Contents

Preface

The problem "The Literary Field under the Communist Regime: Structure, Functions, 'Illusio'" was discussed by literary scholars from various European countries and the USA who came to the Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore in Vilnius (2015). At this conference the literary scholars aimed to overcome the dualistic schemes prevailing in the research of literatures under the communist regime and to create more complex, nuanced, and contextualized frameworks for their analyses. Pierre Bourdieu's concept of literary field suggested a systematic approach towards literary practices, highlighting the functional relationship between literature and society, revealing a network of interconnected individual and collective literary agents, emphasizing the role of *illusio* (the tendency of participants to engage in the political game and believe in its significance), and combining internal and external analysis of literary works. Part of the discussion from this conference was published in the journal *Colloquia* as "A Discussion on Methodology for Researching Soviet Literary Space" (2015). The other part of the discussion—which includes the most relevant articles—has been written for this collection. The goal of the book *The Literary Field under Communist Rule* is to provide a platform for cross-fertilization of ideas on the structure and functioning of literary fields, while the republics were under communist domination. A wider explanation of the set problem of the collection is to be found in the Introduction. The editors would like to thank the colleagues who helped them to prepare this volume: the translator of the Lithuanian articles, Ada Valaitis, and the editor of all the English versions, Violeta Kelertas. We also thank the Lithuanian Ministry of Culture and its Council for their financial support for the publication of this book.

Aušra Jurgutienė
Dalia Satkauskytė

Introduction

Dalia Satkauskytė

Western scholars analyzed literature written in the Soviet Union up until its collapse. The analysis was usually a part of the more general regime of Soviet studies because literature, like culture as a whole, was a means of ideological education as well as a tool of political conflict in the Soviet Union and other Communist bloc countries. The analysis of Soviet literature was one of the ways to showcase the mechanism of ideological indoctrination and to recognize the "real" socialism, that is, its utopian idea. Later, in the post-Soviet era, Evgeny Dobrenko asserted that Socialist Realism was not so concerned with producing literature as an aesthetic phenomenon as it was with producing reality itself; Socialist Realism was and remains the only material reality of socialism.[1]

Studies of Socialist Realism, literature, and culture of the Stalinist era were plentiful both in the Soviet and post-Soviet eras. They provide the most varied interpretations of the phenomenon—from the impossibly aesthetic (Régine Robin, *Le réalisme socialiste: une esthétique impossible*, 1986) to the transference of aesthetic principles to reality (Stalinism as a concept of an aesthetic project in Boris Groys's book *The Total Art of Stalinism: Avant-Garde, Aesthetic Dictatorship, and Beyond*, 1988, English translation 1992), from the transformation of history into a mythical narrative in a Socialist Realist novel (Katerina Clark, *The Soviet Novel: History as Ritual*, 1981) to an interpretation of Socialist Realism as discourse that uses narrative to produce sublimated socialist reality (Evgeny Dobrenko, *Political*

1 Evgeny Dobrenko, "Socialist Realism." In *The Cambridge Companion to Twentieth-Century Russian Literature*, ed. Evgeny Dobrenko and Marina Balina (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 112.

Economy of Socialist Realism, 2007). Western scholars, many of whom were emigrants from the Soviet Union, were less inclined to analyze literature of the post-Stalinist era, which tried to separate itself from the dogmas of Socialist Realism and supposedly moved from the political sphere to the aesthetic. Nonconformist scholars in the Soviet Union were the first to analyze the aesthetic dimension of literature as a counterbalance to ideological indoctrination. However, literature of the Thaw period or of the late Soviet era, where undoubtedly there are works of high aesthetic value, does not cut its ties with the political authority, but usually transforms them by creating, for example, an opportunity for indirect political criticism through so-called Aesopian language (Lev Loseff, *On the Beneficence of Censorship. Aesopian Language in Modern Russian Literature*, 1984). This was a heterogenous time period during which literature both supported the system and eroded it, and in rare instances, attempted to exist beyond the system (as the well-known situation of Joseph Brodsky demonstrates, this infuriated the authorities no less than the dissident movement). During the era of the Cold War Western scholars treated Soviet literature as almost exclusively Russian, and they rarely analyzed national literatures of the Soviet republics,[2] regardless of the time period or aspect of analysis. As Evgeny Dobrenko highlights in this book, the collapse of the Soviet Union and emergence of new independent states in Eastern Europe has prompted a keen interest in the cultures and literatures of the former Soviet republics. While there are some studies of individual national literatures in English,[3] analyses of Russian literature dominate, and most national literatures were examined in isolation from the overarching institutions of Soviet literature and disregarding their role in the project of multinational Soviet literature. According to Dobrenko, the history of "Soviet multinational literature" from the early 1930s to the 1980s has remained *a terra incognita* for Western scholars.

2 Several of the few existing examples would be a history of Belarusian literature (Arnold McMillin. *A History of Byelorussian Literature from its Origins to the Present Day* (1977) or George Luckyj's book *Literary Politics in the Soviet Ukraine, 1917–1934* (1990) which appeared just before the collapse of the Soviet Union.

3 See for instance: Rimvydas Šilbajoris, *A Short History of Lithuanian Literature* (2002); Donald Rayfield. *The Literature of Georgia* (2014); *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe: Junctures and Disjunctures in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, vol. III (ed. Marcel Cornis-Pope, John Neubauer, 2007); selections of articles *Baltic Postcolonialism* (ed. Violeta Kelertas, 2006), *Grotesque Revisited: Grotesque and Satire in the Post/Modern Literature of Central and Eastern Europe* (ed. Laurynas Katkus, 2013).

Much work will have to be done in order to transform this *terra incognita* to a populated land. This collection of articles is an attempt to look at Soviet literature as a systemic phenomenon and to present a few of the functional aspects of this system.

The central concept of the system proposed draws on Pierre Bourdieu's theory of the literary field, which the authors of this volume rely on explicitly or implicitly. According to Bourdieu, the literary field is in part autonomous, has a distinctive structure, specific principles of the formation and circulation of capital, the agents competing for positions within this field depend on the otherwise uncommon *illusio*—the belief that it is worth engaging in this activity, which from the outside does not seem very valuable. The field of power affects the literary field, but this influence is not straightforward. It is indirect, often imperceptibly interiorized in the internal structure of the field and its dynamics, while the process of autonomization of the field is inevitably connected to this interiorization and to the reflection of the structure of field within literature itself.[4] A reasonable question might arise about the ability to rely on this theory when analyzing the literatures of totalitarian societies. The literary field under the Soviet or any other totalitarian regime does not operate according to Pierre Bourdieu's principle of partial autonomy. As with the entire cultural field, it depends directly on the government, that is, the field of power, which forms it to achieve its own goals (to instill an ideology, to produce a subject loyal to the regime—the new Soviet man), and is controlled by various means of repression. Undoubtedly, we must suspend the premise of partial autonomy in the literary field. Nonetheless, if we avoid applying the model of the literary field mechanically, the theoretical model proposed by Bourdieu, whereby society is composed of various social fields that affect one another and are structurally connected, is an effective analytical tool that can be applied to the societies governed by Communist regimes, to the entire multinational Soviet literary field, and to specific segments of Soviet period literature. Used this way, the theory can help reveal rather different modes of the intersection of the fields of politics and literature in different national literatures.

In her article "The Role of Aesopian Language in the Literary Field: Autonomy in Question" the author of this introduction presents the

4 Pierre Bourdieu, *Les règles de l'art. Génèse et structure du champ littéraire* (Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1992), 17–81.

specifics of the Soviet literary field. Within the framework of Bourdieu's theories, the author speculates on what the role of Aesopian language in the literary field is; discusses the positions and dispositions of several of its practitioners; questions how self-censorship and internal control of the field operate in the domain of Aesopian language, how they interact, and how these forms of control insinuate themselves into the agent's *habitus*.[5]

Bourdieu's theory is based on the functioning of a national literature, meanwhile the literary field of the Soviet Union was formed and functioned as a project of multinational literature, thus it was a complex construct composed of varying cultural segments that affected one another. Hence, it is impossible to analyze any Soviet national literature without taking into account the very project of a multinational literature, the history of its formation and continued functioning, its national literatures, and the interactions and relationships of their traditions; in other words, the complexity and multi-layered nature of the literary field cannot be ignored.

Evgeny Dobrenko focuses on this issue in his article "Soviet Multinational Literature: Approaches, Problems, and Perspectives of Study." The author does not directly rely on Bourdieu's theory, though he suggests looking at multinational Soviet literature as a system that formed and functioned in a different manner than the national literatures of democratic societies. He questions the traditional view that the process of the formation of multinational literature was unidirectional, that is, that the literatures of the republics of the Soviet Union simply copied the Russian model of Socialist Realism, and decorated it with elements of the national literature. Each national literature delivered something from its traditions that was required for the formation of Soviet people, and several literatures, for example the literature of Central Asia, were concurrently evolving and participating in the formation of a multinational Soviet literature project. Dobrenko discusses the primary stages of the formation of this project comprehensively, wherein the folklore of Central Asian countries that did not have a professional literature played a key role. Soviet multinational literature was the product of ideological oriental stylization, and

5 "[...] *habitus*, as a system of dispositions, are effectively realized only in relation to a determinate structure of positions socially marked by the social properties of their occupants, through which they manifest themselves." See Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production. Essays on Art and Literature* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992), 71. *Habitus* in Bourdieu's theory refers to the embodiment of cultural capital, to the deeply ingrained habits, skills, and dispositions that the social agent possesses due to his / her life experiences.

a true incarnation of the Eurasian vision, summarizes Dobrenko. He proposes that Stalin's Socialist Realism formula "national in form and socialist in content" be defined as "European in form and Asian in content where European Marxist ideology collided with what Marx called Asian economic and political formation."

The formula "national in form and socialist in content" emerged intermittently within various national literatures in a variety of configurations. Vilius Ivanauskas discusses one such configuration in his article "Between Universalism and Localism: The Strategies of Soviet Lithuanian Writers and 'Sandwiched' Lithuanian Ethnic Particularism." The author uses the "sandwich" metaphor for elements of both particularism or nationalism and Soviet universalism, but proposes to interpret them as closely intertwined in a specific way. Using Soviet Lithuania as an example and comparing it with the situation in Georgia, the author describes it this way: "the 'sandwiched particularism' model, which explains the constant gravitation of 'titular culture' into 'All-Union culture,' at the same time leaving space for local interest, manifestations of ethnic particularism, and individual trajectories of cultural elites. Lithuanian literature, culture and society embody the results of this close correlation and the consequences of its dynamics to this day."

These three articles in the first section consider theoretical issues that arise in analyzing the Soviet literary field as a system and also demonstrate how we may approach certain phases of this system (the formation of a multinational literary field) and its phenomena (Aesopian language, the tension between ethnic particularism and Soviet universalism). The authors of the articles in the following sections analyze the fragments, elements, and samples of the Soviet literary field. They also strive to show, implicitly or explicitly, the relationship between the presented situations and the structure of the Soviet literary field, and how these represent the state of the field in a certain historical period. The authors of the articles in the second section analyze Lithuanian literature as a part of the multinational Soviet literary field.

Lithuania and the other Baltic nations were incorporated into the Soviet Union in 1940 through the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. Yet all three Baltic states became part of the multinational Soviet literature project under rather different circumstances than those nations that had participated in the formation of this field from the very beginning. A very important factor is that from 1918 to1940 Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia existed as independent nations. A literary field evolved in this period, one that functioned

according to the principles of partial autonomy: with a system of publication, literary criticism, and other institutions, with a clear reflection of literary tradition and the role of the writer,[6] and generational literary conflicts. There was a generation of writers who were born in an independent Lithuania in the 1930s, who pursued a version of Lithuanian modernism, using Western literature as a model to expand the boundaries of literary and cultural imagination.

What happens to these preliminary results when they are forced into the empire of Soviet literature?

Under Soviet rule, Lithuanian literature had to either reject the entirety of the literary legacy of the interwar period as bourgeois or to Sovietize it, that is, to identify sources of national Socialist Realism in Lithuanian literature. For example, Vincas Mykolaitis-Putinas's autobiographical novel *Altorių šešėly* (In the Shadow of the Altars, 1933), where the main character is a young priest struggling with his doubts about faith and finally having to choose between priesthood and the vocation of an artist (a poet), was perhaps the best known novel of interwar Lithuania that substantiated the formation of an autonomous literary field. *In the Shadow of Altars* did not become a canonical work of Socialist Realism, however, its narrative model was used for atheistic propaganda. Nerija Putinaitė in her article "Atheist Autobiography: Politics, Literary Canon and Restructured Experience" discusses this situation and examines autobiographies as a case of productive internalization of political aims to create a new society of non-believers. The other authors in this section analyze the situation of the Lithuanian literary field during the post-Stalinist period, when there was an opportunity to directly or indirectly express national interests in literature. This opportunity was seized on first by Lithuanian poets, the so-called *30s generation*, equivalent to the Sixtiers (*shestidesyatniki*) in Russian literature. Donata Mitaitė discusses the trajectories of the main representatives of this generation in the Soviet literary field in her article "The Experiences of One Generation of Soviet Poets, Their Illusions and Choices." Mitaitė is primarily concerned with the connection and the conflict between ideology and poetics, although the problem of the relationship between multinational Soviet literature and Soviet Lithuanian literature also arises. The Lithuanian *30s generation*, like the Russian *shestidesyatniki*, emerged during the Thaw and believed in

6 Pierre Bourdieu considers this type of reflection to be an attribute of the autonomy of the literary field. See Pierre Bourdieu, *Les règles de l'art,* 171.

"socialism with a human face." They followed a similar path of illusion, disillusion, compromise, however, they did not become important agents of the multinational field as did their Russian colleagues. It is likely that this was not merely coincidence or the culture politics of the Soviet Union, but the entirely disparate social and cultural capital of these two groups of poets. In the case of the Lithuanian poets this capital was formed in an independent Lithuania where they were born and completed primary school, experienced Soviet occupation and saw the anti-Soviet resistance up close. Their attempts to become established in the Soviet literary field paradoxically aligned with the aspiration of expressing national interests, while in the case of Justinas Marcinkevičius to assume the role of the national bard. The debate about the cultural and political consequences of this dual game, about the character and poetry of Justinas Marcinkevičius continues in Lithuania to this day. This is also discussed by other authors in this book (Loreta Mačianskaitė and Dalia Satkauskytė in her article).

It is obvious that writers who wanted to work in the Soviet literary field could not avoid compromise. However, those compromises varied greatly. In her article, "The Art of Compromise in Literary Criticism that Legitimated Soviet Era Modernism," Aušra Jurgutienė analyzes instances of Lithuanian literary criticism as examples of so-called mimetic resistance. An examination of the works of two literary critics of the Soviet period shows that compromise is skewed and requires a nuanced approach to judge its impact. A careful analysis of critical texts and a reconstruction of their position in the literary field allow us to consider conformism as a manifestation of loyalty to the system (as in the case of the literary critic Ričardas Pakalniškis) or as an opportunity to defy the system (the case of Albertas Zalatorius.)

The two other articles on Lithuanian literature present examples that demonstrate the contradictory semantics and the effects of the literary field that result from encounters with the literature of the metropolis (Russia) or with significant actors of the Western literary field. Solveiga Daugirdaitė's article "Sartre and de Beauvoir Encounter the Pensive Christ" focuses on the reception of the two French philosophers' visit to Soviet Lithuania in the summer of 1965. The author analyzes how the other's recounting of this event which was held in the greatest regard for its significance to local authors and how the opportunity to meet with Sartre, whose visit lasted only five days, effected a change in the power dynamics within the literary hierarchy.

In the article entitled "The Performance of Eimuntas Nekrošius's *Kvadratas* / *The Square* as a Palimpsest of Soviet-Era Memory," Loreta

Mačianskaitė analyzes how Nekrošius, an internationally recognized director who began his career in the Soviet period, in 1985 succeeded in creating a production opposed to the system. Forced to use material imposed by the state, a Russian documentary narrative, called *It Happened Once*, the director conceived an ideological amalgam wherein he melded the dominating Soviet discourse, including a *perekovka* (a reforging, rehabilitation) intertext, with the most important themes of classical Russian literature (the little man, salvation through a woman's sacrifice, a trial by rendezvous, the sanctity of the working class) and subverted them. When the play about the love between a prisoner and a teacher was performed, it was viewed as a metaphor for totalitarianism; it was interpreted as such in the West, even endowing dissident attributes to the hero. Paradoxically, *The Square* marked the beginning of a nonverbal theatrical paradigm in Lithuanian theater; however, its textual structure reveals the literature-centric mentality of society.

The third section of the book is dedicated to the presentation of other literatures of the multinational Soviet field, and an exploration of the ways in which they function in that field. In Valentyna Kharkhun's article, "Ukrainian Literature of the Late Soviet Period: The History of Three Generations of Poets" the central theme is the equivalence of *the generation of the 1960's* in Ukrainian literature, only that Mitaitė, who analyses the same equivalence in Lithuanian literature, focuses on an analysis of poetics, while Kharkhun concentrates on the dynamics of the poet's position in the literary field. However, the word "equivalence" can only be used conditionally, because, according to Kharkhun "[i]nterest in the non-Russian part of Soviet cultural history increased at that time, symbolizing a shift from the Russian model as dominant in examining post-Stalinist times to the other republics, providing examples of different ways of expressing national and artistic liberation." Just like Mitaitė, she considers the Ukrainian *generation of the 1960s* version not as a copy of the Russian, but as a specific phenomenon of Ukrainian literature formed by cultural conditions, which is why Kharkhun consciously utilizes the Ukrainian version of the term (*shistdesyatnyky)* instead of the Russian transcription (*shestidesyatniki*).*

* Since our standard of the transliteration from Russian is slightly different from the regulations proposed by the Library of Congress we want to clarify it. We use the letter *y* to designate the Russian letter *й* and the corresponding sound, even where the letter itself does not appear in writing (that is, for the letters *я*, *ю*, and where the letter *e* appears after a vowel or in a word initial position). Also we use *-y* for Russian *-ий* in surnames, but a more "phonetic" rendering *-iy* for *-ий* in nouns.

Pavel Arsenjev (Rusakov) is interested in the problem of the morality of literary forms in Russian literature ("Literature of a State of Emergency: Varlam Shalamov vs. 'All Progressive Humanity'"). He analyzes Varlam Shalamov's prose as an example of "the literature of a state of emergency," and interprets it as an existential act of truth that transcends the borders of literature and literariness, and radically opposes all forms of compromise.

How can we characterize the place of this kind of prose in a multinational literary field? It appears that it crosses not only literary boundaries, but is also almost beyond the multinational field of Soviet literature. Nearly, but not completely, because this type of literature is also dependent on the conditions that formed the Soviet literary field, that is, the Communist regime. Besides, we can consider Shalamov and his prose as a segment of this Soviet literary field that held a surreptitious potential to destroy the entire field. This example only confirms just how complex and multidimensional the literary field was in the Soviet Union. Arsenjev's article presents the possibility of typological comparison because there were similar, though lesser known, situations in other national literatures. For example, literature of this type did exist in Lithuania; its most noteworthy instances are the two sets of Dalia Grinkevičiūtė's memoirs, *Lietuviai prie Laptevų jūros* (Lithuanians by the Laptev Sea.)[7] The first variant, written while the author was living in a direct state of emergency from 1949 to 1950, was lost, but was later found; the second was composed in 1974, and published for the first time in Lithuania only in 1988.[8]

The other two articles explore literatures of the Baltic states during the Soviet era. Anneli Mihkelev discusses the principal strategies of resistance to official Soviet discourse and Aesopian language in Estonian literature ("Hamlet and Folklore as Elements of the Resistance Movement in Estonian Literature"). Eva Eglaja-Kristsone's article "Reading Literary History through the Archives: the Case of the Latvian Literary Journals *Karogs*" can be considered to be a fragment of the history of censorship. Political censorship, which perhaps played the principal role in the development

7 The most recent version of Dalia Grinkevičiūtė's memoir was published in English in a new translation by Delija Valiukenas during the course of writing this introduction. See: Dalia Grinkevičiūtė, *Shadows on the Tundra* (London: Peirene Press, 2018).

8 Some critics are of the mindset that this type of literature was influenced by official Soviet discourse. For example, Jura Avižienis argues that the memoirs of Grinkevičiūtė mimic the socialist realist plot and the official Soviet discourse of propaganda. See: Jura Avižienis, "Learning to curse in Russian: mimicry in Siberian exile," in *Baltic Postcolonialism*, ed. Violeta Kelertas (Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi, 2006), 187–202.

of Aesopian language, is analyzed from a somewhat different perspective. The author focuses on the literary journal as an institution of the literary field. Using the major Soviet era Latvian literary journal *Karogs* (Flag) as an example, Eglaja-Kristsone poses a question that concerns every author of the selections in this book: What were "the interactions in the fields of literature, power, and economics during the Soviet era?" She, however, is concerned about something in addition as well, namely the documents that testify to the functioning of the Soviet-era literary field, its dynamics, the missing archival materials and lost documents. Does this dynamic reveal the censoring of censorship that perhaps was most intensely pursued during the first decade of the post-Soviet era?

***

According to Fredric Jameson, the separation between the private and the public sphere is an essential element of Western realist and modernist literature.[9] Literature functions simply as literature and not as political allegory, as a substitute for public discourse or as a device for propaganda. It seems that contemporary post-Soviet literatures became a part of the paradigm of Western culture. Nevertheless, differentiation between the spheres mentioned is not absolute or even similar to that in Western literature. The aftereffects of the Soviet occupation are still evident today—in the very structure of the literary field, in the behavior and consciousness of its agents, in the continuing public discussions regarding the cultural heritage of the Soviet period and its continuing critical reflection in literary works. Consequently, the literature of Post-Soviet nations may appear exotic or even incomprehensible to the Western reader at times. We hope that this collection of articles, analyzing the conditions under which Lithuanian and other Soviet-era national literatures were forced to function, will bring clarity to the situation and enhance the literary field's international perception.

9 Fredric Jameson, "Third-World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capitalism," *Social Text,* no. 15 (1986): 70. In this article Jameson writes about the difference between mature Western literature and that of the Third World. Generally speaking, this difference is also valid in discussions about the literatures of former Soviet captive nations.

Soviet Literature as Theoretical and Historical Problem

Evgeny Dobrenko

Soviet Multinational Literature

Approaches, Problems, and Perspectives of Study

The sudden emergence of new independent states in Eastern Europe and Eurasia that were established as a result of the Soviet Union's collapse has prompted a keen interest in the cultures of the former Soviet republics—now the newly independent states. This is especially true of their so-called "national literatures" which are often seen by the local elites (and not without reason) as both a reflection and a source of a particular national character. It was a peculiar consensus that served as the foundation of the former Soviet empire: instead of sovereignty, the nations were offered an opportunity for "national development." For Russian culture that is predominantly literature-centered, these projects of national development were reflected mostly through the growth of national literatures that became the subject of concentrated construction during the Soviet period. It was precisely through works of literature that the status of national languages was established with the majority of these languages simultaneously receiving their writing systems, often based on the Cyrillic alphabet. National literatures became the real domain of the Soviet imperial imagination, thus creating a national mythology and an appropriate "historical past" for these nations. One of the most important tasks is to trace and document the way in which Soviet Russian literature, its institutions and ideology (including theoretical and critical polemics) shaped the development of national and ethnic identities in the non-Russian Soviet literatures. It is equally important

to investigate the impact of this process on the creation of the new public sphere in the newly independent states. Without such a history, neither the comprehension of the post-Soviet imperial complex nor the specificity of national and cultural development in the former Soviet Republics today can be recognized.

Indeed, for decades, Western scholars treated Soviet literature almost exclusively as Russian. While there are some excellent studies of individual national literatures in English (first of all Ukrainian, Belarusian, Baltic, Georgian, and Armenian literatures)[1] most national literatures were examined in isolation from the overarching institutions of Soviet literature (as purely "national"). According to the prevailing wisdom in the West, Soviet "national literatures" lost their specific national character long ago and, therefore, (in their "Soviet incarnations") did not deserve serious scholarly attention. Western histories of Ukrainian, Baltic, and other literatures typify this thinking. The researchers' specifically literary interest begins to flag as soon as they approach the Stalin era; at that point, their attention veers away from literature, instead concentrating exclusively on the persecution and repression of the particular intelligentsia involved, especially writers. Literature and its institutions as such resurface only when a scholar turns to the culture of a particular national emigration. Even today, a quarter of a century after the Soviet Union's collapse, there is no scholarly work available where the phenomenon of these literatures is considered in its complexity as a part of the Soviet ideological and institutional imperial undertaking. The analyses of different aspects of Soviet national cultural developments are mostly represented in the works of historians;[2] however, the issues relevant to the national

1 See for instance: George Luckyj, *Literary Politics in the Soviet Ukraine, 1917–1934* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1990); Arnold McMillin, *A History of Byelorussian Literature from its Origins to the Present Day* (Giessen: W. Schmitz, 1977); Donald Rayfield, *The Literature of Georgia: A History* (New York: Routledge, 2014).

2 See Geoffrey Hosking, *Russia: People and Empire: 1552–1917* (New York: Fontana Press, 1998); Richard Pipes, *The Formation of the Soviet Union: Communism and Nationalism, 1917–1923* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974); Ronald Grigor Suny and Terry Martin, eds., *A State of Nations: Empire and Nation-Making in the Age of Lenin and Stalin* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001); Terry Martin, *The Affirmative Action Empire: Nations and Nationalism in the Soviet Union, 1923–1939* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2001); Yuri Slezkine, *Arctic Mirrors: Russia and the Small Peoples of the North* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2014); Francine Hirsch, *Empire of Nations: Ethnographic Knowledge and the Making of the Soviet Union* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005).