

**National Research University Higher School of Economics**

as a manuscript

**Pavel F. Uspenskij**

**VLADISLAV KHODASEVICH IN THE 1910–1930s:  
IDENTITY, LITERARY CONTEXT, AND POETICS**

**Dissertation Summary**

for the purpose of obtaining academic degree  
Doctor of Science in Philology and Linguistics

Moscow 2023

This dissertation was prepared at the National Research University Higher School of Economics.

## **Publications**

The ten articles listed below are submitted for defence. Two articles are presented in English, and the other eight are in Russian. In nine of them, Pavel Uspenskij is the only author, and in one – the second author. Nine articles are published in leading journals included in the international databases Scopus and WoS; one is in the HSE List D.

1. Uspenskij P. F. Vladislav Khodasevich nakanune “Putem zerna”: F. M. Dostoevskii, N. A. Nekrasov, Z. Krasin’skii v stikhakh i tvorcheskom soznanii poeta v 1916-1917 godakh (Vladislav Khodasevich on the Eve of *Grain’s Way*: F. M. Dostoevskii, N. A. Nekrasov, Z. Krasin’skii in the Poet’s Works and Creative Consciousness in 1916–1917) // Russkaia literatura. 2014. № 4. S. 193–217.
2. Uspenskij P. F. “Putem zerna” kak formula revoliutsii: Khodasevich, Nekrasov, krest’ianskie poety i agrarnaia topika russkoi liriki (*Grain’s Way* as a Formula for Revolution: Khodasevich, Nekrasov, the “Peasant” Poets and the Agrarian Topoi in Russian Lyrics) // Russkaia literatura. 2020. № 2. S. 131–147.
3. Uspenskij P. F. Modernistskii poet kak fol’klornyi skazitel’ (A Modernist Poet as a Folklore Storyteller) // Shagi/Steps. 2022. T. 8. № 2. S. 187–204.
4. Uspenskij P. “Precisely ‘that’”: Vladislav Chodasevič’s poetic technique in Mandel’shtam’s *Novye stichi* // Scando-Slavica. 2015. Vol. 61. No. 2. P. 207–220.
5. Uspenskij P. F. Tainye pominki po Bloku: Nekrasov, Blok, Khodasevich (A Secret Wake for Blok: Nekrasov, Blok, Khodasevich) // Russkaia literatura. 2013. № 1. S. 164–179.
6. Orekhov B. V., Uspenskij P. F., Fainberg V. V. Tsifrovye podkhody k “Kamerfur’erskomu zhurnalu” V. F. Khodasevicha (Digital Approaches to V. F. Khodasevich’s *Chamber Fourier Journal*) // Russkaia literatura. 2018. № 3. S. 19–53.

7. Uspenskij P. Vladislav Khodasevich in the Emigration: Literature and the Search for Identity // *Russian Review*. 2018. Vol. 77. No. 1. P. 88–108.

8. Uspenskij P. Kompozitsiia “Evropeiskoi nochi” V. F. Khodasevicha: kak emigratsiia opredelila strukturu sbornika? (The Composition of *European Night*: How Did Emigration Define the Structure of This Collection of Poems?) // *Russian Literature*. 2016. Vol. 83–84. S. 91–111.

9. Uspenskij P. F. V. F. Khodasevich i A. I. Gertsen: o nazvanii i poetike sbornika “Evropeiskaia noch” (V. F. Khodasevich and A. I. Herzen: On the Title and the Poetics of the Collection of Poems *European Night*) // *Izvestiia RAN. Seriiia literatury i iazyka*. 2017. T. 76. № 3. S. 5–22.

10. Uspenskij P. F. “Na perekrestke” publitsistiki i poeticheskoi traditsii: k prochteniiu “Pamiatnika” V. Khodasevicha (“At the junction” of Journalist and Poetic Traditions: On the Reading of *The Monument* by V. Khodasevich) // *Voprosy literatury*. 2012. № 5. S. 215–239.

The results of the dissertation research are also presented in the following articles:

1. Uspenskij P. F. “Nachinaiutsia mrachnye stseny”: poeziia N. A. Nekrasova v “Evropeiskoi nochi” V. F. Khodasevicha (“The grim sights begin”: N. A. Nekrasov’s Poetry in V. F. Khodasevich *European Night*) // *Europa Orientalis*. 2012. № 31. S. 129–170.

2. Uspenskij P. “Zhili vmeste dva tramvaia”: “Berlinskoe” V. F. Khodasevicha (“Two Trams Lived Together”: V. F. Khodasevich’s Berlin Theme) // *Russkaia filologiiia*. Vyp. 23. Tartu, 2012. S. 112–121.

3. Uspenskij P. F. Poeticheskaiia tekhnika Boratynskogo v stikhakh Khodasevicha (Boratynskii’s Poetic Technique in Khodasevich’s Poems) // A.M.P.: Sbornik pamiati A.M. Peskova. Moscow: RGGU, 2013. S. 525–534.

4. Uspenskij P. “Iz dnevnika” V. Khodasevicha: zametka o genezise dvukh obrazov stikhotvoreniia (Khodasevich’s *From the Diary*: A Note on the Genesis of Two Images from the Poem) // *Russkaia filologiiia*. 24. Tartu, 2013. S. 200–208.

5. Uspenskij P. F. “Liry labirint”: pochemu V. F. Khodasevich nazval chetvertuiu knigu stikhov “Tiazhelaia lira”? (“The Labyrinth of the Lyre”: Why did V. F. Khodasevich Called His Fourth Collection of Poems *The Heavy Lyre*?) // Lotmanovskii sbornik. Vyp. 4. Moscow: OGI, 2014. S. 450–467.
6. Uspenskij P., Shelia A. “Liubov’ k otecheskim grobam”: sny emigratsii i son Berberovoi (“Love to Paternal Graves”: The Dreams of Emigration and Berberova’s Dream) // Russkaia filologiya. Vyp. 25. Tartu: Tartu University Press, 2014. S. 302–317.
7. Uspenskij P. F. Travma emigratsii: fizicheskaja ushcherbnost’ v “Evropeiskoi nochi” V. Khodasevicha (The Trauma of Emigration: Physical Deformity in V. Khodasevich’s *European Night*) // ACTA SLAVICA ESTONICA VII. Blokovskii sbornik XIX. Aleksandr Blok i russkaia literatura Serebriannogo veka Vyp. XIX. Tartu: Izdatel’stvo Tartuskogo universiteta, 2015. S. 192–210.
8. Uspenskij P. F. “Rossiia schastie. Rossiia svet...” G. V. Ivanova i nasledie F. M. Dostoevskogo (G.V. Ivanov’s *Russia Is Happiness. Russia Is Light* and F. M. Dostoevskii’s Legacy) // Russkaia literatura. 2016. № 1. S. 181–189.
9. Uspenskij P. F. Pochemu V. Khodasevich perevodil v emigratsii “Stikhotvoreniia v proze” Sh. Bodlera? (O roli perevodov v tvorcheskoi evoliutsii poeta) (Why Did Khodasevich Translate Charles Baudelaire’s *Poems in Prose* in Emigration (On the Role of Translations in the Poet’s Creative Evolution)) // Wiener Slawistischer Almanach. 2017. № 93. S. 133–145.
10. Uspenskij P. F. V F. Khodasevich i G. Geine (Stat’ia pervaja) (Khodasevich and H. Heine (Article One)) // Novyi filologicheskii vestnik. 2017. № 1(40). S. 158–169.
11. Uspenskij P. F. V F. Khodasevich i G. Geine (Stat’ia vtoraja) (Khodasevich and H. Heine (Article Two)) // Novyi filologicheskii vestnik. 2017. № 3(42). S. 215–227.
12. Uspenskij P. What interpretation did V. Khodasevich give to the life of N. Petrovskaya in emigration? On the poetics of “Renata’s End”, a memoir essay // Novyi filologicheskii vestnik. 2018. No. 1(44). P. 161–178.
13. Uspenskij P. F., Ignat’ev D. D. Puteshestvie v literaturnyi elizium: “Elegiia” V. Khodasevicha (A journey to the Literary Elysium: V. Khodasevich’s *Elegy*) //

Novyi mir. 2018. № 2. S. 185–195.

14. Uspenskij P. Simvolizm kak tochka sborki: novye issledovaniia russkogo modernizma (Symbolism as an Assemblage Point: New Studies of Russian Modernism)// Russian Literature. 2020. Vol. 114–115. P. 203–217.

15. Uspenskij P. F. “Slepoi cherv’”: zametka ob odnom obraze iz “Putem zerna” Khodasevicha (“A Blind Worm”: A Note on One Image from Khodasevich’s *Grain’s Way*) // Professor, syn professora. Pamiati N. A. Bogomolova. Moscow: Vodolei, 2022. S. 545–551.

### **Conference presentations**

The main provisions and results of the study were discussed in 2011–2022 at 11 international and national conferences and seminars, including:

1. April 2011, Saint-Petersburg – All-Russian Conference “Vtorye nekrasovskie chteniia v Pushkinskom dome” (Second Nekrasov Readings at Pushkin House) at the Institute of Russian Literature at the Russian Academy of Science. Paper presentation: “Nekrasov i Khodasevich. Zametki k teme” (“Nekrasov and Khodasevich. Notes on the Subject”).

2. September 2011, Warsaw – International Conference “Osip Mandelstam Days in Warsaw”. Paper presentation: “Poeticheskaia tekhnika Khodasevicha v ‘Novykh stikhakh’ Mandel’shtama” (“Khodasevich’s Poetic Technique in Mandel’shtam’s *New Poems*”).

3. January 2012, Saint-Petersburg – All-Russian Conference “Tridtsat’ shestaia nekrasovskaia konferentsiia” (36<sup>th</sup> Nekrasov Conference) at the Institute of Russian Literature at the Russian Academy of Science. Paper presentation: “Tainye pominki

po Bloku: Nekrasov, Blok, Khodasevich” (“Secret Blok’s Wake: Nekrasov, Blok, Khodasevich”).

4. February 2012, Moscow – All-Russian Conference “Tekstologiiia i istoriko-literaturnyi protsess” (“Textology and Historico-Literary Process”) at Moscow State University. Paper presentation: “Genezis zaglaviia sbornika Khodasevicha ‘Putem zerna’” (“The Origins of the Title for Khodasevich’s Collection of Poems *Grain’s Way*”).

5. April 2012, Tartu – International Conference of Young Philologists. Paper presentation: “Na podstupakh k poetike zrelogo Khodasevicha. ‘Igraiu v karty, p’iu vino...’” (“Approaching late the poetics of late Khodasevich. ‘I play cards and drink wine...’”).

6. February–March 2013, Tartu – International Conference “Lotmanovskii seminar” (“Lotman’s Seminar”). Paper presentation: “Kakie smysly vkladyval V. Khodasevich v zaglavie sbornika ‘Evropeiskaia noch’?” (“What Meanings did V. Khodasevich Imply with the Title of His Collection of Poems *European Night*?”)

7. March 2013, Moscow – All-Russian Conference “Tekstologiiia i istoriko-literaturnyi protsess” (“Textology and Historico-Literary Process”) at Moscow State University. Paper presentation: “Poeticheskaia tekhnika Boratynskogo v stikhakh Khodasevicha” (“Boratynskii’s Poetic Technique in Khodasevich’s Poems”).

8. February–March 2014, Tartu – International Conference “Lotmanovskii seminar” (“Lotman’s Seminar”). Paper presentation: “Fizicheskoe urodstvo v ‘Evropeiskoi nochi’ V. Khodasevicha” (“Physical Deformity in V. Khodasevich’s *European Night*”).

9. February–March 2015, Tartu – International Conference “Lotmanovskii seminar” (Lotman’s Seminar). Paper presentation: “Emigrantskaia samoidentifikatsiia: Khodasevich v 1930-e gody” (“Emigrant Self-Identification: Khodasevich in the 1930s”).

10. February–March 2016, Tartu – International Conference “Lotmanovskii seminar” (Lotman’s Seminar). Paper presentation: “*Avtomobil’ V. Khodasevicha: tsitatnyi plan stikhotvoreniia*” (Khodasevich’s *The Automobile: Citation Level of the Poem*”).

11. October 2017, Moscow – International conference “1917 god v istorii i sud’be russkogo zarubezh’ia” (“1917 in the History and Fate of the Russian Abroad”). Paper presentation: ““Kamer-fur’erskii zhurnal’ V. F. Khodasevicha: istochnik po istorii russkoi èmigratsii i sotsial’naia set”” (Khodasevich’s *Chamber Fourrier Journal: A Source on the History of Russian Emigration and a Social Network*”).

In total, 20 reports were made in Russian on the topic of the dissertation research.

## **Introduction**

This study is focused on the life and work of a poet, memoirist, literary critic and Pushkin scholar Vladislav Khodasevich (1886–1939). In the academic literary canon, Khodasevich as a poet occupies a prominent place, if inferior in popularity among readers to the “famous four”: Anna Akhmatova, Marina Tsvetaeva, Osip Mandel’stam and Boris Pasternak. Yet, it is beyond doubt that his literary legacy not only played a significant historical role in the literary field in 1900s–1930s but also defined and, in part, continues to define the evolution of Russian poetry, at least its “traditionalist” and “(neo)-classical” segment. Reflexes of Khodasevich’s poems can be found in the works of such different poets of the next generations as Evgenii Krapivnitskii, Mikhail Aizenberg, Sergei Gandlevskii, Mikhail Gronas, etc.

In Khodasevich's case, however, the status of a "neo-classic" is most deceptive. Contrary to Yurii Tynianov's well-known claim made in his article *Provezhutok* (Interval) that "his [Khodasevich's – P.U.] verse is neutralized by the verse culture of the XIX century" [Tynianov 1977: 173], Khodasevich's lyric works are profoundly original. It is especially prominent if they are compared to those of traditionalist poets such as Boris Sadovskii and Yurii Verkhovskii who were not included in the literary canon and are currently known only to specialists. If Khodasevich is indeed a "neo-classic", then a special one. Khodasevich, who emerged as a poet in the environment of Russian symbolism and debuted as a symbolist of the third generation (following "the elder" and "the younger" cohorts), undoubtedly belongs to the Modernist context, and his aspiration for classicism stemmed from a complex literary search rather than the rejection of Modernism. Khodasevich's poetics of the second half of the 1910s and 1920s which was a result of such search is in the focus of my attention.

The main **objective** of this work is to analyse and contextualize late Khodasevich's poetics realized in three collections of poems: *Putem zerna* (Grain's Way, 1920), *Tiazhelaia Lira* (The Heavy Lyre, 1923) and *Evropeiskaia noch'* (European Night, 1927). In this research, poetics is understood relatively broadly, not only as a set of devices structuring literary texts but also as a complex of themes and motives as well as the interaction between the text and the literary tradition. Certainly, it is possible to describe Khodasevich's poetics in an exclusively formal way without turning to literary and biographical contexts, however, in this case, such approach seems to be mostly limiting. Firstly, like his contemporaries, Khodasevich had to live through big historical events such as the First World War, the 1917 Revolution, the Civil War and the first wave of Russian emigration. They could not but influence his worldview, and consequently, his poems. Secondly, Khodasevich's creative biography is of interest in itself within the historical context, and its analysis contributes to our understanding of the subjectivity of Russian intelligentsia in the 1910s–1930s. Therefore, albeit secondary, but no less important objective of this work is to interpret critical moments in Khodasevich's creative biography and



analyse his identity in unique historical circumstances. The main focus is on the 1917 Revolution and emigration which is viewed within various methodological frameworks.

The set objectives entail a range of particular **tasks**. Key events in Khodasevich's creative biography are to be analysed, with the focus both on the circumstances of his private life and the historical context. Khodasevich's attitude to contemporary literature and classic authors within the tradition is to be identified and described. It is no less important to investigate which discursive and poetic patterns appear in his poems, memoirs and critical works; how his poetic principles change from one collection of poems to another; which themes and devices the poet uses, and to which tradition these themes and devices are linked (in the perspective of historical poetics).

In the articles submitted for this defence, pivotal moments of Khodasevich's literary trajectory as well as the poetics of his works which evolved with each collection are explored. At the same time, I turn to Khodasevich's prose, critical essays and memoirs and identify creative principles behind each text. In the dissertation, I highlight the most problematic aspects of the poet's life and creative work. It is worth noting that my goal was not to write Khodasevich's biography or analyse his every poem. On the contrary, I deemed it necessary to reveal key episodes of his biography and poetic principles and offer an integral concept which would, on the one hand, bear in view his most significant works, and on the other hand, allow for expanding our understanding of the specifics of Modernism and reinterpret the philological approaches to this well-studied era.

**The relevance of my research** stems from the fact that Khodasevich's life and creative work in the historical and literary context of the era are in need of serious revision which is long due. Obviously, there is a number of significant works dedicated to Khodasevich [Bethea 1983; Levin 1986; Bogomolov 1989; Bocharov 1996; Surat 1994; Demadre 1999] as well as many factual materials about his life and creative work collected, above all, by the efforts of the late Nikolai Bogomolov [Bogomolov 2011]. However, as I see it, **the development of the topic** is far from

its final stage. A number of provisions of the studies mentioned above have become obsolete while some aspects have never been discussed at all. Recent works are also not sufficient to close the topic. Khodasevich's biographies [Shubinskii 2011; Muravieva 2013] are excessively focused on the factual aspect of the poet's life and offer neither an analysis of his poetics nor a thorough interpretation of certain episodes of his creative biography. New monographs on Khodasevich are too descriptive [Fedotov 2017] or, in my opinion, draw on approaches which do not fully address the specifics of his late poems [Skvortsov 2021], or focus only on particular texts or periods [Zel'chenko 2019; Ananko 2020]. Therefore, there is a substantial number of issues in Khodasevich's poetics which are yet to be clarified. My dissertation is aimed at filling those gaps.

Moreover, in regard to the **relevance** of my work, it is essential to point to a consistent interest in the literature of Russian Modernism and the poetics of certain authors. A.V. Lavrov, R.D. Timenchik, A.K. Zholkovskii, D.M. Magomedova, A.A. Dolinin, M.L. Spivak, I.D. Shevlenko analyse both the Modernist era in general and the works of such authors as Andrei Belyi, Aleksandr Blok, Innokentii Annenskii, Boris Pasternak, Marina Tsvetaeva and other significant Modernist poets in particular. To better understand the historical literary process and poetic trajectories of this period, it is crucial to form a comprehensive perspective on Khodasevich and his poetics as well as literary context relevant to him.

**Theoretical importance** of my work is that it offers an interdisciplinary approach to Khodasevich's life and creative work which can be used to analyse the biographies and poetics of other Modernists. Furthermore, on the basis of Khodasevich's texts, I put forward a modified theory of intertextuality which can help revise the works of several Russian Modernists (the research methods are discussed in detail in the next section). **Practical importance** of the dissertation lies in the fact that its provisions can be used in university courses such as "History of Russian Literature of the XX century", "History of Russian Emigrant Literature" or added as illustrative material to such courses as "Theory of Literature", "Methods of Humanitarian Studies", a special course "the Life and Works of Vladislav

Khodasevich” etc. Additionally, the provisions of this work can be used to develop popular lectures and essays on the XX-century Russian literature and the traditions of Russian culture in Modernism as well as in various textbooks and educational materials.

In regard to **material**, the dissertation is based on Khodasevich’s texts: three collections of poems, *Putem zerna* (Grain’s Way), *Tiazhelaia Lira* (The Heavy Lyre) and *Evropeiskaia noch’* (European Night); his critical essays, his memoirs *Nekropol’* (Necropolis), prose works *Zhizn’ Vasiliia Travnikova* (The Life of Vasilii Travnikov) and *Derzhavin* (Derzhavin: A Biography) as well as his letters and an unusual diary of his emigrant period, *Kamer-furierskii zhurnal* (Chamber Fourrier Journal). It is safe to argue that I have analysed the entirety of Khodasevich’s published creative legacy of 1910s–1930s. However, the scope of my research is not limited to the poet’s works.

As this dissertation constantly addresses Khodasevich’s orientation to literary tradition, my research is also based on numerous classical texts of Russian and European literature. I systematically turn to classical Russian poetry of XVIII and XIX centuries (Gavrila Derzhavin, Vasilii Zhukovskii, Aleksandr Pushkin, Evgenii Baratynskii, Nikolai Nekrasov, and Afanasii Fet) as well as key European poets (Heinrich Heine, Charles Baudelaire). Classic prosaic texts such as those of Fedor Dostoevskii and Aleksandr Herzen play a no less important role. I also look into the works of Polish playwright Zygmunt Krasiński which Khodasevich translated. Modernist literature, Russian symbolism specifically, forms yet another complex of sources. I build on literary legacy, including critical works, of Dmitrii Merezhkovskii, Valerii Briusov, Konstantin Bal’mont, Andreii Belyi, Aleksandr Blok, Boris Sadovskii, Osip Mandelstam, Georgii Ivanov, Georgii Adamovich and other Khodasevich’s contemporaries.

My **research method** is based on traditional historical literary analysis. However, I am convinced that descriptive overview of facts is not sufficient to explain Khodasevich’s life and poetics. Moreover, in some cases, I aimed to reconceive established methods for analysing Modernist poetry and either modify

existing tools embedded in certain theories or apply methods rarely used in Russian literary studies in regard to Modernism to historical literary material.

Exploring the poetics of particular texts, I draw upon four main paradigms for studying Modernism: hermeneutics, formal analysis, structuralism and intertextual theory. Following Russian formalists, I proceed from the claim that devices structuring the literary text play a crucial role. However, unlike formalists, I believe that the category of meaning is no less important for literary texts than their formal structure. Therefore, drawing on hermeneutic practice as well as the best examples of structural analysis (Yurii Lotman, Aleksander Zholkovskii, etc.), I analysed the themes and the structures of meaning in Khodasevich's texts. In my work, I also build on intertextual theory, yet propose its modification based on the theory of epic storytelling developed by folklorists [Lord 2018]. The modification of intertextual theory allows me to better explain the specifics of the poems in *Tiazhelaia Lira* (The Heavy Lyre).

Another complex of approaches is aimed at the description of the social situation Khodasevich lived in, the analysis of his path in literature, and the reconstruction of his creative consciousness and identity. In this context, I draw on several adjacent humanitarian approaches. Analysing the poet's social trajectory, I rely on Pierre Bourdieu's theory of literary field. I use statistics and the well-developed tools for the analysis of social networks to process *Kamer-furierskii zhurnal* (Chamber Fourier Journal) and, consequently, to analyse the dynamics of emigrant communities. I also turn to the cultural studies of interwar emigration [Livak 2003; Kaspé 2005]. Apart from sociology, psychology and the theory of trauma play a substantial role in my work [Caruth 1996; Ushakin&Trubina (red.) 2009].

Thus, the methodology of my research combines traditional historical literary approaches and the approaches of neighbouring disciplines. The multi-facet lens gives me the opportunity to explore Khodasevich's life and works in 1910s–1930s in an integral and more stereoscopic way.

I shall provide a more detailed overview of the results obtained in this research.

Khodasevich's third collection of poems, *Putem zerna* (Grain's Way), was published in 1920. It included the poems of 1914–1920s, and the next edition also included the poems written in 1921. This collection concluded the symbolist stage of Khodasevich's life and creative work and brought a number of innovations to his poetics. These two aspects deserve special attention.

In my understanding of Khodasevich's works and Russian Modernism in general, I presume that symbolism was the key literary current which set the main trends for all writers and poets who came after, including Khodasevich. As I demonstrate in my book on Khodasevich's early works, the poet developed from Russian symbolism [Uspenskij 2014a]. The next stage of Khodasevich's evolution started with the First World War and lasted until 1920. I have thoroughly analysed the creative principles and the poetics of literary texts from this period. From the psychological perspective, it was characterized by instability and catastrophism. In the beginning, the war sparked Khodasevich's patriotism, however, these sentiments vanished rapidly. The global nature of the historical events and the suicide of Muni, Khodasevich's closest friend drafted to the front, resulted in Khodasevich's grave psychological state and thoughts of imminent death.

First the premonitions of the fall of the empire and then the realization of this presentiment in 1917 defined the poet's unstable identity. It was reflected in the poems of 1916–1917. In these poems, Khodasevich systematically turns to Nekrasov's poetry and his iconic themes (the horrors of the city, the suffering of people, the tears of mothers during the war) and reinterprets several existential themes from Dostoevskii, namely from "The Brothers Karamazov". Therefore, Khodasevich continues the humanistic, social and existential traditions of Russian literature. The continuation of the classics was not, however, direct as symbolist poetry mediated its adaptation. At the same time, these poems were the first instance in Khodasevich's creative evolution when his interpretation of the XIX century became original and self-sufficient. Symbolists' texts served only as guidelines

while the works of Russian classics came to the fore. In 1916–1917 poems, the beginnings of a new intertextual poetics developed in *Tiazhelaia Lira* (The Heavy Lyre) can already be discerned.

One of the *Putem zerna* (Grain's Way) book's dominant ideas was the acceptance of the Revolution and the new Soviet Russia. In the most developed form, it is present in the cornerstone texts of the collection: *Putem zerna* (Grain's Way) which served as the title for the book and the final poem *Khleby* (The Loaves). It is generally accepted that the formula of history derived by Khodasevich – “by the way of grain” – can be traced back to Jesus's words from the Gospel of John (John 12:24). However, the biblical subtext was not the main one. Russian literary tradition developed a specific agrarian topos (“grain”, “sower”, “field”, “harvesting”, etc.) which was linked to the concept of revolution. This topos stems from Pushkin's poem *Svobody seiatel' pustynnyi* (Behold a Sower Went Forth to Sow) which reinterprets the New Testament parables in a political way. It was developed by Nekrasov in several seminal poems, and was adopted from Nekrasov both by the *narodniki* poets and Russian symbolists. This topos was especially important and was often evoked during the 1917 Revolution and subsequent years. The “new peasant” poets (Nikolai Kliuev, Sergei Esenin, Petr Oreshin) were the most systematic and consistent in offering its variations. In their works, this topos was linked to the ideology of the left esers. Against such backdrop, Khodasevich's poem *Putem zerna* (Grain's Way) appears to be deeply ideological and reflects the poet's temporary acceptance of the Revolution.

*Tiazhelaia Lira* (The Heavy Lyre, 1922) is rightly considered to be one of the best collections of poems in the XX-century Russian poetry. With this book, Khodasevich found his unique voice and developed his specific poetics. The analysis of its principles constitutes the core part of the next section of my research.

In my dissertation, I offer a new possible view on the intertextuality of Russian Modernist poetry and the poetics of *Tiazhelaia Lira* (The Heavy Lyre) in particular. I suggest distributing the poetry of the Modernist period between two poles with different dominant ideas: explicitly innovative poetics and implicitly innovative one.

Explicitly innovative poetics generates texts which never existed before and which were received by readers and the literary field precisely as innovations. It seeks to avoid a straightforward intertextual game aimed at recognition. Conversely, implicitly innovative poetics in its pure, abstract form attempts to say something new using pre-existing texts and assuming that citations are essential to the acts of perception. The novelty effect is produced by the reconfiguration of cited elements and masterful juxtaposition of more or less known verses and images. Khodasevich implements such implicitly innovative poetics in *Tiazhelaia Lira* (The Heavy Lyre).

As mentioned above, to understand the mechanisms of text production relevant to this type of poetics, I suggest drawing on the theory of folklore storytelling as it is the most articulated in describing the ways in which the text is produced and performed by a storyteller [Lord 2018]. The narrator performing an epic text relied on a set of verbal formulas (word clichés) and the repertoire of epic themes and commonplaces – plot elements regularly used in this type of poetry in general. The narrator's prowess directly depended not only on his memory but also on his ability to redistribute and rearrange formulas and themes.

Although epic folk tales are very dissimilar to the poetry of the first third of the XX century, I argue that applying the folklore model to Modernist authors, Khodasevich in particular, bears important results. Implicitly innovative poetics displays similar principles characteristic of the folklore tradition, but in miniaturized form. For a Modernist poet, the bulk of existing texts merges into a single continuum resembling the folklore tradition. The essential difference lies in the fact that a poet, unlike a folklore narrator, can transform the tradition at his own discretion. Within this poetics, lyric utterances draw on at least two pre-texts at a time. The inclusion of two sources is none other than the creation of a theme or a commonplace.

For a Modernist poet, one of the most important aspects of mastering the tradition was to be able to combine themes and stylistic elements from different segments of the literary canon. It happens when from a corpus of texts forming the cultural heritage, one selects polar opposites whose thematical and stylistic characteristics seem hardly compatible at the first glance. Imbued with various

allusions, the poems in *Tiazhelaia Lira* (The Heavy Lyre) follow this pattern. In this book, Khodasevich achieves a virtuosic divergence of thematic threads and stylistic clichés referring to the poetic language of the “Golden Age” (a substantial list of allusions and reminiscences which can be expanded still; cf. in [Levin 1986: 45–62]).

On the one hand, the proposed model allows me to specify the mechanism of reception of literary works which are composed this way. I assume that the mind of even the most educated reader neutralizes the pre-text like, according to phonology, phonemes become neutralized in certain positions. Such texts cause a sense of familiarity as the readers think that they form part of a tradition and remind them of something, appearing to be profoundly original at the same time. On the other hand, this model helps us better understand how Modernist authors in general and Khodasevich in particular could keep in mind an impressive number of texts and address them in their own works. Overall, from the author’s perspective, a poetic success was to create such a lyric utterance which was not directly dependant on one text but at the same time belonged to a tradition.

In *Tiazhelaia Lira* (The Heavy Lyre), intertextuality reaches great concentration so it is not surprising that its many allusions, reminiscences and pre-texts were already explored by scholars. Although for me, it was more important to reconstruct the creative principles which made such poetics possible, I also deem it necessary to illustrate this type of poetics on the example of several iconic showcase examples. Firstly, it is worth looking into the key manifesto-like poem in the book, *Ballada* (Ballad, 1921). There is a whole range of pre-texts relevant to particular verses and images as well as the poem in general. Among them, the image of a heavy lyre which can be traced back to both Derzhavin and Fet; the act of passing the lyre to a younger poet mythologized in Russian culture; Pushkin’s *Prorok* (The Prophet); Blok’s poems; Annenskii’s and Mandel’stam’s works. *Ballada* (Ballad, 1921) clearly demonstrates Khodasevich’s emphatic engagement with the tradition of Russian literature from Derzhavin to his contemporaries. Secondly, the interaction with tradition is evident in *Elegia* (Elegy, 1921). The range of pre-texts can be



substantially expanded (Zhukovskii, Konstantin Batiushkov, Anton Del'vig, Baratynskii, Tiutchev) and genre characteristics of this text, specified: it reveals reflexes not only of an elegy but also of an ode and a ballad.

Specific poet's irony and an unexpected shift in meaning, rather frequent for his works, are the most prominent features of *Tiazhelaia Lira* (The Heavy Lyre). David Bethea was one of the first to point to the importance of irony in the collection [Bethea 1983: 109ff]. Irony is often hard to formalize as a literary figure, however, in some of Khodasevich's texts it shows through so distinctly that it cannot be doubted. I was particularly interested in the genesis of Khodasevich's poetic irony which, in my view, can be traced back to one of the most ironic European poets, Heine. As I demonstrate, Khodasevich was engaged in a long literary dialogue with Heine. In *Tiazhelaia Lira* (The Heavy Lyre), he adopts not only Heine's irony but also his interpretation of the love theme which in many of the German poet's cycles of poems oscillates between bitter irony and utmost earnest.

Another important device in many of the poems from *Tiazhelaia Lira* (The Heavy Lyre) is an unexpected shift in meaning. It is interesting in two aspects, its structure and its genesis. As a rule, this device is triggered by the ending as the last verses of a poem contradict the previously established meaning and force the reader to reconsider the text in the light of this new meaning. From the psychological perspective, it is a well-studied phenomenon of cognitive dissonance which prompts one's consciousness to opt for different ways to resolve the contradiction. For Khodasevich's contemporaries, this device was his trademark. Specifically, I prove it with analysing the influence the author of *Tiazhelaia Lira* (The Heavy Lyre) had on Mandel'stam's *Novye Stikhi* (New Poems).

Traditionally, the genesis of this device is connected to the poetics of an epigram. However, from the perspective of the history of Russian poetry, this point of view is in need of revision. There is an important intermediate between epigrams and Khodasevich's poems – Baratynskii's works. It was Baratynskii who systematically transposed the epigram principles to the high-brow poetry, creating a

special polyphony of meaning in his poems. I am convinced that Khodasevich drew on his XIX-century predecessor.

Therefore, my research helps deepen our understanding of the poetics of *Tiazhelaia Lira* (The Heavy Lyre) and find new ways of describing it, relying both on the revision of the theory of intertextuality and the history of literary devices.

In this section, I also address Khodasevich's identity in the crucial year of 1921. The poet came to consider himself as Blok's successor down Pushkin's line. However, his attitude to Blok was not unproblematic. Analysing Khodasevich's reaction to the death of his elder contemporary, I address one seemingly odd episode from his memoirs *Nekropol'* (Necropolis). In his essay *Gumilev i Blok* (Gumilev and Blok), Khodasevich reminisces that he proposed to some rural youth to commemorate Blok and sing Nekrasov's *Korobeiniki* (The Hawkers). This "secret wake" was a specific way to deconstruct Blok's ideas of the people and the national character (*narodnost'*). In Khodasevich's view, the fact that young peasants did not know the folklorized verses of the most "national" Russian poet, discarded all possible speculations about the connection between the intelligentsia and the people. In my opinion, this biographical episode allows for correction of the line of succession from Blok to Khodasevich as it has not previously considered the mythologization of Russia and its historical path.

The last part of my research is focused on Khodasevich in emigration (1922–1939). I analyse this period of poet's life and creative work in several aspects.

First of all, I use *Kamer-furierskii zhurnal* (Chamber Fourier Journal, henceforth, *CFJ*) to explore the social structures of the cultural segment of emigrant community and contextualize Khodasevich's place within it. To process *CFJ*, I applied network analysis and other methods of formalization of data and quantitative approach. I was especially interested in Khodasevich's social role, his rivalry with Georgii Adamovich and Georgii Ivanov as well as his relationships with "younger" poets. Memoirs and scholarly studies of emigration in general and Khodasevich in particular developed the idea that Khodasevich was close to the "elder" poets and was not very active in interacting with the "younger" ones. Khodasevich is

traditionally opposed to Adamovich, the ruler of the minds among the younger emigrant writers. As data analysis show, Khodasevich knew the “elder” better than the “younger” throughout his emigrant years, however, starting from 1932, he engaged with the “younger” quite intensely, supposedly, no less intensely than Adamovich. I suggest that the emigrant literary field formed a position of a senior writer, an ideologist of a literary movement and a mentor for young poets; and Khodasevich and Adamovich actively competed for this position implementing different patterns of behaviour. As emigrant themselves finally acknowledged that Adamovich occupied this position, in cultural mythology, he became linked to the “younger” poets. Having lost this battle, Khodasevich was placed at a distance from the “younger” by the cultural tradition and was ascribed the characteristics of a loner writer. Therefore, the data help us debunk the established misconception about Khodasevich in the 1930s and translate this issue into the sociology of literature.

In my view, the fact that Khodasevich lost the position of the ruler of the minds to Adamovich was not accidental and had a psychological explanation, being a result of throes of identity and the trauma of emigration. Having left Soviet Russia in 1922, Khodasevich was hoping for a speedy return; however, in spring 1925, when the poet had to settle down in Paris, it became clear that the period of the “half-emigration” was over and the return was not possible. From that moment on, Khodasevich was tormented by the need to stay in emigration and was almost always disappointed in his life on a deeper level. Khodasevich’s psychological state in 1925–1939 can be characterized as a prolonged identity crisis. Khodasevich saw his life as a series of misfortunes, and the trauma regularly prevented him from acquiring a new positive self-image, however hard he tried to do so in his literary work. Drawing on a number of ego-documents and biographical evidence (letters, memoirs about the poet, and the records of his dreams) and interpreting them from the perspective of trauma studies, I demonstrate that for Khodasevich, the search for identity in emigration was connected to a specific type of escapism to the XIX-century literature which served as an object of his symbolic projections. One moment, he identified himself with the great poets of the past, and the next,

considered himself to be a forgotten and useless writer. Moreover, Khodasevich no longer felt the integrity of his personality and consistently chose trauma-related images and metaphors related to physical deformity to describe his state of mind.

Such an approach to Khodasevich's identity gives me the opportunity to view his works of the emigration period in different light. I look into several pairs of texts imbued with autobiographical projections: *Derzhavin* (Derzhavin: A Biography) – *Poezia Ignata Lebiadkina* (The Poems of Ignat Lebiadkin); unfinished Pushkin's biography – *Zhizn' Vasilii Travnikova* (The Life of Vasilii Travnikov). I thoroughly analyse the mystification *Zhizn' Vasilii Travnikova* (The Life of Vasilii Travnikov) as an autobiographical narrative which describes the poet's traumatic state of mind in detail.

Certainly, the trauma lens allows me to take a closer look at Khodasevich's poetry. The detailed analysis of the representation of body in the poems of *Evropeiskaia noch'* (European Night) leads me to the conclusion that many texts feature images of physical impairment and disability which are described in different modalities, either compassionate or satirical. I directly link these images to the trauma of emigration. The psychological lens allows me to interpret a memoir text – one of the key essays in *Nekropol'* (Necropolis), *Konets Renaty* (Renata's End, 1928). I demonstrate that in this essay, Khodasevich not only insightfully reconstructed and described the worldview and life-creation practices of Russian symbolism but also projected his own traumatic experience of emigration onto the emigrant life of Nina Petrovskaia.

As I mentioned above, 1922–1925 was the first stage of Khodasevich's emigration when he hadn't yet become a full emigrant. This period of “half-emigration” is distinguished by more intense poetic productivity: it was the time when the majority of poems from *Evropeiskaia noch'* (European Night) were written. Conversely, in 1925–1927, Khodasevich's poetic activity came to naught, and he soon went silent as a poet with only occasional humorous texts or very rare serious poems written afterwards.

The importance of such division is further discussed in a separate section. In this part of my research, I analyse Khodasevich's accounts of emigrants and his 1922–1925 poems. Drawing on the fact that he had a viscerally negative attitude towards his compatriots abroad, I prove that *Evropeiskaia noch'* (European Night) was initially conceived as a book of satirical poems which could have been published after Khodasevich had returned home (of course, given that the political environment had changed). However, *Evropeiskaia noch'* (European Night) in its final form known to readers is not regarded as an example of satirical poetry. I see the reason for that in the fact that Khodasevich dramatically shifted the emphasis in the 1925–1927 poems, and since these texts were placed in the key sections of the book, they informed the conceptual dominant and changed the perception of the previously written texts. The 1925–1927 texts created a lyric space in which Europe and Russia were made equal, and the poems about emigrants came to be interpreted as descriptions of Europeans. In addition, these texts were imbued with such existential despair that they etched the satirical intention of the 1922–1925 works.

I tie the meaning of Khodasevich's last collection of poems and the cultural tradition behind it to the image of Aleksandr Herzen. I prove that for Khodasevich in emigration, Herzen, the main Russian exile of the XIX century, became an exceptionally important model. Herzen's disenchantment with the European life as a result of the failed 1848 Revolution and his denunciation of *meschanstvo* set the pattern for the attitude towards the European world for Russian intellectuals who had moved to the West. It became relevant for Khodasevich as well. As I show in detail in my research, the title of *Evropeiskaia noch'* (European Night) and a number of its poems are directly related to Herzen.

While Herzen provided a paradigm for Khodasevich's view on Europe, the Western world and Western *mecshanstvo*, Nekrasov's social poems appeared to be the lyric material most suitable for Khodasevich's objective to formulate his own attitude to the European life. In other words, many poems from *Evropeiskaia noch'* (European Night) match Herzen's works ideologically and Nekrasov's works – poetically. *Evropeiskaia noch'* (European Night) relies on the consistent

reinterpretation of Nekrasov's poetry and in this regard, may compete with Andrei Belyi's *Pepel* (Ash).

Finally, the last section of my dissertation is focused on the poem *Pamiatnik* (The Monument, 1928). To highlight the specifics of this poem, I deem it necessary to compare it to Georgii Ivanov's poem *Rossii schastie. Rossiia svet...* (Russia is happiness. Russia is light...). At first glance, Ivanov's poem is acutely socially-oriented as the poet asks whether Russia exists at all and creates its gloomy and hopeless image; however, as I demonstrate, the conceptual structure of the poem is based on literary associations, with allusions to Dostoevskii's figure and several themes of his works being the most prominent among them. Conversely, *Pamiatnik* (The Monument) at first seems to be no more than a poem with a traditional theme. As I show, *Pamiatnik* (The Monument) reflects Khodasevich's particular views on emigration and its social and political role. It is an essentially two-dimensional poem in which poetical conventions function as such but also as formulas conveying poet's stance. In my research, I summarize other scholars' observations and thoroughly analyse literary and political dimensions of the poem. While Ivanov makes a shift from politics to literature, Khodasevich, somewhat paradoxically, shifts from literature to politics.

Therefore, I argue that the period of emigration was traumatic and internally contradictory for Khodasevich. Emigration allowed him to create his last collection of poems with a number of innovations compared to *Tiazhelaia Lira* (The Heavy Lyre) – I refer primarily to an exceptionally deep engagement with the social and civic traditions of Russian classic literature – as well as to succeed as a memoirist, a Pushkin scholar and a critic. At the same time, Khodasevich's emigrant years are marked with a painful search for identity and the experience of trauma which led to his poetic silence. This complicated state of mind not only defined the poetics of his poems, prose and memoirs but also prompted him to look for other models of self-identification. In the social aspect, Khodasevich's life in emigration turned out to be ambiguous. He was considered to be a particularly prominent poet, critic and memoirist; however, he lost the competition for the position of a mentor of young

poets. Given how important the idea of literature as a live tradition was to him and taking into consideration his eventual poetic silence, it is safe to assume that the period of emigration was a tragedy for Khodasevich, but that kind of tragedy which nevertheless made a unique contribution to emigrant literature.

### **Provisions submitted for the defence**

1. Many tendencies in Khodasevich's creative work are defined by Russian symbolism as the main literary current of Modernism. Khodasevich's engagement with the classic tradition also comes from his elder contemporaries from the symbolist "cohort." However, while early Khodasevich depended on symbolism even in stylized poems, his "mature" poetics overcame symbolism as his distinctive attitude towards the classic tradition became paramount, and symbolism faded into the background.

2. The formation of Khodasevich's "mature" poetics took place during the critical years of Russian history (the First World War, the 1917 Revolution, and the Civil War). In this time, Khodasevich underwent an identity crisis caused by the suicide of his closest friend Muni and the premonition of the nearing collapse of the Russian Empire.

3. The state of crisis is reflected in the "macabre" cycle of poems of 1916–1917 as well as other poems conceptually close to it, including *Slezy Rakhili* (Rachel's Tears), *Doma* (At Home), *Smolenskiy rynek* (Smolenskyi Market), *O buduchshem rebenke* (About the Future Baby), *Po bul'varam* (Along the Boulevards). The poetics of these poems follows the humanistic and social tradition of Russian literature, primarily, Nekrasov's poetry and Dostoevskii's prose. The cycle culminates with the poem *Zoloto* (Gold) which reflects Khodasevich's view on the historical process. These views are expressed through the use of Z. Krasiński's drama *Irydion* which serves as a pre-text in the classical sense of the term. Khodasevich interpreted the problematics of Krasiński's drama through the lens of Dostoevskii's works.

4. In several poems of the “macabre” cycle such as *Slezy Rakhili* (Rachel’s Tears) and *Smolenskiy rynok* (Smolenskyi Market), Khodasevich finds a new poetical principle – the contamination of themes, images, lexical formulas and stylistic features borrowed from different segments of the literary tradition. This principle will be especially important for the poetics of *Tiazhelaia Lira* (The Heavy Lyre).

5. In the collection of poems *Putem zerna* (Grain’s Way), we can discern not only the tragic conceptual thread but also the optimistic one expressed through the key poem *Putem zerna* (Grain’s Way) and in *Khleby* (The Loaves). These poems are the reaction to the revolutions of 1917 which Khodasevich accepted during the first following years and reflect his new, more positive understanding of the historical process.

6. Agrarian imagery of the poem *Putem zerna* (Grain’s Way) and other poems from the same-name collection is related not as much to the New Testament but rather to a specific agrarian topos of Russian literature. Within this topos, agricultural images were directly linked to revolution. Discovered in Pushkin’s *Svobody seiatel’ pustynnyi* (Behold a Sower Went Forth to Sow), this topos was systematically developed by Nekrasov, the *narodniki* poets as well as symbolists, and after the Revolution, by the “new peasant” poets. Khodasevich’s agrarian poems form part of this tradition. In addition, the poem *Putem zerna* (Grain’s Way) is a new stage in his work with the poetic tradition (engagement with particular pre-texts rather than literary topoi).

7. The new stage of Khodasevich’s creative evolution took place in 1920–1922 when he wrote the majority of poems included in *Tiazhelaia Lira* (The Heavy Lyre). These were the years of Khodasevich’s poetic fame. In this regard, August of 1921, a tragic month for the history of Russian literature when Nikolai Gumilev was executed and Aleksandr Blok died, is an especially important moment. After the deaths of both poets, Khodasevich believed himself to be a successor of the Russian literary tradition through Blok’s heritage which went back to Pushkin. This feeling emerged both in ego-documents and poetic manifests such as *Ballada* (Ballad).



However, he did not follow Blok absolutely. As the story of a “secret wake” for the symbolist shows, Khodasevich did not accept Blok’s ideas about the people and intelligentsia and did not adhere to his mythologized understanding of Russia.

8. In *Tiazhelaia Lira* (The Heavy Lyre) – the pinnacle of his creative work – Khodasevich develops a new approach to tradition. To describe it, it is necessary to revise the theory of intertextuality as it has been established in the Russian studies of Modernism. Considering the implicitly innovative segment of Russian Modernist poetry, it can be productive to compare the engagement with “other’s words” in a broad sense (citations, allusions, reminiscences, etc.) to the work of an epic narrator. For an implicitly innovative Modernist poet, “the other’s word” is not subtext in K. Taranovskii’s terms, that is, it is not an element that “codes” the meaning of the lyric texts. Such a poet understands tradition as a continuum in which commonplaces / topoi, on the one hand, and lexical clichés and poetic formulas, on the other hand, are identified or created. Although the implicitly innovative poet is free to choose his own set of text to form a literary tradition, to master the tradition means to be able to divorce problematics, themes and motives of the texts from their lexical and stylistic expressions. Poetic success for such a poet is to combine in his own poem various themes, images and styles from the tradition and in some cases, to create new topoi. This poetics allows the poet to tap into the tradition and at the same time say something new. It distinguishes the implicitly innovative poetry from “neo-classicism.” In *Tiazhelaia Lira* (The Heavy Lyre), Khodasevich excels at this type of intertextuality.

9. Such key poems of the collections as *Ballada* (Ballad), *Elegia* (Elegy) as well as several others showcase the type of engagement with “the other’s words” described in the previous item. In *Ballada* (Ballad), there is a number of pre-texts which are relevant for particular verses and images as well as for the poem as a whole: the image of a heavy lyre which can be traced back to both Derzhavin and Fet; the act of passing the lyre to a younger poet mythologized in Russian culture; Pushkin’s *Prorok* (The Prophet); Blok’s poems; Annenskii’s and Mandel’stam’s works. In its turn, *Elegia* (Elegy) “plays” with pre-texts from Zhukovski, Del’vig,

Baratynskii and Tiutchev as well as, contrary to its title, with genre features, combining the reflexes of an elegy, an ode, and a ballad. In *Elegia* (Elegy), a traditional (in Taranovskii's terms) pre-text can also be found – it is Del'vig's poem *Elisium poetov* (The Elysium of Poets) [Uspenskij 20146; Uspenskij&Ignat'ev 2018].

10. In the poetics of *Tiazhelaia Lira* (Heavy Lyre), poetic irony holds an important place. From the perspective of historical poetics, the figures of irony in Khodasevich's book can be traced back to Heine. Heine had had influence on Khodasevich in regard to themes and intonation in *Nemetskii gorodok* (German Town) and *Aniute* (To Aniuta). He is important for such poems from the collection as *Ulika* (The Evidence) and *Zhizel* (Giselle). In addition, Heine majorly defined the interpretation of the love theme which is presented both ironically and most earnestly in *Tiazhelaia Lira* (The Heavy Lyre) – see *Zhizel* (Giselle) and *Strannik proshel, opiraias' na posokh* (A wanderer has passed, leaning on a staff). Heine's poetry, alongside German Expressionism, would be later important for some of Khodasevich's emigrant poems [Uspenskij 2017a; Uspenskij 20176].

11. A number of poems from *Tiazhelaia Lira* (The Heavy Lyre) feature Khodasevich's trademark device – an unexpected shift in meaning. With this device, the ending contradicts the previous text and forces the reader to revise the already established ideas about it. This device should be described from the psychological perspective as a work of consciousness aimed at resolving cognitive dissonance which in the situation of processing a literary text prompts the reader's aesthetic experience. In terms of historical poetics, this device stems not so much from the poetics of an epigram, as it is commonly thought, but rather from Evgenii Baratynskii's poetry who consistently used this epigram principle in his serious poems [Uspenskij 2013]. In any case, Khodasevich specifically succeeds to Baratynskii, not the epigram. The fact that poets of the XX century regarded this device as Khodasevich's trademark is further proved by Khodasevich's influence on Mandel'stam's *Novye stikhi* (New Poems).

12. Khodasevich's position in the social structure of the emigrant writers' community can be relatively accurately described based on the poet's specific kind of diary – *Kamer-furierskii zhurnal* (Chamber Fourier Journal) processed with the use of digital methods and social analysis. Khodasevich belonged to the “elder” cohort of the emigrant writers and was closer to them, however, interacted more with the “younger” in the 1930s. Despite that, Khodasevich failed to achieve social success among the “younger” as he lost the competition for the position of the ruler of the minds to his opponent, Georgii Adamovich. Subsequently, memoir literature as well as scholarly studies developed the assumption that Khodasevich had never tried to claim this position, which is, however, incorrect. The network analysis of *Kamer-furierskii zhurnal* (Chamber Fourier Journal) also allows for identifying the key figures in the emigrant writers' community and analyse the dynamics of the emigrant social network, with the “younger” gradually replacing the “elder.”

13. For Khodasevich, emigration was a traumatic state stretched in time in which he could not shape an acceptable identity. In his search for a new, emigrant identity, he relied on the late XVIII and XIX centuries – the era of classic Russian literature. Khodasevich saw this period as a space of symbolic projections as he attempted to find appealing models for self-identification; however, trauma prevented him from doing so. A number of Khodasevich's works such as *Derzhavin* (Derzhavin: A Biography), the unfinished biography of Pushkin, *Zhizn' Vasilii Travnikova* (The Life of Vasilii Travnikov) as well as his critical essay *Poezia Ignata Lebiadkina* (The Poems of Ignat Lebiadkin) turn out to be deeply autobiographical texts.

14. The interpretation of Khodasevich's emigration as a traumatic experience allows me to provide a new perspective on his emigrant poems and memoirs. Trauma explains the main theme of physical disability and body deformation of the characters and the lyrical subject alike. Physical disability is presented in different modalities: as an expression of the “ugliness” of the world in *Dachnoe* (Of the Countryside) or as a personal tragedy in *Ballada* (Ballad) and *Dzhon Bottom* (John Bottom). Despite the fact that the images of deformity are in accord with literary

tradition, their genesis lies in the realm of the poet's individual psyche [Uspenskij 2015]. Trauma can also explain a memoir essay *Konets Renaty* (Renata's End) focused on Nina Petrovskaja's life. Despite all the objectiveness of Khodasevich's narrative, the interpretation of her life and death, is based on the symbolist idea of Petrovskaja's duplicity with her disabled sister [Uspenskij 2018].

15. Khodasevich's emigration can be divided into two stages: 1922–1925 and 1925–1939. In both cases, he went through an identity crisis and experienced trauma; however, there is a crucial difference between the periods. In 1922–1925, the poet was a “half-emigrant” and believed that he could return to Soviet Russia after the normalization of political and cultural life. That is why, during these years, he had more inner resources to interact with his trauma and if not see it in a playful mode, then at least distance from it. Starting from 1925, Khodasevich became a full emigrant, which not only aggravated his crisis but led to his poetic muteness in the late 1920s as the idea of writing poetry came to be incorporated in the structure of his trauma.

16. The analysis of Khodasevich's poems of 1922–1925 beyond the trauma studies lens allows me to maintain that initially *Evropeiskaia noch'* (European Night) was conceived as a collection of satirical poems. The majority of characters described by Khodasevich are not Europeans but Russian emigrants. Several images form these poems, for example, Cain from *U moria* (By the Sea) is directly related to Soviet revolutionary discourse. Khodasevich's satirical intention is further reinforced by the fact that a number of 1922–1925 poems match satirical texts by Sasha Chernyi and Nekrasov. The 1925–1927 poems included in *Evropeiskaia noch'* (European Night) significantly toned down the satirical modality of the emigrant texts and reached the level of all-encompassing existential despair. In addition, these texts incorporated Russian space into the collection's geography so that the poems about emigrants were, in most part, reinterpreted as poems about Europeans.

17. Aleksander Herzen, a prominent Russian emigrant of the XIX century, played an important role in Khodasevich's search for a new identity and poetics. Khodasevich took interest in Herzen as early as 1917–1919 as Herzen-inspired

imagery in his pre-emigration poems and essays suggest. In emigration, Herzen became a model figure for Khodasevich. The two writers share a bitter critical view on *meschanstvo*, the rejection of modern European way of life and at the same time – of the political situation back at home (“*chuzhdost’ v obe storony*” – “alienation from both sides”) as well as a utopian vision of the future (political in Herzen’s case, and cultural, in Khodasevich’s). The title of the book *Evropeiskaia noch’* (European Night) can be traced back not only to Spengler and the ideas of *slavianofily* but also partially to the metaphors of night for describing the Nikolas I’s Russia in *My Past and Thoughts*. A number of poems written in emigration develops the themes and images of Herzen’s essays – in particular it applies to political poems such as *Intrigi birzh, potugi natsii* (The intrigues of exchanges, the labours of nations) and *Skvoz’ oblaka fabrichnoi gari* (Through the clouds of factory fumes); however, their intertextual plane is not limited to Herzen.

18. *Evropeiskaia noch’* (European Night) is almost entirely based on the dialogue with Nekrasov’s poetry. The key poems of the book such as *Peterburg, Ballada* (Ballad), *Pered zerkalom* (In Front of the Mirror), *An Mariechen, Zvezdy* (The Stars) recombine the themes and images of Nekrasov’s texts. It concerns not only the poetics of the scary and dark modern city but also Nekrasov’s relations between the poet and his Muse, the theme of poetics muteness, tragic life scenarios for an ordinary woman. Khodasevich’s reception of Nekrasov was strongly influenced by the symbolists (Briusov, Bal’mont, Belyi) rediscovery of the classic as well as the scholarly works of formalists. However, like in other cases, it was no more than an impetus conditioned by his times as Khodasevich’s dialogue with Nekrasov is exceptionally original and self-sufficient [Uspenskij 2012].

19. *Pamiatnik* (The Monument) – one of Khodasevich’s final poems – reflects emigrant views on Russia’s future. If we contrast it with Georgii Ivanov’s famous poem *Rossia schastie. Rossia svet...* (Russia is happiness. Russia is light...), it is important to notice that Ivanov in his socially poignant text moves from politics to literature referring to Dostoevskii [Uspenskij 2016] whereas Khodasevich, working with a purely aesthetical genre of a “literary monument”, in contrast, paradoxically

moves from literature to politics. *Pamiatnik* (The Monument) is a two-dimensional poem which should be read both within the literary tradition and the emigrant political discourse. Khodasevich's criticism which displays a consistent tendency to shift from the internal affairs in Soviet Russia to contemporary literature and vice versa forms the background against which *Pamiatnik* (The Monument) can be interpreted as a sharply social poem. In particular, it reflects very concrete political ideas on the expected merging of the metropolis and the diaspora and the beginning of a new historical era for Russia.

20. Khodasevich is one of the most prominent Modernists who continued Russian classical tradition. If he is to be described as a "neo-classic", then with numerous caveats as Khodasevich's "neo-classicism" is a result of an exceptionally original and intense dialogue with both Russian and European literature.

## Literature

Ananko 2020 — Ananko Ia. Kanikuly Kaina. Poetika promezhutka v berlinskikh stikhakh V. F. Khodasevicha (Cain's Holidays. The Poetics of an Interval in Khodasevich's Berlin Poems). Moscow, 2020.

Bogomolov 1989 — Bogomolov N. A. Zhizn' i poeziia Vladislava Khodasevicha (The Life and Poetry of Vladislav Khodasevich) // Khodasevich V. Stikhotvoreniia / Sost., podgot. teksta i prim. N. A. Bogomolova i D. B. Volcheka. Leningrad, 1989. S. 5–48.

Bogomolov 2011 — Bogomolov N. A. Sopriazhenie dalekovatykh: O Viacheslave Ivanove i Vladislave Khodaseviche. (The Conjunction of Things Far Apart: On Viacheslav Ivanov and Vladislav Khodasevich). Moscow, 2011.

Bocharov 1996 — Bocharov S. G. "Pamiatnik" Khodasevicha (*The Monument* by Khodasevich) // Khodasevich V. Sobr. soch.: V 4 t. Moscow, 1996. T. 1. S. 5–56.

- Zel'chenko 2019 — Zel'chenko V. Stikhotvorenie Vladislava Khodasevicha "Obez'iana": kommentarii. (Vladislav Khodasevich's Poem *The Monkey*: A Commentary). Moscow, 2019.
- Kaspe 2005 — Kaspe I. Iskusstvo otsutstvovat'. Nezamechennoe pokolenie russkoi literatury (The Art of Absence: The Unnoticed Generation of Russian Literature). Moscow, 2005.
- Levin 1986 — Levin Iu. I. Zametki o poezii Vl. Khodasevicha (Notes on the Poetry of Vladislav Khodasevich) // Wiener Slawistischer Almanach. 1986. Bd. 17. R. 43–129.
- Lord 2018 – Lord A. B. Skazitel' (The Storyteller). Saint-Petersburg, 2018.
- Murav'eva 2013 — Murav'eva I. A. Zhizn' Vladislava Khodasevicha (The Life of Vladislav Khodasevich). Saint-Petersburg, 2013.
- Skvortsov 2021 — Skvortsov A. "No mir moi shiritsia, kak volny...". O poezii Vladislava Khodasevicha ("But My World Grows Bigger Like Waves..." On Vladislav Khodasevich's Poetry). Moscow, 2021.
- Surat 1994 — Surat I. Pushkinist Vladislav Khodasevich (Vladislav Khodasevich as a Pushkin Scholar). Moscow, 1994.
- Tynianov 1977 — Tynianov Iu. N. Poetika. Istoriia literatury. Kino (Poetics. History of Literature. Cinema). Moscow, 1977.
- Uspenskij 2012 — Uspenskij P. F. "Nachinaiutsia mrachnye stseny": poeziia N.A. Nekrasova v "Evropeiskoi nochi" V. F. Khodasevicha ("The grim sights begin": N.A. Nekrasov's Poetry in V.F. Khodasevich's *European Night*) // Europa Orientalis. 2012. № 31. S. 129–170.
- Uspenskij 2014a — Uspenskij P. F. Tvorchestvo V. F. Khodasevicha i russkaia literaturnaia traditsiia (1900–e gg. – 1917 g.) (V.F. Khodasevich's Creative Works and Russian Literary Tradition (1900–1917)). University of Tartu Press, 2014.
- Uspenskij 2014b — Uspenskij P. F. "Liry labirint": pochemu V.F. Khodasevich nazval chetvertuiu knigu stikhov "Tiazhelaia lira"? ("The Labyrinth of the

- Lyre”: Why did V.F. Khodasevich Called His Fourth Collection of Poems *The Heavy Lyre?*) // Lotmanovskii sbornik. Vyp. 4. M.: OGI, 2014. S. 450–467.
- Uspenskij 2013 — Uspenskij P. F. Poeticheskaia tekhnika Boratynskogo v stikhakh Khodasevicha (Boratynskii’s Poetic Technique in Khodasevich’s Poems) // A.M.P.: Sbornik pamiati A.M. Peskova. Moscow, 2013. S. 525–534.
- Uspenskij 2015 — Uspenskij P. F. Travma eigratsii: fizicheskaia usherbnost’ v “Evropeiskoi nochi” V. Khodasevicha (The Trauma of Emigration: Physical Deformity in V. Khodasevich’s *European Night*) // ACTA SLAVICA ESTONICA VII. Blokovskii sbornik XIX. Aleksandr Blok i russkaia literatura Serebrianogo veka Vyp. XIX. Tartu, 2015. S. 192–210.
- Uspenskij 2016 — Uspenskij P. F. “Rossiia schastie. Rossiia svet...” G. V. Ivanova i nasledie F. M. Dostoevskogo (G.V. Ivanov’s *Russia Is Happiness. Russia Is Light* and F. M. Dostoevskii’s Legacy) // Russkaia literatura. 2016. № 1. S. 181–189.
- Uspenskij 2017a — Uspenskij P. F. V. F. Khodasevich i G. Geine (Stat’ia pervaia) (Khodasevich and H. Heine (Article One)) // Novyi filologicheskii vestnik. 2017. № 1(40). S. 158–169.
- Uspenskij 2017b — Uspenskij P. F. V. F. Khodasevich i G. Geine (Stat’ia vtoraia) (Khodasevich and H. Heine (Article Two)) // Novyi filologicheskii vestnik. 2017. № 3(42). S. 215–227.
- Uspenskij&Ignat’ev 2018 — Uspenskij P. F., Ignat’ev D. D. Puteshestvie v literaturnyi elizium: “Elegiia” V. Khodasevicha (A journey to the Literary Elysium: V. Khodasevich’s *Elegy*) // Novyi mir. 2018. № 2. S. 185–195.
- Ushakin&Trubina (red.) 2009 — Travma: punkty (Trauma: Bays) / Pod red. S. Ushakina i E. Trubinoi. Moscow, 2009.
- Fedotov 2017 — Fedotov O. Stikhopoetika Khodasevicha (The Poetics of Khodasevich’s Poetry). Moscow, 2017.
- Shubinskii 2011 — Shubinskii V. Vladislav Khodasevich: chaiushchii i govoriashchii (Vladislav Khodasevich: Seeking and Speaking). Saint-Petersburg, 2011.



- Bethea 1983 — Bethea D. Khodasevich, his life and art. Princeton, 1983.
- Caruth 1996 — Caruth C. Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narratives, and History. Baltimore, 1996.
- Demadre 1999 — Demadre E. La quête mystique de Vladislav Xodasevič: Essai d'interprétation de l'oeuvre poétique du dernier symboliste russe. Paris, 1999.
- Livak 2003 — Livak L. How It Was Done In Paris: Russian Emigre Literature & French Modernism. University of Wisconsin Press, 2003.
- Uspenskij 2018 — Uspenskij P. What interpretation did V. Khodasevich give to the life of N. Petrovskaya in emigration? On the poetics of “Renata’s End”, a memoir essay // *Novyi filologicheskii vestnik*. 2018. No. 1(44). P. 161–178.