagogues', running 'an organisation in which the secretary managed

⁴⁹ K. Lushin [*sic*], 'The Levy and *The Daily Standard*', *Solidarity*, 29/3/19.

KEVIN WINDLE

everything and a general meeting merely endorsed his actions'.⁵⁰ This theme provides the leitmotif of his satirical play: there he wrote of a 'conspiracy to depose the anarchist dictator [Zuzenko] from his Secretarial throne' [сбросить с Секретарского престола диктатора от анархии].⁵¹

If Klushin believed that the October revolution had delivered freedom of thought, so – it is clear – did Bykoff. A 'letter to our comrades', written in the cells of Brisbane's Boggo Road Jail in June 1919, bears the title *Svoboda mysli i revoliutsiia* (Free Thought and Revolution). In it Bykoff opines that the Russian people, having endured centuries of mental hibernation, have striven instinctively towards Knowledge, ever seeking truth and justice. He went on:

Мысль вечно бунтует и протестует против умственного застоя. Вот почему право свободной мысли есть в то же время и право бунта, восстания, протеста против царящего насилия, догмы, мракобесия и всяческого суеверия. Русская революция учит мировой пролетариат свободе мысли и бунту.

Thought eternally rebels and protests against mental stagnation. That is why the right of free thought is at the same time the right of rebellion, of insurrection, of protest against the reign of coercion, dogma, obscurantism and superstition of all kinds. The revolution is teaching the proletariat of the world free thought and rebellion.⁵²

⁵⁰ NAA: BP4/1, 66/4/2165, 'Rus' avstraliiskaia', xi-xiii; Windle, 'Hades or Eden', 23-24.

⁵¹ NAA: BP4/1, 66/4/2165, 'O tom ...', 8.

⁵² NAA: BP4/1, 66/4/2165, A. Rezanov (German Bykov), 'Svoboda mysli i revoliutsii. (Pis'mo tovarishcham)'. The manuscript is in poor condition and cannot be read in full owing to lost words at the ends of lines and at the bottom of the first page.

LISTOK: A 1918 BRISBANE RUSSIAN NEWSPAPER

Had these lines been written a year earlier, there seems little doubt that Klushin would gratefully have found a place for them in the pages of *Listok*.

On other matters too there are clear similarities and coincidences of view between Klushin and Bykoff. Of the life of the ‘crowd’ in Australia, Klushin wrote:

всмотритесь в жизнь толпы. Как она живет и что сохраняет?
Машинная работа. Пиво, ту-ап и рейсы, ту-ап, пиво, рейсы... вот
смысл жизни этого стада. [...] Все живое, идущее в разрез
интересам толпы, уничтожается.

Look at the life of the crowd. How does it live and what sustains it?
Beer, two-up and races, two-up, beer, races... That is the meaning of
the life of this herd. [...] Everything which has life in it, everything
which runs counter to the interests of the crowd, is destroyed. (*Listok*,
No. 6, pp. 1-2)

Bykoff in ‘Russian Australia’ had also bemoaned the fact that some Russians in Australia had become acclimatised, that is, they had renounced *obshchestvennost’* and civic ideals in favour of beer, boxing etc.

Лошадиный спорт, глупейшие «пикчурсы», бары и бульварные
романы с яркими и кричащими обложками, бокс – таковы
психологические результаты акклиматизации, неизбежно ведущие
к индивидуализации жизни, к уходу от жизни скопом, миром, от
русской буйной общественности с ее острыми спорами по
вопросам «сущего и должного».

Horse-racing, idiotic ‘pictures’, bars and trashy novels with loud, lurid
covers, and boxing – such are the psychological results of acclimatisa-

KEVIN WINDLE

tion, results which lead inevitably to the individualisation of life, moving away from togetherness and rowdy Russian communal life with its heated arguments about ‘reality and ideals’.⁵³

Bykoff would write again of the ‘sad and dreary life of Russian immigrants’ in his account of the Red Flag demonstration.⁵⁴ Sergeeff too had been contemptuous of the society he found in Queensland in 1911, and this view became something of a received commonplace, echoed at intervals in the pages of the earlier Russian press.⁵⁵

These matters aside, however, the most contentious issue was – as indicated – the ‘Simonoff affair’. The editorial in *Listok* No. 1 states that it was the ‘root cause’ of the split, and accordingly it receives much space there and in most of the material which followed. The editorial concludes with a note saying that subsequent issues will contain ‘Delo Simonova’. It would be an ongoing story, of which only one part is to hand: No 5 (24 Aug 1918), four pages long, consists only of ‘Delo Simonova’ (signed by Klushin), and that is a continuation from No. 4. No. 5 concludes ‘*prodolzhenie sleduet*’ (to be continued), (not ‘*okonchanie sleduet*’ [to be concluded]), but there is no such heading in No. 6, though much of it does deal with Simonoff.⁵⁶ Reduced to essentials, Klushin’s complaint, in this article and others, is a lengthy litany of opprobrium, featuring an impressive range of choice epithets, of which the following are only a sample: (No. 6) ‘political juggler’, ‘chameleon’, ‘poseur’ (p. 5), ‘weathercock’ [*tip prisposobliaiushchiisia* (p. 7)], given to ‘delusions of grandeur’, ‘lacking in talent’

⁵³ NAA: BP4/1, 66/4/2165, ‘Rus’ avstraliiskaia’, iii; Windle, ‘Hades or Eden’, 16.

⁵⁴ ‘Razgrom Soiuz R. R., krasnaia demonstratsiia i okhota za bol’shevikami’, *Nabat*, 6/8/19, 2; Windle, ‘Crude Orgy’, 170.

⁵⁵ For example, P. Grei, [Editorial], *Izvestiia SRE*, 29/11/13, 1.

⁵⁶ The greater part of the text of ‘Delo Simonova’ from *Listok* No. 5 also appeared in English in the *Daily Standard*: K. Klushin, ‘Bolshevism: Reply to Consul-General Simonoff’, *Daily Standard*, 17/7/18, 2; 18/7/18, 2.

(p. 8) and 'ignorant of social questions' (p. 4, p. 8).⁵⁷ The charges against him accord broadly with those which Klushin and Bykoff had set out in letters to Chicherin and Litvinoff earlier in the year: «мистер Симонов недостойн представлять Российскую крестьянскую и рабочую республику» (Mr Simonoff is unworthy to represent the Russian Peasants' and Workers' Republic), and «больше вредит, чем помогает российскому рабочему движению в целом» (does more harm than good to the Russian workers' movement as a whole).⁵⁸ In *Listok* (No. 5, 'Delo Simonova'), however, Klushin went further, saying that Simonoff lacked any Bolshevik credentials, that his curriculum vitae showed a shortfall in the key area: participation in revolutionary activity. Others, including Bykoff, Zuzenko, Pikunoff and Klushin himself, had gone to prison in Russia for their pains; Simonoff had not.

Simonoff himself had once acknowledged this deficiency in print. He related how, when he arrived in Queensland in 1912, he suffered from «полной [...] неосведомленности в политических вопросах» (complete ignorance of political matters); he was, he freely admitted, 'backward' and lacking in any 'political awareness'.⁵⁹ But in 1918, when appointed consul, he gave a different account of himself, claiming a longer record of activism.⁶⁰

As for his having become a Bolshevik, he found himself in some self-inflicted difficulty: while editing *Rabochaia zhizn'* at the time of the October Revolution, he had published an editorial 'My, Rossiia i voina' (Russia, the War and Us), which he must have regretted a few months later, arguing persuasively that Russia must con-

⁵⁷ See Windle, 'Trotskii's Consul', 501 and 'Pervyi konsul', 181.

⁵⁸ Artemov, 44.

⁵⁹ A. Simens [Petr Simonov], 'Korrespondentsiia', *Rabochaia zhizn'*, No. 47, 12/1/17, 4.

⁶⁰ 'Trotsky's Consul: Mr Simonoff Interviewed', *Daily Standard*, 29/1/18, 2.

tinue to prosecute the war against Germany and Austria. It included statements such as the following:

Мы совершенно уверены, что русские рабочие и солдаты, а тем более русские революционеры, слишком далеки от позорного мира с кайзером и его юнкерами.

We are quite sure that the Russian workers and soldiers, not to mention the Russian revolutionaries, are very far from concluding a shameful peace with the Kaiser and his Junkers.⁶¹

Far from the centre of Bolshevik power, Simonoff could hardly have foreseen that some three months later the Bolshevik regime would sign just such a humiliating peace treaty, surrendering vast swathes of territory, resources and population. For Klushin this was valuable ammunition: he reprinted Simonoff's 'My, Rossiia i voina' (*Listok*, No. 6, pp. 2–3), only slightly abridged, and commented: «теперь вы поймете почему мы говорили, что он не большевик и шел и идет против большевизма» (now you will understand that he is not a Bolshevik and was and is going against Bolshevism) (*Listok*, No. 6, p. 5). Thus Simonoff himself appeared to have proved Klushin's point.⁶²

But of course Klushin himself was open to the charge of being no Bolshevik. Bykoff in February 1919 wrote of him refusing to declare openly for the Bolsheviks.⁶³ Some had accused Klushin of embracing a form of Nietzschean 'supermanism' – a

⁶¹ P.S. [Petr Simonov], 'My, Rossiia i voina', *Rabochaia zhizn'*, No. 89, 14/11/17, 1.

⁶² Uindl, 'Pervyi konsul', 181. Simonoff had followed 'My, Rossiia ...' with another leading article in which he estimated the numbers of German troops who would be freed for action on the Western front if Russia were to conclude a separate peace. (P. Simonov, 'Nashtoishchaia pravda', *Rabochaia zhizn'*, No. 92, 5/12/17)

⁶³ NAA: BP4/1, 66/4/2165, 'Rus' avstraliiskaia', ix, and Windle, 'Hades or Eden', 21.

LISTOK: A 1918 BRISBANE RUSSIAN NEWSPAPER

charge he repudiated in his newspaper (*Listok*, No. 1, p. 2) and his 'Letter to Ipswich' (p. 3). Nonetheless, it was not difficult for Bykoff to represent him as an effete intellectual, cut off from the masses, citing Klushin's own articles in evidence, and when he wrote of the 'sentimental, petty bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia, who love the people only in theory, and know them from books, written by themselves',⁶⁴ Klushin was one of those he had in mind. For such 'former revolutionaries' there could be no place in the movement which had seized command in Russia.

The Australian authorities, however, did not discriminate: 'all the members' of both the URW and GRW were 'agitators of the worst type', and all were bent on 'spreading the poison amongst their fellow workers'.⁶⁵ If they departed from Marxist orthodoxy, this was not noticed, or was of no account. This much is clear from the observations and acerbic tone of those responsible for the perlustration: an intelligence report in February 1919 mentions a 'dangerous clique' and an 'inner circle of murderous ruffians', naming Klushin, Rezanoff, Zuzenko and A. Lenin as individuals of particular concern.⁶⁶ Recommending deportation in the wake of the riots, Brigadier-General G. Irving wrote of these and others that they were 'confirmed Bolsheviks' and 'undesirables of the worst type and very clever propagandists. They have, conjointly, done everything possible to bring about a Revolution and have so taught their fellow-workers through their untiring efforts [...] that Bolshevism is the only means of gaining their object.'⁶⁷ The Brisbane riots of March 1919 provided the catalyst for firm action against all Russian radicals. Arrests quickly ensued, followed by deporta-

⁶⁴ A. Resanoff [*sic*], 'Bolshevism and Democracy', *Knowledge and Unity*, 22/3/19.

⁶⁵ NAA: A6286 1/58, 1st MD, Censor's notes, Zuzenko to Simonoff, 8/8/18, QF1701.

⁶⁶ NAA: A6286 1/104, 1st MD, Censor's notes, Timms to Resanoff [*sic*], 6/2/19, QF3075.

⁶⁷ NAA: BP 4/1, 66/4/3660, ff. 407-408. Irving to Dept of Defence, 1/4/19.

KEVIN WINDLE

tion orders: Zuzenko was deported to Soviet Russia in April;⁶⁸ several others followed in September, including Klushin and Bykoff. Klushin's *Listok* had ceased publication before the end of 1918, with the decline of the GRW, and some members had returned to their original fold, the URW. *Listok* had proved the short-lived organ of a short-lived organisation, but its surviving issues make a substantial contribution to our knowledge of the Russian radicals active in Australia at the time, the personalities, their aspirations, their attitudes to the revolution in their homeland, and the often bitter conflicts between them.

⁶⁸ In Leningrad, twenty years later, Zuzenko would be arrested again, this time by the NKVD, and in August 1938 executed as a 'British spy'. See Windle, *Undesirable*.

PETER M. HILL

SEX AND GENDER IN SERBIAN AND BULGARIAN: A COMPARATIVE STUDY¹

1. Gender as a Grammatical Category

Gender is a grammatical category in the Indo-European languages. It is generally assumed that sex and gender agree in nouns that denote animate beings, but there are many exceptions, as will be shown below (cf. also Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 2003, 68). In the Slavonic languages there are three genders, masculine (masc.), feminine (fem.) and neuter. I have chosen to compare Serbian (Sr.) and Bulgarian (Bg.) as representatives of the West-South-Slavonic and East-South-Slavonic languages respectively. I have dealt with other Slavonic languages in various articles (see in References).

In Serbian, adjectives and pronouns display three genders in both the singular and plural. In Bulgarian, adjectives and pronouns show only one ending in the plural, that is, the category of gender does not exist in the plural. This means that *pluralia tantum* such as *данни* ‘data’, *скрупули* ‘scruples’, *въглища* ‘coal’ or *очила* ‘glasses’ have no gender in Bulgarian, cf. Sr. *скрупула* (fem. singular) - *скрупуле* (fem. plural) ‘scruples’, *наочаре* (plurale tantum, fem., ‘glasses’). However, in Bulgarian, the numeral ‘two’, *два/две*, displays a binary distinction between masc. on the one hand (*два*) and non-masc. (fem./neuter) on the other (*две*), e.g. Bg. *два вола* (masc.) ‘two oxen’, *два коня* (masc.) ‘two horses’, *две крави* (fem.) ‘two cows’, *две зърна* (neuter)

¹ A much briefer study on this subject appeared as ‘Sex and Gender in Serbian and Bulgarian. A Comparative Study’ [with Krasimira Koleva] in: *Deutsche Beiträge zum 16. Internationalen Slavistenkongress, Belgrad 2018. Herausgegeben von Sebastian Kempgen, Monika Wingender und Ludger Udolph (= Die Welt der Slaven, Sammelbände. Sborniki, 63)*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2018, pp. 147-156.

‘two grains’. In the following Bulgarian examples, the numeral shows a distinction of gender, but the adjective does not: *два силни вола* (masc.) ‘two strong oxen’, *две* (fem.) *сини очи* ‘a pair of blue eyes’, *две* (fem.) *силни ръце* ‘two strong arms/hands’, *Впечатлението, което произведе срещането на двата младежки погледа* (Михалаки Георгиев) ‘The impression created by the meeting of the two youthful glances’ (*два* ‘two’, masc., *поглед* ‘glance’, masc.). In Serbian there is a distinction between fem. and non-fem.: *две* is used with fem. nouns, *два* with masc. and neuter nouns: *два прозора* ‘two windows’, *два лешника* ‘two hazelnuts’, *две ноге* ‘two legs/feet’, *два нова студента* ‘two new (male) students’, *два нова писма* ‘two new letters’ (neuter), *две нове студенткиње* ‘two new (female) students’; *не могу да говорим са два ученика у исто време* ‘I cannot talk to two pupils (male or generic masc. – see below) at the same time’; *Између та два догађаја је размак од четири месеца* ‘Between these two events there was an interval of four months’.

Nouns that end in a consonant (strictly speaking, zero) are masc, e.g. *зид/зид* ‘wall,’² *путь/път* ‘path, way’, *знак/знак* ‘sign’, *прозор/прозорец* ‘window’, *ударац/удар* ‘hit, blow’, *лист/лист* ‘leaf’, *пепео* (from **репелъ*)/*пепел* ‘ash’,³ *посао* (from **росалъ*)/*труд* ‘labour, work’.⁴ Some nouns ending in a consonant are fem., e.g. *любав/любов* ‘love’, *со, сол* (<**солъ*)/*сол* ‘salt’, *ноћ/нощ* ‘night’, *лјубазност/любезност* ‘kindness’, *вечност/вечност* ‘eternity’. In Serbian, collective forms are treated as fem. singular nouns, e.g. *телед, -и* ‘calves’. Some nouns can have one of two different genders, e.g. Sr. *бол, -а* (masc.) or *бол, -и* (fem.) ‘pain, ache’, *глад, -а* or *глад, -и* ‘hunger’, Bg. *вар* ‘lime’, *жал* ‘pity, regret’, *кал* ‘mud, dirt’, *пепел* ‘ash’.

² Serbian examples are listed first, Bulgarian ones second.

³ Bg *пепел* can be either masc or fem. (see below).

⁴ *Труд* occurs also in Serbian. In Bulgarian, *работа* (fem.) is a closer semantic equivalent of Sr. *посао*. *Труд* may be a learned borrowing from Russian in Bulgarian.

SEX AND GENDER IN SERBIAN AND BULGARIAN

The following masc. nouns designate animate beings: *човек/човек* ‘man, person’, *отац/отец* ‘father’,⁵ *син/син* ‘son’, *ован/овен* ‘ram’, *јарац/козел* ‘billy-goat’, *бик/бик* ‘bull’. Nouns that end in *-a* in the nominative singular are normally fem.: *земља/земля* ‘land, country’, *воља/воля* ‘will’, *глава/глава* ‘head’, *трава/трева* ‘grass’, *борба/борба* ‘struggle, fight’. The following fem. nouns designate animate beings: *жена/жена* ‘woman, wife’, *мајка/майка* ‘mother’, *кћерка/дъщеря* ‘daughter’, *овца/овца* ‘sheep’, *коза/коза* ‘goat’, *крава/крава* ‘cow’. Nouns in *-o* or *-e* (historically < *-o*) are neuter, e.g. *село/село* ‘village’, *писмо/писмо* ‘letter’, *полје/поле* ‘field’, *море/море* ‘sea’, *име/име* ‘name’, *знанје/знание* ‘knowledge’, *свануће/разсъмване* ‘dawn, daybreak’. Foreign borrowings are also neuter in Bulgarian, e.g. *дерби* ‘derby’, *жури* ‘jury’, *такси* ‘taxi’, *бижу* ‘jewel’, *интервју* ‘interview’, while in Serbian they are masc., e.g. *дерби*, *жури*, *такси*, *бижу*, *интервју*. However, if a foreign noun in Bulgarian designates a person, the gender agrees with the sex of the referent, e.g. *махди* (masc.) ‘Mahdi’. The noun *аташе* appears to be neuter, but is in fact masc., reflecting the sex of the person: Sr. *војни аташе* ‘military attaché’, *трговински аташе* ‘commercial attaché’, Bg. *военен аташе* ‘military attaché’, *културен аташе* ‘cultural attaché’; note also Bg. *жиголо* ‘gigolo’, *денди* ‘dandy’, *гуру* ‘guru’, *парвеню* ‘upstart’.

The gender of a noun is determined by agreement, following the famous statement by Hockett: “*Genders are classes of nouns reflected in the behavior of associated words*” (Hockett 1958, 231; cf. also Corbett and Fedden 2016, 498): cf. Sr. *авлија* (noun, fem. singular) *је још пуста* (adjective, fem. singular) (*Време смрти*) ‘the courtyard is still deserted’,⁶ ...*аутомобил* (noun, masc.), *окољен* (past participle passive, masc., agrees with *аутомобил*) *болничаркама* (noun, fem. plural, in-

⁵ The normal Bulgarian word for ‘father’ is *баца*, which is masc, despite the desinence (see below).

⁶ Some of the examples are taken from the novel *Време смрти* by Dobrica Ćosić (henceforth *BC*).

strumental case) *што су изишле* (predicate, fem. plural, agrees with *болничарке*) *да се поздраве с Миленом (BC)* ‘the car, surrounded by nurses who had come out to greet Milena’, *очи* (noun, fem. plural) *му нарасле* (participle, fem. plural, agrees with *очи*) *и још више поплавеле* (participle, fem. plural, agrees with *очи*) (BC) ‘his eyes, swollen and turned even darker’. In Bulgarian, *по воден/въздушен път* ‘by water/air’, literally ‘by water/air way’ (masc. attribute + masc. noun), *Един-едничък* (numeral, masc., agrees with *поглед*) *поглед той хврџли случајно на Нединя* (possessive adjective, masc. definite oblique, agrees with *стан*) *витџк* (adjective, masc. indefinite, agrees with *стан*) *стан и го спря на небесния* (adjective, masc. definite oblique, agrees with *цвет*) *цвет, којто* (relative pronoun, masc. singular, agrees with *цвет*) *се отражаваше в очите ѝ* (Михалаки Георгиев) ‘He cast a single casual glance at Neda’s supple body and dwelt on the sky-blue colour that was reflected in her eyes’; *това тџко* (adjective, neuter singular, agrees with *момиче*) *чернооко* (adjective, neuter singular, agrees with *момиче*) *момиче, с бяла* (adjective, fem. singular, agrees with *рокля*) *рокля и бели* (adjective, plural, no gender, agrees with *рџкавици*) *кожени* (adjective, plural, no gender, agrees with *рџкавици*) *рџкавици* (Їордан Їовков) ‘that slim black-eyed girl, with a white dress and white leather gloves’.

Some nouns have atypical endings. Here the agreement reveals the gender of the noun, e.g. Sr. *деда* ‘grandfather’ or *чича* ‘uncle, old man’ are masculine, even though they have the typical feminine ending *-а*: *Чича Милоје је лежао* (predicate, masc.) *непомичан* (complement, masc.) (Stevanović 1979, 125) ‘Uncle Miloje lay there motionless’, *мој* (pronoun, masc.) *добри* (adjective, masc.) *деда* ‘my kind grandpa’, *дошао* (predicate, masc.) *је деда* ‘grandpa has arrived’. The following hypocoristic forms offer similar examples: *ујка* ‘uncle, mother’s brother’, *стрика* ‘uncle, father’s brother’, *бата* ‘brother’, *тата* ‘dad’. In Bulgarian there are examples such as *баца* ‘father’ or *вуйчо* ‘uncle, mother’s brother’. Further examples are Sr.

SEX AND GENDER IN SERBIAN AND BULGARIAN

дипломата ‘diplomat’, *активиста* ‘activist’, *анархиста* ‘anarchist’, *машиниста* ‘machinist’, *специјалиста* ‘specialist’. Bulgarian, on the other hand, has *дипломат*, *активист* etc., with the typical masc. desinence.

By contrast, there are nouns in *-e* or *-o* that are neuter, even though they denote animate beings, e.g., Sr. *дете* ‘child’, *чедо* ‘child’, *пиле* ‘chicken’, *теле* ‘calf’: *а дете безбрижно* (adjective neuter singular, agrees with *дете*) *и весело* (adjective neuter singular, agrees with *дете*) (Stevanović 1979, 125) ‘but the child [was] care-free and cheerful’; Bg, *Ти излез, майко, питай ги де ти е чедо остало* (predicate, neuter, agrees with *чедо*) (Христо Ботев) ‘Go outside, mother, and ask them where your child has ended up’; *Много баби, хилаво* (adjective, neuter singular, agrees with *дете*) *дете* (a proverb) ‘many grandmothers, sickly child’, i.e., ‘too many cooks spoil the broth’. Note German *das Kind* (‘child’, neuter), but *enfant* in French is a double-gender noun, thus *un enfant – une enfant*. Diminutives are also neuter, even when they designate people, e.g. Sr. *момче* ‘boy’, *девојче* ‘girl’, *чобанче* ‘little shepherd’: *једно високо* (attribute, neuter singular, agrees with *момче*) *и кршино* (attribute, neuter singular, agrees with *момче*) *момче* (Бранислав Нушић) ‘a tall, strong boy’. Similarly in Bulgarian *Вие едно* (numeral, neuter singular, agrees with *дете*) *дете ли сте? Братя, сестри нямате ли?* (Св. Минков) ‘Are you an only child? You don’t have brothers or sisters?’; *Чие* (possessive pronoun, neuter singular, agrees with *момиче*) *си момиче?* (Елин Пелин) ‘Whose daughter are you?’, *Много ми харесва Ниновото* (possessive adjective, neuter singular, definite form, agrees with *момче*) *момче* (К. Петканов) ‘I’m very fond of Ninov’s son’. In German, too, diminutives are neuter, hence *das Mädchen* ‘girl, neuter’. Serbian and Bulgarian *лице* meaning ‘person’ is neuter, even though it always designates a person: Sr. *правно лице* ‘legal person’, *познато лице* ‘well-known personality’, Bg. *духовно лице* ‘clergyman’. Similarly, Sr. *особа* ‘person’, is feminine even when it designates a man: *Деца*

долазе у Опоравилиште у пратњи једне (numeral, fem. singular, agrees with *особа*) поуздане (adjective, fem. singular, agrees with *особа*) особе ‘The children come to the convalescent home in the company of a reliable person’.

There are other nouns in Serbian that denote people and can display either neuter or masculine agreement, e.g. *оклевало* ‘procrastinator’ is classified as a neuter noun, as in *Само је размишљала да је старо* (adjective, neuter singular) *оклевало* (www.nbks.org.rs/digNBK/sintezaNS/.../page8.html) ‘She just thought that he was an old procrastinator’, but, according to *RSKNJ*, it can also be used as a masculine noun (agreement by sex rather than by declensional class). The same is true of, for example, *мрдало* ‘fidgeter, bungler’ (*RSKNJ* XIII, 150: *с (м)* [“neuter (masculine)”]), also *мувало* ‘pest; busybody’. Bulgarian has *мухльо* (masc.), *мухла* (fem) (derog.) ‘nincompoop, ninny, sucker’, *мижитурка* (masc. or fem), *мижитурко* (masc.) (colloq. derog.) ‘squit, milksop, pigeon’, *лигльо* (colloq., derog.) masc. ‘twaddler; mollycoddle; yob’. Some emotive expressions designating girls or women in Serbian are masc., e.g. *девојчуљак/девојчурак* ‘little girl’: *Катица [је] румен* (adjective, masc. singular, agrees with *девојчурак*) и *весео* (adjective, masc. singular, agrees with *девојчурак*) *девојчурак од петнаестак година* (Бранко Ћопић) ‘Katica [is] a rosy-cheeked and cheerful girl of some 15 years of age’.

Corbett and Fedden (2016, 508) point out that two neuter nouns in Serbian change their gender in the plural: *њезино* (pronoun, neuter singular) *око* ‘her eye’ – *њезине* (pronoun, fem. plural) *очи* ‘her eyes’, cf. *њезино ухо* ‘her ear’ – *њезине уши* ‘her ears’.

There is another class of nouns in Serbian which have the typical fem. –a, but are generally masc. in the singular, e.g. *веран слуга* ‘a faithful servant’, *Ништа опасније од паметног* (attribute, masc., agrees with *слуга*) *слуге (ВС)* ‘nothing more dangerous than an intelligent servant’. The following are in this class: *војвода* ‘com-

SEX AND GENDER IN SERBIAN AND BULGARIAN

mander; governor’, *владика* ‘bishop’, *слуга* ‘servant’, *судија* ‘judge’, *старешина* ‘elder; prefect’: *Сам* (pronoun, masc., singular, agrees with *војвода*) *војвода остао* (predicate, masc., singular, agrees with *војвода*) *је у шанцу* (Вук Караџић) ‘the commander himself remained in the trench’; *Ето зашто је гомила најсигурнији* (attribute, masc., singular, agrees with *судија*) *судија* (Ј. Скерлић) ‘that is why the crowd is the most reliable judge’ (Stevanović 1979, 130f.). However, surprisingly, such nouns are regularly treated as fem. in the plural, where the gender follows the typically fem. ending: *У свим другим поротским седницама председавају среске* (attribute, fem. plural, agrees with *судије*) *судије* (Ј.Ђ. Авакумовић) ‘all the other jury meetings are presided over by the district judges’; *За једним столом су младе* (attribute, fem. plural, agrees with *газде*) *газде* (И. Андрић) (Stevanović 1979, 131) ‘the young masters sit around one table’, but there are counter-examples: *И једног и другог су подстицали моћни* (attribute, masc., plural, agrees with *наше*) *наше* (И. Андрић) ‘the powerful pashas goaded on both the one and the other’, *Са стране и позади јахали* (predicate, masc., plural, agrees with *зантије*) *су зантије ливњанског кајмакама* (И. Андрић) ‘on the side and at the rear rode the Livno Deputy Vizier’s guards’ (Stevanović 1979, 132f.). In Bulgarian, *владика* and such nouns are masc. *Шваба* is a pejorative expression in Serbian to designate Germans (or Austrians). In the singular the noun is masc., in the plural fem, even when Germans and/or Austrians of either sex are meant: *Швабе су гладне* (predicate, fem, plural, agrees with *швабе*) (ВС) ‘the Swabians are hungry’. Note also Вг. *държавният глава* ‘Head of State’ (masc. attribute + fem. noun):

“Прав сте, г-н Радев, че доверието в Народното събрание е критично ниско. Това се дължи на много фактори, но и до голяма степен се дължи на грубите и непремерени нападки на държавния глава, който по Конституция трябва да бъде обединител на

PETER M. HILL

нацията и да води диалог с останалите институции, а не да раздава обидни квалификации”, заяви в отговор Караянчева

“You are right, Mr Radev, that trust in the National Assembly is critically low. That is due to many factors, but to a great extent it is due to the crude and immoderate attacks by the Head of State, who according to the Constitution should be the unifier of the Nation and should conduct a dialogue with the other institutions, and not hand out insulting appraisals”, Karajančeva replied.

(<http://www.politika.bg/article?id=54346>, accessed 1 Feb 2018)

Epicene nouns have only one form, but may refer to animate beings of either sex: Sr. *cucap* ‘mammal’ is masc., but can designate animals of either sex; similarly *птица* ‘bird’ is fem., but can designate birds of either sex, cf. *жаба* ‘frog’, *кос* ‘blackbird’, *славуж* ‘nightingale’, *препелица* ‘quail’, *гуштер* ‘lizard’. The noun *пас* ‘dog’ is masc., but can designate a dog of either sex; there is also a marked fem. form *куја* or *кучка* ‘bitch’. The noun *лисица* can mean (1) ‘fox’ (unmarked for sex) or (2) ‘female fox’ (marked fem. form). The noun *лисац* designates a male fox (marked masc. form). Similarly *овца* designates (1) a sheep (unmarked for sex) or (2) a female sheep (marked for sex), while *ован* designates a male sheep (ram) (marked for sex). With most wild or only partly domesticated animals, sex is of no great significance and so there is normally just one word to denote the species and the gender is random (Hentschel 2003, 291). Where the animal is of economic importance, there are usually terms for the different sexes and the offspring: Sr. *крава* ‘cow’ – *бик* ‘bull’ – *теле* ‘calf’ (Hentschel 2003, 290). Nouns like *особа* ‘person’, *жртва* ‘victim’, *члан* ‘member’ can also be considered to be epicene, since they have a particular gender, but refer to people of either sex (Hentschel 2003, 291).

SEX AND GENDER IN SERBIAN AND BULGARIAN

Substantiva mobilia are those where a change in the desinence reflects the sex, e.g. Latin *filius* m. ‘son’ – *filia* f. ‘daughter’, *magister* m. ‘male teacher’ – *magistra* f. ‘female teacher’, *victor* m. – *victrix* f. ‘victor’, *asinus* m. – *asina* f. ‘donkey’, Russian *супруг* ‘husband’ – *супруга* ‘wife’, Sr. *супруг* ‘husband’ – *супруга* ‘wife’, Bg. *съпруг* – *съпруга*.

In the classical languages nouns that can be either masc. or fem. are said to be of *genus commune* (*substantiva communia*, double-gender nouns, Sr. *двородне именице*): Ancient Greek *ὁ βοῦς* ‘bull’, but *ἡ βοῦς* ‘cow’; Latin *civis* ‘citizen’, which is either fem. or masc., depending on the sex of the person. A good example in Serbian is *варалица* ‘swindler’: *Он је прави* (masc. attribute) *варалица* ‘he’s a real swindler’ vs. *Она је права* (fem. attribute) *варалица* ‘she’s a real swindler’ (Hentschel 2003, 291). Examples of other such double-gender nouns in Serbian are, e.g. *присталица* ‘supporter’, *пијаница* ‘drunkard’, *пропалица* ‘wastrel, reprobate’, *муштерија* ‘customer’, *трчилажа* ‘fabricator’. On the other hand, the following examples designate men, irrespective of whether they display masc. or fem. agreement: *наш присталица* – *наша присталица* ‘our supporter’, *велики пропалица* – *велика пропалица* ‘a great wastrel’, *велики пијаница* – *велика пијаница* ‘a great drunkard’: *Роберт Редфорд: Био сам главна* (fem. attribute) *пијаница на универзитету* (in *Свет*, 2.12.2013) ‘I was the main drunkard at university’. There is also a masc. form *пијанац* and in this case *пијаница* is considered to be the fem. form. If the noun designates a woman, only fem. agreement is possible (agreement by sex): *наша присталица*, *велика пијаница* (Stevanović 1981, 178). Many double-gender nouns are of Turkish origin: Sr. *муштерија* ‘customer’ from Turkish *müşteri*. Bg. *муштерија* (dial.), on the other hand, is a masc. noun. The gender of Sr. *муштерија* is a matter of dispute: according to some dictionaries it is fem, following the desinence, and, according to other dictionaries, it is masc. Vuk (1818) classifies *муштерија* as a fem.

noun, without any commentary and without any examples. *RSKNJ* (XIII, 371) classifies it as a double-gender noun (“ж [fem.] и м [masc.]”). *Будала* ‘fool’ appears to be a double-gender noun: *велики будала/велика будала* ‘a great fool’. Vuk 1818 gives *будала* as a fem. noun. *RSKNJ* (XIII, 371) classifies it as a double-gender noun (“ж [fem.] и м [masc.]”). In *BC*, Nikola Pašić describes himself as *највећа* (fem. attribute) *будала* ‘the greatest fool’. In Bulgarian *будала* is a double-gender noun, i.e., it is fem. or masc., depending on the sex of the person (*RBE*, I, 819). Sr. *комишја* (from Turkish *komşu*, dial. *komşi* ‘neighbour’) is a masc. noun, but it takes fem. agreement in the plural (cf. above); the fem. forms are *комишјиница*, *комишница*, *комишјка* and *комишка*. In Bulgarian, *комишия* (popular usage) is a masc. noun, the fem. is *комишійка*.

2. Sexism in Language

Serbian and Bulgarian, as with many other European languages, have certain sexist characteristics within their systems of gender. For instance, in Serbian one would assume that *човек* means ‘person’ or ‘human being’ (cf. *човечанство* ‘(hu)mankind’, *човечански* ‘human’), as well as its suppletive plural *људи* (cf. *људски* ‘human’), but it is clear that women are not really included, as in *један човек и једна жена* ‘a man and a woman’, *људи и жене* ‘men and women’ (Hentschel 2003, 291), or the utterance *Жене говоре више него људи* ‘women talk more than men’.

In Bulgarian, too, under certain circumstances, *човек* is understood to refer to a man: *Дохожда един човек и пита за тебе* ‘A man turns up and asks for you’. And in dialectal or substandard usage one finds, e.g., *Търсим човека ти* ‘We’re looking for your man’ (i.e. husband); *Нейният човек още не се е върнал* ‘Her man (husband) still has not come back’.

SEX AND GENDER IN SERBIAN AND BULGARIAN

In Russian, the pronoun *никто* is masculine, even when it refers to women, cf. *никто из женщин не пришел* ‘none of the women came (masc. singular predicate)’ (Doleschal & Schmid 2001, 264). Serbian, on the other hand, allows indefinite pronouns to agree with the sex of the referent, as in: *Нека је дошла и питала за тебе* ‘someone (fem. pronoun) came (fem. predicate) and asked (fem. predicate) for you’; *Да ли је нека од њих звала?* ‘Did one (fem. pronoun) of them call (fem. predicate)?’ (Hentschel 2003, 294).

From a grammatical point of view, masc. nouns, pronouns and plural predicates are considered to be unmarked for sex (‘generic masculine’): Sr. *не могу да говорим са два* (masc. [or neuter] numeral) *ученика* (masc. noun) *у исто време* ‘I cannot talk to two pupils at the same time’; ...*говорили су они који ме воле* (BC) ‘the ones (masc. pronoun) who like me spoke (masc. predicate)’; *Дошли су људи и жене* ‘the men and the women came (masc. predicate)’ (Hentschel 2003, 293), *Драги студенти и студенткиње!* ‘Dear (masc. attribute) male students (masc. noun, plural) and female students (fem. noun, plural)’. Mozdierz (1999, 166) writes: “In the category of gender, the feminine form is the marked member of the opposition in that it is restricted to denote only females, while the unmarked masculine does not have such a constraint”, but feminists consider this practice discriminatory, since women become ‘invisible’. Attempts to come to grips with this in Serbian are sometimes observable, e.g., *Драге студенткиње и студенти!* (Hentschel 2003, 293) ‘Dear (fem. attribute) female students and male students’; *Сви студенти и студенткиње* (у даљем тексту *студенти*) ‘all (masc. pronoun) male students and female students (henceforth *студенти*)’ vs. *Они/оне* (у даљем тексту ‘*оне*’) ‘they (masc. plural pronoun)/they (fem. plural pronoun), henceforth *оне* (fem. pronoun)’ (Hentschel 2003, 305); *Активисткиње и активисти Центра за ненасилну акцију Београд* ‘the female activists and the male activists of the Centre for Non-Violent Action Belgrade’;

чланови/це ‘members (masc.)/(fem.)’, *студенти/киње* ‘male students/female students’, *доктори/ке* ‘male doctors/female doctors’; *морамо да будемо свесне и свесни неких ствари* ‘we must be conscious (fem. adjective) and conscious (masc. adjective) of certain things’ (Bugarski 2005, 63).

3. Designations of Professions

Modern European languages with gender can have problems with the designations of professions. Serbian and Bulgarian can form fem. agentives by adding a particular suffix (e.g. Sr. *-ica, -nica, -inja, -ka*, Bg. typically *-ka*, less often also *-ica, -inja, -kinja*) to the masculine form, but whereas Serbian makes abundant use of this, Bulgarian is less likely to do so. The treatment of fem. agentives is, thus, different in the two languages.

Serbian normally has a fem. agentive even for professions and positions of authority. There are traditional forms such as Sr. *секретарица/секретарка* ‘secretary’ or *благајница* ‘cashier’ for low-status occupations. Further, for professions traditionally open to women, not necessarily low-status occupations, such as ‘writer’ or ‘teacher’, there will often be a commonly used feminine agentive, e.g. *наставница/учитељица* ‘teacher’, *професорка* (meaning ‘high-school teacher’), and *студенткиња* ‘student’. Unlike some other languages (e.g., Russian, Macedonian), Sr. *секретарка* can also be used for a high-status position such as ‘First Secretary of the Party’: *Међу највећим фаворитима за функцију председника владе била је и градоначелница Лила и прва секретарка Социјалистичке партије Мартин Обри* (RTV 15 May 2012: http://rtv.rs/sr_ci/evropa/oland-preuzeo-duznost-predsednika-bez-pompe_319178.html) ‘among the greatest favourites for the function of Prime Minister was also the Mayor (fem. noun) of Lille and First (fem. attribute) Secretary (fem. noun) of the Socialist Party Martine Aubry’; *Бивша државна секретарка*

SEX AND GENDER IN SERBIAN AND BULGARIAN

Хилари Клинтон (<https://sr.wikipedia.org>: Председнички избори у САД 2016) ‘the former (fem. attribute) Secretary (fem. noun) of State (fem. attribute) Hillary Clinton’.

In Serbian, *професорка* is often understood to mean ‘professor’s wife’ (Hentschel 2003, 299), otherwise it designates a high-school teacher. In the novel *Време смрти* Milena Katić refers to her former high-school teacher, Nadežda Petrović, as *професорка* and addresses her as *професорко*, even though the latter is now working as a nurse in a military hospital. On the other hand, a university professor, that is, a woman with a high-status profession, is referred to only as *професор*.⁷ According to Klajn (1966, 47f.), in recent years Serbian has seen an increase in fem. agentives such as, *полицајка* ‘police woman’, *преводитељка* ‘woman translator’, *премијерка* ‘Prime Minister (female)’, *пешакиња* ‘woman pedestrian’, *навијачица* ‘female fan’, *гледатељка* ‘woman spectator/viewer’, *слушатељка* ‘woman listener’, *нобеловка* ‘woman Nobel-prize winner’, *герилка* ‘woman guerilla’; but Sr. *генералица* is glossed in *RSKNJ* (III, 238) as ‘general’s wife’. When referring to high-status professions in Serbian one would normally say *Она је лекар/професор/пилот* ‘she is a doctor (masc.)/professor (masc.)/pilot (masc.)’ (but cf. below). In Serbian, agentives of foreign origin regularly form fem. forms with the suffixes *-иња/-киња*, e.g. *социологиња* ‘woman sociologist’, *психологиња* ‘woman psychologist’, *теологиња* ‘woman theologian’, *филозофкиња* ‘woman theologian’ (Hentschel 2003, 295). However, Klajn (1996, 48) disputes this, stating that there are no fem. forms for the names of scholarly professions in *-лог*. This shows that the area is still very fluid. In some cases, *-ка* and *-ица* coexist, as in *професорица/професорка*, *докторица/докторка* (Hentschel 2003, 295).

⁷ This statement may need to be revised, in the light of utterances such as *професорка Универзитета у Београду* ‘Professor (fem.) of the University of Belgrade’ (RTS 1, August 2018).

The problem of fem. agentive nouns is twofold: 1. whether they can easily be formed and 2. whether they are actually used. Hentschel (2003, 297) quotes Nikolić (1954/55, 150): “When we talk about native words denoting professions that have been open to women for a longer time [...] then we usually have the formation of special words, of special forms for male and for female persons [...] *učiteljica* ‘female teacher’, *radnica* ‘female worker’, *pomoćnica* ‘female helper’ [...] However, when we come to talk about a new profession, job, position or title [...], then the doubting begins. Should one say: *drugarica kapetanica* ‘comrade (fem.) captain (fem.)’, *Jovanka S, inženjer hemije* ‘Jovanka S., chemical engineer (masc.)’ or *Jovanka S., inženjerka hemije...?*” However, as early as 1934, forms like *gospodja profesor* were condemned and the formation and use of fem. agentives was advocated (Hentschel 2003, 297).

In some cases it is morphologically difficult to form a fem. agentive. This is the case with, for example, *руководилац* ‘executive, manager’ and *деловођа* ‘manager, book-keeper’, and so these terms are regularly used to designate women (as well as men). But even today there is still considerable hesitation, e.g. all three of the following variants are possible today: *Мој нови професор из математике је жена* ‘My new (masc. attribute) maths teacher (masc. noun) is a woman’; *Из математике имам женског професора* ‘In maths I have a female (masc. attribute) teacher (masc. noun)’; *Ово је моја нова професорка из математике* ‘This is my (fem. pronoun) new (fem. attribute) teacher (fem. noun) in mathematics’ (Hentschel 2003, 298). Stevanović (1981, 177) cites the following examples: *Рада је наш највреднији и најсавеснији судија* ‘Rada (fem. name) is our most capable (masc. attribute) and most conscientious (masc. attribute) judge (masc. noun)’; *Другарица ће бити ваш разредни старешина* ‘This comrade (fem. noun) will be your (masc. pronoun) class (masc. attribute) prefect (masc. noun)’. Some other examples from Serbian TV are:

SEX AND GENDER IN SERBIAN AND BULGARIAN

Министарка правде ‘the Minister (fem. noun) of Justice’, *Министарка финансија* ‘the Minister (fem. noun) of Finances’, *Милица Делевић*, *директорка канцеларије за европске интеграције* ‘Milica (fem. name) Delević, Director (fem. noun) of the Office of European Integration Measures’, *Јоргованка Табаковић*, *гувернер Народне банке Србије* ‘Jorgovanka (fem. name) Tabaković, Governor (masc. noun) of the National Bank of Serbia’ (key on the screen), but the announcer (a woman) and the reporter (also a woman) referred to her as *гувернерка* ‘woman Governor’ (repeatedly); *Тања Мишчевић*, *шеф тима за преговоре са ЕУ* ‘Tanja (fem. name) Mišević, Head of the Team for Negotiations with the EU’, but on other occasions she was referred to as *шефица тима* ‘woman head of the Team’; *Немачка канцеларка и шефица ЦДУ Ангела Меркел* ‘the German (fem. attribute) Chancellor (fem. noun) and the Leader (fem. noun) of the CDU, Angela Merkel’. Currently in Serbian, forms such as *председница* ‘woman president, fem.’ or *посланица* ‘woman ambassador, fem.’ are normal, but, according to Ranko Bugarski, forms such as *предавачица* ‘woman lecturer’, *асистенткиња* ‘woman assistant professor’, *доценткиња* ‘woman lecturer’ still have a “feminist overtone” (“*феминистички призвук*”) (Bugarski 2005, 61-62). There is no fem. form of *војник* ‘soldier’. There is also no acceptable fem. form of *мајстор* ‘tradesman’: *мајсторица* (?), ***мајсторка* (Hentschel 2003, 299). Usage in Serbian is still quite inconsistent, as the following excerpts from an article in Wikipedia (Serbian) demonstrate:

Маја Гојковић је српска политичарка, председник Народне скупштине Републике Србије и бивши градоначелник града Новог Сада. Гојковићева је била члан Српске радикалне странке, из које је искључена 2008. Гојковићева је исте године основала нову странку – Народну партију. Крајем 2012. своју странку припаја Српској напредној странци, где постаје члан председништва. Дана

PETER M. HILL

23. априла 2014. постаје председник Народне скупштине Републике Србије. [...] У политику је ушла почетком 90-их, прво у Народну радикалну странку, која се потом сјединила са Српским четничким покретом [...] и тако се формирала Српска радикална странка, у којој је обављала истакнуте партијске дужности – од секретарке странке до потпредседнице [...] Маја Гојковић је била посланица Српске радикалне странке у Савезној скупштини СР Југославије од 1992.

Maја (fem. name) Gojković is a Serbian (fem. attribute) politician (fem. noun), Chairman (masc. noun) of the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia and a former (masc. attribute) Mayor (masc. noun) of the town of Novi Sad. Mme Gojković (fem. surname) has been a member (masc. noun) of the Serbian Radical Party, from which she was expelled in 2008. Mme Gojković (fem. surname) founded a new party that same year – the People's Party. At the end of 2012 she amalgamated her party with the Serbian Progressive Party, in which she became a member (masc. noun) of the presidency. On 23 April 2014 she became the Speaker (masc. noun) of the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia. She entered politics at the beginning of the 90s, first in the People's Radical Party, which later amalgamated with the Serbian Četnik Movement [...] and thus was formed the Serbian Radical Party, in which she performed prominent party rôles, from Secretary (fem. noun) of the Party to Deputy-President (fem. noun). Maја Gojković was a deputy (fem. noun) of the Serbian Radical Party in the Federal Parliament of the SR Yugoslavia from 1992'.

(<https://sr.wikipedia.org/> - Маја Гојковић)

SEX AND GENDER IN SERBIAN AND BULGARIAN

In Serbian it is still not unusual to use the male agentive when talking about a woman, e.g. *Амерички државни секретар Хилари Клинтон* 'The American (masc. attribute) Secretary of State (masc. attribute, masc. noun) Hillary Clinton', *Нгози Окоњо Ивеала, директор у Светској банци* 'Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, Director (masc. noun) at the World Bank'. Croatian uses *sutkinja* 'woman judge' from *sudac*, but Serbian uses *судија* for both men and women, because *судиница* would still be understood to mean 'judge's wife'; and in titles before persons' names the masc. form is still used: *Професор др Иванка Иванковић*, not *Професорка др Иванка Иванковић*. On a programme on TV Pink in Belgrade, a man referred to the compere, a woman, as *наша домаћица* 'our (fem. attribute) hostess (fem. noun)', to which she replied angrily: *Ја нисам домаћица, ја сам домаћин [masc.] емисије!* 'I am not a hostess, I am the host of the program!' (Bugarski 2005, 61-62).

Klajn (1996, 48) notes that women have achieved some parity in sport with fem. agentives such as *рукометашица* 'woman handball player', *одбојкашица* 'woman volleyball player', *џудисткиња* 'woman judoka', *каратисткиња* 'female student of karate', *ватерполисткиња* 'woman water-polo player', *мачевалка* 'swordswoman' being now completely normal. But in the professions there is still hesitation: according to Klajn, *доценткиња/доценткица* 'woman lecturer', *архитектица* 'woman architect', *адвокатица* 'woman solicitor' are still unusual. There are various fem. forms of *судија*, but none has become established. Quoting S. Nikolić, Klajn notes a tendency to use a fem. address with a masc. professional name, as in *другарица благајник* 'comrade (fem. noun) cashier (masc. noun)', or to indicate the sex of the person by other means, as in *доктор Јелица Петровић, дечји лекар* 'Doctor (masc. noun) Jelica (fem. name) Petrović, paediatrician (masc. noun, with masc. attribute). According to Klajn, there are no fem. forms of scholarly titles in *-лог* (but see above) or for other occupations such as *агроном* 'agronomist', *академик*

‘member of the academy’, *магистар* ‘Master of Philosophy/Arts/Science’, *борац* ‘combatant, veteran’, *стручњак* ‘expert’, *доктор наука* ‘Doctor of Science’, *посланик* ‘ambassador’, *руководилац* ‘executive, manager’ or *вршилац дужности* ‘chargé(e) d’affaires’.

Marković (2012, 118) claims that prescriptive grammar often requires the use of a masc. agentive for a woman. She conducted an experiment with university students and discovered that they do not always use fem. agentives, even where they are available. Quoting Romaine (2001, 156), Marković (2012, 120-122) argues that the purpose of using fem. agentives is “visibility through feminization”, therefore it is not always necessary to use fem. agentives if it is clear from the text that the agent is a woman.

Nikunlassi (2000, 781f.) refers to so-called hybrid nouns in Russian,⁸ which either lack derived female counterparts or whose use is stylistically restricted, e.g., *врач* ‘doctor’, *секретарь* ‘secretary’, *инженер* ‘engineer’, *бухгалтер* ‘book-keeper’, *управдом* ‘janitor’: *недовольная* (fem. attribute) *контролер* (masc. noun) ‘dissatisfied ticket inspector’, *упрямая* (fem. attribute) *бухгалтер* (masc. noun) ‘stubborn book-keeper’. One can say, for example. *Она – отличный/отличная врач* ‘She is an excellent (masc. attribute/fem. attribute) doctor’; *Врач уже пришла* ‘the doctor (masc. noun) has already arrived (fem. predicate)’; *Наша профессор сказала* ... ‘our professor (masc. noun) said ... (fem. predicate)’; *Профессор пришел/пришла* ‘the professor has arrived (masc. predicate)/(fem. predicate)’ (cf. Weiss 1993, 88; RSG 1988, 200; *Russkaja grammatika* 1980, 467f.; Doleschal 2000; Doleschal/Schmid 2001, 263). In Serbian such constructions are not possible: **психолог је рекла да је социолог закаснила* ‘the psychologist (masc. noun) said (fem. predicate) that the sociologist (masc. noun) was late (fem. predicate)’ (Bugarski

⁸ The term was devised by Corbett (1991, 183), cf. also Corbett 2015, Corbett and Fedden 2016.

2005, 62), **инженјер је нацртала скицу* ‘the engineer (masc. noun) drew (fem. predicate) a sketch’ (Hentschel 2003, 292), and they are not necessary, because there will normally be a fem. agentive available (*психологиња, инжењерка/инжењерица*).

The hesitation in using fem. forms may be due in part to the ambiguity of the suffixes used to form fem. agentives, e.g. in Serbian one of the suffixes used to form fem. agentives, *-к(а)*, is also used to form the names of objects, as in *петролејка* ‘petroleum lamp’, *најлонка* ‘nylon stocking’. The suffix *-ица*, which may be used to form feminine agentives, is used also to form deminutives: *сестра – сестрица* ‘sister – little sister’, *рука – ручица* ‘hand/arm – little hand/arm’, *птица – птичица* ‘bird – little bird’, *кућа – кућица* ‘house – little house’, *врџа – врџица* ‘ribbon – little ribbon’, and also to designate devices, as in *слушалица* ‘receiver; headphones’ from *слушати* ‘to listen’ or *дизалица* ‘crane’ from *дизати* ‘to raise, lift’, and also for designations of female animals: *голуб – голубица* ‘male pigeon’ – ‘female pigeon’, *вук – вучица* ‘male wolf – she-wolf’.

Bulgarian has traditional fem. agentives for traditional feminine occupations, such as *секретарка* ‘secretary’, *болногледачка* ‘nurse’, *касиерка* ‘cashier’, *келнерка* ‘waitress’. There are also some older and substandard forms such as *царица* ‘empress’, *даскалица* ‘teacher’ (cf. Scatton 1983, 259). However, unlike Serbs, Bulgarians tend to hesitate to use fem. agentives to designate women in positions of authority, e.g. according to Comati (2009, 177), forms such as *мениџерка* ‘woman manager’ and *министърка* ‘woman minister’ are used only pejoratively. In Bulgarian, theoretically, one can say *Той/тя е лекар* ‘He/She is a doctor (masc. noun)’, though, according to *Enciklopedija* (2000, 401), it is preferable to say *Тя е лекарка* ‘She is a doctor [using the fem. agentive]’. The following examples demonstrate that Bulgarian avoids fem. agentives to designate women in influential positions (from the press): *Еврокомисар Вера Йоурова* ‘EU Commissar (masc. noun) Vera Jourová’; *кметът*

на София Йорданка Фандъкова ‘the Mayor (masc. noun) of Sofia Jordanka (fem. name) Fandǎkova’; an announcement in Bulgarian by the ‘Мелітопольський державний педагогічний університет “Богдан Хмелницьки”’: *Магистър филолог Наталия Василенко – Отлична диплома на нашата студентка!* ‘Master (masc. noun) of Arts (lit., philologist [masc. noun]) Natalija (fem. name) Vasilenko – An excellent diploma for our student (fem. noun)!’

In the following example, a woman is consistently referred to and refers to herself, using masc. forms:

“В бъдещия ми мандат ще видите какво ще направя за здравеопазването.” Това заяви номинираната за здравен министър Таня Андреева, в отговор на изказване на бившия министър на здравеопазването и сега депутат Десислава Атанасова. “Аз съм практикуващ лекар, за разлика от вас [...] .”

“In my coming term of office you will see what I do for public health.” That was the declaration by Tanja (fem. name) Andreeva, who has been nominated for the position of Health (masc. attribute) Minister (masc. noun), in response to a statement by the former (masc. attribute) Minister (masc. noun) of Health, now a back-bencher (masc. noun) Desislava (fem. name) Atanasova. “I am a practising (masc. attribute) doctor (masc. noun), unlike you [...] .”

However, there are exceptions:

Социалистите се възползваха от това, за да атакуват шефката на НС [Народното Събрание] Цвета Караянчева заради изказването ѝ

SEX AND GENDER IN SERBIAN AND BULGARIAN

в сряда след речта на президента Румен Радев. В отчета си след една година на „Дондуков” държавният глава заяви, че парламентарната република е „атрофирала”.

The Socialists took advantage of that to attack the head (fem. noun) of the National Assembly Cveta Karajančeva because of her statement on Wednesday after the speech by the President, Rumen Radev. In his report after a year residing on Boulevard Dondukov, the Head of State declared that the parliamentary republic had “atrophied”.

(<http://www.politika.bg/article?id=54346>, accessed 1 Feb. 2018)

Бившата председателка на регионалния парламент в испанската област Каталуня Карме Форкадел се яви пред върховния съд в Мадрид във връзка с ролята ѝ в движението за независимост.

The former (fem. attribute) speaker (fem. noun) of the regional parliament of the Spanish region of Catalonia Carme Forcadell appeared before the Supreme Court in Madrid in connexion with her role in the independence movement.

(<http://www.bgnes.com/sviat/evropa/4547576/>, accessed 8 March 2018)

An example of *лидерка* ‘leader (fem.) of a political party’ is given below:

Испански съд издаде заповед за арест на влиятелната каталунска сепаратистка лидерка Анна Габриел, ако се върне в Испания от Швейцария. Габриел замина за Швейцария, за да избегне съдебно преследване, предадоха Асошиейтед прес и Франс прес. ‘A Spanish court has ordered the arrest of the influential Catalan separatist leader Anna Gabriel if she returns to Spain from Switzerland. Gabriel

PETER M. HILL

left for Switzerland in order to avoid prosecution, as reported by Associated Press and France Presse’.

(<http://bnr.bg/horizont/post/100936444>, accessed 8 March 2018)

In the following examples, a woman is initially referred to using the fem. form *министър-председателка* ‘Prime Minister (fem. noun)’, but subsequently, once her sex is established, masc. forms are used, although the agreement can be with her sex rather than with the gender of the noun, as in *бившият* (masc. attribute) *премиер* (masc. noun) *е осъдена* (fem. predicate) *задочно* ‘the former PM was sentenced in absentia’:

Върховният съд на Тайланд призна за виновна бившата министър-председателка на Тайланд Инглук Шинаватра ... в небрежност при изпълнението на държавна програма за изкупуване на ориз [...] Бившият премиер е осъдена задочно [...] Първата жена премиер в историята на Тайланд бе обвинена в небрежност при изпълнение на държавна програма за изкупуване на ориз [...]

The Supreme Court of Thailand found the former (fem. attribute) Prime Minister (fem. noun) of Thailand Yingluk Shinawatra guilty [...] of carelessness in implementing the national programme of buying up rice [...] The former (masc. attribute) PM (masc. noun) was convicted (fem. predicate) in absentia [...] The first (fem. attribute) woman (fem. noun) PM (masc. noun) in the history of Thailand was accused (fem. predicate) of carelessness in implementing the national programme of buying up rice [...]

(www.mediapool.bg/bivshata-ministar-predsedatelka-na-tajland-..., accessed 8 March 2018)

SEX AND GENDER IN SERBIAN AND BULGARIAN

In the following example, the accused is initially referred to as *председателка* ‘president, fem.’, but later on in the same report she is referred to as *председател* (masc.):

Окръжната прокуратура в Добрич е предала на съд бившата председателка на читалището “Йордан Йовков” в града за престъпление по служба. Според обвинението тя е нанесла имуществени вреди за над 600 хиляди лева, съобщи БНР [Българското национално радио].⁹ Бившият председател на Народното читалище “Йордан Йовков” е обвинена, че в периода от 2004-та до 2014-та година е подписала договори за проектиране, обзавеждане и ремонт на помещения с братята Ивелин и Димитър Иванови [...] В замяна те са получили под наем помещения на обща площ над 400 квадратни метра [...]

The County Prosecutor’s Office in Dobrič has indicted the former president (fem. noun) of the “Jordan Jovkov” Library in the town for malfeasance in office. According to the charge, she caused material damages of over 600,000 Leva, Bulgarian National Radio reports. The former president (masc. noun) of the “Jordan Jovkov” People’s Library stands accused (fem. predicate) of signing contracts for the planning, equipment and renovation of certain premises in the period from 2004 to 2014 with the brothers Ivelin and Dimităr Ivanov [...] In return, they obtained rental premises amounting to 400 square metres [...]

(<https://www.24chasa.bg/novini/article/6118287>,
accessed 8 March 2018)

⁹ Bulgarian National Radio

4. Conclusion

Gender is a feature of most European languages. With nouns designating animate beings, one assumes that sex and gender coincide, but there are many exceptions, e.g. German *das Kind* (neuter) ‘child’, *die Person* (fem) ‘person’, Russian *лицо* (neuter) ‘person’, Sr. *особа* (fem.) ‘person’. In Serbian some emotive expressions designating girls or women are masc.: *девојчуљак, девојчуак*. Epicene nouns have only one gender, but may refer to animate beings of either sex, e.g. Sr. *жаба* fem. ‘frog’, *славуј* masc. ‘nightingale’. Interestingly, diminutives are neuter in different languages, e.g. German *Mädchen*, Sr. *момче, девојче*, Bg. *момче, момиче*.

European languages currently have to deal with the phenomenon that certain professions previously reserved for men are now open to women. While in English generally – and also, of course, in non-gender languages such as Turkish – there is only one noun to designate both men and women, one would expect that, in the other European languages, fem. agentives would be formed and employed to designate women in these professions, but this area is fraught with difficulties. In some cases, the derivation of a fem. form is morphologically impossible, e.g. Russian *драматург* ‘playwright’, *политик* ‘politician’ (Doleschal & Schmid 2001, 259). A lot of fem. agentives originally designated the wife of the agent. To a certain extent, even today, the fem. agentive is perceived as being subordinate to the male agent. Fem. agentives are mostly derived from masc. agentives using suffixes. The exceptions are the double-gender nouns, where there is no derivation. In Russian masc. agentives can sometimes be construed as fem. (‘hybrid nouns’).

Further, suffixes are often polysemous. The most used feminising suffix in the Slavonic languages, *-k(a)*, has other functions, such as as a diminutive and for producing *nomina instrumenti*. In Russian, Polish, Bulgarian and Italian fem. counterparts of terms denoting prestigious occupations tend to be avoided. Fem. agentives are avail-

able and are normally employed for traditional female occupations. Fem. forms are employed consistently for women in high-status occupations today in German and Croatian (cf. Hill 2014) and increasingly in Spanish and French, but to a lesser extent in Serbian. In Bulgarian there is considerable hesitation in using fem. agentives to designate prestigious occupations.

REFERENCES

- Bugarski, Ranko, 2005: *Jezik i kultura*, Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek – Knjižara Krug.
- Comati, Sigrun, 2009: ‘Bulgarien nach der Wende bis zum EU-Beitritt: Betrachtungen zum Sprachgebrauch aus den Bereichen Wirtschaft, Medien und Musikkultur’, in Voß, Christian (ed.), *EU-Bulgaristik. Perspektiven und Potenziale. Festgabe für Norbert Randow zum 80. Geburtstag* (SLCCEE Band 6), München, Berlin: Otto Sagner, pp. 173-192.
- Corbett, Greville, 1991: *Gender*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Corbett, Greville G., 2015: ‘Hybrid Nouns and Their Complexity’ in Fleischer, Jürgen, et al. (eds.), ‘Agreement from a Diachronic Perspective’ (Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs, vol. 287), Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 191-214.
- Corbett, Greville, and Sebastian Fedden, 2016: ‘Canonical Gender’, *Journal of Linguistics*, 52, 495–531.
- Doleschal, Ursula, 2000: ‘Gender Assignment Revisited’, in Unterbeck, B., et al. (eds.), *Gender in Grammar and Cognition* (Trends in Linguistics 124), Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin, N.Y., pp. 117-166.
- Doleschal, Ursula, & Schmid, Sonja, 2001: ‘Doing Gender in Russian: Structure and Perspective’, in Hellinger, Marlis, & Bußmann, Hadumod (eds.), *Gender*

PETER M. HILL

- across Languages. The Linguistic Representation of Women and Men*, 3 vols, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, vol. 1, pp. 253-283.
- Eckert, Penelope & McConnell-Ginet, Sally, 2003: *Language and Gender*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Enciklopedija*, 2000: *Enciklopedija na sãvremennija bãlgarski ezik: V*. Tãrnovo: Sveti Evtimij Patriarh Tãrnovski.
- Hellinger, Marlis & Bussmann, Hadumod, 2003: 'Engendering Female Visibility in German', in Hellinger, Marlis & Bussmann, Hadumod, (eds.), *Gender across Languages. The Linguistic Representation of Women and Men*, 3 vols, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, vol. 3, pp. 141-174.
- Hentschel, Elke 2003: 'The Expression of Gender in Serbian', in Hellinger, Marlis, & Bußmann, Hadumod, (eds.), Hellinger, Marlis, & Bussmann, Hadumod (eds.), *Gender across Languages. The Linguistic Representation of Women and Men*, 3 vols, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, vol. 3, pp. 259-286.
- Hill, Peter M., 2014: 'Sex and Gender in Croatian and other Languages', *Croatian Studies Review*, 10, 85-103.
- Hockett, Charles F., 1958: *A Course in Modern Linguistics*, NY: Macmillan.
- Kersten-Pejanić, R., Rajilić, S., & Voß, C., (eds.): *Doing Gender – Doing the Balkans. Dynamics and Persistence of Gender Relations in Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav Successor States*, München: Sagner (Studies on Language and Culture in Central and Eastern Europe 20).
- Klajn, Ivan, 1996: 'Leksika' in Radovanović, Milorad (red. nauk.), *Najnowsze dzieje języków słowiańskich. Srpski jezik*, Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski – Instytut filologii Polskiej, pp. 37-86.

- Marković, Liljana, 2012: 'Language and Gender in Tertiary-Level Education' in Kersten-Pejanić, R. et al. (eds.), *Doing Gender – Doing the Balkans. Dynamics and Persistence of Gender Relations in Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav Successor States*, München: Sagner (Studies on Language and Culture in Central and Eastern Europe 20), pp. 109-126.
- Meseguer, Alvaro G., 1991: 'Gender-Sex Clashes in Spanish: A Semantic Typology of Animated Nouns (A Contribution to the Study of Linguistic Sexism)' *Journal of Pragmatics*, 15, 445-463.
- Mozdzierz, Barbara M., 1999: 'The Rule of Feminization in Russian' in Mills, Margaret H., (ed.), *Slavic Gender Linguistics*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: J. Benjamins (eBook), pp. 165-181.
- Nikolić, Svenka, 1954/1955: 'Oblici imena zvanja', *Naš jezik, nova serija* 5/6, 148-152.
- Nikunlassi, Ahti, 2000: 'On gender assignment in Russian' in Unterbeck, B. et al. (eds.), *Gender in Grammar and Cognition* (Trends in Linguistics 124), Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin, N.Y., pp. 771-791.
- Nissen, Uwe Kjær, 1986: 'Sex and Gender Specification in Spanish' *Journal of Pragmatics*, 10, 725-738.
- Proudfoot, Anna, & Cardo, Francesco, 1997: *Modern Italian Grammar*. London, N.Y.: Routledge.
- RBE: Rečnik na bālgarskija ezik*. Sofija: 1977-.
- RSKNJ: Rečnik srpskohrvatskog književnog i narodnog jezika* 1959-. Beograd: Institut za srpskohrvatski jezik.
- Romaine, Suzanne, 2001: 'A Corpus-Based View of Gender in British and American English' in Hellinger, Marlis & Busmann, Hadumod (eds.), *Gender across*

PETER M. HILL

- Languages. The Linguistic Representation of Women and Men*, 3 vols, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, vol. 1, pp. 153-175.
- RSG: Die Russische Sprache der Gegenwart*, Bd. 2: *Morphologie*, 1988. Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie.
- Russkaja grammatika*, tom I, 1980, Moskva: Nauka.
- Scatton, Ernest A., 1983: *A Reference Grammar of Modern Bulgarian*, Columbus: Slavica.
- Stevanović, M., 1979: *Savremeni srpskohrvatski jezik (gramatički sistemi i književno-jezička norma, II: Sintaksa*. Beograd: Naučna knjiga, 3 izd.
- Stevanović, M., 1981: *Savremeni srpskohrvatski jezik (gramatički sistemi i književno-jezička norma), I: Uvod. Fonetika. Morfologija*. Beograd: Naučna knjiga, 4 izd.
- Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, 1985 [1818]: *Srpski rječnik*, Beograd: Prosveta, Nolit.
- Weiss, Daniel, 1993: 'How Many Sexes are there? Reflections on Natural and Grammatical Gender in Contemporary Polish and Russian' in Hentschel, G., & Laskowski, R., (eds.), *Studies in Polish Morphology and Syntax*, München: Sagner, pp.71-105.

REVIEWS

Giovanna Brogi Bercoff, Marko Pavlyshyn, Serhii Ploky (eds), *Ukraine and Europe: Cultural Encounters and Negotiations*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017. ISBN 9781487500900. vii + 461 pages.

The result of several years of work and the main output of a conference held in Gargano, Italy, in 2011, this collection is doubtless one of the most significant contributions to Ukrainian studies in recent years. The volume, one more demonstration of the commitment of the University of Toronto Press to supporting the study of Ukrainian literature and culture, features twenty-two contributions by prominent authors working in Europe (including Ukraine), North America, and Australia.

Thanks to the diverse expertise and fields of research of the authors, the book covers the span of Ukrainian cultural history from the Baroque period to the post-Maidan present. As the editors clearly state in their introduction, their privileged viewpoint on this key issue of Ukrainian national and cultural identification is literary studies, although the book does not fail to include chapters written by historians, linguists and philologists. George G. Grabowicz's contribution, the first after the editors' preface, sets the tone for the entire volume, problematising the nature of Ukraine's complex Europeanness, as diverse and multiform as the idea of Europe itself. Seven articles (Giovanna Brogi Bercoff, Michael S. Flier, Natalia Yakovenko, Michael Moser, Frank E. Sysyn, Natalia Pylypiuk, Giovanna Siedina) explore the European features of Ukrainian culture in the early-modern era from the point of view of literary studies, history and linguistics. Six contributions (Marko Pavlyshyn, Edyta M. Bojanowska, Giulia Lami, Maxim Tarnawsky, Stefan Simonek, Yaroslav Hrytsak) deal with Ukraine's complex European path from Romanticism to Modernism, focusing on

REVIEWS

Western Europe's image of Ukraine, the Ukrainian perception of Western Europe and their encounter in and through literature, with or without Russian mediation. The remaining seven articles (Oleh S. Ilnytzkyj, Tamara Hundorova, Alexander Kratochvil, Halyna Hryn, Oxana Pachlovksa, Ola Hnatiuk, Serhii Plokhii) gauge the interconnections between Ukraine and Europe in the long and extremely diverse period spanning late Imperial times, the Soviet era and the present age, making use of a wide range of methodologies and approaches.

The considerable attention devoted to the early-modern period is another remarkable feature of the book, which can be greeted as an indirect plea for a comprehensive approach to the study of literature and culture in a moment in which modern and contemporary studies, on the one hand, and Medieval and early-modern studies, on the other hand, seem to be regrettably condemned to move along different trajectories. As one would expect from a collective of authors, the volume shows a broad variety of methodological approaches to the study of the relation between Ukrainian culture and Europe, ranging from an analysis of the European theme in writings of Ukrainian authors, to descriptions of other authors' responses to their own experience of the West and of European culture, to the study of the Western image of the Ukrainian lands. The chronological approach is thus masterfully combined with a range of diachronic interconnections between different chapters and epochs, which allows the book to be read and re-read from several perspectives. The two conclusive contributions stand out in their rather explicit perlocutionary character, as two fine pieces of academic writing directed not only to academic readers, but also to (Ukrainian) intellectuals and (Western) politicians respectively.

In their study of Ukraine's participation in the European cultural space and of Ukraine's appropriations of European narratives, the authors of the collection have consistently sought to problematise their subject matter, shedding light on the multi-

REVIEWS

furious and often contradictory character of both Ukraine's self-perception in a European perspective and European culture itself. The very idea of Europe is not subsumed to a stereotypical set of values and achievements, but presented in the variety of its progressive and conservative policies and worldviews. Ukraine's response to European stimuli is, consequently, seen as a programme of continuous negotiations, as explicitly stated in the title of the book, comprising a wide range of reactions, which span the entire range from attraction to rejection. At the same time, the book cannot but be seen as a scholarly homage to Ukraine's cultural and geopolitical efforts in its path towards full integration in the European space. Last but not least, the scholarship presented in the volume is also a tribute to Ukraine's multilingual cultural heritage, which has resulted in the production of literary works and cultural artefacts written in a number of languages other than Ukrainian, including Latin, Polish and Russian.

One could wish that more attention had been dedicated to some periods which are slightly under-represented, including the late 18th century and the early years of the post-Soviet era. It is nevertheless evident that 'Ukraine and Europe' will surely prompt scholars of Ukrainian studies to undertake further research in this area, building on the legacy of this remarkable edited collection.

Alessandro Achilli
Monash University

REVIEWS

Michael S. Flier, Valerie Kivelson, Erika Monahan & Daniel Rowland (eds), *Seeing Muscovy Anew: Politics — Institutions — Culture: Essays in Honor of Nancy Shields Kollmann*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica Publishers, 2017. ISBN 978-089357-481-9. viii + 416 pages.

This book is another in a distinguished series of *Festschrift* volumes emanating from the USA, and mostly published by Slavica or by the Harvard Ukrainian Research Unit. Preceding volumes that I know have honoured A. A. Zimin, Ned Keenan (twice), Don Ostrowski, Horace Lunt, Daniel Kaiser, Richard Hellie, Michael Flier, Daniel Rowland, and Robert Crummey. The leaders in the field of early-modern studies of Muscovy came together again at Stanford University in 2015 to honour another scholar: Nancy Shields Kollmann. The book is a triumph. The essays are uniformly stimulating, clustering around sixteenth- and seventeenth-century themes, and re-addressing key debates and problems in the early East Slav field with fresh evidence. The most pleasing aspect of the book is how these historians do not always see things the same way. Unlike Soviet-era scholarship with its obsessive-compulsive focus on forms of homage and a long and systematic review of the literature, there is no ‘line’ to be followed here, save for a remarkable privileging of the primary sources: whether chronicles, illustrations in chronicles, genealogies, hagiographies, oaths and incantations, complaints about besmirched honour, population registers, and translations of concepts. These scholars are truly the imagined sons and daughters of A. A. Zimin, the first to point to the importance of focussing on the sources, and not on the chorus.

Sergei Bogatyrev opens the collection by showing how Muscovite boyar obsessions with honour, clan rank-service and genealogies in the sixteenth-century — a topic Ned Keenan encouraged Nancy Kollmann to make her own — oddly find few echoes in princely chronicles. By contrast, a later contributor to the volume, Alexan-

REVIEWS

der Kamenskii, traces the unusual persistence of disputes about honour and slights between merchants in eighteenth-century Russia. Through an artful juxtaposition of changes in the manuscripts, Bogatyrev shows his mastery of textual analysis and suggests that the lists of princes compiled in non-princely Novgorod in the late-fourteenth- and early-fifteenth centuries set the pattern, as different Novgorod clan élites used lists of Grand Princes in neighbouring states to locate themselves in and amongst potential allies in other Rus' dynasties.

Charles Halperin surveys the influence of Ivan IV on Muscovite political culture, offering fresh evidence to establish some distinct points of view. He surveys the key tendencies in the field: the tyrannical 'hypertrophic state' thesis (most often associated with Harvard's Richard Pipes) and the oligarchical 'collegial-consensual' state thesis (ditto, with Harvard's Edward Keenan). Some of his most stimulating points carry footnotes prefaced by, "Despite the work of ...". The essay is a welcome review of some of the major trends in the field. We have the paper in the volume, but in this case, I also wanted to read a summary of the discussion!

Valerie Kivelson's penetrating essay offers a fresh perspective on the motives for Ivan IV's extraordinary *Oprichnina*. She validates most aspects of the classic foreigner accounts by a Pomeranian-born Livonian prisoner in Muscovy, Albert Schlichting (captured in 1564, serving at the Kremlin in Muscovy in 1568-70), by the Westphalian adventurer, Heinrich von Staden (an *Oprichnik* doubling as a spy for the Order of Teutonic Knights), and by the Livonians Johann Taube & Elert Kruse. Kivelson contrasts her careful readings of monastic chronicles, whose discretion did not completely overrule their fears that Ivan IV might be Satan. Using her studies of Muscovite oaths and spells, Kivelson also casts new light on the eschatological interpretation of Ivan's behaviour (which relies on the lost evidence of the frescoes in the Golden Hall, and the surviving evidence of the battle banner, the throne in the Uспен-

REVIEWS

sky Cathedral and the political icon, “Blessed is the Host of the Heavenly Tsar”). Kivelson also shows that Muscovites believed that powerful and ordinary people alike were capable of being captured by Satan. *Grozny*’s indiscriminate violence and his choice of bizarre symbols referenced those beliefs: the black-ropes and steeds, the severed heads of dogs and especially his insistence that his *Oprichniki* break all ties with the *Zemshchina* and with their families. The eschatological and the demonic were two sides of the same coin, hence Schlichting’s report of Ivan’s profession of guilt when chastised by a Metropolitan, possibly the Filipp Kolychev celebrated in Kurbsky’s history of Ivan IV.

Russell Martin continues his work on Muscovite court politics, viewed from the angle of the management of dynastic marriages and betrothals. Martin shows conclusively why these rituals were important, and the clan tensions they managed. Martin also shows that the elaborate Muscovite system of clan precedence in service ranking (*mestnichestvo*) was widely in use (*s mest*) in dynastic marriages in the sixteenth century, but was avoided (*bez mest*) in the seventeenth century. Martin fails to explain why the custom changed, however.

David Goldfrank’s study is a subtle and impressive exploration of Iosif Volotskii’s notions of honour, another homage to an important theme in the work of Nancy Kollmann. This study complements another recent study of Volotskii’s barbed invectives. Goldfrank revises Kollmann’s sound view based on her fine reading of the court cases between boyar clans about honour disputes. Goldfrank finds a new source. He points to how the founder of the influential Volokolamsk monastery, Iosif Volotskii, framed an acerbic and uncompromising stance about the honour of the clergy and about the impossibility of compromising on matters of doctrine. These clerical stances breached the mediatory and reconciliatory objectives of the system of secular honour and standing (*mestnichestvo*) which Kollmann studied. Facing heresy, Volotskii was

REVIEWS

convinced ridicule (*poruganie*), denigration (*unichizhenie*) and dishonour (*bezchestie*) were legitimate tools of leading white clergy. Something of Edward Keenan's classic point about commonalities in the peculiarities of old-Muscovite, late-Soviet (and now Putin-era) Russian political culture now comes back into view: an axle-and-spokes essential notion of autocracy as the only guarantee of stability, though the actual power of the autocrat may or may not be real. The ideological unity and purity of assertions of autocracy may still be associated, in practice, with other notions of oligarchy and compromise (Muscovite boyar, Soviet *nomenklatura*, Putin robber-baron).

Donald Ostrowski sorts contending lines of argument about whether heretical 'Judaizers' existed in Jew-free Muscovy. He supports Iakov Luria's scepticism, but nonetheless describes well the bases, which he thinks are flimsy, for the alternate lines of argument about this surprising late-fifteenth-century Muscovite clerical concern. Most scholars who think that where there was smoke, there must have been fire, point to the crucial translation work conducted in Lithuanian and Ruthene Rus' by Jewish intellectuals who helped to restore Old-Orthodox gospels, psalters and other texts which had become riddled with copyists' errors and gaps. Experience with nineteenth- and twentieth-century history surely suggests there is no need to find fire whenever smoke is sniffed.

The recent and unprecedented publication, in 37 glorious volumes, by *Akteon*, of Muscovite illustrated universal chronicles (*Litsevoi letopisnoi svod*) has stimulated three essays in this volume by Michael Flier, Daniel Rowland and Isolde Thyrêt. *Litsevye svody* were elaborate compilations. They were also illustrated extensively: some 16,000 images, mostly in black ink, most seemingly rather formulaic, but not under the guise of these scholars. The *svody* were sponsored by the same Orthodox circle which had sponsored the innovation of the crowning a 'Tsar' in 1547. The compilation coincided with the otherwise troubled years of the late-1560s and 1570s: the *Op-*

REVIEWS

richnina era. Flier analyses the elaborate cartoon account of the assassination at Bogoliubovo, outside Vladimir, of Grand Prince Andrei Bogoliubskii in 1174. Flier notes the mid-16th-century *Litsevoi* account was determined *not* to make a martyr of the assassinated prince who had resisted his murder as best he could, listing him only as “blessed” (*blazhennyi*); 15th-century Hypatian accounts would have made him a martyr. Flier speculates cogently about an implied message, preferring to extol passive non-resistance to evil, rather than the resistance evident in the narrative about Bogoliubskii’s plucky attempts to ward off, and hide from, his assassins.

Thyrêt uses the *Litsevye svody* to contrast the accounts of the conversion of the Finno-Ugric (Zyrian) pagan peoples of Perm. There was a late-14th-century contemporary hagiography of the monk who converted the Zyrians, St Stephen of Perm (d. 1396), written by a fellow monk and friend, Epifanii Premudryi. And then there is a revisionist account in the 1560s-1570s *Litsevoi* account. Thyrêt shows how the later account, both text and illustrations, presumed more Muscovite state support for Stephen’s endeavour than was evident in the original account. The later account canonises Stephen as a key agent of Orthodox empire, albeit with ongoing but inaccurate concerns about the survival of pagan practices. Epifanii’s earlier account, however, was far more heedful of Finno-Ugric pagan religious practices, even when describing Stephen’s callous attacks on idols, showing much more understanding of the role pagan shamans and sorcerers in the local (fur trading) economy and (taiga) culture.

By contrast, Rowland dwells equally effectively on the illuminations in the same chronicle dealing with the worrisome early death of Vasilii III, the unsettling infancy of Ivan IV, and the regency of the supposed Belarus temptress, Elena Glin-skaia. Rowland discerns new evidence for Keenan’s and Bogatyrev’s theses, emphasising the oligarchical basis of Muscovite society, behind a façade of autocracy. Rowland cites the way sovereigns from Ivan III through to Ivan IV were always depicted

REVIEWS

in the *Litsevye svody* surrounded by counsellors. The hands of the boyars may have been depicted open in a Eurasian gesture of faith and acquiescence, but their constant presence around the ruler seems to tell quite another tale, argues Rowland.

Other studies in this excellent collection explore the late-seventeenth-to-early-eighteenth-century work of Karion Istomin, a rare intellectual of the era who was not from Belarus or Ruthenia. Gary Marker reveals the westernising agenda in Istomin's illustrations and from the courtly audience for his texts. Brian Boeck reconstructs the appalling thirteen-percent death rates applying to the state peasants whom Peter the Great conscripted to build Azov. Paul Bushkovitch analyses the sixteenth-century work and workers who compiled the first French, German, Polish and English dictionaries of Russian, focussing on their difficulties in translating political posts and concepts. Georg Michels impresses by exploring Habsburg archival sources in German and Italian, complemented by secondary sources in Hungarian by Magyar Orientalists. Focussing on the role of the Habsburg ambassador to the Sublime Porte, Giacomo Baptista Casanova, Michels pieces together Habsburg counter-espionage measures when trying to deal with the extraordinary threat posed, after the fall of Crete in 1669, by the Bosnian Köprülü dynasty of Ottoman Grand Viziers of the *Avci* Sultan Mehmed IV (r. 1648-87).

Overlooking similarities with Ottoman and Tatar-Mongol Islam, Eve Levin explores how monasteries in Muscovy were used to house the insane relatively humanely. Erika Monahan studies a late-seventeenth- and eighteenth-century merchant family's salt enterprise in the Urals. Janet Martin's essay on the first century of Muscovite policy on conditional land tenure (*pomest'e*) reveals how the state used the policy more and more to protect widows, thereby safeguarding the next generation of gentry cavalrymen. Her essay also reinforces a general theme in the book: how the hold of the Muscovite state over Rus' society enlarged during the sixteenth century,

REVIEWS

and how the enlargement was in general something which the people of Rus' welcomed. Serhii Plokhy traces the history of cartography and the emergence of 'Ukraine' on maps in the first decades of the seventeenth century.

This collection is informative, accomplished and provocative throughout. While the size of the 'tribe' of early-modern East-Slav historians is small, and shrinking, the quality of the essays in this collection are ample proof of the need for early-modern studies not to be too focussed on western and Mediterranean Europe, and for studies of Russian history not to become the sole prerogative of modernists, whether they call themselves Soviet or post-Soviet. Be inspired.

Adrian Jones
Latrobe University

Karin Hyldal Christensen, *The Making of the New Martyrs of Russia: Soviet Repression in Orthodox Memory*. London, UK: Routledge, 2018. ISBN 978-0-415-78696-6. xi + 234 pages.

Any attempt to understand the new Russia that has emerged since 1991 must take into account the religious aspects of national culture. This book focuses on a specific element in the Orthodox piety that has made its appearance in the public imagination since the collapse of the Soviet Union. The book is based on the author's doctoral thesis, which in turn draws upon more than a decade of living in Russia and extensive, well documented interviews with more than thirty key players in the re-emergence of Orthodoxy as a powerful social force. The point of focus is the official acknowledgement and veneration of the so-called 'new martyrs', those Orthodox church people

REVIEWS

who perished for their faith during the Soviet period, especially during the civil war of the early 1920s and the ‘Great Terror’ of 1937-38. As such, the book represents an important piece of research into contemporary Russia. The author distinguishes three distinct processes in moves to acknowledge the martyrs: canonisation, iconisation and veneration.

Canonisation, or the making of new saints, is seen as an exercise of power on the part of the Russian Orthodox Church (ROC), though this is not the major emphasis of Christensen’s treatment. Rather, her emphasis is on the novelty of the canonisations since 1988, the millennium of Christianity in Russia, and, in the author’s estimation, the watershed year for church renewal in the ROC. These canonisations are new in two ways. Firstly, there is the sheer number of new saints, which at the time of writing had added 1,776 new saints to the approximately 300 Russian saints canonised over the previous thousand years. Secondly, these saints are martyrs, and thus very different from the more traditional style of Russian saints, predominantly holy ascetics. As martyrs, their lives also draw attention to the moral ambiguities of Soviet society and the compromises made by many Soviet citizens. This has led to controversies within the ROC as to the strictness of the criteria to be applied for sainthood, and the timing of canonisations. There have also been calls from the public to curtail freedom of information about relatives who have been or may be exposed as Soviet-era informers. The Russian Orthodox Church outside Russia (ROCOR), which did not need to consider such sensitivities, had already canonised a number of martyrs before the church reunion of 2007.

The section on iconisation includes the compiling of written hagiographies, as well as depicting the new saints in painted icons. This is an exercise in ‘functional aesthetics’, according to Christensen, who outlines a number of problems in both these processes. One is the extent to which information is available, and how this in-

REVIEWS

formation should be written up. Should it be a bare outline of a life, or should it be an evocation of prayer to the saint? Can the files of the secret police be relied upon for accurate information? On the one hand, they constitute valuable primary sources for the hagiographer, but they also represent the voice of the perpetrator. The existence of photographs also poses a problem for the icon-writer: to what extent is she bound by the photographic likeness, when the whole nature of iconography is to find and depict a transfigured image of the saint?

The third section, on veneration, is comprised largely of a fascinating case study of the shrine at the Butovo Polygon, the former military base outside Moscow where many of the executions took place. The Polygon is now administered by and memorialised under the oversight of the ROC. This in itself is problematic, as many of the victims were not Orthodox or even Christian. Many of the executioners themselves became victims in due course. An interesting effect of this concerns the representation of the perpetrators in the new icons: are they to be represented in profile, with disfigured faces, effectively (in the symbolism of traditional iconography) as devils, or as human beings in need of salvation? Not least of the problems associated with the veneration of the new martyrs is that the promotion of their cult has been largely a top-down endeavour by the leadership of the ROC, rather than a case of popular, local, bottom-up piety. Again, this supports Christensen's thesis that the canonisations have been an exercise of power. In a church that values reception by the people as an indicator of validity, this must loom as a matter of concern for the ROC.

The book is not without its problems. Some passages are in need of clearer editing, an example being the paragraph on the Old Believers (pp. 24-25). There are statements that require explanation. What does it mean, for example, to assert that the government of Nicholas II 'lacked secular legitimacy' (p. 25)? There are places where the argument seems to jump over a missing premise. For example, on pp. 84-85, the

REVIEWS

author correctly makes the association between sanctity and *svet* (light), but then moves to the notion of sanctity as deification. It may have been useful here to have mentioned the role of enlightenment in the process of sanctification. A larger possible issue throughout the book is the author's reliance on the concept of a 'mimetic chain' between the worshipper and the saint (pp. 89 ff., *passim*). Although the idea of imitating Christ, or a saint as an *alter Christus*, appears in eastern spirituality, it is more prominent in western piety. Eastern Orthodox spirituality, in my understanding, focuses more on participation, on entering into a living relationship with the saint. One of the sources Christensen cites (Maksimov, p. 168) in support of her mimetic understanding of veneration seems to me to speak much more of a participatory than an imitative relationship. Despite these quibbles, the book is an important, well researched contribution to our understanding of post-Soviet Russia, of which the religious aspects are very significant drivers.

Rev. Dr. Duncan Reid

Trinity College Theological School, Melbourne

M. N. Epstein, A. A. Genis, and S. M. Vladiv-Glover, *Russian Postmodernism: New Perspectives on Post-Soviet Culture* (translated by S. M. Vladiv-Glover). New York, NY: Berghahn Books, 2016. ISBN 978-1-78238-864-7. xxii + 579 pages.

Berghahn Books is a publisher of scholarly books and academic journals in the humanities and social sciences, with a special focus on social and cultural anthropology, European history, politics, and film and media studies. *Russian Postmodernism* is a title in Berghahn's General Cultural Studies list. The first edition of this title — published in 1999 — constituted Volume 3 in Berghahn's Studies in Slavic Literature,

REVIEWS

Culture and Society series, edited by Thomas Epstein. Whilst this independent publisher was founded relatively recently (1994) it has published over 160 titles on Slavic topics at time of writing.

There are three contributors to this book: Mikhail Epstein, Alexander Genis and Slobodanka Vladiv-Glover. All three authors have played their part in contributing to the five sections: 'The Making of Russian Postmodernism', 'Manifestos of Russian Postmodernism', 'Socialist Realism and Postmodernism', 'Conceptualism' and 'Postmodernism and Spirituality'. In the first instance, these sections aim to answer the questions that Thomas Epstein asks in his Preface to the First Edition: "What was Russian postmodernism?" and "What will come after it?" This is augmented by Mikhail Epstein's reflections on 'Postmodernism and the Explosive Style of the Twenty-First Century', where he questions the future of postmodernism under Putin's "New Muscovy". Both prefaces lead in to Vladiv-Glover's introduction which uses as its base Mikhail Epstein's concept of *новое сектантство* to examine examples of 'New Sectarianism' from Vladimir Sorokin and Alexei Varlamov. Vladiv-Glover goes on to explore, through a close reading of these texts, how these exemplify the Pleasure Principle. She concludes by contrasting the 'inoperosity' — Giorgio Agamben's term — of significant aspects of Russian life with Tolstoy's test for cultural authenticity. The essays in the following sections are, in aggregate, tightly thematic and generally speaking, the collection of essays manages to achieve the goals set out in the prefaces.

I found the section entitled 'The Making of Russian Postmodernism' the most absorbing of the five. It contains four entries: two by Mikhail Epstein and one each by the other two authors. Epstein's essay on the 'Dialectics of Hyper' connects modernism and postmodernism through the concept of 'hyper', with its connotations of approaches that are excessive and/or heightened. The author runs the gamut of domains

REVIEWS

from science and culture, through textuality, the existential, sexuality, sociality and materiality, concluding with a section on the transition from ‘super’ to ‘pseudo’. Epstein follows up his essay on the conceptual development of postmodernism with a chapter that deals with its historical development — ‘postfuturicity’ (*послебудущее*) in Russian — noting that “the similarity between postmodernism and communism as programmatic methods of influencing public consciousness is not at all coincidental” (p. 52). Epstein proceeds to analyze the debt of the postmodern project in Russia to both the communist project and socialist realism (and its successor Sots-Art).

However, Slobodanka Vladiv-Glover’s chapter on ‘The Rediscovery of the Other’ is cut from different cloth. She situates the emergence in the 1960s of Andrei Bitov’s novel *Pushkin House* at the confluence of two cultural streams: those of the Soviet novels of the 1930s and the later influences of Hemingway and Salinger. Vladiv-Glover then uses *Pushkin House* as an exemplar of the rediscovery of the other, combining close reading of the novel with Freudian and Lacanian analysis, augmented by references to Derrida. This results in a rich interpretation of the novel employing a semiotic vocabulary supplemented by a Foucauldian archaeological methodology. This process results in an examination of the nature of identity and difference as it plays out in Bitov’s novel. Vladiv-Glover’s dense argument will reward careful readers.

‘Perestroika as a Shift in Literary Paradigm’ is an offering by Alexander Genis that comprises the last chapter in this section. Genis takes us through what he sees as the collapse of Russian literature during this period and its re-emergence out of that silence caused by the “end of utopia” (p. 158). On the basis of his analysis he looks forward to the genres he considers the foundation for the immediate future of Russian literature: mystery and detective stories, science fiction and humanistic *belles lettres*

REVIEWS

(‘art about art’). He concludes that “the representation of reality is abandoned in favour of the modelling of reality” (p. 166).

In summary, I found this book to be an absorbing reference, although somewhat daunting in its density. However, it is not without its disappointments, the most conspicuous being the excision of the appendix containing a ‘Who’s Who’ of Russian Postmodernism which appeared in the first edition. Presumably this was done for reasons of space, but the removal of such a valuable resource detracts from the addition of the three new chapters mentioned in the Preface to the Second Edition. Other issues occasionally crop up — sometimes relating to the currency of material — but it would be churlish to cavil at these in such a useful resource.

John Cook
University of Melbourne

A.B. McMillin. *Breaking with Tradition: Belarusian Short Prose in the Early Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge, UK: Modern Humanities Research Association, 2018. ISBN 978-1-781887-70-7. 84 pages.

Following in the footsteps of *Spring Shoots* and *Writing in a Cold Climate*, as well as McMillin’s earlier well-known inquiries on Belarusian literature, *Breaking with Tradition: Belarusian Short Prose in the Early Twenty-First Century* presents the most up-to-date overview of the thematic scope of the contemporary Belarusian literary scene. While paying less attention to the idiosyncrasies of its language and style, McMillin creates a detailed reconstruction of Belarusian short prose’s heterogeneous thematic profile by exploring how various subjects – from romance to politics, from

REVIEWS

beliefs and myths to hardships of everyday life – are approached by Belarussian authors.

The first chapter of *Breaking with Tradition* deals with representations of love and sex in the works of young Belarussian authors. In McMillin's account, romantic and sexual relationships rarely originate from overwhelming feelings. Love is almost always represented as an antidote to ubiquitous and excruciating loneliness. This is true for both stories reflecting traditional patriarchal gender roles and those incarnating alternative romantic scenarios. McMillin does not delve into the question about the origins of this cultural script, yet his comments about the marginal status of young Belarussian-speaking intellectuals in a discourse strongly affected by state propaganda allows the reader to account for the recurrence of the theme of loneliness in Belarussian short prose and the subsequent renegotiation of romantic love as a refuge (alas, often futile) from solitude and a hostile environment.

In the second chapter, 'The World and Its Inhabitants', McMillin points at the diversity of plots through which different stages of human life are conceptualised by Belarussian authors. He then highlights the role of narratives about the animal world in the aesthetic space of Belarussian prose. For instance, stories portraying fish, are either characterised by the motif of determination, passion and confrontation (when fish are presented as humans' prey) or the theme of escape to an alternative reality (when a human is transformed into a fish). McMillin contends how the first theme follows traditions in Western literature by mentioning the works of Hemingway and Harris. At the same time, the second theme equally demonstrates a certain rhetorical similarity with Western literary works, such as Judy Budnitz's *Flush* and Daniel Wallace's *Big Fish: A Novel of Mythic Proportions*. Other animals, particularly cats and dogs, tend to function in the stories as catalysts of humans' emotions and behaviour and, thus, allow authors to highlight particular features of characters.

REVIEWS

In the third chapter of his book, McMillin describes the interplay of myths, beliefs, philosophical ideas and fantasies in the short prose's artistic interpretation of reality. The works considered in the book testify to authors' largely critical attitude towards the Christian (and particularly, Orthodox) church and their frequent adoption of the rhetoric of magic realism and science fiction in the reflections on spirituality and philosophical issues.

Chapters four, five and six reflect different facets of Belarusian authors' complex national identities. The representations of opposition to (almost Kafkaesque) power in short prose is shown to follow a more satirical vector, compared to, for instance, contemporary drama by the Belarusian Free Theatre. The narratives about language tend to avoid straightforward accusations of Belarusians for neglecting their mother tongue. Instead, they portray it as an attribute of a different, sometimes fairy-tale-like world. The invincible mystical power of the language is presented as responsible for the authors' addiction to creative writing and its transformative effect upon reality. Finally, historical prose follows one of the focal strategies of the construction of national pride by celebrating the glorious past of the Great Lithuanian Kingdom. It tends to adopt postmodern aesthetics, following the traditions of both Belarusian (Uladzimir Karatkievič) and European (Umberto Eco, Julia Kristeva) literatures of the twentieth century. By contrast, the stories about World War II created by young authors sporadically deviate from previous, Soviet ideology-inspired, scenarios and suggest alternative interpretations of the past. Thus, as rightly outlined by McMillin, Siarhiej Balachonaŭ echoes the ideas of Vasilii Grossman by replacing the motif of patriotism and resistance with the critique of all authoritarian régimes in his *Fifteen Superfluous Minutes*. Sieviaryn Kviatkoŭski's *May Saga* is reminiscent of Mario Vargas Llosa's *Captain Pantoja and the Special Service* with its satiric focus peppered with erotic images.

REVIEWS

It is not entirely clear from McMillin's work in what sense he finds contemporary Belarusian prose to break with traditions. The authors reviewed by McMillin do indeed sporadically touch on previously tabooed topics (such as homosexuality), yet, as the book demonstrates, they are actively drawing on the narrative resources of preceding Belarusian literature, as well as inscribing themselves in the global literary process. A few instances of word plays in cited works would benefit from explanations for foreign readers. Finally, a few seminal topics of twenty-first-century thought (technological progress, globalisation, multiplicity of truth) are not paid much attention in the book. It leaves the reader with the question whether these themes are not characteristic of the works selected or whether they are somewhat excluded from the Belarusian literary canon. In spite of this, McMillin's work makes an invaluable contribution to the scholarship on Belarusian literature. Considering the difficulties with accessing the texts (often hard to find in print, as well as on the Internet), McMillin's successful inclusion of these rare works in his analysis allows him to shed light not only on the writing of the renowned representatives of the Belarusian literary scene, but also on the subtle undercurrents of the literary process.

Palina Urban
New College, University of Oxford

REVIEWS

Dennis Ioffe, Marcus Levitt, Joe Peschio, and Igor Pilshchikov (eds), *A/Z: Essays in Honor of Alexander Zholkovsky*. Boston, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2018. ISBN 978-1-61811-778-6. ix + 660 pages.

How diverse and inspiring can a researcher's interests be? In the case of Alexander Zholkovsky, who celebrates his eightieth anniversary with thirty-five books and about four hundred articles, not including translations and reprints, interviews and other newspaper materials, the scope must be very wide. *Essays in Honor of Alexander Zholkovsky*, comprised of 39 articles, reveal the talent and the academic fertility of the anniversary celebrant.

The volume is prefaced with a comprehensive review of Zholkovsky's biography and academic achievements by the editors, Dennis Ioffe, Marcus Levitt, Joe Peschio and Igor Pilshchikov. The papers fall into four main groups. One is composed of literary work studies, a second deals with cinematography, a third relates to research in philology and philosophy, and a fourth to Zholkovsky's research.

In the first group, a number of researchers look back on Pushkin's literary legacy. Alina Bodrova discusses the unpublished versions of some of Pushkin's poems; Igor Nemirovsky provides his view on Fedor Karamazov belonging to Pushkin's epoch; Stuart Goldberg investigates one poetic device in Pushkin's lyrics of the 1830s; Oleg Proskurin explores the origin of Puskin's "mrachnaia bezdna", and Michael Wachtel leaves *Four Notes on Pushkin's Prose*. Other researchers in this group discuss Baratynsky and the Silver Age poets, such as Gumilev, Mandelshtam and Blok; while two essays are devoted to modern Russian poetry: Marijeta Bozovic discusses Russian Modernist poetry represented by Olga Sedakova, and Kevin Platt writes of the 'weaponisation of discourse poetry' (p. 419) using the example of Dmitry Golyenko's works. Besides poetry, the literary styles of Tolstoy, Gogol, Nabokov and

REVIEWS

Zamyatin are analysed by Thomas Seifrid, Boris Uspensky, Alexander Dolinin and Leonid Heller. More general insights into the invariants in Russian literary works are offered by Mikhail Bezrodny, and Nikolai Bogomolov reveals the power of one of Zholkovsky's favourite song-writers – Bulat Okudzhava.

A second group of papers considers the contribution of Russian and Soviet film directors into cinematography. Anthony Anemone discusses the history of an unmade film; Oksana Bulgakowa writes of different representations of Sergei Eisenstein, both in his own works and in the works of others, comparing him to a film star evoking a wide interest. Andreas Schönle analyses the 'structures of time and the topos of ruin in Kira Muratova's "Among Grey Stones"' (p. 492) as 'forcing spectators to rise above the conventional parameters of their existence' (p. 507); and Frederick H. White explores Balabanov's criticism of post-Soviet society.

The third group of papers deals with topical issues in philosophy and anthropology, language and linguistics. The philosophical and anthropological investigations go as far as considering the place of explosion in Art (Yuri Leving), liminality in poetry (Ronald Vroon) and in Slavic rites (Aleksey Yudin), as well as offering a historical perspective on the discourse of organicity in Russia between 1917 and 1953 (Galina Tihanov). Aage Hansen-Löve and Wolf Schmid ponder faith in God and theodicy in *The Brothers Karamazov*. Mikhail Epstein draws attention to transformative and counterformative speech acts in literature, and John Bowlt discusses the development of realism in post-revolutionary Art. Two essays of this group offer an outside perspective on the evolution and future of philology and poetry, in particular: Mikhail Gronas and Boris Orekhov predict a transition from the digital texts to the semantic web which will provide a connection between research and literary works on the level of meaning, while David Bethea compares the growing taste and desire for

REVIEWS

new ideas, demonstrated by each generation of *Homo sapiens*, to the neck of the giraffe (p. 45).

Fourthly, four papers deal closely with Zholkovsky's research and personality. Mark Lipovetsky builds his research on Zholkovsky's *Dialogue between Bulgakov and Olesha* (p. 327) and argues for the structural and compositional commonality of characters and motifs in Olesha's *Envy* and Bulgakov's *The Heart of a Dog*. Alexander Dolinin adds to Zholkovsky's analysis of Nabokov's *Spring in Fialta*. An interesting question about knowing such a writer as Alexander Zholkovsky from his work is raised by Willem Weststeijn, and one of the celebrant's major contributions to the notion of Deep-Syntactic Structure – “wordlets” (p. 350) – is discussed by Igor Mel'čuk.

Finally, in an essay written in quasi-Zholkovskian vignette style, Sarah Pratt recalls her encounters with Lidiia Ginzburg; Michael Meylac shares his memories of the interest in India during the Khrushchev 'Thaw'; and Ilya Vinitsky draws attention to historical anecdotes and questions their reality.

This review began by posing the question of how diverse and inspiring a researcher can be. *Essays in Honor of Alexander Zholkovsky* demonstrates that the celebrant's creativity and academic fertility clearly give life to a large number of research ideas in a wide variety of research domains.

Natalia Batova
University of Melbourne

REVIEWS

Michael C. Finke and Michael Holquist (eds), *Approaches to Teaching the Works of Anton Chekhov*. New York, NY: The Modern Language Association of America, 2016. ISBN 9781603292689. viii + 233 pages.

In terms of its clarity of purpose and procedure (although not only in these capacities), this book is exemplary. Editors Michael Finke and Michael Holquist (who, sadly, died in 2016), plus about twenty more contributors involved in tertiary level education across America, describe their individual approaches and classroom experiences of teaching the stories and plays of Anton Chekhov to undergraduate students. The resulting essays are grouped under headings such as Materials (biography, editions, secondary sources etc); Classroom Strategies (student writing and performance); Chekhov in Film and Theatre. Under Cross-Curricular Approaches, another grouping caters to teachers of students whose primary studies are in medicine, the environment, aesthetics and so on. The full collection is thus multi-faceted. Specialists may be gratified by an essay just up their alley, as it were – for example, Jane Costow’s ‘Reading the Environmental Chekhov’, or Valleri J. Robinson’s ‘Adapting Chekhov: A Primer for Dramaturgs’; generalists will appreciate the broader scope of the essays concerned with a variety of perspectives. This dual spread will no doubt be reflected in the book’s audience: virtually essential for academics, it should also attract more diletante readers.

The introductory overview, Part One: Materials, by Michael Finke (who also writes a separate essay on ‘point of view’, linking writing to doctor-patient relations) provides a brief biography of Chekhov which highlights the degree to which the Life is a source for the Works. Chekhov’s purchase of Melikhovo, for example, the estate about fifty miles south of Moscow, which, Finke notes, ‘changed Chekhov’s life and left echoes in his writings’ is especially reflected in the 1897 story ‘Peasants’; the fact

REVIEWS

that he was forced by illness to spend his last years on the warm Black Sea coast of Russia moved him to write his ultra-famous story 'The Lady with the Little Dog'. The only one to be set in Yalta, the story reflects the profound changes in ordinary behaviour and their unpredicted aftermath that are triggered by the transient mores of a seaside resort. Finke's perceptions set parameters for the detailed discussion and fruitful analysis that become the hallmark of the whole collection.

He also takes on, if summarily, the eternal bugbear of teachers operating in English: 'Which translation should I recommend to my students?', and provides practical information pertaining to the various forms in which students may encounter the plays (on the page, on the stage, in a film, on video) plus helpful advice regarding secondary materials relating to almost anything to do with Chekhov.

Part Two: Approaches begins with a superb exegesis by Michael Holquist of *A Boring Story*. This rewarding example of Holquist's expertise in reading Russian literature begins with disarming warmth: "Chekhov loved teachers...". It continues with predictable generosity: *all* of the essays will show proof of "Chekhov's ability to defy the expectations of readers"; and ends with a quite striking challenge: the assertion that in our digital age Chekhov's art takes on *more* rather than less significance. The argument is that our need for critical thinking, which Holquist defines as the seeking of wisdom rather than of mere information, has become extremely urgent. Referencing his previous work on the chronotope without actually using the word, he emphasises his belief that one of the most important things a student can learn from reading Chekhov is that "the singularity of the physical space and time we occupy has perceptual and ethical implications for how to love and die". (The reader is aware of suddenly swimming in profound waters.) Chekhov lived, as do we, in a rapidly changing culture, and was acutely aware of the relation between the great, grand design and the unique personal moment. The disconnects and silences in his narratives and dramas,

REVIEWS

the non-linear shape of his stories, the gap between external conventions and the living person – all are set in a linguistic time that is self-referential to the speaker. Thus, while simply sitting at his dining-table, the narrator of *A Boring Story* silently anguishes over the realisation that “once he had a real home and family”, but now feels like “someone else’s dinner guest”. The dichotomy between passion and habit running throughout the story raises for the narrator the importance of education ... letting Holquist segue to the lively discussion that is one of the main goals of this book and its editors – whether that occurs in the classroom or just in the mind of the responsive reader. *A Boring Story* is shown to work in literary terms as a master lesson in writing mature irony, but also, in Holquist’s view, as an antidote to digital technology, big data and the algorithm! (My punctuation.)

Obviously full justice cannot be done in one review to all the essays that follow the editorial chapters – but this is only a reason to repeat that in this book there will be something for everyone. In one of the essays, as entertaining as it is useful, Lisa Siefker Bailey gives an entertaining account of the wily strategies she had to develop in order to battle the surreptitious text-messaging that threatened to undermine her performance-based classes. Rather than ban the devices of social media, she decided to embrace them, even finding a way of using *Facebook* to help teach Chekhov. She began by her asking her students to create a *Facebook*-style profile page (however baffling that might be to some of us) for a character from one of the stories on their curriculum. The exercise apparently revealed the ‘fake’ quality of many *Facebook* self-descriptions and “helped students recognise the differences among how characters perceive themselves, how others perceive characters, and how characters want to be perceived.”

The Cherry Orchard, with its significant off-stage events and frequent lack of ‘action’, requires the imaginative filling of blanks, argues Bailey, which makes it an

REVIEWS

ideal text for application in terms of profile assignment: “Facebook is a place where users construct identities for others to see.” Even non-users will hardly argue with that. Neither can they deny the relevance of ‘constructed identity’ to that ambitious wannabe, Ermolai Lopakhin, or the ‘what do I really want to do with my life?’ uncertainty at the root of Varya’s unhappiness.

John Griswold, reflecting on a survey showing that, in twenty-five top American MFA programs in creative writing, only twelve teachers used Chekhov stories in their undergraduate classes, is also depressed by the statistic that only three per cent of literature published in the US is literature in translation. He feels obliged to concede that Chekhov’s ‘quietude’ and elliptical endings can infer that the stories are often “about nothing” – but sees them like episodes of *Seinfeld*, though sadly nowhere near as popular. Yet they are not meaningless, he maintains, expounding the two apparently inconsequential references to Moscow fish stew in *The Lady with the Dog* to make his point. The first occurs when Gurov thinks fondly of this undistinguished dish as one of the city’s homespun treats to which he is pleased to return, something whose familiarity will help him shake off the disquieting memories of his Yalta holiday; the second, in stark contrast, is when his longing for Anna has begun to wreck his equilibrium. A fellow-diner’s reference to the fish at their club being “a little off” makes him explode with rage at the whole of Moscow’s philistinism, venality, self-importance and general crassness. He now hates his native city because Anna does not live there. The two fish references subtly but brilliantly epitomise the wildly impressionistic swings of subjective experience.

Griswold also uses, though in less depth, the story titled *The Darling* to show how successfully Chekhov can make a foolish character sympathetic without pretending s/he is anything other than a fool – again an example of the experiential gap between the external world and the inner self. Griswold points to the emotional-

REVIEWS

psychological dynamism inherent in the stories, as characters first fool themselves, then struggle to gain a truer understanding of something, and after that seek to verify a wavering comprehension – only to grasp that there has already been another change in themselves or in the thing. Communication with others is just as fraught. Rather than follow a path that leads directly to happy agreement, exchanges between humans can be like self-created stumbling-blocks. We all live somewhere in the gap between outer world and inner feelings, but Chekhov's characters, caught desperately in that space, struggle to escape and reconcile the split. Whether or not they are objective about their situation hardly seems to matter; usually, they (we) are beyond objectivity.

Several of the essays go outside the canon. Lyudmila Parts considers some (out of many) literary and theatrical rewritings and reinterpretations of Chekhov's plays to argue that late-twentieth century plays engaged in inter-textual dialogue with Chekhov often reflect on and draw attention to contemporary literary trends. Her examples are two versions of *The Seagull*, one by Boris Akunin, subtitled 'A Comedy in Two Acts' (2000), the other, *The Notebook of Trigorin*, by Tennessee Williams (1981-1983). The former posits that Treplev did not commit suicide but was murdered; in the second act it supposes a scenario in which each of the characters confesses to the crime, for reasons of jealousy, love, fear, professional curiosity or revenge. Students are then encouraged to discuss the post-modernist features of the new play, which introduces them to tropes such as intertextuality, parody, erasure, the interaction of high style with popular literature, mixed genre, non-linear plot and metafictionality. Parts's discussion of theory is intellectually sophisticated, although it also contains some quite simple reminders, for example, the fact that Chekhov labelled *his* play, which ends with a suicide, a comedy, while Akunin's sequel takes the form of a detective story designed for a post-perestroika Russian audience. She also notes that Russians can purchase both the Chekhov and the Akunin in the same vol-

REVIEWS

ume, while Akunin, translated into English by Michael Katz, is available to English-speaking students anywhere in the world. Those equipped to read both Russian and English and also wishing to engage in intertextual considerations can thus read both plays in either Russian or English.

Parts points out that both Akunin and Williams treat Chekhov's play as raw material from which to make a new and different text for their linguistic compatriots. Williams, who revered Chekhov, also said that he wanted to make him more "audible" to contemporary American audiences – and thus rewrote *The Seagull* as a soap opera, preserving the plot but changing the dialogue. What Chekhov merely hints at, Williams makes explicit, discarding "subtlety, psychological complexity and irony". But in Parts's view this is no disservice. For, '[e]very instance of intertextuality, be it a small quotation or a complex network of allusions, signals that an older text is a vital part of culture.' When they exploit cultural memory, new writers also reconfirm and reinforce it.

This essay will be enjoyed by students who have 'done' literary theory, and might see it as a well-argued application thereof; but more importantly, in engaging so radically with Chekhov's text, Akunin, Williams and Parts have all prised open old wisdoms to reveal and renew their inner radiance.

As already said, it is, unfortunately, impossible to mention all the authors. The three I have pulled out will I hope give some idea of the wide range covered by the volume as a whole, and of the varying ways in which individual essays stimulate and please the reader. In the end, I would suggest that the sense of uplift this volume leaves us with is due not just to its consistently impressive quality, but also to the realisation that there are, in the US, a great many teachers dedicated to the sacred task of introducing students to Anton Chekhov through their own energetic, persuasive and

REVIEWS

unpredictable ways of appreciating and expounding him. Would that the situation were as healthy in Australia.

Judith Armstrong
University of Melbourne

F. Dostoevsky, *The Russian Soul: Selections from A Writer's Diary* (Introduction by Rosamund Bartlett). Honiton, UK: Notting Hill Editions, 2017. ISBN 9781910749630. xxxiii + 137 pages.

The Russian Soul: Selections from a Writer's Diary is part of the *Classic Collection* series published by Notting Hill Editions. The publisher's aim is to provide "the best in essay writing... [from their] authors, living and dead." The *Classic Collection* list embraces distinguished essayists such as Montaigne, Hazlitt, Wilde, Woolf and Priestley, in whose company Dostoevsky would appear to be the odd man out. However, the introduction — in combination with the selections from the compendious *Writer's Diary* — provides a coherence to, and a focus for, that collection of essays. All the elements are housed in a slim volume that features high production values.

Any collection of extracts from *A Writer's Diary* must necessarily be arbitrary, driven by the anthologist's perspective. This selection ranges from the experiences of childhood ('The Boy with His Hand Out', 'The Boy at Christ's Christmas Party'), through the problems of suicide in contemporary Russia ('The Boy Celebrating His Saint's Day', 'The Dream of a Ridiculous Man'), crimes and the nineteenth-century Tsarist court system ('Environment'). These topics are complemented by further explorations of the fundamental importance of the peasant to Russia ('The Peasant Marey'), the Slavophile-Westerniser debate ('The Death of George Sand', 'A Few

REVIEWS

Words about George Sand', and 'My Paradox'), and the importance of literature in providing a moral compass ('Anna Karenina as a Fact of Special Importance', 'A Lie is saved by a Lie', and 'Pushkin (A Sketch)'). The thread that passes through all the essays, even those which concentrate on Western European writers, is that concerned with what it means to be Russian.

Rosamund Bartlett's introduction skilfully prepares the reader for what follows by providing the context for the twelve extracts from this voluminous work. Bartlett's scholarly credentials are impeccable: she is a biographer and translator of Tolstoy and Chekhov and writer on music (especially opera) in Russia, as well as a documenter of literary Russia. This expertise is reflected in her introduction, which weaves together the strands mentioned above in the context of Dostoevsky's selected genre for *A Writer's Diary*: the *feuilleton*, or newspaper's arts section. His selection of this genre did not prevent Dostoevsky from polemicising with real and imaginary opponents, also a characteristic of his polyphonic novels. Likewise, his identification of *sobornost'* (spiritual community) as a defining characteristic of the Russian people did not preclude his observation of a heterogeneous society, peopled with distinct individuals. This variety can be seen in the selected pieces which provide evidence of an almost preternatural sensitivity to the human condition with what Bartlett describes as "a deeply unpleasant xenophobia" (p. xxv) that manifests itself in "chauvinistic and anti-semitic sentiments" (p. xi). This sensitivity is alive to the ridiculous, but also to a deeply felt sense of beauty, especially in the works of George Sand, Cervantes and Tolstoy, and, above all, in Pushkin. Bartlett's introduction captures the complex *mélange* that is Dostoevsky's work in this genre.

In conclusion, this book represents a good selection from *A Writer's Diary* and, as such, a wonderful 'taster' for the whole work. It is tied together neatly by Bartlett's introduction, which informs without imposing values that would incline the reader of

REVIEWS

the extracts to prejudge the work. The only editorial decision that I found slightly mystifying was that of using the Olga Shartse translation of 'A Dream of a Ridiculous Man', rather than that by Lantz; one presumes that there were permission issues that made this impossible. The contents are enhanced by the high production values: cloth-covered boards and a headband with a ribbon book mark. All in all, this 'slender volume' represents a good entrée into the world of Dostoevsky's *A Writer's Diary*.

John Cook
University of Melbourne

BOOKS RECEIVED

Owing to the fact that we receive more books than we can review in any given year, we have determined to provide a list of books received, so that readers become aware of these titles and can follow up their bibliographic details. If you are interested in reviewing any of the following titles, please write to our reviews editor, Dr John Cook, using the following email address: john.cook@acslink.net.au

- O. Bakich, *Valerii Perelshin: Life of a Silkworm*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015. ISBN 978-1-4426-4892-0. xxiii + 391 pages.
- E. Bemporad, *Becoming Soviet Jews: The Bolshevik Experiment in Minsk*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2013. ISBN 978-0-253-00822-0. xi+276 pages.
- J. Besemeres, *A Difficult Neighbourhood*. Canberra, ACT: ANU Press, 2016. ISBN 9781760460600. xii +526 pages.
- K. Boterbloem, *A History of Russia and its Empire from Mikhail Romanov to Vladimir Putin*. Lanham, MA: Rowman & Littlefield, 2018. ISBN 978-1-5381-0440-8. xiv+349 pages.
- M. Gabowitsch, *Protest in Putin's Russia*. Cambridge, UK: Polity, 2017. ISBN 978-0-7456-9626-3. xii+332 pages.
- P. D. Simashenkov, *Istoricheskii progress i involiutsiia idealov*. Samara, RU: Izd.“ASGARD”, 2017. ISBN 978-5-9905791-2-5. Illustrations. 176 pages.

John Cook, Reviews Editor

Notes on Contributors

Ivana Gulic is Lecturer in Screen and Cultural Studies at the University of New England, Armidale. Her research interests include the intersection between film and philosophy, ethical subjectivity, critical theory and intercultural communication. Her latest work, which focuses on Federico Fellini's cinema, was published in *Studies in European Cinema*.

Peter Hill was formerly Professor of Slavonic Studies at the University of Hamburg. He has also worked at the University of Melbourne, Macquarie University and the Australian National University, where he contributed to the *Routledge Macedonian-English Dictionary*. He is now a Visiting Fellow at the ANU. He has published on semantics and lexicology, on the Macedonians in Australia, on Macedonian dialectology, the theory of standard languages, sex and gender in European languages, nation building in Europe and multilingualism in South-Eastern Europe.

Henrietta Mondry is Professor in the Department of Global Languages and Cultural Studies at the University of Canterbury, New Zealand, and Fellow of the Royal Society of New Zealand. She has published widely on literature and cultural history, especially on the intersections in representations of gender, sexuality, class and animality.

Kevin Windle is an Emeritus Fellow in the School of Literature, Languages and Linguistics at the Australian National University. His major publications include the monograph *Undesirable: Captain Zuzenko and the Workers of Australia and the World*, the collection of documents *From St Petersburg to Port Jackson: Russian Travellers' Tales of Australia 1807-1912* (co-edited with Alena Govor and Alexander

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Massov), and *A New Rival State: Australia in Tsarist Diplomatic Communications 1857-1917* (co-edited with Alexander Massov and Marina Pollard).