



G.-B. KOHLER, P. I. NAVUMENKA

INTERFERENCE OF AUTONOMIZATION AND DEAUTONOMIZATION IN THE BELARUSIAN LITERARY FIELD. INDICATION OF 'SMALLNESS', OR SOMETHING DIFFERENT?

Исследуется модель возрастающей автономизации литературного поля, предложенная теорией поля Пьера Бурдьё. Обсуждается специфическая модель, включающая взаимовлияние факторов и процессов, способствующих как автономизации, так и деавтономизации. Гипотеза изучается на примере белорусской литературы (первая треть XX в.), рассматриваемой на основе объективных параметров как «малая» литература и, следовательно, подходящей для проверки тезисов Бурдьё. Показано, что благодаря эффекту «памяти поля» взаимоотношения авторов и литературных институтов принимают «двойную», зачастую амбивалентную форму: это приводит, с одной стороны (в основном на эстетическом уровне), к разработке специфических литературных приемов и позиционирований, свидетельствующих о предрасположенности к автономии, а с другой – (на институциональном уровне) определенно препятствует дальнейшей автономизации. Таким образом, развитие «малых» литератур рассматривается с точки зрения воздействия именно факторов автономизации – деавтономизации, что позволяет взглянуть на этот процесс несколько иначе, чем в случае модели Бурдьё.

The paper investigates the model of increasing autonomization of the literary field suggested by Pierre Bourdieu's theory of the literary field. It argues for a different model, capturing the interference of parameters and processes that prompt autonomization and deautonomization likewise. This hypothesis is discussed using the example of Belarusian literature (first third of 20th century), conceptualized, on the basis of objective parameters, as a 'small' literature and therefore particularly appropriate to put under question the common validness of Bourdieu's theses. The study reveals, indeed, that due to an effect described as 'field memory' interrelations between authors and literary institutions in several respects assume a 'double', often ambiguous shape: this generates, on the one hand (mostly on the aesthetical level), the elaboration of specific techniques and positionings witnessing autonomous attitudes and claims, whereas on the other hand (and first of all on the institutional level) it definitely disables further autonomization. As a result, the paper argues for investigation of literary evolution more in terms of possible interferences than so far suggested by Bourdieu's model.

Comme les voies de la domination, les
voies de l'autonomie sont complexes,
sinon impénétrables.

Pierre Bourdieu (1992. 92)

1. The 'smallness' of Belarusian literature: theoretical, historical and systematical preliminaries (theses)

The characteristic symptoms of what might be called a literature's 'smallness' are conditioned by specific circumstances within the historical process (Van Rees 2012). In the case of Belarus, literature within today's Belarusian territory develops under conditions of a discontinued, even 'broken' cultural tradition, of multilingualism, of conflicting mono- vs. multiculturalism, of absence (or rather: deficiency) of its 'own' cultural *elites*, of the lack of distinctive confessional self-identification, of a rural structure with an almost complete lack of urban centres. These conditions might – at least to a certain extent – be called 'colonial' (Spivak 1990; Said 1978); they roughly correspond to the criteria Miroslaw Hroch identifies as the motivating and promoting factors of 'small' peoples' national movements in the 19th century (Hroch 1967).

On a Bourdieu-inspired theoretical level, these symptoms might be related to a concept of 'smallness' that is heuristically defined by a) (low) significance (understood as a field's power to cause ripple effects within and beyond its boundaries and to process such effects coming from other fields); and b) (weak) organizational development with respect to the institutions and agents involved in the material and symbolic production as well as in the distribution of the work of art (Van Rees 2012).

¹ Артыкул публікуецца ў аўтарскай рэдакцыі.

As for Belarus, throughout the 19th century (as well as earlier, in the period of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and later, until nowadays) one of the important invariable features can be seen in the necessity of a double, bilateral distinction, if not double defense, from pretensions on the part of the Russian Empire on the one hand and of the former partner Poland on the other hand.

This setting in some sense reminds us of the conditions, under which Croatian literature developed in the 19th century: here, too, the formation of an 'own' national consciousness, of an 'own' field of power and, after all, of an 'own' literary field intensively conflicts with ambitions held by the medieval partner (Hungary) on the one hand, and the dominating state in power (Austria), on the other hand. But in Croatia we are dealing with a 'single' (even if 'double') field of power, which in a certain sense even brings forward the formation and development of the literary field (Kohler 2010).

The historical development of Belarus, on the contrary, takes place under conditions of a dichotomic and antagonistic system: the alienation and differentiation from the one pole automatically results in an approach towards the respective other pole. The lack of an own state, which could favor and protect an 'own' development (Casanova 2004), handicaps the structuring of the social space. This structuring, as well as the institutionalization of the Belarusian cultural system will be possible only at the beginning of the 20th century, during the so-called 'Adradženne'-period (HBL/I 1999, 12; McMillin 1977).

In this manner, what Bourdieu on the level of the inner structure of the literary field and of its direct or indirect correlation with the field of power calls the 'double rupture' (referring to the refusal of bourgeois as well as of social art; Bourdieu 1996, 77 ff.) – with regard to Belarusian literature can be found already on the level of the literary field itself – and even on the level of the field of power, precisely because the latter develops under the sign of refusal of (or distinction from) two antagonistic dominant systems.

So, as being, in a certain way, dependent on the relation of power between the rivaling dominating systems, the field of power itself, to which the literary field is subordinated, turns out to be deeply instable and unpredictable. This instability of the field of power is one of its characteristic features: it guides the direction of its development and thus sets the parameters of possible refusals and ruptures on the part of the literary field¹.

Therefore, during the 20th century the literary development in Belarus is directed (more or less straightforward) by the essential cataclysms and transformations the field of power is subjected to. The permanent need to redefine the dominating parameters set by the field of power, to redefine positions, their prestige and value, is, to some extent, reminiscent of the "Go back to 'Go'" -community-chest-card in the popular monopoly game, that forces the player to give up the current move and restart the round².

2. Progressing autonomization of the literary field? Theoretical outlines

As to the autonomy of the literary field it seems, at first glance, as if Bourdieu is quite clear: autonomy – taken as the power to function and to be measured according to 'own', inner-literary laws and rules (Bourdieu often uses the metaphor of the 'game'), in the framework of the field-model, depends on certain parameters and criteria, the most important of which are considered to be a) the effect of 'refraction' or translation that the specific inner logic of the literary field imposes to external influences; b) the strength of the negative sanctions inflicted on heteronomous practices; c) the strength of positive incitements to resistance or even open struggle against the powers (Bourdieu 1996, 220).

The criteria named for measuring the status of autonomy of a given literary field (see as well the subordination of the external hierarchization to the principle of internal hierarchization; *ibid.*, 217) assume – at least implicitly – the historically progressing autonomization of the field (*ibid.*, 215–216, 242). In French literature this autonomization proceeds in two phases³ and is achieved in the second half of the 19th century (compare: "a period when the literary field achieved a degree of autonomy which it has never since surpassed"; *ibid.*, 219). At the same time, Bourdieu admits a) the unsteady, varying status of autonomy depending on epochs and national traditions of the literary field (221), as well as b) the relativity of autonomy of the field, which remains more or less dependent on the field of power (248).

Besides, Bourdieu here and there names other particular parameters. However, they are to be taken rather as 'symptoms' than as 'criteria' of autonomy (as, for instance the hypothesis about reflexivity; 242).

As a result of what has been said, Bourdieu's concept of autonomy in the framework of the field model turns out to be less definite than it has seemed to be: 'valid' in the proper meaning of the word, besides the

¹ The literary field *sensu* Bourdieu is defined as a set or a configuration of objective relations between positions. The existence of each among these positions as well as the determinations to which it submits its owners are objectively defined by the actual position within the structure of the field (relative to other positions) and by the degree of prestige and power assigned to it (Bourdieu 1992).

² Thus, in a way, Belarusian literature could be seen as a 'small' one even in comparison with what Deleuze/Guattari (1987) called 'small' literatures.

³ There are several periodizations (beginning from the 1850-ies, and later on from the 1880-ies further on; Viala 2005, 45), while Bourdieu himself speaks, more generally, about the 1840-ies.

hypothesis of a 'logic process', are only the general parameters given by Bourdieu. They can serve as a framework and have to be defined and substantiated in accordance to any phase of any literary field and its specific conditions (Viala 2005, 45).

In western literary criticism this has been stated and repeated a number of times and in relation to different aspects. The results of this heuristic use of Bourdieu's field model prove its fruitfulness (cf. Joch/Wolf 2005; Korthals Altes 2004; Dorleijn/Grüttemeier/Korthals Altes 2008). A first attempt of such a use with respect to non-western 'small' Slavonic fields (especially the Belarusian) has been made recently (Kohler/Navumenka (eds.) 2012).

The French sociologist Gisèle Sapiro complied with the need of a "social history of the process of autonomization" (Bourdieu 1996, 248), that avoids, as she claims, too 'easy' or 'mechanic' interpretations of the complex correlations between autonomization of the field itself and the 'social context' (Sapiro 2005). As a result, Sapiro comes to the explicit conclusion about the 'non-linearity' and 'non-irreversibility' of the formation of autonomy ("Zerbrechlichkeit der mühsam erlangten Autonomie, deren Herausbildung weder linear noch irreversibel verlief"; *ibid.*, 43). This confirms precisely what Bourdieu said about the unsteadiness and relativity of autonomy and strictly speaking draws a final line under the idea of a process of permanent 'increasing autonomization'. It has to be replaced by the idea of a general and principal reversibility of the process and his results: thus, once achieved autonomy can be lost at a later state of the field. Non-linearity in this perspective concerns not only the speed of the process, and, maybe, its extent, but even the direction the movement takes. As a result, the idea of de-autonomization moves into focus.

However, neither Bourdieu himself, nor Sapiro explicitly mention such a phenomenon. But Bourdieu himself states, on the one hand, the 'never since being surpassed' degree of autonomy of the literary field in the second half of the 19th century (Bourdieu 1996, 218). On the other hand Sapiro argues, that 'any stage of the autonomization brings about a new form of dependency' ("dass jede Etappe der Autonomisierung eine neue Form von Abhängigkeit mit sich bringt"; Sapiro 2005, 43). Taken together, this boils down to the question, whether the autonomization Bourdieu talks about with reference to the period all since the second half of the 19th century (in France) – whether this is not the defense of autonomy, the struggle for its preservation, the attempt to prevent its degradation, rather than its 'conquest', its increase.

And according to this, it comes into question, whether what Sapiro describes with respect to the period since the beginning of the 20th century should not rather be called a social history of 'struggle against deautonomization' than, as she claims, a social history of 'autonomization' of the French literary field.

In any case, Bourdieu, by the end of his life, came to the conclusion about the 'end' of autonomy, the impossibility of autonomy in a postmodernist field of art (cf. Prior 2005). This is, of course, not the topic we are dealing with – but it shows, in a way, the instability and reversibility of both autonomy and, consequently, autonomization.

We can conclude, that by postulating implicitly a concept of historically increasing autonomy of an established literary field, the framework of the field model provided by Bourdieu to a certain extent principally favors the concept of autonomy and neglects the idea of its potential loss – though this idea is (at least latently) present.

After all, Bourdieu's model stages parameters, instruments and examples to describe autonomy and its increase – autonomization (for instance the historically accumulated symbolic capital which makes possible the defense of autonomy of a literary field dominated by the field of power (Bourdieu 1996, 221))⁴ – but not its loss, its decrease its deautonomization, to such an extent, that even processes that objectively point to a threatening loss of autonomy as mentioned in Sapiro's paper are described in terms of autonomization (notably as its 'defense').

In order to have a closer look and to better understand this phenomenon and to develop more adequate instruments to describe it, it might be fruitful to turn to 'small' literatures which, as we suppose, have to deal with the problem of instable autonomy and of threatening or even real deautonomization to a higher (or maybe more 'conscient') degree than other literary fields.

The development of Belarusian literature in the 1920-ies is usually described as its heyday (McMillin 1977; HBL/II 2001): even considered from a (maybe not completely 'orthodox', for we are dealing with a 'small' literature) field-theoretical point of view, the process taking place in the 1920-ies reveals the existence

⁴ And even here Bourdieu is not always clear. Arguing, for instance, that "the literary order (etc.) [...] was progressively instituted in the course of a long and slow process of autonomization" (1996, 215), he suggests, that 'autonomization' of the field and 'genesis' of the field are one and the same process, which, however, he denies in other contexts. Similarly, taking together the important chapter "The conquest of Autonomy: The critical phase in the emergence of the field" (47–112) on the one hand, and the thesis about 'increasing autonomization' on the other hand, the question arises, how to define the 'minimum level' of autonomy which makes it possible, in terms of the field model, to talk about a 'field' at all.

of a more or less established, differentiated and professionalized Belarusian literary field⁵. On the other hand, the heyday period quickly ends in a nearly complete 'destruction' of the field mechanisms. The destructive power of this annihilation becomes evident with the shooting of a big part of the most notable or promising authors (especially in 1937). But, as a matter of fact, we can diagnose an 'ending' considerably earlier, in 1931, when the literary association *Uzvyšša*, symbol of what might be understood as an 'autonomous' positioning, suspends itself and liquidates its literary magazine. Or in 1930, when Janka Kupala (Ivan Lucëvič), officially named 'national poet' in 1925, attempts suicide as a reaction to growing pressure and publishes a letter of apology. Or still earlier, in the year of beginning collectivization 1929, when the group *Uzvyšša* is forced to public confession of wrong and 'dangerous' political and social convictions, and, for instance, one of the leading poets, Ales' Dudar is arrested. Or again earlier, in 1926 with the ban on Janka Kupala's tragicomedia *Tutejšyja* because of its insufficient support of the dictatorship of the proletariat⁶.

So the question arises, which moment exactly marks the beginning of the decline of autonomy, or, in other words, from which moment on the threat of autonomy begins to prevail – and how, by which mechanisms does the former balance get lost. The indefiniteness of this moment (even if we acknowledge, that 1929 can be considered as upheaval) points out to the fact that we have to deal with a (mainly politically motivated, of course) process of deautonomization taking place simultaneously to the process of increasing autonomization that can be noticed at the same time⁷.

This interesting interference of processes can be described as an increasing of autonomy, on the one hand, and as an increasing of heteronomy, on the other. To understand the reasons and especially the mechanisms of this particular interference, we will now first examine the general status of the Belarusian literary field in the first third of the 20th century, and then investigate the most important parameters that precondition and shape the mentioned interference.

3. The Belarusian literary field in the first third of the 20th century. General characteristics (theses)

As it has already been stated, one of the most crucial factors in the development of the Belarusian literary field is an essentially instable field of power. This instability affects political, ideological, social as well as economical matters and provokes a nearly permanent changing of paradigms not only on the political and social, but also on the literary floor. 'Power', in terms of Belarusian history in the first third of 20th century is a fragile, ephemeral and precarious concept. Paradoxically, during the whole period the main continuity is permanent change and instability⁸. Within this framework of permanent changing there are maybe two parameters that seem to characterize each of the power-constellations and are (at least indirectly) reflected in literary matters; namely a) the relevance of ideology (national-democratic or Marxist mainly), and b) the definition and self-definition in terms of dichotomic models (Polish or Russian, right or wrong, according to the party or against it, friend or enemy etc.)⁹.

The constitution of the Belarusian literary field takes place during the so-called *Naša-Niva*-phase (named in Belarusian literary history after the newspaper *Naša Niva* that (similarly to *Danica* in Croatian literature in the first third of 19th century) initializes the process of formation and constitution of the literary field (Navumenka 2012). As it has been argued with respect to Croatian literature, the beginning of the literary field significantly supports and pushes the establishment of an 'own' field of power (Kohler 2008) and hence establishes a close relation between the literary field and the field of power that might be considered as a specific feature of 'small' literatures. Unlike the Croatian literary field, however, the Belarusian field quickly proceeds in differentiation, as show, for instance, the polemics taking place in *Naša Niva* from 1912 on¹⁰.

A further specific feature of the field in comparison to the Croatian field during the equivalent period about 70 years earlier can be seen in the constitution of 'legislators' (the so-called 'classics', Kolas, Kupala, Bahda-

⁵ Competing heteronomous and autonomous sub-fields with free 'choice' of positioning, broadening of the spectrum of genres, hierarchization, more or less 'normal' functioning of the literary market, professionalized authorship, from the middle of the 1920-ies, increasing importance of the autonomous sub-field, etc.

⁶ The piece, forbidden as well in today's Belarus, gives a lucide portrait of the 'instable field of power' mentioned above.

⁷ The prevailing political context in the 1920-ies is the organization and consolidation of the Soviet Empire. It provokes an increasing hostility towards efforts of autonomization (or towards what is seen as such) of the 'small' Soviet Republics and causes a politics of cultural repression.

⁸ The instability of the field of power enables various correlations with the literary field – a kind of moderate dominance (1906–1915), liberalism with a sub-note of growing dominance (1923–1928) and intransigent dominance (from 1929 on). Strictly speaking, we have to deal with three completely different fields with incompatible rules.

⁹ It is precisely the part of the literary field that aspires to and claims autonomy, which will try to overcome this dichotomic model (in the sense of the double rupture diagnosed by Bourdieu (1996, 77 ff)). This could be one of the main reasons, why (autonomous) literature is considered as 'dangerous' within the Soviet system.

¹⁰ The polemics clearly reveals topics close to problems of autonomization, for instance with respect to the function of literature: the position "we need literature to build and educate readership" leads to the (competing) positions according to which literature should "satisfy the reader's requirements" or rather "be orientated to the ideal of beauty". Here we can observe specific field rules at work.

novič). With respect to the field's agents, actually, one more characteristic of this phase is their awareness to be the 'first ones' (unlike the usual idea of rupture or change towards precedent phases and agents) – a self-awareness that provokes a specific habitus of conceptualization not common in other literatures¹¹.

The fruitful process of constitution, beginning institutionalization and differentiating of the literary field, however, is broken down by the cataclysms of First World War, Revolution and Civil War that prevent a further organic development (that would have included, without any doubt, the emergence of open field-fights in the sense of Bourdieu). The years between 1915 and the beginning of the 1920-ies are a phase of nearly complete suspension of literary and cultural life. The reconstitution of the literary field after these years of inertia will proceed under completely different signs, even if, once again, marked by instability of power. But it is important to notice that the named characteristics that emerged during the period of constitution are preserved in a kind of 'field-memory'. These characteristics (relevance of ideology, close (in a way – equal) relation to and alliance with the field of power, habitus of conceptualization, self-awareness, veneration of 'legislators' etc.) would eventually be revitalized in the framework of the 'new' field. However, as they pursue the pre-war-development of literary autonomization they necessarily enter into conflict with the parameters set by the new, soviet field of power.

4. Interference of autonomization and deautonomization during the 1920-ies

The interference between autonomization and deautonomization during the 1920-ies is therefore to a high degree based on the incompatibility of parameters anchored in the 'field-memory' as a kind of indistinct *nomos* (the 'belief' in specific values assigned to literature and its agents, especially in relation to the field of power, by certain representatives of the literary field) with the values and function assigned to literature on the part of the field of power. To get a more detailed idea about this interference and its mechanisms it might be helpful to differentiate heuristically four actually tightly intertwined parameters.

4.1. Illusory alliances between literary field and field of power

At first glance it seems as if the characteristic interweaving of literary field and field of power taking place in the first decade of the 20th century (when the relative institutional autonomy of the literary field promoted the consolidation of the field of power) is being repeated in the beginning of the 1920-ies. Unlike the Croatian case, where this alliance fades into an interrelation of domination and rejection of domination ('normal' in terms of field-theory) at an early state of the fields in the case of Belarus the situation of both the fields of power and literature after the period of war and revolution seems to be similar to the beginning of the century and enables, if not necessitates the renovation of this alliance. But in fact the paradigm has changed – what seems, in the framework of 'field memory', to be a renewal of the former alliance (especially the authors remembering *Naša Niva* were taking it as such) turns out to be a false imitation, the active literary institutionalization considerably being promoted by power.

So, while literature seems to take over the same function as during the former period (heteronomous strictly speaking, but with an effect of relative autonomy), the alliance turns out to be a false, illusory one, the political vector pointing out not to establish an 'own' field of power, but, again, a 'foreign' one¹². As a matter of fact, the literature's loyalty to the field of power is not compensated by a similar loyalty towards literature anymore, but turns into control and subordination in the long run¹³. 'Field memory' here turns out to be fallacious. The literary association *Maladnjak*, founded in 1923 and assembling young authors, literary beginners of mostly peasant or proletarian origin, initializes the reorganization of the literary field and considerably popularizes literary production and literary discussion. But as launched and organized by the political field, it is in debt of loyalty to power, and even by its origin and form of organization is closer to heteronomy than to autonomy.

4.2. The double effect of institutionalization

The foundation of *Maladnjak*, indeed, significantly animates and accelerates literary life in the young Soviet republic. It organizes a critical mass of producers, creates a literary public and promotes important field processes on a large scale, as for instance the polemics of generation conflict (by polemizing against the *Naša-Niva*-generation). But on the other hand, the vivid process of institutionalization of the literary field turns out to be deeply ambiguous. As a matter of fact, almost all the institutions created at this time will mutate into instruments of control:

One of the great merits of *Maladnjak* is indeed the fact, that the organization refunds a tradition of literary competition, discussion and polemics of more and more professionalized authors. *Maladnjak*, by way of ne-

¹¹ This mainly refers to Maksim Harečki and the question, 'how the Belarusian literature should be'; cf. Mušynski 2012. This parameter could be discussed in relation to the moment of reflexivity asserted by Bourdieu (1996, 242 ff.) as a sign of autonomy.

¹² The Soviet national politics towards the small republics turns into prohibition.

¹³ Consequently, the renewal of the liberal and intrinsic *Naša-Niva*-concept undertaken by the agents of *Uzvyyšša* from 1926 on is clearly directed towards autonomy (Navumenka 2012).

gation and splitting (the latter inspired by ideas and ideals of *Naša Niva* and thus, in a certain way, by generation-conflict), is the generator of literary life in the 1920-ies with the quest for autonomy undertaken by competing groups (especially the above-mentioned *Uzvyšša*). But on the other hand, *Maladnjak's* structure and form of organization as well as especially its alliance to the ideology-in-power enables the formation and the professionalization of a critical discourse that will inflict severe damage to literary diversity up to inhibiting and sanctioning any manifestation of autonomy.

Similarly, the Belarusian State University, founded in 1921, has an ambiguous effect, enabling, on the one hand, the education of authors, giving them a forum to discuss ideas, generating and establishing an academic literary discourse, but, on the other hand, perverting to an instrument of ideological control and propaganda¹⁴. The same must be said with respect to the Academy founded as the Institute of Belarusian Culture (*Inbelkul't*) in 1922 and transformed into Academy of Science in 1929. Playing a decisive role in the establishment of academic discourse, an education system and a conception of cultural identity, the Academy becomes one of the most important instruments of sovietization by the end of the 1920-ies, as the liquidation and reorganization of nearly the entire academic cadre illustrate.

The diversity of Belarusian publishing houses is severely affected by their centralization in the State publishing house *Beldzjaržvyd* in 1924. Closely linked to the *Haloŭlit* it is entirely submitted to official ideology and actually will function (precisely as the latter) as an instrument of censure.

Belarusian Theater is affected by the same mechanism¹⁵.

However, despite the increasing perversion of the literary institutions later on turning to instruments of pressure and control, they vivify and consolidate the literary field (at least for some time). Ignoring their positive effect on literary production would be as inadequate as neglecting the negative impact on the field and its agents: the function is a double one.

4.3. Pseudo-functioning of institutions

As a result, the institutions turn into 'imitations', losing their protective function. Maintaining their external appearance, they cease to fulfill their function as such, which lies in the defense of literary agents and in the reassurance of the validity of symbolic capital in literary matters.

The example of Michas' Zarécki, formerly one of the group's leading figures and chief editor of the magazine *Maladnjak*, might be illustrative in this respect: his change from *Maladnjak* to *Polymja* in 1928 sensibly affects his ideological immunity and prestige in the (partly already heteronomized) field, because *Maladnjak* functions as a mouthpiece of the official ideology. In 1929 neither the mainly neutral (with respect to literary production, though loyal) *Polymja*, nor the newspaper *Saveckaja Belarus* that has been a Marxist but aesthetically ambitious stepping stone for young authors and new works for some years, are able (or willing) to protect the author against severe attacks after having published two works that are read as offending official ideology and politics¹⁶. Zarécki, as a result of the following press campaign against himself, is excluded from the Party as an 'enemy'. But the actually significant fact is that the organ does not protect the author anymore: publishing, for instance, in *Polymja*, does no longer guarantee the organ's identification with the author's work. This could be interpreted, in a way, as a gain of autonomy (in the sense of differentiation of the author's tasks and auto-responsibility). But on the other hand the division between institution and agent is dictated by the paper's need to subordinate itself to official ideological norms promoted by Marxist literary criticism in the associations *Maladnjak* and *BelAPP*. Both *Polymja* and *Saveckaja Belarus* give a public confession of guilt in having published Zarécki's works.

Generally the institutions – magazines and above all groups – continuously develop specific strategies of camouflage and delusion. *Polymja*, for instance, which ideologically represents an aesthetically high-levelled conservative branch of literary production, exists on the basis of a severe hard-lined activity of Marxist critics on the one hand, and of an explicit and unambiguous commitment to the Marxist-proletarian ideology on the other: like with many other print media at the time the magazine's cover cites the slogan taken from the Communist Manifesto "workers of the world, unite!", which was in use as official Soviet Union's State motto. The magazine's heteronomous commitment to power is – at least formally – undoubted and confirmed by the manifesto published in the first number: "Those who accept our program will follow us. Those who lack the courage to accept it will be against us. We will admit no middle course for it must not be"¹⁷. The Marxist and socialist label has a mere external, harmless function (*Uzvyšša* in 1927 avows itself to the ideology as well) –

¹⁴ Cf. the so-called "list troch-affair" (Letter of the Three).

¹⁵ First there is hope of revival of the nonofficial theater of the NN-phase (Ul. Halubok) with the creation of even several 'departments' according to the languages in use (Belarusian, Russian, Hebrew), but later on unification and entire control prevail.

¹⁶ The one is understood as an apology of national democratism, the other as a critical statement in respect to the collectivization politics.

¹⁷ *Polymja* 1/1922:3 («Тыя, хто нашу праграму прымуць, пойдучь за намі. Усе-ж, хто ня знойдзе сьмеласьці яе прыняць, пойдучь супроціў нас. Сярэдзіны мы не прызнаем, ды яе й ня можа [быць]»). By the way, here we meet again with the above mentioned traditional dichotomic model – one of the most important systemic parameters of Soviet Union's ideology.

it is the label required by official power. At this early state of the field a habitus of ambiguity and pretense is introduced that would assert relative freedom to the literary organs for quite a long period: internal autonomy is maintained and guaranteed by external, formally heteronomous commitment. Paradoxically, the hypertrophization of the field of power finally, fatal to literature and culture, is grounded precisely on such strategies of a double habitus – a strategy that effectively ‘functions’, *inter alia*, on the basis of the mentioned tight relation between field of power and literary field¹⁸.

4.4. Decline of institutional and raise of aesthetical autonomy

Thus, the pseudo-functioning of institutions has a double effect: on the one hand it promotes heteronomy, first on a mainly ‘formal’ level that later on expands to real control. On the other hand the increasing heteronomy and the loss of faith in institutions on the aesthetic level generate strategies of disguise which seem to increase inversely proportional to the decline of institutional autonomy. These strategies do not only reveal a claim of autonomy that had never (or rarely) been stated in a direct and explicit way. Moreover, they establish a kind of (hidden) meta-discourse that can be related (at least partly) to the effect of ‘refraction’ or translocation imposed on external influences by the logic of the field (Bourdieu 1996, 220).

One of the strategies widely made use of (by Zarëcki, Kolas, Duboŭka, Krapiva and others) is the refraction of the Marxist critical discourse on the aesthetic level. Michas’ Zarëcki, for instance, refracts the mainstream-discourse that had roundly condemned him in the 1929 affair: The fragment *Smerc’ Andrëja Beražoŭskaha*, published in 1931 in *Polymja*, turns out to be a mere mystification on several levels that artfully demonstrates the complete annihilation of literature by the official ideological maxims. The fragment, which is preceded by a mystifying and sophisticated confession of guilt, meticulously meets all the criteria favored by official discourse and thus reveals the hollowness and shallowness of a literature subordinated to heteronomous principles on the level of the plot as well as with reference to personages, structure and style. Due to the specific conception and techniques (intertwining of text and paratext, for instance) the fragment stalemates official critics: formally the work is ‘clean’. However, the unmasking of his ambiguous sense would submit official criticism to the norms of Zarëcki’s literary concept, would constrain it to admit the legitimacy of the principles of art (Kohler 2012).

Similar strategies are frequent, as for instance Jakub Kolas’s *Adščapenec* (1929), externally pro-soviet, but actually deeply polemical. A similar polemic subtext characterizes works of Čorny, Mryj, Krapiva, Halubok and others.

Other strategies can be seen in the retreat to specific genres, as for instance to autobiography allowing an open nostalgia of former, ‘rural’ times by transferring it in the sphere of the individual childhood (the Jewish-Belarusian author Zmitrok Bjadulja), or to popular fiction (Kolas), or to the drama (Krapiva).

One of the most interesting and promising strategies developed in the context of deautonomization – and maybe the most extreme one – is what might be called ‘minimized’ or ‘pure narration’. Indeed, the young author Lukaš Kaljuha turns towards phenomena which the official line keeps out of proletarian and socialist literature. Kaljuha turns towards village life, towards single individuals without any specific ‘use’ for society; his prose entirely leaves ideology, concentrates on the single man and his everyday life (so-called ‘bytavizm’). In a way, it defends self-worth of normal village life and could be read as an opposition to official ideology facing town, society, work and progress. In reality, however, with relation to aesthetics, Kaljuha’s prose does not even represent an opposition to whatever it might be – it just turns away from plot, narrating the marginal, the void – precisely what is usually neglected. This minimized narration has no public function and therefore comes very close to completely disinterested, pure art¹⁹. So, from an aesthetic point of view, Kaljuha is maybe the most ‘autonomous’ author of his time, even if (or: and) not (yet) positioned on a ‘prestigious’ place on the subfield of autonomy-oriented production (*Uzvyšša*).

All these strategies arise in a more or less direct way from the intertwining of deautonomization and autonomization and manifest their ‘positive’ (autonomy-claiming) value precisely in this context. With varying intensity this process will persist until the last third of the 1930-ies. One could say, that the most consequent manifestations of autonomy are, in a way, stimulated by the clash from 1929 on: in 1931 *Uzvyšša* officially ends its activity and gives, ambiguously enough, the following explanation:

Due to its narrow and closed form of organization the literary group *Uzvyšša* lacks of perspectives in growing up and therefore is not able to fulfill successfully the tasks proletarian and soviet literature nowadays is confronted with²⁰.

¹⁸Another strategy of ambiguity and camouflage is used, once again, by *Uzvyšša*, whose ‘real’ front-figures and leaders Babarëka and Duboŭka, explicitly centered on an autonomic position of Literature and Art, stay in the background, whereas the group is officially represented by less challenging names. Similarly, *Uzvyšša* can sometimes use a kind of ‘collective pseudonym’: one pseudonym can be used by several authors, etc.

¹⁹At the same time Kaljuha stocks the prose lexical inventory systematically introducing many dialectal and colloquial lexemes taken from landlife – an innovation that is sometimes viewed as a (potential) ‘renewal of the Belarusian standard language’.

²⁰*Uzvyšša* 15/1931:179 («літаратурнае згуртаваньне ‘Узвышша’, дзякуючы сваёй арганізацыйнай вузкасьці і замкнутасьці, ня маючы перспектыву росту, тых задач, якія стаяць сёньня перад пролетарскай і савецкай літаратурай, з поспехом выконваць ня можа»).

Here, once again, the decline on the part of institutional self-organization once more assures the defense of autonomy in aesthetical matters: the former members of *Узвышша* – as far as they do not stop writing – will continue their work individually as described above up to total liquidation, mainly by the 1937 shootings.

5. Conclusion – Perspectives

Hence, Belarusian literature in the first third of the 20th century and especially the literary process taking place during the 1920-ies show characteristics of autonomization as well as of deautonomization that can be interpreted as the interference of two processes. However: it might be more adequate not to talk about the interference of two processes, but about the ambiguous value of parameters determining one single process – but this should be discussed elsewhere: for our purpose it seemed heuristically helpful to conceptualize two processes. The following conclusions can be made:

First, the hypothesis of the reversibility of once conquered autonomy and thus the general precarity of an autonomous field seems to be confirmed. The assumption of a permanent ‘movement’ towards autonomization therefore has to be modified by the idea of permanent tendencies towards increasing heteronomy.

Second, this seems to be closely linked to the ambiguity of literary institutions that can protect and defend literary autonomy, but may pervert into efficient instruments to affect it, corrode it and destroy it.

Third, based on interference and ambiguity, the Belarusian process reveals very interesting strategies directed towards aesthetical autonomy. This raises the question about a possible relation of reversed proportionality between institutional and aesthetical autonomy typical for ‘small’ literatures, i. e. literatures developing under conditions of an instabile field of power.

Fourth, with respect to Belarusian literature, we meet some very interesting strategies indicating autonomization in aesthetic matters provoked by heteronomous impacts. They differ from conventional manifestations of autonomy in established authoritarian systems (primarily satire in Polish and Russian Classicism (e. g. Antioch Kantemir, Ignacy Kraśicki) and Socialism (e. g. Slawomir Mrozek, Demian Bednyj, Michail Zoščenko, Michail Bulgakov).

The most important topic to be discussed, however, is the common validness of the model suggested here – the question, in what respect and on the base of which criteria it can help to conceptualize other literatures: ‘small’ ones in general, or, maybe, literary fields submitted to specific forms of power.

Hypothetically, we would argue that, for instance, the establishment of the Soviet Regime submits the Russian literary field to heteronomous impacts in a very similar way to what we can see in Belarusian Literature. The results are the same or at least similar in many²¹, but by far not all respects – maybe precisely because in the Russian field (as a ‘big’ literature, e. g. with a traditionally ‘stable’ field of power), strategies of defense of autonomy can be developed which are not available for agents in the ‘small’ Belarusian field.

LITERATURE

Bourdieu P. The field of cultural production: essays on art and literature. Cambridge, 2008.

Bourdieu P. The rules of art. Stanford, 1996.

Casanova P. The world republic of letters. Cambridge, 2004.

The autonomy of literature at the fins de siècles, 1900 and 2000. A Critical Assessment / G. J. Dorleijn, R. Grüttemeier, L. Korthals Altes (eds.). Leuven, 2008.

Kohler G.-B. Institutional autonomy 1840 versus aesthetic autonomy 1900? Moments of tension in Croatian literature with respect to the idea of ‘nation’ in the poetic self-positionings of authors // The autonomy of literature at the fins de siècles, 1900 and 2000. A Critical Assessment / G. J. Dorleijn, R. Grüttemeier, L. Korthals Altes (eds.). Leuven, 2008. P. 1–27.

Kohler G.-B. National disposition and the author’s trajectory. Reflections on polish and croatian literature // Authorship revisited. Conceptions of authorship around 1900 and 2000 / G. J. Dorleijn, R. Grüttemeier, L. Korthals Altes (eds.). Leuven, 2010. P. 11–38.

Korthals Altes L., van Heusden B. Aesthetic autonomy: problems and perspectives. Leuven, 2004.

McMillin A. Die Literatur der Weißrussen: a history of Byelorussian literature from its origins to the present day. Giessen, 1977.

Prior N. A question of perception: Bourdieu, art and the postmodern // The British Journal of Sociology. 2005. Bd. 56. № 1. S. 123–139.

Said E. Orientalism. New York, 1978.

Spivak G. The post-colonial critic: interviews, strategies, dialogues. New York, 1990.

Deleuze G., Guattari F. Kafka: für eine kleine Literatur. Frankfurt am Main, 1987.

Hroch M. Die Vorkämpfer der nationalen Bewegung bei den kleinen Völkern Europas: eine vergleichende Analyse zur gesellschaftlichen Schichtung der patriotischen Gruppen. Praha, 1967.

Joch M., Wolf N. C. Text und Feld: Bourdieu in der literaturwissenschaftlichen Praxis. Tübingen, 2005.

Kohler G.-B. Fehlpositionierung und Autopalimpsest. Michas’ Zaréckis Romanfragmente Kryvičy (1929) und Smerec’ Andréja Berazoŭskaha (1931) im Kontext der Entautonomisierung des belarussischen Literaturfeldes // Zeitschrift für Slawistik. 2012.

Sapiro G. Elemente einer Geschichte der Autonomisierung. Das Beispiel des französischen literarischen Feldes // Text und Feld: Bourdieu in der literaturwissenschaftlichen Praxis / M. Joch, N. C. Wolf (eds.). Tübingen, 2005. S. 25–45.

Viala A. Bourdieu, wiedergelesen mit den Augen Boileaus // Text und Feld: Bourdieu in der literaturwissenschaftlichen Praxis / M. Joch, N. C. Wolf (eds.) / Tübingen, 2005. S. 45–55.

²¹It is, for instance, interesting to see that authors referring to the value system in force in prerevolutionary literature and art (Osip Mandel’stam; in a way Anna Achmatova, and others) will be repressed and / or eliminated in a very similar way (and partly for the same reasons) as their Belarusian colleagues.

Bourdieu P. Les règles de l'art: genèse et structure du champ littéraire. Paris, 1992.

Гісторыя беларускай літаратуры XX стагоддзя. Т. 1. 1901–1920. Мінск, 1999.

Гісторыя беларускай літаратуры XX стагоддзя. Т. 2. 1921–1941. Мінск, 2001.

Колер Г.-Б. Стратэгіі posture і пазіцыянавання ў «малых» літаратурах: псеўданімы беларускай літаратуры першай трэці XX ст. // Погляды на спецыфічнасць «малых» літаратур. Беларуская і ўкраінская літаратуры / Уклад. Г.-Б. Колер, П. І. Навуменка. Мінск, 2012. С. 257–287.

Мушыньскі М. Дзейнасць Максіма Гарэцкага і суадносіны беларускай літаратуры да нацыянальнай ідэнтычнасці ў 10–30-х гадах XX ст. // Погляды на спецыфічнасць «малых» літаратур. Беларуская і ўкраінская літаратуры / Уклад. Г.-Б. Колер, П. І. Навуменка. Мінск, 2012. С. 77–99.

Навуменка П. Літаратурныя аб'яднанні першай трэці XX стагоддзя як цэнтры кансалідацыі літаратурных сіл і стваральнікі перадумоў аўтанамізацыі // Погляды на спецыфічнасць «малых» літаратур. Беларуская і ўкраінская літаратуры / Уклад. Г.-Б. Колер, П. І. Навуменка. Мінск, 2012. С. 225–245.

Погляды на спецыфічнасць «малых» літаратур. Беларуская і ўкраінская літаратуры / Уклад. Г.-Б. Колер, П. І. Навуменка. Мінск, 2012.

Ван Рес К. Поле, капитал и габитус: реляционный подход к «малым» литературам // Погляды на спецыфічнасць «малых» літаратур. Беларуская і ўкраінская літаратуры / Уклад. Г.-Б. Колер, П. І. Навуменка. Мінск, 2012. С. 11–61.

Паступіў у рэдакцыю 27.06.12.

Гун-Брыт Колер – прафесар славянскіх літаратур Ольдэнбургскага ўніверсітэта імя Карла фон Асецкага, намеснік дырэктара Інстытута славістыкі (Германія).

Павел Іванавіч Навуменка – кандыдат філалагічных навук, дацэнт кафедры беларускай літаратуры і культуры БДУ.

Н. Л. БЛИЦ

ИСТОРИЯ ТВОРЧЕСКИХ КОНТАКТОВ А. М. РЕМИЗОВА И М. И. ЦВЕТАЕВОЙ В 1920–1930-е гг.

Анализируется история творческих взаимоотношений Ремизова и Цветаевой, раскрывается мифологизированная подоплека их отношений и шифры взаимных умолчаний. Делается вывод, что М. Цветаева наследует и творчески перерабатывает некоторые аспекты ремизовской поэтики, подчас достигая новой степени художественной выразительности в общих для них с Ремизовым мотивно-тематических сферах.

The article analyses the history of Remizov and Tsvetayeva's creative relationships, reveals the mythologised background of their relations and ciphers of mutual omissions. The author comes to the conclusion that M. Tsvetayeva derives and creatively processes some aspects of Remizov's poetics, often reaching a new level of artistic expressiveness in mutual for both of them motive-theme spheres.

Творческие установки А. Ремизова и М. Цветаевой очень похожи: оба выбирали экстремальные формы жизненного самоотречения ради творчества, оба создавали уникальный и труднопереводимый язык, ценили лексические редкости и метафорическую вязь образов, оба стремились к раскрытию потенциальных возможностей словотворчества и ощущали родство вещей через слово. Обоим было присуще близкое к абсолютному музыкальное чувство слова: Ремизов *подбирал слова по слуху*; Цветаева же свой творческий процесс – *писание* – определяла как *вслушивание* (Цветаева 1994–1995 V, 285). Цветаева считала, что стиль художника определяется ритмом; Ремизов был уверен, что *по ритму автора можно узнать точнее, чем по образной системе* (Ремизов 2005, 221).

В эмигрантской периодике имена А. Ремизова и М. Цветаевой почти неразлучны в ситуациях, когда говорилось о евразийском движении и о журнале «Версты». На его обложке сообщалось, что журнал выходит «при ближайшем участии Алексея Ремизова, Марины Цветаевой и Льва Шестова». После выхода первого номера развернулась бурная полемика. Тот факт, что в «Верстах» публиковались произведения оставшихся в Советской России И. Бабеля, А. Белого, С. Есенина, Б. Пастернака, воспринимался эмигрантской общественностью как попытка обосновать политическое течение с просоветской ориентацией. Именно контекст реакций на позицию «Верст» может послужить исходной точкой для размышлений на тему «Ремизов и Цветаева».

У писателей был общий печальный опыт критического «бичевания». Единственная доброжелательная статья, посвященная сопоставительному анализу рассказов Ремизова «Наперекор» и Цветаевой «Башня в плюще», принадлежит профессору А. Бему, который считал, что художники *находятся незаслуженно в загоне*, поскольку их творчество предназначено «для немногих», для избранных», и пророчески предупреждал, что Ремизов и Цветаева *едва ли не самые крупные явления нашей эмигрантской литературы* (Бем 1933, 2). Впрочем, М. Осоргин позднее также отметил достоинства Ремизова и Цветаевой: *На них обоих злится рядовой читатель, но их обоим нельзя не признать лучшими фабрикантами русского слова* (Осоргин 1926 [а], 3).

Парадигма уничижительных характеристик двух писателей не требует комментариев: от насмешливых *чудака и чудачка, монах-непристойник и вечно влюбленная институтка* (Осоргин 1926, 2) до сравнения с «мухами», которые *засиживают прекрасную русскую литературу* (Рыбинский 1926, 2).