



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY  
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

*Natalia M. Dolgorukova*

**ON EARLY RUSSIAN RECEPTION  
OF MIKHAIL BAKHTIN'S WORK:  
THE CASE OF VLADIMIR TURBIN,  
OR STAYING AT THE  
“BOUNDARY OF SILENCE”**

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM  
WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: LITERARY STUDIES

WP BRP 01/LS/2014

This Working Paper is an output of a research project implemented at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE). Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.

*Natalia M. Dolgorukova*<sup>1</sup>

**ON EARLY RUSSIAN RECEPTION OF MIKHAIL  
BAKHTIN’S WORK: THE CASE OF VLADIMIR TURBIN, OR  
STAYING AT THE “BOUNDARY OF SILENCE”<sup>2</sup>**

The history of the Soviet reception of Mikhail Bakhtin’s heritage and ideas has not been written yet. The present working paper is a case study of works by Vladimir N. Turbin (1927—1993) who was one of the early Bakhtin’s followers in the USSR. The paper examines Turbin’s books (*A Short While Before Aquarius*, *A Farewell to Epos*) and his articles in different years (including published posthumously) related to Bakhtin, his life, theories, and ideas. The careful exploration of these works enables to explain why the proper reception of Bakhtin’s heritage in the USSR in the 1960-70s did not take place and why the book Turbin wanted to write about his teacher has not been written. Turbin’s case allows to argue that Bakhtin’s reception was not successful because of different nature as compared to all of his contemporaries and conversation partners.

Keywords: Mikhail Bakhtin, Vladimir Turbin, history of reception, history of Russian thought and aesthetics.

JEL: Z

---

<sup>1</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics. Department of Foreign Languages. Faculty of Philology. Assistant Professor ; E-mail: ndolgorukova@hse.ru.

<sup>2</sup>This study (research grant No 13-05-0037 ) was supported by The National Research University–Higher School of Economics’ Academic Fund Program in 2014.

The research problem of this study concerns some paradoxes of the Soviet reception of Mikhail Bakhtin's heritage. The main of them is that the persons who were closest to Bakhtin remained silent. In the 1960-80s, the popularity of Bakhtin's ideas reached the climax, but there were no works which profoundly studied this period of reception<sup>1</sup>. The study of Vladimir Turbin's works, who was one of the closest Bakhtin's followers in the 1970s, may shed light on this paradox and explain the silence.

In 1961, Vadim Kozhinov, Sergey Botcharov and Georgi Gatchev, all three of them research workers at the IMLI (Institute of World Literature of the Russian Academy of Sciences), found out that Mikhail M. Bakhtin (hereinafter: MMB), the author of *Problems of Dostoevsky's Art*, was, in fact, still alive. It took them some time to locate him in Saransk (Mordovia) where he was a head of the Department of Russian and World Literature in the Saransk University. Somewhat later Vladimir Turbin, a postgraduate student and, after 1953, a professor at the Moscow State University, joined them—he was the one whose destiny was to rescue the Russian philosopher from his “live non-existence in Saransk” as well as to become “Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin's personal attendant” (Turbin 1994: 445).

This was, on the one hand, a “material” rescue: transferring MMB from Mordovia to Moscow (disregarding the fact that he was not rehabilitated, not cleared of his charges; or that he did not have a Doctor of Sciences status) and installing him at the privileged and hard-to-access Kremlin Hospital. All of which Mr. Turbin managed to solicit with Yuri V. Andropov, because he was a professor and a research advisor of Andropov's daughter Irina who at the time studied at the MSU<sup>2</sup>. Later on, when MMB was already transferred to Moscow, both Mr. Turbin and the MSU students (those who were attending his seminar) had been visiting the ailing philosopher in his new apartment in Moscow—providing necessary care, giving him their support, asking questions related to their term paper topics...

On the other hand, however, that was a “spiritual” rescue: the participants of the above mentioned seminar with Professor Turbin were recalling how, as early as in the 1950s, he was getting for them, practically on the sly, *The Formal Method of Literary Scholarship* by Medvedev and Bakhtin or MMB's Dostoevsky book and insisted that they read both texts. The later essays written by Vladimir Turbin were constantly interspersed with words and expressions

---

<sup>1</sup> See (Bronckart, Bota 2011), (Dolgorukova, Makhlin 2013), (Bronckart, Bota 2014). Zbinden's book (Zbinden 2006) is a profound research on some particular cases of Bakhtin's studies but in Canada and France.

<sup>2</sup> V. L. Makhlin related this episode in the following way (as per V. N. Turbin's recollections): “Andropov was inclined to help Bakhtin to be admitted to the Kremlin Hospital (in fact, his daughter who had been studying under Turbin talked him into doing that), but he got quite upset because this person whom his daughter and her university professor were petitioning for did not have any chances for being admitted to such a privileged medical institution. So the head of the KGB looking for an objective reason to be used on Bakhtin's behalf asked them: “Is he, at the very least, a Doctor of Sciences?” – “No, he is not”, Turbin sighed. – “Was he rehabilitated?” – “No, Yuri Vladimirovich, he was not even rehabilitated”, sighed Turbin, with even more regret. – “How so?” stuttered Andropov, totally confused: “Not even rehabilitated? Well, is there a solution, then?” (At the Boundary of Silence 1997: 393).

from his teacher's vocabulary: "dialogs of party leaders and church hierarchs" (Turbin 1990: 18), "a person removed from the epos" (Turbin 1990: 6), "e-pi-cism of public conscience" (Turbin 1990: 6). It would not be an exaggeration to state that Turbin's theory of the epos and the novel (Turbin 1990: 37-42) was created with an eye on MMB's theory. Apart from these essays by Vladimir Turbin, correspondence between MMB and V. N. Turbin from 1962-1966 was preserved (Correspondance between M.M. Bakhtin and V.N. Turbin 2005), and it will also stay in the focal point of our attention.

Both V. N. Turbin and his three acquaintances from the IMLI wrote very little about MMB. In fact, it would be fair to say that Turbin's only paper which was directly dedicated to this Russian thinker and which was printed during Turbin's lifetime was only three pages long: it appeared in June 1989 in the Kino [Cinema] magazine, and at first this may even prompt questions and create a certain bewilderment—why, Bakhtin and ... film? (Turbin 1989: 18-20).

The article was dedicated, however, to one line that MMB uttered in the mid 1960s after watching René Clair's film *Porte des Lilas* at the Writers Union country home in Maleyevka by Moscow. MMB did not like the movie, but that was, of course, not the point of the matter. Turbin's thoughts about the film lead up to his thoughts on MMB—however, before we turn to those considerations, we should complete our short review of Turbin's works on MMB. What is left to say relates only to three of his articles dedicated to Bakhtin, his life and his inventive legacy—and they were all published posthumously.

One was a 30-page-long article titled *On Bakhtin*<sup>1</sup> in Turbin's book *A Short While Before Aquarius* that was published a year after Vladimir Turbin's death. This article is a view on Bakhtin's life and on his carnival concept from the position of someone who had been for twenty years MMB's "personal attendant" as well as "his private driver and the supplier of groceries and medications" (Turbin 1994: 446); also "in a certain manner an organizer of his life who had been taking care of his everyday needs" (Turbin 1994: 446).

Turbin himself, as if wishing to make excuses for his silence and his Perceval-esque unwillingness to ask questions, wrote as follows: "Despite the dictum that a valet cannot appreciate a great man, I knew perfectly well just how outstanding was the man whom destiny sent me to care for. I was always fascinated by the intellectual valor of those visitors who would, while meeting with him, start querying him about philosophical origins of his concept. As far I was concerned, I knew my place and I was not certain that I had the right to pose such questions—thus, my conversation partner would open up to me rather via everyday concerns, through the hustle of prosaic worries of life." (Turbin 1994: 446).

---

<sup>1</sup> The date when Vladimir Turbin wrote this text about M. M. Bakhtin is not exactly known: his widow took it from Turbin's archive and offered it for publication in the *Philosophic Sciences* magazine: its first issue in 1995 was dedicated only to Bakhtin. It was written, perhaps, in 1991-92.

Sometimes, however, his curiosity got the best of him, so Turbin would ask MMB about something that was most important: for example, about his views on Rabelais, about carnival and noncarnival age, about God...

Two more articles were published in 1995, two years after Vladimir Turbin's death—they appeared in the first issue of the *Filosofskie Nauki* [Philosophic Sciences] magazine which was dedicated only to MMB (a centenary of whose birth was celebrated quite widely that year).

The first article titled *Fragment One from Unpublished Materials on M. M. Bakhtin* (Turbin 1995a) appeared in the magazine section headed *Serious Laughter*—it was an attempt to connect the discourse on God with the discourse on carnival. The second article titled *Fragment Two from Unpublished Materials on M. M. Bakhtin* (Turbin 1995b) was published in the magazine section headed *Concept Contribution*—this one was a comment on an idea expressed by S. S. Averintsev in his review of MMB's book *Questions of Literature and Aesthetics*: the comment about who was the only, permanent and authentic opponent of the Russian thinker.

Turbin said that a book about Bakhtin would be his last publication (At the Boundary of Silence 1997: 389). However, he did not write it, thus effectively staying “at the boundary of silence”.

We will try, nevertheless, to answer the question, a book of what kind it could have been and why Turbin may have been delaying the writing of it. This question is a pretty complex one, but we have, however, two “justifications” for ourselves.

First justification: a general impression regarding what this hypothetical book could have been like might appear if we reconstruct what's available, that is if we can extract and analyze Turbin's notes, remarks and comments about MMB that are scattered all over his writings. Taking this angle, we can divide the whole body of Turbin's work into three groups of sources related to our topic: first, it is the correspondence between Vladimir Turbin and MMB; secondly, there are four smaller articles which Turbin wrote about MMB (one of them was published during his lifetime and three other only after his death); thirdly, there exist all the remaining articles by Mr. Turbin that were not directly dedicated to the Russian thinker, but contained comments with regard to him, his writings, his theories, concepts, terminology, etc.

Second justification: the question about the book was raised by Vitali L. Makhlin, MMB researcher, during a conversation with Vladimir Turbin. Its fragment is worth quoting here in full:

”The book about Bakhtin,” - he told me at the time, not without a tempered importance in his tone, - “will be my last book.”

Seeing my surprise he explained:

- Just imagine this: OK, let us say, that I wrote this book on Bakhtin, it was published and then I would go, for example, to a beer stand in order to drink some beer. So, I would come up there and someone would ask about me: “Who is this guy coming over to drink beer? Is it, perhaps, the one who wrote about Bakhtin?..” Oh, no, no, I will speak the whole truth about Mikhail Mikhailovich only at the very end, as Leo Tolstoy did about his “dames”, do you remember? I’ll tell everything and then, right then, jump down, straight into the grave, so that no one can get at me there...

I could not be silent anymore: “Aren’t you afraid that you might be late?”

- Oh, I understa-a-and that, Vitali Lvovich, I do. But...» (At the Boundary of Silence 1997: 389).

Turbin did not finish his answer and he did not write the book, and his explanation, as we can see, has not helped us to get closer to the understanding of why he was keeping his silence.

Let us analyze all three groups of sources in order to see how MMB and his writings were mentioned in them and in the hope that we may get closer to the understanding of the logic for Turbin’s “silence.”

Let us start with the letters. The correspondence between MMB and Vladimir Turbin (1962-1966) published in the July issue of the *Znamya* magazine in 2005, contained very insightful commentary by N. A. Pan’kov, MMB’s biographer. Twenty two letters were published in this issue—fifteen of them were written by Turbin and seven by MMB. This became a record of the Bakhtins’ life in Saransk, with all those requests to bring butter and sugar to Saransk, with a special thank you for an orange and with discussions of the ills of the day: in 1961 *Iskusstvo* published Turbin’s book titled *Comrade Time and Comrade Art* for which he paid too heavy price at a later point. In his letter to MMB of December 31, 1962 he mentioned this not without a grain of irony and self-irony: “I was not intending to upset you with this, but you will find out about it anyway. No, it did not turn out well, not at all! They dubbed me a “trouvere of abstract art” and my book was characterized as being, from the first to the last page, enraptured with modernist perversions in the arts. Well, I am fine, I am keeping my chin up. I even wrote a ditty:

My sweetheart blowing in his horn

Threw his sounds as perfect darts.

Now I know that he was born

A trouvere of abstract arts!» (Correspondance between M.M. Bakhtin and V.N. Turbin 2005: 122).

And more: these letters contain attempts to negotiate what might be a good time for Turbin to come to Saransk, sometimes on his own, old and beat-up Moskvitch car, at other times in the company of his students, who already knew about MMB from Turbin, had read the first

edition of his 1929 book *Problems of Dostoevsky's Art* (at the time it was not yet called *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* – N. D.) and participated in Vladimir Turbin's seminar at the MSU, in which, as by his own expression, "the Bakhtinianism" was blooming, "for the young joyfully accepted it". There were discussions in these letters regarding a future book to be co-written by both Bakhtin and Turbin (the latter called it in his letters "a book about animals"...).

As Nikolai Pan'kov writes, "It appears that it was Vladimir Turbin who suggested to co-author the book, but he may have mistaken MMB's polite and non-committal manner of communicating for a readiness to cooperate" (Correspondance between M.M. Bakhtin and V.N. Turbin 2005: 127). There was, quite likely, some discussion about writing a book dedicated to how animals were presented in the arts and in literature. MMB often mentioned, in Turbin's presence, his own essay that dealt with how Flaubert described the animals. One might assume that Turbin would also wish to write on the subject and that he started collecting material, but eventually MMB and Turbin did not manage to author a book together.

In his own commentary on one of his letter Turbin remembered how he first got to know of the typewritten copy of MMB's Candidate of Sciences dissertation, which later became the basis for his main work—the book on Rabelais: "Late at night I would come back to my hotel (this one being a hotel in Saransk whereto Turbin was coming late at night from the Bakhtins' apartment—N. D.), then I would shield off my table lamp with some rag and start reading Bakhtin's candidate (!) dissertation (there were three beds in my hotel room, and right next to me railway workers, somewhat drunk and tired, were sleeping: they were on a business trip having come to Mordovia's capital in order to lobby for the necessary amount of kerosene and diesel oil to be distributed to their faraway and backwoods switching track—this being the fate of a Russian drudge of a wandering worker. The carnival world opening up in front of me was whimsical and joyful; but I could not comprehend its deep-rooted religious basis, yet, and thus, as many others, I was seeing in it only a possibility for ideological freedom which would stand up against the deadening boredom of any official dogma" (Correspondance between M.M. Bakhtin and V.N. Turbin 2005: 123).

This same ideological freedom was something that very many other readers, contemporaries of Turbin, would see in Bakhtin's text. However, in this fragment, Turbin made an observation regarding something that escaped from many of his contemporaries: "I could not, yet, comprehend its (i.e. the carnival world's—N. D.) deep-rooted religious basis" (Correspondance between M.M. Bakhtin and V.N. Turbin 2005: 123). We will find thoughts about this in Turbin's articles which will be discussed later. For now, we can only highlight this and also quote one more of Turbin's observations made in his letter to Bakhtin of March 8, 1963, illustrating the reception of the carnival theory by the generation of the 1960s: «You know, I left

Saransk thinking that the idea of representing art as carnival was only one of its possible forms and a pretty specific one of that. Then, slowly, I started getting it. Because one of the traits of truly brilliant ideas is in that they do not get accepted immediately, not in one gulp. Suddenly I realized that if we shall, to some extent, carefully and reasonably interpret the carnival formula, everything, decidedly everything, from Homer to Voznesenski, would fit it” (Correspondance between M.M. Bakhtin and V.N. Turbin 2005: 129).

So, Turbin started looking for carnival everywhere: in Lermontov’s texts (e. g., in *Masquerade*), in Gogol’s as well as, of course, in Pushkin’s oeuvre. In a letter of May 10, 1963 Bakhtin, however, made an attempt, with his natural caution and tact, to admonish both Turbin and his students who kept seeing the carnival everywhere and were even trying to write about that in their term and diploma papers: “I liked very much your ideas regarding Hamlet and advertisement, on modernism, on carnival nature of art, and they coincide with my own thoughts in many ways. There is a whole section in my Rabelais text dedicated to the street vendors’ shouts advertising their wares during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance (the so called “les cris de Paris” [‘Parisian shouts’]). This was an ambivalent shouting advertising which, along with some other street elements, existed in great harmony with the Renaissance art blending perfectly with it. Over the course of thousands of years the folk and carnival model of the world defined all creative forms of culture and thought. Only the 19<sup>th</sup> century almost entirely denied it and thus *bestia seriosa* won (that is, “Shakespeare *a la* Sofronov<sup>1</sup>”). I said “almost” because immaculate seriousness is devoid of any creative potential. Even a simple comparison or a metaphor implies a certain minimum of freedom with laughter. In the atmosphere of absolute seriousness (at its limit) no movement of thought is possible (any thought, not only the artistic one). Complete seriousness commands for standing there and not moving (“Stand still!”)” (Correspondance between M.M. Bakhtin and V.N. Turbin 2005: 138).

The second group of sources is the articles from various years that were not dedicated to Bakhtin directly but contained notes and ideas about him or about his books and theories, or those suffused by the spirit of “Bakhtinianism”.

M. M. Bakhtin was mentioned several times in Turbin’s short pamphlet called *A Farewell to Epos?* published by *Pravda* publishers some time before Turbin died, in 1990. Turbin described here the celebration of the millennium of Christianity in Russia. Speaking of the “dialogs” between Communist party leaders and Church hierarchs, he recalled an episode that happened to him in a Russian Orthodox church: while he was standing there and thinking of something, he put his hands behind his back—and got immediately scolded by some ill-natured hag: “Why are you standing like that? You are not in a theater. It’s not allowed. God, he sees

---

<sup>1</sup> Anatoli Sofronov (1911-1990) was a Soviet playwright, poet and writer, winner of two Stalin Awards in 1948 and 1949.



everything!” (Turbin 1990: 18). Seeking to defend himself from this woman’s attack Vladimir Turbin turned his mind to MMB recalling how on one occasion Bakhtin “smiling ironically with his wise and somewhat caustic smile... uttered only these words: ‘One should not think that God would be so... easily offended.’ In his text on Rabelais MMB quoted, and for a good reason, the phrase spoken by Pope Leo XIII: God does not need our hypocrisy.”

The second Turbin’s book titled *A Short While Before Aquarius* was a posthumously published collection of his articles (he called them “novellas”), which he had been editing for printing. The first article titled *Instead of an Introduction* described MMB, Andropov, their whimsical, non-direct dialog and containing this confession of Turbin: “It was not possible, of course, for me to enter the depths of the secret and wise system which appeared as philosophy and, most notably, aesthetics created by Bakhtin” (Turbin 1994: 6).

However references to Bakhtin and his terminology are strewn throughout this book: “material esthetics” (Turbin 1994: 11), “the Other” (Turbin 1994: 12), “participatory word” (Turbin 1994: 21), “dialog” (Turbin 1994: 28), even fragments of conversations and MMB’s utterances:

- Mikhail Mikhailovich, would it be fair to say that your methodology, all of it, in its entirety, conforms to the term ‘sociological poetics’?

- Yes, - immediately answered Bakhtin. – No doubt about that. (Turbin 1989: 30)

Or this:

“One must not kill this cockroach,” – said Bakhtin, dignified and with his usual composure, speaking to a matron-like housemaid in the Writers Union country home. – “What if I turn at some point into something like him? What if that is my karma?” (Turbin 1989: 31).

Or here is Turbin’s prediction that partially came true: “All of Bakhtin extends into the future. Into the time that, in accordance with his terminology is “big”. In that big time he will remain whereas none of us will.” (Turbin 1989: 41).

Here are his thoughts about this thinker’s fate: “Bakhtin skirted the prison.” “I was never under torture,” he told me once, and a ghost of some awkwardness appeared for a moment in his face: this is how, perhaps, a soldier may feel awkward if he did not get to fight in a war, even though there was none of his fault in that. Bakhtin, however, who in his fifties had to take an exam in ... History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and then had to defend his Candidate (!) of Sciences thesis and still, despite all of his grandeur, was living the last years of his life having the title of acting assistant professor—all of this meant that he was the type of prisoner who was enchained to the desk of some bureaucrat” (Turbin 1989: 152).

Lastly, let us look at the articles that were directly related to M. M. Bakhtin already mentioned above.

The article about Bakhtin is a short history of the travails that befell this Russian thinker, all of which happened right after the 1960s, right in front of Turbin-the-personal-attendant who had been always trying to make the life of his “great conversation partner” somewhat easier.

Turbin’s wife found two more articles and they were published in 1995 in the already mentioned *Philosophic Sciences* magazine

Both articles were outstanding in their own way. The first started like this: “The New Testament is also a carnival!” told me Bakhtin in a half-whispering tone, shrinking in a funny manner, as if some spring got compressed inside him. That was in Saransk in the 1960s. Bakhtin spoke this, about the New Testament, in a very conspiratorial tone of voice. As if talking to an accomplice.” And further on Turbin was trying to do something that no one before him would even try to do: justifying Bakhtin’s idea regarding the carnivalesque nature of the New Testament and combining something that seemed an impossible combination—God and carnival: “I already said: carnival is not thinkable without the Holy Spirit connecting the realms, both our world and the empyreal world, and sending us “downwards”, towards our “material and bodily lower stratum” and thus, if you wish, sending us to f... ourselves” [...].

Carnival is the sensation of the earth from the point of view of the Cosmos, of being from the point of view of reincarnation. [...]”. As is well known, orthodox religion was rejecting Bakhtin’s theory. Even pianist Maria Yudina, who as MMB’s close friend did so much for the proliferation of his books in the West, said as follows: “There is no place for this book in a Christian home” (Turbin 1994: 217).

In his second article Turbin paid the reader’s attention to an idea stated in S. S. Averintsev’s critical review, which became, perhaps, the best judgment regarding MMB: “The main idea of the review was striking: Bakhtin’s writings were filled with polemic which is quite perceptible. Well, but with whom? Or with what? Averintsev recounted MMB’s possible opponents, and I will only name a few, highly approximately: cultural-historical school, formalism, impressionism. Averintsev, however, removed, one by one, all of Bakhtin’s opponents of this kind: starting to polemicize with them would have been too shallow task for Bakhtin. And then Averintsev named Bakhtin’s real and permanent opponent: it was, in his opinion, none other than Aristotle. Both Aristotle and whatever else derived from him.”

This thought, being most profound by itself, deserves a separate examination. We should only recall how quickly Bakhtin agreed with Turbin’s definition of his poetics: that it was sociological poetics. Aristotle’s poetics is prescriptive and this is the reason why it is dead<sup>1</sup>. It

---

<sup>1</sup> It is not a coincidence that Wilhelm Dilthey (who represented a branch of German philosophy which was quite close to that of MMB’s) forwarded the same idea when starting his own poetics.

must be superseded by a new poetics—a project that was envisaged and partly realized by A. N. Veselovsky.

As we noted above, the last and only article that Turbin wrote about MMB was published during his lifetime in the *Kino* magazine. Its title—*Ovid Among Nomads: on One Utterance by M. M. Bakhtin*—leaves one even more puzzled than the name of the magazine. Turbin presented Makhlin with his own copy of this article and he made one correction in its text, in his own handwriting: he changed the word “nomads” to “Gypsies.” It was, perhaps, Soviet censorship that insisted on abstract “nomads” instead of naming a specific ethnic group. And even a reference to Pushkin did not help. Here is the key to both the book that could not have been written and, in a wider sense, to the fact that for Turbin (and for all those around him, from the circles of this kind) it was not possible to dialog with MMB: “We (that is, Gatchev, Botcharov and others—N. D.) got together a short while ago, and we were all those who had been around Bakhtin from the early 1960s to his last day, March 7, 1976. And once again, like so many times before, we were trying to define Bakhtin, to find an image that would have been most adequate to what he was. I think that Georgi Gatchev’s pronouncement was the best: “What can we say? Ovid stayed among the Gypsies. What could Gypsies say about Ovid?” (Turbin 1989: 19).

This “strategy of silence” that V. N. Turbin practiced (as well as others who were closest to MMB) was caused, in V. L. Makhlin’s opinion, by the fact that a dialog with MMB’s legacy “could not have happened during the Soviet era, just as it cannot happen today—and the worldwide fame of this Russian thinker should not mislead anyone for it is, rather, more appropriate to call it a worldwide misconception, which has, however, its own, special logic in terms of its social and historical as well as its scientific approach: it is a logic of a *break in communication*” (Makhlin 2014: 360).

The Soviet reception of MMB’s works consists in different cases (one of these cases we analyzed in this paper), mostly this reception was unsuccessful, because of the fact, that the cultural gap in the 1910-20s led to the situation in which there were no reasons for appearance of MMB’s readers and interlocutors in the Soviet Russia.

Bakhtin was well educated both in classical philology and in German philosophy and hermeneutics, but his young friends, for objective reasons, did not have an opportunity to get such a good education. The potential interlocutors and interpreters of Bakhtin were either shot (such as Gustav Shpet, who was shot in 1937) or immigrated (such as Mikhail’s brother – Nikolai, who worked in Cambridge and probably influenced on Wittgenstein (See Eagleton 1987). This situation was understood by the closest to MMB persons, the “gypsies”, one of which was Vladimir Turbin.

As MMB noted prophetically in *Lectures on the History of Russian Literature*, “reception goes his own way, reception is going back only when it comes to old issues by his own way. These old issues undergoes deep processing, taking another spirit, another sense. There is a huge gap between reception and tradition” (Bakhtin 2000: 376-377).

### References

- At the Boundary of Silence 1997: In Memory of Vladimir Nikolaevich Turbin. *The Bakhtin Collection* (Issue 3). Edited by V. L. Makhlin, Moscow: Labirint.
- Bakhtin M.M. (2000). Works. T. 2 Moscow: Russkie slovari.
- Bronckart J.-P., Bota Cr. (2011). Bakhtine démasqué. Histoire d’un menteur, d’une escroquerie et d’un délire collectif. Genève: Droz.
- Bronckart J.-P., Bota Cr. (2014). Bakhtine démasqué. Réaction aux critiques de l’ouvrage // *Contextes*, July 2014 (<http://contextes.revues.org/5971>).
- Correspondence between M. M. Bakhtin and V. N. Turbin (1962-1966) (2005). In *Znamya [Flag]*, July 2005.
- Dolgorukova N., Makhlin V. (2013). Le ressentiment des dupes // *ENTHYMEMA*. 2013. No. IX. P. 407-411
- Eagleton T. (1987). Saints and Scholars. London: Verso.
- Makhlin, V. L. (2014). Overdue conversation. In: *Issues and Discussions in Russia’s Philosophy of the Second Half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century: A Modern View*. Edited by V. A. Lektorsky, Moscow: ROSSPEN.
- Turbin, V. N. (1994). *A Short While Before Aquarius*, Moscow: Radiks.
- Turbin, V. N. (1989). Ovid among nomads: re one utterance by M. M. Bakhtin. *Kino [Cinema]*, 6, pp.18-20.
- Turbin, V. N. (1990). *A Farewell to Epos? Attempting to Understand the Years That We Lived*, Moscow: Pravda.
- Turbin, V. N. (1995a). Fragment one from unpublished materials re M. M. Bakhtin. *Filosofskie Nauki [Philosophic Sciences]*, 1, pp. 235-243.
- Turbin, V. N. (1995b). Fragment two from unpublished materials re M. M. Bakhtin. *Filosofskie Nauki [Philosophic Sciences]*, 1, pp. 264-268.
- Shaitanov, I. O. (2011). History with missing chapters. Bakhtin and Pinsky in the context of Soviet Shakespearian studies. *Voprosy literatury [Issues of Literature]*, 3.
- Zbinden K. (2006). *Bakhtin between East and West. Cross-Cultural Transmission*. Oxford: Legenda.

**Natalia M. Dolgorukova**

National Research University Higher School of Economics. Department of Foreign Languages.  
Faculty of Philology. Assistant Professor ; E-mail: [ndolgorukova@hse.ru](mailto:ndolgorukova@hse.ru).

**Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.**

© Dolgorukova, 2014