



HAL
open science

Literary History, Field-Formation and Transnational Spaces of Possibles Literature in the Space of Belarus in the 1920s

Gun-Britt Kohler, Pavel I Navumenka

► **To cite this version:**

Gun-Britt Kohler, Pavel I Navumenka. Literary History, Field-Formation and Transnational Spaces of Possibles Literature in the Space of Belarus in the 1920s. Slovo, 2020, How to think of literary history in the 21st century in the Euro-Asian space?, 10.46298/slovo.2020.6143 . hal-02485232

HAL Id: hal-02485232

<https://hal.science/hal-02485232v1>

Submitted on 24 Feb 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Literary History, Field-Formation and Transnational Spaces of Possibles

Literature in the Space of Belarus in the 1920s

Gun-Britt KOHLER
Carl von Ossietzky University of Oldenburg

Pavel I. NAVUMENKA
Belarusian State University in Minsk

Introduction: About the Project *A Literary History of Belarus*

The starting point of this article is the thesis that Belarusian literature (as a literature shaped by discontinuity, multilingualism, colonialism and de- or extra-territoriality) might provide a substantial contribution to the current struggle for a theoretically grounded and problem-oriented restoration of literary historiography¹ and to the development of an adequate model² after the comprehensive scepticism of post-modernism³ has subsided.⁴

1. KOHLER, 2014; KOHLER & NAVUMENKA, 2019.

2. See BUSCHMEIER, ERHART & KAUFMANN, 2014; TIHANOV, 2014.

3. WELLEK, 1973; PERKINS, 1996; GUMBRECHT, 2008.

4. See BUSCHMEIER, 2011.

Due to changing disjunctions of state, culture and language,⁵ the central, but certainly not the only, problem of Belarusian literature is its “smallness,” and therewith its marginality: the share of the current Belarusian area in the (for its time very modern) Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the so called Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth; the non-simultaneous constructions of national literatures ensuing from this cultural region (especially the Polish, in part also the Lithuanian, Ukrainian and Russian, and only very late the Belarusian), and as a consequence the “reinterpretation” of this space as a twofold equally “annexed” and “displaced” space of the north-western or respectively eastern periphery (*severno-zapadnyj kraj* from Russian imperial perspective, *kresy wschodnie* from Polish perspective); its religious-confessional as well as multilingual specifics; the division of the area and again its non-simultaneous integration in the Soviet apparatus, etc. Such changing incongruities of ethnicity, language(s), cultural space and state territory require a revision, reevaluation (for instance in the context of Polish and Russian literary historiography) and, last but not least, the confrontation with current theoretical discourse.

In other words, what generally is conceptualised as “Belarusian literature” in the sense of a historical continuity has, as such, never (or hardly ever) existed. Instead, the literature that developed in the area of the current Republic of Belarus or that refers to this area has at nearly all times been part of wider, superior pre- or transnational linguistic, cultural and literary spaces. Its transfer to parameters of “national literary” narratives now and again have generated aporetic conflicts in view of the splitting of the previously “common” cultural capital (authors and texts but also literary and cultural centres and others) into competing “national cultures.” Due to the absence of a Belarusian national movement and therefore of the development or construction of a specific “Belarusian” cultural capital in the 19th century, the literary phenomena in the area of today’s Republic of Belarus were marginalised and absorbed otherwise. In this context, exemplary reference should be made to the so called “Belarusian School” in the Polish literature of the 19th century⁶ and to the conceptualisation of Vilnius as a centre of the “Polish” elite.⁷

Similar processes of marginalisation, disjunction and extra-territoriality can also be noticed in earlier and later development phases of “Belarusian” literature (for example, the multilingualism of literature(s) of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania

5. KOHLER, NAVUMENKA & GRÜTTEMEIER, 2012; KOHLER & NAUMENKO, 2013.

6. See CHAŮSTOVIČ, 2012.

7. See SNYDER, 2003.

or the *Rzeczpospolita* [the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth] in the 15th through 18th centuries,⁸ the split of Belarusian literature into a Soviet-Belarusian and a “Western-Belarusian” branch, due to the political division of the country in the 1920s and 1930s,⁹ *émigré* literature,¹⁰ and more). They characterise not only the current situation of Belarusian literature, which has split into a Belarusian-language and a Russian-language branch and is not clear about itself: the model of a multilingual “Literature of Belarus” stands in competition with the model of a “Belarusian Literature” in national language.¹¹

Thus, the case of Belarusian literature, whose sheer historical existence could be doubted with some reason (except for the short phase of constitution as a “national literature” at the beginning of the 20th century), emphasises the eminently constructed character of “national” literatures in an exceptional way. Consequently, the traditional Belarusian literary historiography exemplifies that the making of a coherent “history of national literature” goes along with the construction of continuity, the smoothing of discontinuity, the levelling of disparities, the suppression of ambiguity and the reinterpretation of “incompleteness.”¹²

Therefore, when re-concepting Belarusian literary history, a model of literary historiography must be designed that does not withhold, level or reinterpret the outlined *aporiae*, disjunctions and disparities, but instead focuses on them as a central category of literary development in the transitional space of Belarus. Such a re-conceptualisation does not need to (and should not) begin at zero. Theoretical reflections on literary historiography, but also various practical implementations with “history of events,”¹³ “entangled history,”¹⁴ “history of space,”¹⁵ “history of

8. See KAVALĚŮ, 2010; NEKRAŠĚVIČ-KAROTKAJA, 2011.

9. See KOHLER, 2015a.

10. See McMILLIN, 2002.

11. See KOVALEV, 2013.

12. Concerning Ukrainian literature, see, for instance, TSCHIŽEWSKIJ (1975) and GRABOWICZ (1981). Gerd Jan Johannes discusses similar phenomena from the Dutch perspective (JOHANNES, 2001).

13. For instance, WELLBERY, 2004 or HOLLIER, 1993.

14. A recent example is CORNIS-POPE & NEUBAUER, 2004-2010. Unlike Cornis-Pope and Neubauer, Annette Werberger considers the potential of “entangled history” for literary historiography from a theoretically grounded and methodologically reflected point of view (WERBERGER, 2012).

15. For instance, ZEYRINGER & GOLLNER, 2012. For a theoretically grounded discussion, see LAMPART, 2014.

mass media,”¹⁶ just to name a few, provide various models that can fruitfully be used in the attempt to break up the “big narrative.” Recently, a growing acceptance has developed towards a transnational perspective.¹⁷

Regarding Belarus, though, a significant discrepancy becomes visible: Whereas the post-Soviet *History of Belarusian Literature of the 20th Century* (Minsk 1993-2015) constructs this very “big narrative” and emphasises the identity of ethnicity, language and space (while this narrative has largely lost its persuasiveness elsewhere), Cornis-Pope’s and Neubauer’s *History of the Literary Cultures* lacks even a glimpse on Belarus. Covering the wider area from Albania to Lithuania, this *History* yet does not dedicate a single article to Belarus, even though the neighbouring cultures of Lithuania, Latvia, Poland and Ukraine are addressed. The fact that in the wide transnational mosaic of literary culture(s) of central and eastern Europe mapped out by the editors, Belarus, of all areas, is missing, shows that the “blank-space Belarus” (Martin Pollack) may in a decisive way be seen as symptomatic. It indicates that the “transnational view” reproduces exclusion mechanisms, and this reproduction seems all the more questionable as the transnational approach is supposed to be resistant towards such “old” exclusion mechanisms. Supporters of the transnational perspective would surely do well to ask the question, why a literary culture such as the Belarusian one remains disregarded in a transnational *History* such as the one mentioned above. The reasons might have to do with the nature of international scientific networks upon which projects such as this one are reliant. However, the question must be asked whether a transnational approach of this dimension does not, despite everything, reproduce the dichotomy of “big” and “small” literatures,¹⁸ even if on a different level. The question of whose requirements must be fulfilled to become “visible” in a transnational perspective seems even more urgent. If one of the central purposes of a literary history is still to provide orientation, then the transnational view may be more dependent than one realises on established (and internationally “accepted”) “national narratives” that, in a sense, are transferred to a transnational model to be dissolved in it and by it only in a second step. The “blank-space Belarus” in Cornis-Pope’s and Neubauer’s *History* could in that case be understood as creating evidence for the need to initially make the narrative “Literature of Belarus” visible.

How could such a narrative look nowadays—a narrative that captures the outlined specifics and problems, makes discontinuity visible, works towards a

16. NOVAK, 2012.

17. STURM-TRIGONAKIS, 2007.

18. *sensu* CASANOVA, 2004.

transnational perspective and at the same time offers orientation, without walking into the “big-narrative-trap?”

The projected *Literary History of Belarus* links several currently prevalent approaches and is essentially based on three central categories that will be outlined below:

- . *Cultural space*: As a history not of “Belarusian literature” but of the “literature of Belarus,” the narrative is conceptualised as a history of the space of Belarus.¹⁹ Thereby, there will be no attempt to create the “cultural space of Belarus” as linear or constant or distinctively “Belarusian” (whatever that may mean).²⁰ Space, on the contrary, will be understood as *variable* in its territorial expansion as well as in its character, hence, concerning its distinguishing parameters.²¹ This can be illustrated by the following example: The cultural space that mediaeval Belarus is assigned to exceeds later ones (namely, as space lying within the culturally, especially ecclesiastically dominated area of the Kievan Rus’). At the same time, for example, entanglements or transitions between *Slavia latina* and *Slavia orthodoxa*²² in this specific space usually are not considered sufficiently: Up until now, Belarusian mediaeval studies conceptualise the culture of the Middle Ages in the space of Belarus primarily as “orthodox.” On the contrary, the cultural space of the 16th and 17th century is considered as mainly “Latin” space with a clear emphasis on the paradigms of Humanism, Renaissance, Counter-reformation and Baroque, whereas regional parcelling and centres seem to be given little attention.

- . *Chronology*: Analogous to the substitution of a fixed and clearly defined territory by using a flexible cultural space as a reference, the category of time structure is also carefully softened. With complete literary periods missing²³ and the non-simultaneousness of literary development in the

19. It thus accounts for the fact that already in previous literary *Histories* something different is conceptualised as “Belarusian literature” in virtually every given period.

20. The territorial basis is not the State of Belarus; such a literary history could start at the earliest in 1918 – and without restrictions only in 1991.

21. Compare ZEYRINGER & GOLLNER, 2012.

22. See GARZANITI, 2007.

23. “Belarusian romanticism,” for instance, if at all could be mentioned only in the frame of the “Polish Romanticism”-paradigm as “Litvian School.” “Realism” or “Modernism” as a

space of Belarus, structuring into epochal terms turns out to be obsolete from the beginning. Instead, an *open chronology* will be followed. It is based on the literary-historical perspective of the indeed random but largely objective division into centuries. Their borders, though, will be understood as “fluent” and will be defined separately. This allows for extensive conceptualisations in the sense of a “long 16th,”²⁴ a long 18th²⁵ and 19th²⁶ or also a “short 20th century,”²⁷ such as for the modelling of shorter periods, single incidents or of blank-space-periods. Beside the “great linearity” on a macro-level, non-linear processes, compressions, repetitions, overlaps, non-simultaneousness, leaps, discontinuities and “breakpoints” become depictive.²⁸

- . *Institutions*: If reference area and time structure are conceptualised as changeable, contingent categories, a firm approach is needed within the *Literary History* that makes disjunctions, rejections and overlaps “measurable.” That is why the operative approach to the material that should be transferred in a “narrative of discontinuities” will follow the perspective of field theory²⁹ and will focus on the literary-historically assessed institutional access developed in the wake of Bourdieu.³⁰ This is not the place to address the objections that might be made from the side of both cultural studies and field theory against the attempt of merging “cultural space” and “literary field.” Both concepts are fruitful at different levels: the concept of “Space” on a political, social and cultural macro-level (as a substitute for “Belarus”), the concept of decidedly heuristically understood “Field” on the level of literary communication and production. An approach consistent with the framework of cultural studies probably would give preference to the concept of “Geopoetics,”³¹ surely offering a brilliant base for transnational

period could not be talked about at all.

24. BRAUDEL, 1972.

25. BAINES, 2004.

26. HOBBSAWM, 1962, 1975, 1987.

27. HOBBSAWM, 1994; see also HOBBSAWM, 2004.

28. Compare HOLLIER, 1993; WELLBERY, 2004; see BERTRAND & GAUVIN, 2003.

29. BOURDIEU, 1996.

30. VAN REES, 1987; see GRÜTTMEIER & LEUKER, 2006.

31. See MARSZALEK & SASSE, 2010.

entanglements. At the given time and considering the outlined complexity of the matter, it seems nevertheless to make more sense to give preference to the institutional approach that allows, by focusing on the changing of literary institutions, to create objectivity and comparability between periods and to clearly diagnose discontinuities and blank spaces.

In a broader sense, however, field theory itself creates a bridge to “cultural space,” namely through the concept of the “Space of Possibles.”³² The field (as well as a field that according to Bourdieu does [not yet] count as such) can also be understood as a space in which certain literary actions are possible at a given time—or not.

Let us briefly explain this on an equally prominent and problematic example. In the case of the 19th century it cannot be about attempting to assign Adam Mickiewicz—who was born in the historical region of “Lithuania” (“Litwa”) on the western periphery of the Russian Empire and who was a representative of the social elite that since the 17th century considered itself part of the Polish culture (*szlachta*)—to “Belarusian” literature (which *de facto* did not exist yet at that time), as is sometimes undertaken by Belarusian scholars.³³ Instead, a depiction of the 19th century must reconstruct the complex entanglement of regional, linguistic, confessional, social, institutional, individual biographical and poetological aspects. These aspects elucidate the processes of shifting, exclusion and absorption that precisely do *not* make it possible to construct Mickiewicz as an author or even a founder of a “Belarusian” literature. In reverse (in the sense of Bourdieu’s concept of “space of possibles”), they make him apprehensible as being one of the constitutive factors of its (im)possibilities to develop in the course of the 19th century.³⁴

The present article stands in the context of the outlined project of a *Literary History of Belarus*. It attempts to explore the benefits and limits of a transnational view on the literary “spaces of (im)possibles” from an institutional perspective using the example of the 1920s. That is to say, this article will specifically ask for the transnational potential that is usually blanked out by the traditional view on Belarusian national literature. To make this undertaking plausible, we will first briefly outline the space of Belarus in the 1920s.

32. BOURDIEU, 1996, p. 234-239.

33. BRUSEVIČ, 2008; HAJBA, 2011.

34. See KOHLER (2014a, 2014b). These aspects have also to be correlated to models of Polish national literary historiography (for example, to the “szkoła białoruska” ([belarusian school]; see JANION, 1991; JACKIEWICZ 1996), or to the “literatura kresowa” ([borderland-literature]; see HADACZEK, 2011).

Transnational? The Space of Belarus in the 1920s

A "Divided Space"

The space of Belarus in the 1920s was initially characterised by two borders: On the one hand by the state border between the Belarusian Socialist Republic and the Second *Rzeczpospolita Polska*, drawn in the Peace of Riga, which subdued literature emerging (or not emerging) in this space (meaning literature in Belarusian) into two different legal-normative systems. On the other hand, this territorial state border split the social space into two ideologically opposed hemispheres, which were designed for the elaboration and consolidation of two opposing models of society—proletarian or socialistic on the one side, bourgeois-national (or capitalistic) on the other side of the border.

For Belarusian literature (again: literature in Belarusian) of the 1920s, which had passed through a first (!) foundation and consolidation phase before the outbreak of First World War,³⁵ this meant the following under general viewpoints:

1. The two threads of Belarusian literature now developing further in separate systems had a common reference-spot in the aforementioned “foundation phase” (1905-1915), which was, however, modelled by the two systems in an antagonistic way—as a spot of historical imitation in one case, and as a rejection point in the other. Besides, the macro-systems that were established on each side of the border ascribed a respectively opposing status to literature. Whereas in the Soviet part of the country Belarusian literature—as one to be moulded as “proletarian”—programmatically was assigned a major role in the construction of the “new society,” in the framework of the Polish state it was—as “nationally” oriented—reduced to the status of a regionally limited “minority literature.”
2. The division of the space of Belarus also produced two literary centres: Vil'nja, on the one hand, was anchored as capital of the “national” literature not just in collective memory,³⁶ but also in the institutional “field-memory.”³⁷ In reality, however, Vil'nja, now situated within the Polish state, was unable to regain its former charisma as Belarusian cultural centre in the 1910s.

35. See UNUČAK, 2008; VABIŠČEVIČ, 2009; NAVUMENKA, 2012.

36. LUCKEVIČ, 2006.

37. KOHLER & NAVUMENKA, 2012.

Minsk, as the capital of the BSSR, on the other hand, experienced a significant institutional boost in the 1920s, literary and cultural institutions included. At the same time, as a literary centre (and not only as such) it was subordinated to the Soviet super-centre of power, Moscow.

3. So far, to literary historical conceptualisations of the 1920s and 1930s the ongoing processes on both sides of the ideological and state border seemed to differ so much that they established the model of “Western Belarusian literature” as being fully distinct from Soviet Belarusian literature. This conceptualisation is symptomatic. Whereas the Soviet interpretation³⁸ emphasised the interplay of revolutionary literary forces between Western Belarus and the BSSR in order to literarily legitimate the unification of Western Belarus with the Soviet part in 1939 as an “organic” literary affiliation to Soviet literature, the post-Soviet modelling³⁹ emphasised the “autonomy” of Western Belarusian literature in order to profile it as a stronghold of “humanistic” and national ideals withstanding Soviet literary perversions. It actually seems more appropriate to look at Western and Soviet Belarusian literature(s) as two interacting (sub)systems that were both significantly controlled by Vil’nja (pre-war national movement’s infrastructure maintained in the 1920s), by Minsk, but also by Moscow.⁴⁰ Looked upon as a whole, the literary system definitely stands under the tension of a (not less than) double competition between a national and a transnational as well as between a national, a transnational and a regional-minority literature model. Thereby, the separate models also imply differently profiled literary communication spaces.

38. KOLESNIK, 1977, p. 122.

39. LIS, 1999, p. 280.

40. NAVUMENKA, 2015; KOHLER, 2015a; KOHLER, 2015b.

Multilingual System

Another aspect instantly raises the question of literature's transnational potential: From 1924 on, four equal state languages—Belarusian, Russian, Polish and Yiddish—were official, with Belarusian as the language of the quantitatively prevalent ethnicity being given preference in official communication.⁴¹ An exceptional position, even if not as “state language,” was given to Lithuanian and Latvian, as well. This multilingualism initiated by Moscow was institutionalised in political organisation (national sections or offices within the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of Belarus (KP(b)B) as well as in education (national sections in the Council of People's Commissars (SNK) that organised the school and higher education of national minorities, the founding of Jewish and Polish pedagogical institutes or respective departments in the State Pedagogic Institute of Minsk). But mainly it became relevant on the level of cultural organisations (respective departments in the Institute for Belarusian Culture (IBK), the precursor of the Academy of Sciences, as well as in the State Theatre, in the founding of newspapers and journals, libraries or respective sections, etc.).⁴² Hereby, multiple literary communication spheres were at least potentially revealed.

This nationalities policy stood in an unclear relationship of tension with the policy of the so called “Belarusizacyja.”⁴³ Primarily, though, it was under the sign of an inherent misunderstanding regarding its political motivation. What representatives of national minorities as well as nationally disposed Belarusians perceived as a possibility of national self-realisation (and maybe even more), actually solely served the maximally effective and extensive ideological re-education of the population.⁴⁴ This is proven not only by the destruction of traditional cultural micro-structures and by “anti-religious propaganda” such as the closing or re-purposing of Talmud schools and synagogues going on simultaneously, but also or even particularly by the recalling of the subsidies policy (closing of the aforementioned institutions, enforcing Russian as compulsory language in school lessons, and more) from the late 1920s, or, at the latest, from the early 1930s, and,

41. Compare PLATONAŨ & KORŠUK, 2001, p. 129.

42. See ZACHARKEVIČ (2009, p. 240f.). Beyond this, the nationalities policies also extend to the agricultural area (founding of national kolkhoses, national representations in the village administrative bodies, the Polish minority receives an autonomous region, etc.), and also take into account the minorities of the Roma (“cyhany”) and Tatars (*ibid.*, p. 245f.).

43. See PLATONAŨ & KORŠUK, 2001.

44. ŠYBEKA, 2003, p. 250.

last but not least, by the fate of the protagonists involved in subsidising nationalities policy and Belarusization in the second half of the 1930s. The actual motivation of the nationalities policy (not only concerning the BSSR) is revealed in a letter from Stalin to Lenin in 1922:

We are experiencing such a band of development, when form, law, constitution cannot be ignored, when the young generation of communists in the borderlands refuses to accept the game of independence as a game, stubbornly understanding the words about independence at face value, and also stubbornly demanding us to bring the letters of the constitution of the independent republics to life.⁴⁵

Thus, the space of Belarus in the 1920s is to be understood as an extremely complex configuration equally characterised by territorial and ideological division and by poly-ethnicity that stood under multiple tensions of national differentiation and ideological homogenisation, especially in the area of culture. Before this background we will try to understand in how far literary fields overlapped in the outlined specific conditions, which literary spaces of (im)possibility resulted from these and whether, and to what extent, transnational aspects can be exposed.

Field Borders and Interference of Fields in the Space of Belarus from an institutional viewpoint

Where are the borders of a literary field and how can it be defined? In *The Rules of Art* Bourdieu implicitly assumes a literary field whose “spatial” expansion coincides with state borders.⁴⁶ Under this premise, he defines the borders of the literary field primarily on the vertical axis, that is to say, through the differentiation between literature and not-literature. Bourdieu only marginally reflects “horizontal” interactions between (national) literary fields, using the example of Belgian literature and initially denying it the character of a (separate) field.⁴⁷ As a reaction to

45. «Мы переживаем такую полосу развития, когда форма, закон, конституция не могут быть игнорированы, когда молодое поколение коммунистов на окраинах игру в независимость отказывается принимать как игру, упорно признавая слова о независимости за чистую монету и также упорно требуя от нас проведения в жизнь буквы конституции независимых республик», STALIN, 1989 (22.09.1922), p. 199.

46. BOURDIEU, 1996.

47. See BOURDIEU, 1985.

Casanova's considerations,⁴⁸ Bourdieu later specifies the case of Belgian literature as an example for "specific literary dominance" and states: "One can be free politically while remaining literary dominated."⁴⁹ Nevertheless, one has to admit that field theory has so far contributed little to the conceptualisation of spatial field borders and overlappings of fields.⁵⁰ Especially against the background of the rather hazy categories of "field logic" and "field effects"⁵¹ and bearing in mind the modelling of Casanova (2004), the question could be asked whether the "World Republic of Letters" in its core is not thought of as one single, autonomous, internationally acting "French field" whose logic is implicitly or explicitly used to measure all other fields.

Among others for this reason, it seems reasonable to draw close to the question—whether in the space of Belarus of the 1920s and under the conditions of division, poly-ethnicity and ideological regulation one or more literary fields function, and if the latter is the case, how these fields interact with each other—pragmatically from the perspective of the institutional approach.

Western Belarusian and Soviet Belarusian (Sub-)Fields

In connection to the hypothetical division of Belarusian literature into a Western Belarusian and a Soviet Belarusian (sub)field, respective research is already going on. The institutional comparison leads to the preliminary result, that, on the one hand, "there can be no question of a 'Western Belarusian literary field,'" but also that, on the other hand, "a model of Western Belarusian literature as a 'sub-field' of the Soviet Belarusian literary field for now [cannot be made] sufficiently plausible." At the same time, the cross-border field effects prove themselves as

48. Casanova reflects spatial aspects, namely in the sense of arrangements of (again: national) fields alongside the "literary Meridian." She marginally considers interferences of fields when investigating "small" literatures as literary dominant spaces (CASANOVA, 2004). With regard to Belgian literature she defines the catchphrase of "Belgian anger" (« La colère belge »). In the 19th century Brussels has the role of the "capital of the second chance towards that Paris that dominated the whole literary world" (« capitale de la deuxième chance contre ce Paris qui dominait le monde littéraire tout entier »; DUBOIS & BOURDIEU, 1999, p. 13; see CASANOVA, 1995, p. 13-17).

49. « On peut être libre politiquement tout en restant dominé littérairement »; DUBOIS & BOURDIEU, 1999, p. 12.

50. On the problem of national modelling of social fields, see SAPIRO, 2013, p. 70-85.

51. BOURDIEU, 1996; BOURDIEU & WACQUANT, 2006, p. 124-147.

too obvious for it to be justified to finally put aside reflections on an integrative model. Thus, the preliminary result must read that the field theoretical approach—and especially the methodological focus on the question of field effects evoked by institutions and protagonists—can provide the necessary analytical apparatus, but that the model allows for no systematic place to which the result of the study could be conceptually assigned to. Unless this place is exactly the one that Bourdieus model with its laconic tautology leaves to itself— precisely the border of the field.⁵²

“Transnationality,” as it seems, might, in a way, be stated here in a reversed sense: Here we have a field (or two “sub-fields”) that basically crosses state borders and at the same time is integrated into two superior and antagonistic macro systems (or macro-fields).

Transnational literary field?

Unlike the interrelation of Western Belarusian and Soviet Belarusian literature, the question of possible interactions between literature(s) written in the four official state languages within the BSSR—Belorussian, Russian, Yiddish and Polish—has so far not, or hardly, been stated in this clarity. First, we need to clarify to what extent these four languages or literatures were institutionally secured, and in which literary models, spaces—and not least markets—they actually participated or potentially could participate.

The quantitative distribution of population of the BSSR in the year 1926 was composed as follows:

52. „[...] allzu augenfällig, als dass es gerechtfertigt wäre, Überlegungen zu einem integrativen Modell abschließend ad acta zu legen. So muss der vorläufige Befund wohl lauten, dass der feldtheoretische Ansatz – und insbesondere der methodische Fokus auf die Frage nach durch Institutionen und Akteure hervorgebrachten Feldeffekten – wohl das analytische Instrumentarium bereitzustellen vermag, dass das Modell aber keinen systematischen Ort vorsieht, dem das Ergebnis der Untersuchung sich konzeptuell zuweisen ließe. Es sei denn, dieser Ort ist eben jener, den Bourdieus Modell in lakonischer Tautologie sich selber überlässt – eben die Grenze des Feldes“, KOHLER, 2015a, p. 170.

TABLE 1

| | Total | Belarus. | Jews | Rus. | Polish | Ukrai. | Latv. | Lith. | other |
|-------|----------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| Count | 4 983240 | 4 017301 | 407059 | 383806 | 97498 | 34681 | 14061 | 6864 | |
| in % | 100 | 80,62 | 8,19 | 7,7 | 1,98 | 0,69 | 0,28 | 0,14 | 0,42 |

Composition of the population of the BSSR 1926 (according to ethnicity)⁵³

Needless to say, ethnicity is not indicative of language use.⁵⁴ Furthermore, the groups differ significantly in their social composition, regional distribution, cultural homogeneity, social-political affinities and, last but not least, in their “literary potential.” Keeping these reservations in mind, the numbers introduced above shall serve as a point of reference for the sake of orientation.

Differences between the ethnic groups were also apparent in the manner and extent of their institutional representation. At the Institute for Belarusian Culture [Instytut Belaruskaj Kul'tury], founded in 1922, a Jewish and, since 1925, a Polish department (both with further commissions), as well as, since 1926, a Latvian and then a Lithuanian section were represented (but no Russian, factually proving that Russians living in the BSSR were not considered a “national minority”). Among these departments or sections, the Jewish one was by far the biggest and most productive.⁵⁵

53. According to PRACHARĚNJA, 2017, p. 225 and http://demoscope.ru/weekly/ssp/ussr_nac_26.php?reg=3 (21.06.2019).

54. For example, in urban and administrative life Russian is factually prevalent, and Russian or Jewish-Russian employees of the party apparatus not rarely defy the Belarusization measures (ŠYBĚKA, 2003, p. 251).

55. Special importance is ascribed to the Jewish department. Its founding was justified by Balicki in 1924 in front of the SNK as follows: “In various places and different corners of Belarus, Jewish culture is so intertwined with Belarusian that the study of one demands the imperative study of the other. [...] That is why the organisation of a Jewish department in the Institute of Belarusian culture does not only not divide the tasks of the IBC, but also gives this organisation a special symmetry and harmony” («По различным местечкам и другим уголкам Белоруссии еврейская культура настолько переплелась с белорусской, что изучение одной требует непременно изучения другой. [...] Вот почему организация при Институте белорусской культуры еврейского отдела не только не раздваивает задач Инбелкульты, но придает этому учреждению особую стройность и гармонию»; quoted from SKALABAN & TOKARAŪ, 2011, p. 64; highlights GK/PN). In the report to the first half of 1925, the following is stated: “The Jewish section has developed very widely due to

The Jewish section published the specialised journal *Zeitschrift*, a scientific almanac mainly (but not only) in Yiddish, which marginally also touched literary issues.⁵⁶

Multilingual Production in the Belarusian State Publishing House

In view of the literary productivity of the four language groups and the question of their interrelation, the decisive institution was printing and publishing. Generally, two publishing channels for literary texts were available for the authors of the BSSR in the 1920s, the Belarusian State Publishing House [Belaruskaje Dzjaržaŭnae Vydavectva] and literary, as well as non-literary periodicals.⁵⁷

In the Belarusian State Publishing House (BDV), which held a *de facto* monopoly,⁵⁸ multilingual production was programmatically promoted. Actually, the languages used in the space of Belarus were virtually institutionally merged in BDV:

According to the production plan of 1924, BDV was supposed to begin publishing literature in accordance to the national needs in the following proportions: Belarusian—68%, Jewish—15%, Russian—10%, Polish—5%, Latvian and Lithuanian—2%.⁵⁹

a bigger number of suitable employees and has already outgrown its projected frame. It has already founded several sub-sections (theatre and Art, folklore) and has constituted several new commissions. The work of the Polish section so far consists only of three permanent commissions due to the lack of suitable employees, whereby a new ethnographic commission has been founded to explore the Polish population in the area of the BSSR” («Яўрэйскі аддзел развіўся, дзякуючы прысутнасці большага ліку належных працаўнікоў, вельмі шырока і перарос ужо сваі запраектаваныя рамкі. Ён выдзеліў некалькі ўжо падсекцый (па тэатру і мастацтву, па фальклору) і склаў некаторыя новыя камісіі. Праца польскага аддзела, за адсутнасцю адпаведных працаўнікоў, вылілася зараз толькі ў тры сталыя камісіі, прычым заснавана новая этнаграфічная камісія, вывучаючая расселенае па БССР польскае жыхарства»; *ibid.*, p. 111-112). In the context of the reconstruction of the IBC in 1927, five commissions are allocated to the Jewish sections, including one for the research of Jewish literature. The Polish section is divided into three commissions in 1927, also including one for the investigation of Polish language and culture (*ibid.*, p. 194). In 1926, 121 of 206 employees of the Institute are Belarusian (58,7%), 45 Jewish (21,8%) and 23 Polish (11,2%); *ibid.*, p. 155.

56. See FILATOVA, 2012, p. 162.

57. Publishers or periodicals outside of Belarus, especially in Vilnius but also in Moscow, Warsaw, Kiev, L'viv, Prague, Berlin and others offer another option.

58. NIKALAEŭ *et al.*, 2011, p. 206.

59. «Згодна з выдавецкім планам 1924 года, БДВ павінна было пачаць выпускаць літаратуру ў адпаведнасці з нацыянальнымі патрэбамі ў наступных суадносінах:

Once again, the numbers prove the prominent position of Yiddish, compared to Russian and Polish. However, they refer to the respectively total publishing activity of BDV, whose lion's share is made up of political or propagandistic texts with artistic literature ("fiction") playing a clearly inferior role. Also, target figures are usually not fulfilled, as is documented in BDV's report from May 1927:

TABLE 2

| Language | Branch | planned | fulfilled |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|---------|-----------|
| Belarusian | Textbooks | 350 | 353 |
| | Artistic literature | 170 | 116 |
| | Farmer's literature | 80 | 59 |
| | Lenin | 120 | 202 |
| | Political literature | 70 | 55 |
| | Komsomol | 60 | 35 |
| | Children's/Pioneer's literature | 40 | 28 |
| | Women's literature | 20 | 13 |
| | War | - | 15 |
| | <i>Total</i> | 910 | 876 |
| Yiddish (Jaürejski) | <i>Total</i> | 188 | 167 |
| Polish | <i>Total</i> | 63 | 56 |
| Russian | <i>Total</i> | 100 | 55 |

Planned and fulfilled production of the BDV in the four state languages 1926/1927⁶⁰

беларускай – 68%, яўрэйскай – 15%; рускай – 10%; польскай – 5%; латышскай і літоўскай – 2%»; ПРАЧАРАЊА, 2017, p. 227.

60. The table does not include the so called "commercial literature." The figures refer to print sheets [*arkuśy*] and are partially rounded. The depiction in the report differentiates between "published" [*izdana*] and "in review" [*na prahljadze*]. The balance, though, counts all three as "carried out" (NARB, f. LA 17, op. 1, d. 18, l. 91-99).

The BDV's catalogues from 1925 to 1929 also confirm the weak status of artistic literature in book production. The jubilee catalogue presents the multilingual production as a clear success:

Before the Revolution no books were printed in Minsk, but now *three hundred book titles in Belarusian, Yiddish, Polish, Russian and Lithuanian are simultaneously worked on daily.*⁶¹

The efforts, though, were primarily directed at the production of functional books (designed for practical application), and only to a small extent to artistic literature. Hereby we see that the development of single segments and especially of artistic literature exhibits even opposed dynamics in the various languages: there was a noteworthy increase in the specifically literary production (*mastackaja litaratura*) not only for Belarusian but especially for Yiddish.

TABLE 3

| | | 1924/ 1925 | 1925/ 1926 | 1926/ 1927 | 1927/ 1928 | 1928/ 1929 | Total for 5 years |
|------------------|--------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------|
| In Belarusian | Textbooks | 863 | 593 | 501 | 714 | 727 | 3.398 |
| | Mass literature | 330 | 275 | 183 | 240 | 620,5 | 1.648,5 |
| | Belletristic | 98 | 117 | 67 | 148,5 | 129 | 559,5 |
| | Children | 15 | 10 | 23 | 240,5 | 166 | 454,5 |
| | Periodicals | 26 | 30 | 16 | 15 | 7 | 94 |
| | Other | 99 | 27 | 14 | 122 | 111,5 | 373,5 |
| | Total | 1.431 | 1.052 | 804 | 1.480 | 1.761 | 6.528 |

61. «У дарэволюцыйны час у Менску аніякіх кніх [sic!] не друкавалі, а цяпер у друкарні БДВ штотдня ідзе работа над трымастамі назвамі кніг на беларускай, яўрэйскай, польскай, расійскай і літоўскай, мовах адначасна» (*Кніhas'pis za pjac' hod*, 1929, p. VII; highlights GK/PN).

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------|----|----|----|------|------|-------|
| In Yiddish | Textbooks | 12 | 20 | 25 | 52,5 | 41,5 | 151 |
| | Mass literature | 30 | 24 | 28 | 2 | 34 | 118 |
| | Belletristic | 6 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 42,5 | 66,5 |
| | Children | 3 | - | 9 | 43,5 | 57 | 112,5 |
| | Other | 12 | - | - | - | - | 12 |
| | Total | 63 | 47 | 65 | 110 | 175 | 460 |
| In Polish | Textbooks | - | 20 | 24 | 7 | 17 | 68 |
| | Mass literature | 11 | 12 | 15 | 15 | 8 | 61 |
| | Belletristic | 2 | 10 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 32 |
| | Children | - | - | - | 5 | 15 | 20 |
| | Other | 4 | - | - | - | - | 4 |
| | Total | 17 | 42 | 41 | 33 | 52 | 185 |
| In Russian | Textbooks | 27 | 5 | - | 3 | - | 35 |
| | Mass literature | 30 | 14 | 7 | 16 | 3 | 70 |
| | Belletristic | - | 8 | 5 | - | 5 | 18 |
| | Other | 15 | - | - | - | - | 15 |
| | Total | 72 | 27 | 12 | 19 | 8 | 138 |
| In Lithuanian and Latvian | Mass literature | - | - | - | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| | Belletristic | - | - | - | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| | Total | - | - | - | 4 | 5 | 9 |

Statistics of the publications of the BDV sorted by languages and segments
1924-1929⁶²

62. Data in thousand copies (*Knibas'pis za pjac' hod*, 1929, p. XIV). The total production of fiction in all languages develops as follows (in thousand copies): 1924/25: 106; 1925/26: 138; 1926/27: 77; 1927/28: 169,5; 1928/29: 189. That means, in five years altogether 680, which amounts to about 9,3% of the total production of BDV (textbooks account for almost fifty per cent of the total production of copies). The quantitative drop in all segments in 1926/27 is due to the paper crisis that forces BDV to reduce the production by 20% (NARB, f. 4p, op. 1, d. 2904, l. 1-29).

This observation is further relativised by the titles themselves, as recorded in BDV's catalogue. They document a particularly poor original literary production (for Polish only single works of Waclaw Pański-Solski, Adolf Stankiewicz and W. Noskiewicz, a few small plays (published without an author's name), as well as small anthologies (including *Idziemy*, a publication of the Polish sector of the Belarusian Association of Proletarian Writers).⁶³ The Yiddish language authors published in the BDV are, in addition, by no means typical for the Yiddish literature of Belarus—important authors such as M. Kulbak, I. Kharyk, Z. Akselrod, E. Savikoški and others are missing here (at least in the 1920s).

The striking discrepancy between the programmatic multilingualism of BDV's production and its realisation in the area of literature, implies that the (part-) literatures are either not sufficiently productive in the 1920s or in their productivity do not comply with the BDV's orientation.

"National" literary groups and literary journals

Literary journals or periodicals with a noteworthy literary proportion were an important publication option for literary texts in the 1920s, among other reasons because most periodicals were organs of literary groups.⁶⁴

- . For Belarusian writing authors these were particularly the journals *Maladnjak* [Saplings], *Polymja* [The flame] and *Uzvyšša* [Excelsior] (each tied to the group of the same name).
- . Yiddish writing authors were organised in a Jewish section of the group "Maladnjak," which founded the trans-regionally received literary journal *Štern* [Star] in 1925. In 1926 the newspaper *Junger Arbejtër* [Young worker] emerged, which is tied to the group of the same name.⁶⁵

63. From altogether sixteen titles named under the category "Literatura piękna" in the catalogue, only three were published before 1928; nine are original Polish texts, seven are translations (three from Ukrainian, four from Belarusian; *Knihas'pis za pjac' hod*, 1929, pp. 145-146).

64. General figures of periodicals in 1927: 11 trans-regional newspapers, including four in Russian, three in Belarusian, two both in Polish and Yiddish. Regional newspapers are all in Russian. Among 11 journals four are in Belarusian, three in Russian, two in Russian and Belarusian, two in Yiddish (ŠYBĚKA, 2003, p. 252).

65. BASIN, 2003, p. 18-38. Reliable research on Jewish or Yiddish language literature and culture in the 1920s focusing on groups and periodicals hardly exists. The meagre information is contradictory regarding title, type and publication period of the periodicals.

- . Russian-writing authors were also organised in a section of “Maladnjak.” In 1925 the group “Zven’ja” was founded, from which the group “Minskij pereval” split off in 1926.⁶⁶ Various periodicals were at the disposal of these authors (for example, the newspaper *Zvezda*, which included a literary column), but the authors did not run their own literary journal (in 1926 the almanac *Zven’ja* is published).⁶⁷
- . Authors of the Polish minority organised themselves in a section of “Maladnjak”⁶⁸ and published their texts in the weekly newspaper *Orka*, published since 1926 (edited by the Central Committee of the KP(b)B).⁶⁹ An author’s own proper literary group, let alone a literary journal in Polish, did not succeed.

It so seems that the Belarusian and Yiddish authors are the best organised, whereas Polish authors are the weakest, probably also because most of them are orientated towards Moscow.⁷⁰

From an institutional perspective, the aforementioned literary journals are of an essential significance, because they virtually “structure” the literary field.⁷¹ In this light, it is important to note that neither the journals in various languages nor the

A contemporary description is given by ARŠANSKI (1929). A general introduction gives RELES (2006).

66. “In November 1925 the literary organisation ‘Zven’ja’ appeared, uniting authors writing in Russian. [...] In 1927, 7 authors emerged (mainly farmer authors) who organised the literary Association ‘Minskij pereval,’ which aspired to work according to the “Declaration of the All-Union Association of worker and peasant authors ‘Pereval’” («В ноябре 1925 года возникла литературная организация „Звенья“, объединявшая литераторов, писавших на русском языке. [...] В 1927 году из „Звеньев“ выделились 7 литераторов (в большинстве крестьянских), которые организовали литературное объединение „Минский перевал“, ставившее своей целью работать согласно „Декларации Всесоюзного объединения рабочих и крестьянских писателей „Перевал“»; [о.А.А.], 2014, p. 41).

67. The absence of a Russian literary journal can probably be accounted for by the lack of demand: Those who read “Russian” literature are surely primarily interested in the well-known ‘Russian’ papers (especially as *Krasnaja Nov’*, *Pereval* and *LEF* are actively advertised for in the Belarusian periodicals), and not in the literary production on the periphery.

68. SIEROCKA, 1967, p. 419.

69. In 1929 the collection of poems *Idziemy* is published in Minsk.

70. SIEROCKA, 1967, p. 420.

71. KOHLER, 2016, p. 211.

groups exhibited a noteworthy interrelation with one other.⁷² This suggests that the four language groups largely kept to themselves. A differentiation took place only, if at all, *within* the respective language groups (most distinctly in Belarusian). There were few cases of a language transcending mutual perception, let alone mixing with other languages. This seems to be true even for national sections within “Maladnjak.”⁷³

Regarding the questions of the transnational potential of the literature(s) in the space of Belarus in the 1920s, the following result can be derived from the outlined aspects: On the one hand, the hypothesis of a *transnational potential* is clearly confirmed by the coexistence of four (more or less) literary prolific languages and their evidently institutional funding. On the other hand, it becomes apparent that, especially in an institutional perspective, this transnational potential *was not or was hardly realised*. Instead, we see a configuration, where Belarusian (the Belarusian language) literature clearly dominates the field quantitatively and qualitatively, while the other three part-literatures played a marginal role in 1920s Belarus. They seem to neither stand in a noteworthy exchange relationship with the dominating

72. This finding, which should be verified in deepened research, results from an excursive examination of Belarusian literary journals regarding the reception of non-Belarusian publications. On the other hand, literary groups express themselves personally accordingly on the occasion of a survey by the SNK: “Maladnjak” declares: “All the time, the Central Board strives to establish a permanent cooperation with other literary organisations. In this process, ‘Uzvyšša’ takes up an especially hostile relation to ‘Maladnjak’” («ЦБ все время стремится наладить постоянное сотрудничество с другими литературными организациями. В этом направлении особенно враждебную позицию в отношении к „Маладняку“ занимает „Узвышша“» (NARB, f. 4p, op. 1, d. 2895, l. 16-17); “Uzvyšša” writes: “The group maintains a connection to the Ukrainian organisation ‘VAPLITĚ’” («Группа поддерживает связь с украинской организацией „ВАПЛИТЭ“»; *ibid.*, l. 24); “Zven’ja” declares: “A connection to ‘Pereval’, ‘Maladnjak’, ‘Vzvyšša’ and ‘Junger Arbejtër’ exists” («Есть связь с „Перевалом“, с „Маладняком“, „Взвышей“ и „Юнгер Арбејтер“, постоянная связь пока не установлена»; *ibid.*, l. 27); “Junger Arbejtër”, finally, answers: “Excerpt for ‘Ju.-A.’ there are no further Jewish authors’ organisations in Belarus. There are no official connections to non-Jewish authors’ organisations” («Кроме „Ю.-А.“, других еврейских писательских организаций в Белоруссии нет. С нееврейскими писательскими организациями официальной связи нет»; *ibid.*, l. 28).

73. The founding of national minorities’ sections (Jewish, Polish, Russian) within “Maladnjak” is decided on the plenary meeting on the 23.03.1925 (compare [o.A.A.], 1925, p. 33). In 1929, the deepened dialogue with the Jewish section of “BelAPP”, a successor organisation of “Maladnjak” (and the Belarusian analogue to Russian “RAPP”) is named as an urgent desideratum in a resolution (see [o.A.A.], 1929, p. 123-125). As a result, for example, translations of Jewish authors or reviews of foreign language publications increase distinctly after 1929 in *Maladnjak* and *Polymja*, even though nationalities policy is officially closed at the end of the 1920s.

segment, nor to transgress or to question the field borders in the direction of the neighbouring fields (the Polish and the Russian field). This result seems to confirm the predominantly “programmatic” character of a “multi-national Soviet literature”⁷⁴ that, at least in the 1920s, remains widely within national categories: From an institutional perspective, at any rate, the space of Belarus seems to be realised as a *multinational* but not as a *transnational* literary space. We can conclude, that transnational entanglement in the sense of *crossing* national parameters may be identified, if at all, on the level of the protagonists.

Transnational Spaces of Possibles?

Bourdieu's concept of the space of possibles, as the “potentially realisable in the field,”⁷⁵ mediates between the objectively given structure of existing positions or accomplished position-takings in the field, on the one hand, and objectively—but also subjectively—*possible* position-takings, on the other:

The relationship among positions and position-takings is by no means a relationship of mechanical determination. Between one and the other, in some fashion, the space of possibles interposes itself, [...] that is, as an oriented space, pregnant with position-takings identifiable as objective potentialities, things “to be done,” “movements” to launch, reviews to create, adversaries to combat, established position-takings to be “overtaken” and so forth. [...] Thus the heritage accumulated by collective work presents itself to each agent as a space of possibles, that is, as an ensemble of probable *constraints* which are the condition and the counterpart of a set of *possible uses*.⁷⁶

The concept is to be understood as a “necessary theoretical-conceptual addition”⁷⁷ of Bourdieu's field model that makes it possible “to have regard for fundamental changes in practice.”⁷⁸ It nuances Bourdieu's occasionally mechanical-seeming model, mainly in view of explaining literary transition, and is therefore especially

74. HAYWARD, 1980, p. 185.

75. „[...] das im Feld potenziell Realisierbare“ (DÖLLINGER, 2017, p. 248; see also SPELLER, 2011, p. 65).

76. BOURDIEU, 1996, p. 234-235; highlights from the original.

77. „notwendige theoretisch-konzeptionelle Ergänzung“ (DÖLLINGER, 2017, p. 256).

78. „fundamentalen Veränderungen in der Praxis Rechnung zu tragen“ (*ibid.*).

interesting from a literary-historical perspective. What *a posteriori* becomes visible as “new” in the field, are specific realisations of what is, at a certain point, virtually laid out in the logic of the field in the form of “*structural lacunae*,”⁷⁹ but has so far not been realised.⁸⁰

Here we will consider the question whether, or to what extent, the Belarusian literary field of the 1920s constituted institutionalised “multinational” transnational spaces of possibles—and who was able to realise such virtual possibilities.

Choice of language and Space of possibles

It has become obvious that the options available to the literary field of this time and hence to its protagonists are substantially pre-structured by the “language” and “literary corporation” parameters. Thus, the transnational perspective has already complemented a significant aspect to the knowledge of literature of Belarus in the 1920s, because Belarusian studies—including literary-historic—have so far paid attention mainly to the literature in the Belarusian language in this period.⁸¹

It has also become obvious that the language groups and the literary groups largely remain isolated from each other on the institutional level (cf. note 72). *In reality*, this means that the primary language choice opens up to the protagonists a respectively differently structured ideological and poetological-aesthetic space of possibles. This space of possibles is differentiated unequal for each of the language groups in 1927:

79. BOURDIEU, 1996, p. 235, 239.

80. Speller criticises Bourdieu’s concept of the space of possibles that creates a too weak connection between the “space of the oeuvre” and the “space of the positions” (SPELLER, 2011, p. 70).

81. This stands in contrast to other (former) periods of literary history in Belarus, where the same “exclusively Belarusian” viewpoint would merely meet his object. In those periods a transnational perspective becomes compelling to make it possible to say anything about the literature of the space of Belarus.

TABLE 4

| Belarusian ⁸² | | | Yiddish | |
|--------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Maladnjak | Polymja | Uzvyšša | Junger Arbeiter | Maladnjak: jaür. sekcyja |
| Russian | | | Polish | |
| Maladnjak: ras. sekc. | Zven'ja | Minskij Pereval | Maladnjak: pol'skaja sekcyja | |

Institutional choice possibilities (languages and groups)

All of these organisations were at least *formally* (programmatically) subordinated to the model of “proletarian” literature serving the construction of socialist society, and were committed to the formula “national in form, proletarian in content.”⁸³ The internal differentiation between the journals can therefore not be revealed at first glance.⁸⁴ It is important to note that to all authors an affiliation with the group “Maladnjak” stood open consistently, as “Maladnjak’s” national sections ensured the extensive implementation and enforcement of the “national in form, proletarian in content” model. Choosing the group “Maladnjak” therefore implied a subordination to a literary model that—as a *proletarian model*—was orientated *internationally*, and whose national variants were to be understood in the function of “proletarian internationalism.”⁸⁵

In view of the *realisation* of transnational spaces of possibles in relation to the institutionally designated *possibilities* of choice, it is symptomatic that the

82. Only the most important groups are mentioned here. Small, short-lived splinter groups (see PLATONAŪ, 1999, p. 6) and regional groups have been left out.

83. See, for example, manifestos or programmatic texts of “Maladnjak” ([o.A.A.], 1926, p. 9) as well as of “Uzvyšša” ([o.A.A.], 1927a, p. 169).

84. Internal differentiation partly depends on generations, partly it is, on a very general level, connected to the status attributed to the aesthetic quality of the text in relation to its ideological orientation, partly, again, inter- and transnational networks and literary models seem to play an indeed very hazy role (see “Uzvyšša’s” contacts to Ukrainian “VAPLITE”, the by far trans-regional radius of the journal *Štern*, the proximity of “Minskij Pereval” to Russian “Pereval” etc.). A systematic comparative study to the complex internal differentiations between the journals in Belarusian language continues to be a desideratum (see KOHLER, 2016, p. 236).

85. In this respect, the association “Maladnjak” in a certain way “copies” the “Soviet-Union-model” with the difference that the leading role is taken over by the Belarusian core group.

language choice and the appropriate trajectory options do not naturally correlate imperatively with authors' ethnicity. This particularly applies to Jewish authors, for whom the "institutionally designated" Yiddish is far from being the only option. Instead, Jewish authors were represented in the Russian speaking group "Zven'ja"⁸⁶ as well as in Belarusian-speaking groups and journals.⁸⁷ Transnational space of possibles thus seems to have been revealed especially for and by them—in view of a "Jewish" as well as of a "Belarusian," and for a proper "Transnational," literature that both connects and crosses borders.

In the given context of a *Literary History of Belarus* we are for now especially interested in those spaces of possibles that result from the orientation of Jewish authors towards literature in Belarusian language.

Case study: Jewish Authors in Belarusian Language—Samuil Plaŭnik

Samuil Plaŭnik (1886-1941) was born to a poor Jewish family in the village of Pasadzec, about 70 km north of Minsk. Plaŭnik nowadays is considered to be one of the central "classics of Belarusian literature,"⁸⁸ known under his main pseudonym Zmitrok Bjadulja. He thus is probably the most prominent proof of a transnational space of possibles in the first third of the 20th century.

Plaŭnik received a traditional Jewish school education in a Cheder and was then sent to the Yeshiva, which he left one and a half years later without a degree. He wrote his first literary texts in Hebrew, then in Russian,⁸⁹ but then, unlike, for example, Běr Aršanski, Izi Kharyk or Majsej Kulbak, who connected to the

86. NARB, f. 4p, op. 1, d. 2895, l. 27.

87. See, for example, [о.А.А.], 1927b, p. 93; NARB, f. 4p, op. 1, d. 2895, l. 16. Bemporad indicates that the Jewish population of the BSSR critically looked upon the orientation towards the Belarusian language. She describes Jewish authors who turned towards Belarusian as an exception: "It should be noticed that while Jews generally opposed Belorussian, there were a few Jewish writers who opted for Belorussian as the language of their literary activity" (BEMPORAD, 2007, p. 103). Factually, though, there were more authors than the ones she names.

88. «[К]ласік[] беларускай літаратуры» (KAVALENKA, 1985, p. 5). Compare also: "The great Belarusian author Zmitrok Bjadulja, whose name rightly stands beside the names of the great masters of the Belarusian artistic word – Janka Kupala, Jakub Kolas, Maksim Bahdanovič and Maskim Harëcki" («выдатны беларускі пісьменнік Змітрок Бядуля, чьё імя па праву стаіць побач з імёнамі буйнейшых майстроў беларускага мастацкага слова – Янкі Купалы, Якуба Коласа, Максіма Багдановіча, Максіма Гарэцкага»; *ibid.*, p. 6). Similar assessments are made by NAVUMENKA (1985, p. 237) and by KAZBJARUK (2006, p. 5).

89. KAZBJARUK, 2006, p. 5.

international Jewish literary space by using Yiddish, he switched to Belarusian as the language for his literary activity. His acquaintance with the Belarusian newspaper *Naša niva* [Our field] (1906-1915) is considered a milestone on his way to choosing Belarusian instead of “imperial” Russian.⁹⁰ A decisive factor for the shaping of Plaŭnik-Bjadulja's space of possibles therefore seems to be the fact that he grew up into the *constitution phase* of Belarusian (national) literature at the beginning of the 20th century. With the choice of Belarusian as the “language of the people” in combination with the corresponding thematic orientation promoted by *Naša niva*, he was able to take up a clearly visible position in the developing literary space as early as 1912.

Thus, Bjadulja steps into the 1920s as a mature and recognised writer. On the one hand, as a representative of the “founder generation” of the national literary tradition, who, on the other hand and in contradiction to Jakub Kolas and Janka Kupala, specifically does *not* carry the label of a “Belarusian national poet” (this probably has to do with his Jewish background). This very specific position could be the reason why Bjadulja's trajectory of the 1920s “crosses” several institutional possibilities simultaneously. Beside his “natural” place (the journal *Polymja* which primarily gathered authors of the older generation around itself and in whose closer circle of collaborators he counted), Bjadulja at the same time chose a place that was actually “impossible” for him from a generational perspective. He became a member of the group “Maladnjak” (which was the “natural” place for young newcomers in the field who looked critically upon Bjadulja's generation). In “Maladnjak” he joined the central group settled in Minsk and writing in Belarusian—and not the so called “Jewish section.” When he left the group in 1926 together with the founding members of the group “Uzvyšša,” he explicitly excluded himself from their sharp criticism towards “Maladnjak.”⁹¹ These “border crossings,” which manifest Bjadulja's compatibility with groups competing among themselves, document an outstanding flexibility of his space of possibles, further reinforced by his position as literary editor of the daily newspaper *Saveckaja Belarus'* [Soviet Belarus].

Furthermore, Bjadulja distinguished himself from an aesthetic and poetological perspective through a considerable eagerness to experiment: In the first half of the 1920s, his experiments with the “revolutionary theme,” the comparison of

90. *Ibid.*, p. 5f. “It is unknown what Bjadulja's literary fate would have looked like, had Sosenski not shown him the newspaper in Belarusian” («Невядома, як бы склаўся літаратурны лёс Бядулі, калі б Сосенскі не паказаў яму газету на беларускай мове»; see MAKARĚVIČ, 2014).

91. See PLATONAŪ, 1999, p. 18.

the pre-revolutionary social reality with the new Soviet order, and his affinity to poetry, poems and small prose forms⁹² made him compatible to “Maladnjak” and *Polymja*. As a member of the group “Uzvyšša,” again, he contributed considerably to the differentiation of forms of long narrative fiction, in which he critically reflects pre-revolutionary types under the new conditions.⁹³

Only from the second half of the 1920s did Bjadulja emerge as a translator of Jewish authors (especially Sholom-Alejkhem, Kharyk und Kulbak, furthermore Godiner, Akselrod, Iudelson and others) into Belarusian (occasionally at first and more and more in the 1930s—thus in accordance to the institutional stipulations of an intensified mutual awareness (cf. note 73). Nevertheless, the attribute of a “mediator” could be given to Bjadulja only with reservation.⁹⁴ Instead, transnational moments come to bear at various places in his oeuvre, on a stylistic level (for example, in his lyric prose), as well as on the level of the personages, for example in the character Jazep Krušynski, where the traditional type of the Belarusian farmer is merged with that of a Jewish merchant.

But the transnational most explicitly emerges in his late autobiographic *apovesc’* “*U drymučych ljasach*” (“In the dense forests”; first published in *Polymja* 1939/8). Similar to Bruno Schulz, Bjadulja locates the lost Jewish world of his childhood in a mythical space (in the “dense forests”). It is the only (fictional or at least fictionalised) text in which Bjadulja explicitly positions himself (the first-person-narrator) as Jewish—doubly broken by the childlike-alienated distance to the cultural universe of Jewish faith (the commandments of Shabbat are personified for the child by the enigmatic “Queen Šabas”),⁹⁵ and through the temporal distance to childhood. In this *apovesc’* Bjadulja falls in line with the “transnational Jewish” (comparable to Bruno Schulz or Isaak Babel’), and at the same time anchors the narrative of Jewish life in Belarusian literature.⁹⁶

92. In the 1920s he published two collections of poems under his second pseudonym “Jasakar.”

93. He published his novels *Salavej* [‘The nightingale’] and *Jazep Krušynski* first in *Uzvyšša*.

94. An exception is the essay “Žydy na Belarusi” (“The Jews in Belarus”) published as early as 1918. Here Bjadulja gives a historical overview of the cultural and economic entanglement between Jews and Belarusians and explicitly positions the article as a stimulus for a deepened scientific debate on the theme—a task the Institute for Belarusian Culture attends to from the middle of the 1920s on (cf. note 55).

95. “I image Queen Šabas in the shape of our rich innkeeper’s wife Zlata [...] She watches that the Jewish lads do not collect berries in the forest” («Я ўяўляю сабе царыцу Шабас у выглядзе нашай багатай карчмарыхі Златы [...] Яна сочыць за тым, каб жыдоўскія хлопчыкі ягад не збіралі ў лесе»; Bjadulja, 2006, p. 245).

96. The sharp contradiction between the authoritative regulations in the Yeshiva and the

Bjadulja's oeuvre has so far not been viewed from a transnational perspective. A passage from the essay "Žydy na Belarusi" ([Jews in Belarus], 1918) suggests that this would be worthwhile beyond the aforementioned examples:

The Jews who recall Zion in their prayers three times a day, picture this Zion in their minds as a hilly elevation such as the ones that surround them here in Belarus. The Jewish child who dedicated his young years to the Bible in the Cheder, had before him the live Bible of Belarusian field farmers, of the quiet, calm Belarusian country with woods, forests, rivers and meadows. Without this Belarusian nature, which had taken possession of their soul since birth, they could not picture Palestine in their fantasy, which they imagine according to the example of the Belarusian country.⁹⁷

This outline of a "Belarusian-Jewish world of life and imagination" that comes astonishingly close to modern conceptualisations of the "transnational"⁹⁸ does not only resonate in Bjadulja's *apovesc'* "U drymučych ljasach," which was to be written about twenty years later. It also casts light on Bjadulja's work as a whole: The Belarusian village itself that is always in the centre of his literary texts, and out of which his literary work virtually arises, *is*—at any rate for him—already a symbiotic transnational space.

Conclusion

A transnational perspective thus seems to provide new aspects to a *Literary History of Belarus*, especially with regard to the question about the formation of transnational potentials in relation to the polyethnically-structured space of

child's artistic-literary imagination is emphasised in the chapter "Miryjam." The burning of the book "Miryjam," which contains the child's poems, by the rebbe and the subsequent expulsion from the Yeshiva signify the end of childhood, but also the liberation to an independent study and literary creativity (BJADULJA, 2006, p. 295f.).

97. «Жыды, тры разы на дзень у малітвах сваіх успамянаючы Сіён, малявалі сабе ў думках гэты Сіён як нейкі ўзгорак-узвышчу, якія акружаюць іх тут, на Беларусі. Жыдоўскае дзіця, аддаючы ўсе свае маладыя гады Бібліі ў хедэрах, мела перад сабой жывую Біблію беларускіх ратаяў, беларускай спакойнай, ціхай зямелькі з лясамі, пушчамі, рэчкамі, лугамі. Без гэтай беларускай прыроды, што завалодала іхнай душой ад нараджэння, яны б не маглі ў фантазіі сваёй маляваць Палестыну, каторую яны маляюць, маючы ўзорам беларускую зямлю» (BJADULJA, 2006, p. 405).

98. For instance, as stated by BASCH, GLICK SCHILLER & SZANTON BLANC (1994, p. 7).

Belarus. In contradiction to traditional conceptualisations of Belarusian literary history that took these transnational potentials into account only in cases when they were needed to create a “great (national) narrative,” the general question could be asked by whom, and under what conditions these potentials are respectively realised in history, and how they manifest themselves.

Concerning “Western Belarusian” literature, transnational border-crossings in the complex constellation of antagonistic macro systems can be merely registered in the sense of a diffuse, mainly politically motivated interaction of two (equal) national subfields across a state border. The cursory study of the 1920s BSSR shows us that the institutional structure of the literary sphere is orientated towards the formation of transnational possibilities, mainly by the programme of the State publishing house BDV, but also by literary groups and associations. Factually, however, it does not go beyond a multinational coexistence of different language groups, among which the Belarusian clearly dominates. This can be discerned by the meagre interaction between the institutionally formed literary groups of the BSSR up to the end of the 1920s.

In the context of the generally binding model of a “proletarian literature” in the BSSR, it therefore seems possible to disclose virtual transnational spaces of possibles primarily in the concrete literary actions of individual authors. Thereby, the choice of language (and, independent thereof, the choice of the literary group) pre-structure these spaces of possibles in a different manner. Belarusian authors’ spaces of possibles are, on the one hand, the most clearly differentiated (as Belarusian is the literary dominating language). However, on the other hand, they are factually restricted by the constitutive tension of “not (yet) sufficiently accumulated cultural capital”—in other words: of a model of “national” literature. Authors adopting this model did not only make themselves suspicious if they tried to reconcile the “proletarian” with the “national,” but also if they ascribed more importance to aesthetic than to ideological principles. The repressions and the Great Purge of the 1930s, which hit Belarusian (speaking) authors in particular, prove this. Polish and Russian speaking authors’ spaces of possibles seem small—they are factually limited to the orthodox implementation of the proletarian model and in final consequence “lead to Moscow.” Thus, the most flexible possibility spectrum seems to have been offered to Jewish authors. Depending on the initial disposition, various languages are at their disposal that open up differently profiled but principally equally productive spaces—via the Russian language the connection to the superordinate literary system, via the Yiddish language the participation in an international (or virtually *per se* transnational) Jewish literature, and via the Belarusian language the affiliation with the (dominating) Belarusian literature.

The—necessarily sketchy—case study of Zmitrok Bjadulja (Samuil Plaūnik) shows that with the choice of Belarusian in combination with the generational disposition a space of possibles opens up that clearly exceeds that of “Belarusian” authors. The realisation of transnational potentials in this case releases the tension between the “national”-Belarusian and the “proletarian” model. The prominent case of Bjadulja illustrates that “Belarusian” literature can and must be understood as transnational—even in the 20th century, and also (or maybe especially) in the context of a “multinational Soviet literature.”

Out of the reflections discussed here, the question arises whether the entanglement of a national and a transnational perspective would (or could) not be exactly the appropriate answer to former Soviet literary historiography. Be that as it may, a *Literary History* carving out—in careful confrontation with the (internationally widely unknown) “great narrative” of Belarusian literature—the productivity of changing multi-ethnic and multi-lingual configurations in the space of Belarus is a difficult but undoubtedly fascinating *desideratum*.

Bibliography

—, 1929, *Кнігасьніц за пяць год (1924-1929 гг.)* [Book catalogue for five years (1924-1929 hh.)], БДВ [BDV], Мінск [Minsk], 192 p.

ARŠANSKI BÈr АРШАНСКІ Бэр, 1929, «Яўрэйская літаратура на Беларусі» [Jewish literature in Belarus] in *Маладняк* [Saplings], n° 10, pp. 100-123.

BAINES Paul, 2004, *The Long 18th Century*, Arnold, London, 188 p.

BASCH Linda, GLICK SCHILLER Nina & SZANTON BLANC Cristina, 1994, *Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments, and Deterritorialized Nation-States*, Gordon and Breach, Langhorne, 344 p.

BASIN Jakov БАСИН Яков, 2003, «Языковая культура евреев Беларуси в 1920-е гг.» [Language culture of Jews in Belarus in the 1920s] in *Беларусь у XX стагоддзі* [Belarus in the 20th century], vol. 2, pp. 18-38.

BEMPORAD Elissa, 2007, “The Yiddish Experiment in Soviet Minsk” in *East European Jewish Affairs*, n° 1, vol. 37, pp. 91-107, DOI : 10.1080/13501670701302777.

- BERTRAND Jean-Pierre & GAUVIN Lise (dir.), 2003, *Littératures mineures en langue majeure : Québec, Wallonie-Bruxelles*, Presses Universitaires de Montréal, Montréal, 318 p.
- ВЈADULЈA Zmitrok БЈДУЛЯ Змітрок, 2006 [1918], «Жыды на Беларусі. Бытавыя штрыхі» [Jews in Belarus. Sketches on everyday life] in *Выбраныя творы* [Selected works], pp. 399-409.
- ВЈADULЈA Zmitrok БЈДУЛЯ Змітрок, 2006 [1939], «У дрымурых лясах» [In the dense forests] in *Выбраныя творы* [Selected works], pp. 199-296.
- BOURDIEU Pierre, 1985, « Existe-t-il une littérature belge ? Limites d'un champ et frontières politiques » in *Études de lettres*, n° 3, p. 3-6.
- BOURDIEU Pierre, 1996, *The Rules of Art* [Les règles de l'art], Polity Press, Cambridge, 410 p.
- BOURDIEU Pierre & WACQUANT Loïc, 2006, *Reflexive Anthropologie*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main, 351 p.
- BRAUDEL Fernand, 1972, "History and the Social Sciences" in BURKE Peter (ed.), *Economy and Society in Early Modern Europe: Essays from Annales*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, pp. 11-42.
- BRUSEVIČ Anatoľ БРУСЕВІЧ АНАТОЛЬ, 2008, *Фактары беларускай культуры ў творчасці Адама Міцкевіча* [Factors of Belarusian culture in the works of Adam Mickiewicz], ГрДУ [HrDU], Гродна [Hrodna], 135 p.
- BUSCHMEIER Matthias, 2011, „Literaturgeschichte nach dem Ende der Theorie? Thesen zu den (Un-)Möglichkeiten einer bedrohten Gattung“ [Literary history after the end of theory? Theses on the (im)possibilities of an endangered genre] in *Internationales Archiv für Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur (IASL)* [International Archive for the Social History of German Literature], n° 2 vol. 36, pp. 409-414, DOI : 10.1515/iasl.2011.029.
- BUSCHMEIER Matthias, ERHART Walter & KAUFFMANN Kai (hrsg), 2014, *Literaturgeschichte: Theorien, Modelle, Praktiken* [Literary history : theories, models, practices], De Gruyter (coll. Studien und Texte zur Sozialgeschichte der Literatur [Studies and texts on the social history of literature] n° 138), Berlin/Boston, 384 p.

CASANOVA Pascale, 1995, « Même pas étranger. Sur Henri Michaux » in *Liber, revue internationale de littérature*, n° 21-22, p. 13-17.

CASANOVA Pascale, 2004, *The World Republic of Letters*, transl. DE BEVOISE M. B., Harvard University Press, Cambridge Mass, 440 p.

CHAŮSTOVIČ Mikola, 2012, „Zwei Strömungen der belarussischen Literatur des 19. Jahrhunderts. Die Emanzipation des belarussischen Literaturprozesses aus dem literatursystem der Rzeczpospolita“ [Two trends of the Belarusian literature of the 19th century. The emancipation of the Belarusian literary process from the literary system of the *rzeczpospolita*] in KOHLER Gun-Britt, NAVUMENKA Pavel & GRÜTTEMEIER Ralf (hrsg), *Kleinheit als Spezifik: Beiträge zu einer feldtheoretischen Analyse der belarussischen Literatur im Kontext „kleiner“ slavischer Literaturen* [Smallness as specificity. contributions to a field-theoretical analysis of belarusian literature in the context of “small” slavonic literatures], BIS-Verlag, Oldenburg, pp. 59-77.

CORNIS-POPE Marcel & NEUBAUER John (eds.), 2004-2010, *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe*, 4 vol., John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam & Philadelphia.

DÖLLINGER Dominik, 2017, „Autonomes Feld und Räume des Möglichen – Jean-Luc Godard und das Feld des Films zur Zeit der Nouvelle Vague“ [Autonomous field and spaces of possibilities – Jean-Luc Godard and the field of film at the time of the Nouvelle Vague] in KARSTEIN Uta & ZAHNER Nina Tessa (hrsg), *Autonomie der Kunst? Zur Aktualität eines gesellschaftlichen Leitbildes* [Autonomy of art? On the topicality of a social model], Springer VS, Wiesbaden, pp. 239-259.

DUBOIS Jean & BOURDIEU Pierre, 1999, « Champ littéraire et rapports de domination (entretien avec Pierre Bourdieu) » in *Textyles*, n° 15, p. 12-16.

FILATOVA Elena Филатова Елена, 2012, « „Zeitschrift“ как популяризатор истории еврейского народа » [„Zeitschrift“ as popularizer of the history of the jewish people] in KOVALENJA Aleksandr КОВАЛЕНЯ Александр *et al.* (eds.), *Институт белорусской культуры и становление науки в Беларуси. К 90-летию создания Института белорусской культуры. Материалы Международной научной конференции, 2011 г., Минск, 8-9 декабря* [Institute of belarusian culture. Materials of the international scientific conference, 2011,

Minsk, 8-9 December], *Беларуская навука* [Belaruskaja navuka], Мінск [Minsk], pp. 161-163.

GARZANITI Marcello, 2007, „Slavia latina und Slavia orthodoxa: Sprachgrenzen und Religion im Mittelalter“ in KNEFELKAMP Ulrich & BOSSELMANN-CYRAN Kristian (hrsg), *Grenze und Grenzüberschreitung im Mittelalter. 11. Symposium des Mediävistenverbandes vom 14. bis 17. März 2005 in Frankfurt an der Oder*, Akademie Verlag, Berlin, pp. 256-269.

GRABOWICZ George, 1981, *Toward a History of Ukrainian Literature*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass, 101 p.

GRÜTTEMEIER Ralf & LEUKER Maria-Theresia (hrsg), 2006, *Niederländische Literaturgeschichte* [Dutch literary history], Metzler, Stuttgart, 332 p.

GUMBRECHT Hans Ulrich, 2008, “Shall We Continue to Write Histories of Literature?” in *New Literary History*, vol. 39, pp. 519-532.

HADACZEK Bolesław, 2011, *Historia literatury kresowej* [History of Kresy literature], Universitas, Kraków, 451 p.

НАЈВА Мікалај ГАЙБА Мікалай, 2011, *Сэрцу мілая Айчына: Вобраз Радзімы ў жыцці і творчасці Адама Міцкевіча* [The heart's beloved fatherland. The image of the homeland in the life and work of Adam Mickiewicz], Беланігал [BelAniGal], Баранавічы [Baranavičy], 103 p.

HAYWARD Max, 1980, “Literature in the Soviet Period” in AUTY Robert & OBOLENSKY Dimitri (eds.), *Companion to Russian Studies. An Introduction to Russian Language and Literature*, vol. 2, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 185-212.

ННІЛАМЁДАЎ Uladzimir ГНІНАЛМЁДАЎ Уладзімір *et al.* (eds.), 1993-2015, *Гісторыя беларускай літаратуры XX стагоддзя* [History of belarusian literature of the 20th century], 4 vol., Беларуская навука [Belaruskaja navuka], Мінск [Minsk].

НОВСВАМ Eric John, 1962, *The Age of Revolution: Europe 1789-1848*, New American Library, New York, 366 p.

HOBBSAWM Eric, 1975, *The Age of Capital: 1848-1875*, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London, 384 p.

HOBBSAWM Eric, 1987, *The Age of Empire. 1875-1914*, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London, 404 p.

HOBBSAWM Eric (ed.), 2004, *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 309 p.

HOLLIER Denis, 1993, *De la littérature française*, Bordas, Paris, 1091 p.

JACKIEWICZ Mieczysław, 1996, „«Szkola białoruska» w polskiej literaturze romantycznej” [The “belarusian school” in romantic Polish literature] in *Acta Polono-Ruthenica*, vol. 1, pp. 11-121.

JANION Maria, 1991, „«Szkola białoruska» w poezji polskiej” [“The Belarusian school” in Polish poetry] in *Przegląd Wschodni. Historia i współczesność Polaków na Wschodzie* [Eastern Review. History and Present of Poles in the East], n° 1, pp. 35-48.

JOHANNES Gerd Jan, 2001, “The Development of The Literary Field and the Limitations of ‘Minor’ Languages: The Case of the Northern Netherlands 1750-1850” in *Poetics*, n° 5-6, vol. 28, pp. 349-376, DOI: 10.1016/S0304-422X(00)00032-2.

KAVALENKA Viktor КАВАЛЕНКА Віктар, 1985, «Шчасце – служыць народу» [The luck of serving the people] in ВЯДУЛJA Zmitrok БЯДУЛЯ Змітрок (eds.), *Збор твораў у 5 т., т. 1: Вершы, паэмы* [Collected works in 5 volumes, vol. 1: verses, poems], Мастацкая літаратура [Mastackaja litaratura], Мінск [Minsk], pp. 6-19.

KAVALĖŪ Sjarhej КАВАЛЁЎ Сяргей, 2010, *Шматмоўная паэзія Вялікага Княства Літоўскага эпохі Рэнесансу* [Multilingual poetry of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the epoch of Renaissance], Кнігазбор [Knihazbor], Мінск [Minsk], 375 p.

КАЗВЯРУК Uladzimir КАЗВЯРУК Уладзімір, 2006, «Будзь сам сабою, Беларусь...» [Be yourself, Belarus...] in ВЯДУЛJA Zmitrok БЯДУЛЯ Змітрок (ed.), *Выбраныя творы* [Selected works], Кнігазбор [Knihazbor], Мінск [Minsk], pp. 5-20.

- KOHLER Gun-Britt & NAVUMENKA Pavel, 2012, "Interference of Autonomization and Deautonomization in the Belarusian Literary Field. Indication of 'Smallness', or Something Different?" in *Веснік БДУ. Серыя 4: Філалогія, Журналістыка, Педагогіка* [BDU Herald. Series 4: Philology, Journalism, Pedagogy], n° 3, pp. 3-11.
- KOHLER Gun-Britt, NAVUMENKA Pavel & GRÜTTEMEIER Ralf (hrsg), 2012, *Kleinheit als Spezifik: Beiträge zu einer feldtheoretischen Analyse der belarussischen Literatur im Kontext „kleiner“ slavischer Literaturen* [Smallness as specificity. Contributions to a fieldtheoretical analysis of belarusian literature in the context of "small" slavonic literatures], BIS-Verlag (coll. *Studia Slavica Oldenburgensia*, n° 20), Oldenburg, 266 p.
- KOHLER Gun-Britt КОЛЕР Гун-Брыт & НАУМЕНКО Павел НАУМЕНКО Павел (eds.), 2013, *Белорусская литература как модель развития «малых» (славянских) литератур. Материалы к тематическому блоку на XV Международном съезде славистов* [Belarusian literature as a pattern of "small" (slavonic) literatures' development. Papers on the XVth International Congress of Slavists], Бизнесофсет [Biznesofset], Минск [Minsk], 131 p.
- KOHLER Gun-Britt КОЛЕР Гун-Брыт, 2014а, «Старыя факты, новыя пытанні. Актуальныя праблемы літаратурнай гісторыі на прыкладзе беларускай літаратуры» [Old facts, new questions. Current issues of literary history using the example of belarusian literature] in ŠTĚJNER Ivan ШТЭЙНЕР Иван *et al.* (eds.), *Спадчына І. Навуменкі і актуальныя праблемы літаратуразнаўства. Зборнік навуковых артыкулаў* [The legacy of I. Navumenka and current problems in literary theory. Collection of scientific articles], vol. 2, HDU, Гомель [Homel'], pp. 249-263.
- KOHLER Gun-Britt, 2014b, „Selbst, Anderes Selbst und das Intime Andere: Adam Mickiewicz und Jan Čačot“ [Self, other self and the intimate other: Adam Mickiewicz and Jan Čačot] in *Studia Białorutenistyczne*, n° 8, pp. 79-94.
- KOHLER Gun-Britt, 2015a, „Westbelarussische Literatur und belarussisches Literaturfeld (1921-1939). Versuch einer Standortbestimmung“ [Westbelarusian literature and belarusian literary field (1921-1939). An attempt of localization] in *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch*, n° 3, pp. 135-176.

КОHLER Gun-Britt КОЛЕР Гун-Брыт, 2015b, «Літаратура Заходняй Беларусі ў ракурсе тэорыі поля. Пастаноўка праблемы» [Literature of Western Belarus from a field theoretical point of view] in ВАНДАНОВІЧ Ірына БАГДАНОВІЧ Ірына (ed.), *Беларуска-польскія моўныя, літаратурныя, гістарычныя і культурныя сувязі. Зборнік артыкулаў* [Belarusian-polish linguistic, literary, historical and cultural relations. Collection of articles], Кнігазбор [Книгазбор], Мінск [Minsk], pp. 186-194.

КОHLER Gun-Britt, 2016, “‘Success’ and ‘Failure’ of Literary Collaboration Between Authors in Belarus in the 1920s” in BUTLER Martin, HAUSMANN Albrecht & KIRCHHOFFER Anton (eds.), *Precarious Alliances: Cultures of Participation in Print and Other Media*, Transcript, Bielefeld, p. 207-240.

КОHLER Gun-Britt КОЛЕР Гун-Брыт & НАУМЕНКО Pavel НАУМЕНКО Павел (eds.), 2019, «Новыя тэарэтычныя падыходы да літаратурнай гістарыяграфіі (на матэрыяле беларускай літаратуры першай трэці ХХ-а ст.)» [New theoretical approaches to literary historiography (using the example of belarusian literature in the first third of 20th century)] in *Матэрыялы VI Міжнароднага кангрэса Беларусістаў* [Papers on the VIth International Belarusists' Congress], *forthcoming*, Мінск [Minsk].

КОLESNIK Vladimir КОЛЕСНИК Владимир, 1977, «Літаратура Западной Белоруссии» [Literature of Western Belarus] in PERKIN Naum ПЕРКИН Наум & НАУМЕНКА Ivan НАВУМЕНКА Иван (eds.), *История белорусской советской литературы* [History of belarusian soviet literature], Наука и техника [Nauka i tehnika], Мінск [Minsk], pp. 90-122.

КОВАLEV Sergej КОВАЛЕВ Сергей, 2013, «Полилингвизм как особенность „малых“ литератур (на примере развития белорусской литературы в XVI-м веке)» [Multilinguism as a characteristic of ‘small’ literatures (using the example of the development of belarusian literature in the 16th century)] in КОHLER Gun-Britt КОЛЕР Гун-Брыт & НАУМЕНКО Pavel НАУМЕНКО Павел (eds.), *Белорусская литература как модель развития ‘малых’ (славянских) литератур. Материалы к тематическому блоку на XV Международном съезде славистов* [Belarusian literature as a pattern of ‘small’ (slavonic) literatures’ development. Papers on the XVth International Congress of Slavists], Бизнесофсет [Biznesofset], Мінск [Minsk], pp. 90-122.

- LAMPART Fabian, 2014, „Problemfeld Literaturgeschichte und Raum. Italienische Perspektiven“ [The problem of literary history and space. Italian perspectives] in BUSCHMEIER Matthias, ERHART Walter & KAUFFMANN Kai (hrsg), *Literaturgeschichte : Theorien, Modelle, Praktiken* [Literary history : theories, models, practices], De Gruyter, Berlin/Boston, pp. 337-356.
- LIS Arsen ЛІС Арсен, 1999, «Літаратура Заходняй Беларусі» [Literature of Western Belarus] in ГНІЛАМЁДАЎ Uladzimir ГНІЛАМЁДАЎ Уладзімір et al. (eds.), *Гісторыя беларускай літаратуры XX стагоддзя* [History of belarusian literature of the 20th century, т.2 (1921-1941)], vol.2, Беларуская навука [Belaruskaja navuka], Мінск [Minsk], pp.210-282.
- LUSKEVIČ Anton ЛУЦКЕВИЧ Антон, 2006, «Вільня ў беларускай літаратуры» [Viĺnja in Belarusian Literature], in *Выбраныя творы: праблемы культуры, літаратуры і мастацтва* [Selected works: Problems of culture, literature and art], Кнігазбор [Knihazbor], Мінск [Minsk], pp. 176-184.
- МАКАРЭВИЧ Sjarhej МАКАРЭВИЧ Сяргей, 2014, «Ятой легендарны Сосенскі, якога шмат ведалі...» [I am the legendary Sosenski, whom knew many people...], *Наша Ніва* [Our field], <https://nn.by/?c=ar&i=126470> (consulté le 21 Juni 2019).
- MARSZAŁEK Magdalena & SASSE Sylvia (hrsg), 2010, *Geopoetiken. Geographische Entwürfe in den mittel- und osteuropäischen Literaturen* [Geopoetics. Geographical outlines in central and eastern european literatures], Kulturverlag Kadmos, Berlin, 304 p.
- McMILLIN Arnold, 2002, *Belarusian Literature of the Diaspora*, University of Birmingham (coll. Birmingham Slavonic monographs, n° 34), Birmingham, 503 p.
- NARB, Нацыянальны Архіў Рэспублікі Беларусь [National archive of the Republic of Belarus], n° 4р, op. 1, d. 2904, l. 1-29, Документы о сокращении выпуска печатной продукции в БССР в связи с нехваткой бумаги (циркуляры, постановления, выпуски из протоколов, сведения и др.) [Documents on the reduction of printing production in BSSR due to shortage of paper (circular letters, resolutions, publications from protocols, remarks and others)].

NARB, Нацыянальны Архіў Рэспублікі Беларусь [National archive of the Republic of Belarus], n° 4р, op. 1, d. 2895, l. 1-144, Проекты уставов федэрацыі аб'яднанняў савецкіх пісатэлей, Всебеларускага саюза пісатэлей і паэтаў, аб'яднання беларускіх пісатэлей „Польмя“, сведення о літаратурных групах „Маладняк“, „Узвышша“, „Юнгер Арбейтер“, „Звенья“, „Агняцвет“ [Projects of statutes of the Federation of soviet writers' associations, of the Allbelarusian association of poets and writers, of the association of Belarusian writers “Polymja”, informations about the literary groups “Maladnjak” [Saplings], “Uzvyšša” [Excelsior], “Junger Arbeiter” [The young worker], “Zven’ja” [Link], “Ahnjacvet” [Firelight]].

NARB, Нацыянальны Архіў Рэспублікі Беларусь [National archive of the Republic of Belarus], n° LA 17, op. 1, d. 18, l. 91-99, Справаздача па выкананню пляну на 1926/27 г. на 1. мая 1927 г. [Report on the realization of the plan of the year 1926/27 on 1st may 1927].

NAVUMENKA Ivan НАВУМЕНКА Іван, 2003, «Змітрок Бядуля» [Zmitrok Bjadulja] in ННІЛАМЁДАЎ Uladzimir ГНІНАЛМЁДАЎ Уладзімір *et al* (eds.), *Гісторыя беларускай літаратуры XX стагоддзя, т. 1 : 1901-1920* [History of belarusian literature of the 20th century, vol. 1: 1901-1920], Беларуская навука [Belaruskaja navuka], Мінск [Minsk], pp. 237-264.

NAVUMENKA Pavel, 2012, „Die Autonomisierung des belarussischen Literaturfeldes im ersten Drittel des 20. Jahrhunderts. Literarische Vereinigungen als Konsolidierungszentren“ [Autonomization of the belarusian literary field in the first third of the 20th century. Literary associations as centres of consolidation] in KOHLER Gun-Britt, NAVUMENKA Pavel & GRÜTTEMEIER Ralf (hrsg), *Kleinheit als Spezifik : Beiträge zu einer feldtheoretischen Analyse der belarussischen Literatur im Kontext „kleiner“ slavischer Literaturen* [Smallness as specificity. contributions to a fieldtheoretical analysis of belarusian literature in the context of “small” slavonic literatures], BIS-Verlag, Oldenburg, pp. 143-164.

NAVUMENKA Pavel НАВУМЕНКА Павел, 2015, «Заходнебеларуская літаратура: праблема сістэматызацыі і літаратуразнаўчага кантэксту» [Western-belarusian literature: Problem of systematisation and literary studies context] in ВАНДАНОВІЧ Ірына БАГДАНОВІЧ Ірына (ed.), *Беларуска-польскія моўныя, літаратурныя, гістарычныя і культурныя сувязі. Зборнік артыкулаў* [Belarusian-polish linguistic, literary, historical and cultural relations. Collection of articles], Кнігазбор [Knihazbor], Мінск [Minsk], pp. 195-200.

НЕКРАШЭВІЧ-КАРОТКАЯ Жэанна НЕКРАШЭВІЧ-КАРОТКАЯ Жанна, 2011, «Роля лацінамоўных паэтаў нямецкай культурнай прасторы ў літаратурным жыцці Вялікага Княства Літоўскага ў сярэдзіне 16-а стагоддзя» [The role of latin-speaking poets of the german cultural space in the literary life of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the middle of the 16th century] in *Беларускае літаратуразнаўства. Навукова-метадычны зборнік* [Belarusian literary studies. Scientific-methodical collection], n° 9, pp. 88-95.

НІКАЛАЕЎ Mikola НІКАЛАЕЎ Мікола & et al. (eds.), 2011, *Гісторыя беларускай кнігі. Т. 2. Кніжнасць новай Беларусі (XIX-XX stst.)* [History of the belarusian book. Vol. 2. Literature of the New Belarus (19th-20th Century)], vol. 2, Беларуская энцыклапедыя імя Пятруся Броўкі [Belaruskaja ěncyklapedyja imja Pjatrusja Broўki], Мінск [Minsk], 436 p.

NOWAK Helge, 2012, „Literarische Kommunikation als Leitbild einer transkulturellen und medienhistorisch orientierten Literaturgeschichtsschreibung“ [Literary communication as a guiding concept of a transcultural and media-historical literary historiography] in *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Germanistenverbandes* [Communications of the German Association of Germanists], n° 4, vol. 59, pp. 333-359, DOI: 10.14220/mdge.2012.59.4.333.

О.А.А, 1925, «„Маладняк“ і яго месца ў літаратуры. Рэзалюцыя па дакладу А. Бабарэкі, прынятая пленумам Усебеларускага аб'яднання паэтаў і пісьменьнікаў „Маладняк“ 23-га сакавіка 1925 году» [“Maladnjak” and his place in literature. Resolution about the report by A. Babareka that was accepted in the plenum of the Allbelarusian poets and writers association “Maladnjak” on 23rd march 1925] in *Бюлетэн пленуму цэнтральнага бюро ўсебеларускага аб'яднання паэтаў і пісьменьнікаў Маладняк 21-23 сакавіка 1925 году* [Bulletin on the plenum of the central board of the Allbelarusian poets and writers association “Maladnjak” on 21-24 march 1925], pp. 30-33.

О.А.А, 1926, «Ад Усебеларускага аб'яднання паэтаў і пісьменьнікаў „Маладняк“» [From the Allbelarusian association of poets and writers “Maladnjak”] in *Маладняк* [Saplings], n° 9, pp. 5-10.

О.А.А, 1927а, «Хроніка. Ад Беларускага літаратурна-мастацкага згуртавання „Узвышша“» [Chronicle. From the Belarusian literary-artistic group „Uzvyšša”] in *Узвышша* [Excelsior], n° 1, pp. 168-171.

O.A.A, 1927b, «Ад Цэнтральнага Бюро „Маладняка“» [From the central board of “Maladnjak”] in *Маладняк* [Saplings], n° 3, pp. 93-94.

O.A.A, 1929, «Хроніка. Рэзалюцыі пленуму Бел.АПП. 2: Аб становішчы яўрэйскай пролетарскай літаратуры ў БССР» [Chronicle. Resolutions by Bel.APP's plenum. 2.: About the situation of Jewish proletarian literature in the BSSR] in *Маладняк* [Saplings], n° 4, pp. 123-125.

O.A.A, 2014, «Сравнительный анализ литературы и печатно-полиграфического дела в Беларуси в 1917 – августе 194 годов», <http://refleader.ru/jgeujgotryfs.html> (consulté le 21 Juni 2019).

PERKINS David, 1992, *Is Literary History Possible?*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore/London, 208 p.

ПЛАТОНАЎ Rascislaŭ ПЛАТОНАЎ Расціслаў (ed.), 1999, *На крутым павароце. Ідэолага-палітычнай барацьба на Беларусі ў 1929 1931 гг. Дакументы, матэрыялы, аналіз* [At the turning point. Ideological-political struggle in Belarus in the years 1929 1931. Documents, materials, analysis], БелНДІДАС [BelNDIDAS], Мінск [Minsk], 384 p.

ПЛАТОНАЎ Rascislaŭ ПЛАТОНАЎ Расціслаў & KORŠUK Uladzimir КОРШУК Уладзімір (eds.), 2001, *Беларусізацыя, 1920-я гады. Дакументы і матэрыялы* [Belarusization in the 1920s. Documents and aterials], БДУ [BDU], Мінск [Minsk], 268 p.

ПРАШАРЭНЬА М. ПРАХАРЭНЯ М., 2017, «Друк БССР ва ўмовах поліэтнічнасці 1920-х 1930-х гадоў» [Publishing in the BSSR Under the Condition of Polyethnicity in the 1920s-1930s] in DASAЕVA Tat'jana ДАСАЕВА Татьяна (ed.), *Международная журналистика-2017: идея интеграции интеграций и медиа: материалы VI Международной научно-практической конференции, Минск, 16 февраля 2017 г.* [International journalism—2017 idea of integration of integrations and media. Proceedings of the International Conference on Science and Techology. Minsk, 16 February 2017], БГУ [BGU], Мінск [Minsk], pp. 225-228.

РЕЛЕС Girš РЕЛЕС Гирш, 2006, *Еврейские советские писатели Белоруссии. Воспоминания* [Jewish soviet writers of Belorussia. Memoirs], Колас [Kolas], Мінск [Minsk], 317 p.

- SAPIRO Gisèle, 2013, « Le champ est-il national ? La théorie de la différenciation sociale au prisme de l'histoire globale » in *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, n° 5/200, p. 70-85, DOI : 10.3917/arss.200.0070.
- SIEROCKA Krystyna, 1967, „Literatura nieznaną. Poezja i proza polska w ZSRR w latach 1918-1939” [Unknown literature. Polish poetry and prose in the USSR in the years 1918-1939] in *Pamiętnik Literacki. Czasopismo kwartalne poświęcone historii i krytyce literatury polskiej* [Literary album. Quarterly journal devoted to the history and criticism of Polish literature], n° 58/4, pp. 403-431.
- SKALABAN Vital' СКАЛАБАН Виталь, ТОКАРАЎ Mikalaj ТОКАРАЎ Мікалай et al (eds), 2011, *Інстытут беларускай культуры 1922-1928. Дакументы і матэрыялы* [Institute of Belarusian culture. 1922-1928. Documents and materials], Беларуская навука [Belaruskaja navuka], Мінск [Minsk], 258 p.
- SNYDER Timothy, 2003, *The Reconstruction of Nations: Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569-1999*, Yale University Press, New Haven/London, 367 p.
- SPELLER John R. W., 2011, *Bourdieu and Literature*, Open Book Publishers, Cambridge, 203 p., DOI : 10.11647/OBP.0027.
- STALIN Iosif СТАЛИН Иосиф, 1989, «Письмо И.В. Сталина В.И. Ленину (22.09.1922)» [Letter from I.V. Stalin to V.I. Lenin (22.09.1922)] in *Известия ЦК КПСС* [Izvestija SK KPSS], n° 9, pp. 198-200.
- STURM-TRIGONAKIS Elke, 2007, *Global Playing in der Literatur: ein Versuch über die Neue Weltliteratur* [Global playing in literature. An attempt at the New World Literature], Königshausen & Neumann, Würzburg, 275 p.
- ЎЫБЕКА Zachar ШЫБЕКА Захар, 2003, *Нарыс гісторыі Беларусі, 1795-2002* [An outline of history of Belarus, 1795-2002], Энцыклапедыкс [Ėncyklapedyks], Мінск [Minsk], 489 p.
- ТИХАНОВ Galin ТИХАНОВ Галин, 2014, «„Малые и большие литературы“ в меняющемся формате истории литературы» [“Small and large literatures” in a changing format of literary history] in *Вопросы Литературы* [Problems of Literature], n° 6, pp. 253-278.
- TSCHIŻEWSKIJ Dmitrij, 1975, *A History of Ukrainian Literature: from the 11th to the End of the 19th century*, Ukrainian Academic Press, Littleton, 681 p.

UNUČAK Andrej Унучак Андрэй, 2008, «„*Naša Niva*“ i belaruskі нацыянальны рух (1906-1915 гг.)» [“*Naša Niva*” and the Belarusian National Movement (1906-1915)], Беларуская навука [Belaruskaja navuka], Мінск [Minsk], 184 p.

VABIŠČEVIČ Taccjana ВАВІШЧЭВІЧ Таццяна, 2009, *Станаўленне нацыянальнай паэтычнай традыцыі (1900-1910-я). Фактары, механізмы, этапы* [The Formation of a National Poetic Tradition (1900-1910). Factors, Mechanisms, Stages], Беларуская навука [Belaruskaja navuka], Мінск [Minsk], 251 p.

VAN REES Kees, 1983, “How a Literary Work Becomes a Masterpiece: On the Threefold Selection Practised by Literary Criticism” in *Poetics*, n° 4-5, vol. 12, pp. 397-417, DOI : 10.1016/0304-422X(83)90015-3.

WELLBERY David E. & RYAN Judith (eds.), 2004, *A New History of German Literature*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1004 p.

WELLEK René, 1973, “The Fall of Literary History” in KOSELLECK Reinhart & STEMPER Wolf-Dieter (hrsg), *Geschichte—Ereignis und Erzählung* [History—event and narrative], Fink, München, pp. 427-440.

WERBERGER Annette, 2012, „Überlegungen zu einer Literaturgeschichte als Verflechtungsgeschichte“ [Considerations on literary history as entangled history] in KIMMICH Dorothee & SCHAHADAT Schamma (hrsg), *Kulturen in Bewegung : Beiträge zur Theorie und Praxis der Transkulturalität* [Cultures in Motion. Contributions to the Theory and Practice of Transculturality], Transcript, Bielefeld, pp. 109-141.

ZACHARKEVIČ Stepan ЗАХАРКЕВІЧ Степан, 2009, «Этнічныя меншасці Беларусі. Вопыт сацыяльнай трансфармацыі ў XIX да пачатку XX ст.» [Ethnic Minorities of Belarus. The Experience of Social Transformation from the 19th until the Beginning of the 20th Century] in KORSUK Uladzimir КОРШУК Уладзімір (ed), *Працы гістарычнага факультэта БДУ. Навуковы зборнік, вып. 4* [Works of the Historical Faculty of Belarusian State University. Scientific Collection, n° 4], БДУ [BDU], Мінск [Minsk], pp. 242-249.

ZEYRINGER Klaus & GOLLNER Helmut, 2012, *Eine Literaturgeschichte: Österreich seit 1650* [A Literary History. Austria Since 1650], StudienVerlag, Innsbruck, 40 p.

Abstract: As a literature that develops in the historically multi-ethnic and multi-confessional transitional space between Slavia latina and Slavia orthodoxa, the literature of Belarus challenges the validity of the “grand narrative” in a special way. At the same time, as a “small” literature, the development of which has taken place over the centuries and until recent times in the spheres of dominance of neighboring “bigger” literatures (Russian and Polish), Belarusian literature seems to reveal some problems of a transnational approach, which perpetuates mechanisms of exclusion and absorption. Based on these considerations, the article first outlines an alternative approach for a “grand narrative” based on the parameters of cultural space, open chronology, and institutional development. Within the framework of this model is then systematically examined the transnational potential of Belarusian literature from an institutional perspective, using literary development in the 1920s as an example. This shows that the transnational potential resulting especially from multilingualism is superimposed institutionally and ideologically by the concept of the “multi-nationality” of proletarian literature, with different languages pre-structuring different “Spaces of possibles.” The realization of transnational spaces of possibles seems to be open above all to Jewish authors, as the case study on Samuil Plaūnik (Zmitrok Bjadulja) shows.

Keywords: Literary Historiography, Belarusian Literature, Twentieth Century, transnational, field borders, literary institutions, literary groups, Space of possibles, Zmitrok Bjadulja.

Histoire littéraire, formation d'un champ et espaces transnationaux des possibles. La littérature dans l'espace biélorusse pendant les années 1920

Résumé: la littérature de la Biélorussie qui s'est développée dans l'espace de transition historiquement multiethnique et multiconfessionnel entre Slavia latina et Slavia orthodoxa, remet en question d'une manière particulière la validité du « grand récit ». En même temps, il semble que ce soit justement l'exemple de cette littérature « mineure », dont le développement s'est déroulé pendant des siècles et jusqu'à récemment dans les sphères de domination des littératures voisines « majeures » (russe et polonaise), qui rende manifeste les problèmes posés par une approche transnationale, notamment la perpétuation de mécanismes d'exclusion et d'absorption. Prenant ces considérations comme point de départ, cet article esquisse d'abord une approche alternative d'un « grand récit » fondée sur les paramètres d'espace culturel, de chronologie ouverte et de développement institutionnel. Dans le cadre de ce modèle sera examiné ensuite systématiquement, d'un point de vue institutionnel et prenant l'exemple des années 1920, le « potentiel transnational » de la littérature biélorusse.

Il s'avère que le potentiel transnational résultant notamment du multilinguisme se superpose institutionnellement et idéologiquement au concept de « multinational » de la littérature prolétarienne : les différentes langues pré-structurent différents « espaces des possibles ». La réalisation d'espaces transnationaux des possibles semble ouverte avant tout aux auteurs juifs, comme le montre l'étude de cas de Samuil Plaŭnik (Zmitrok Bjadulja).

Mots-clefs : historiographie littéraire, littérature biélorusse, XX^e siècle, transnational, limites du champ, institutions littéraires, groupes littéraires, espace des possibles, Zmitrok Bjadulja.

Literaturgeschichte, Feldformation und transnationale Möglichkeitsräume. Literatur im Raum Belarus in den 1920er Jahren

Zusammenfassung: Als eine Literatur, die sich im historisch multiethnischen und multikonfessionellen Übergangsraum zwischen der lateinischen und der orthodoxen Slavia entwickelt, stellt die Literatur Weißrusslands die Gültigkeit des großen Narrativs in besonderer Weise zur Diskussion. Gleichzeitig scheint sich gerade an dieser Literatur als einer „kleinen“, deren Entwicklung sich über Jahrhunderte hinweg und bis in die jüngere Zeit in den Dominanzsphären benachbarter „größerer“ Literaturen (der russischen und der polnischen) vollzieht, die Problematik eines transnationalen Ansatzes zu erweisen, der Exklusions- und Absorptionsmechanismen fortschreibt. Ausgehend von diesen Überlegungen skizziert der Artikel zunächst einen alternativen Ansatz für ein „großes Narrativ“, dessen Basis die Parameter kultureller Raum, offene Chronologie und institutionelle Entwicklung bilden. Im Rahmen dieses Modells wird anschließend am Beispiel der literarischen Entwicklung der 1920er Jahre das transnationale Potential der Literatur Weißrusslands aus institutioneller Perspektive systematisch untersucht. Hier zeigt sich, dass das insbesondere aus der Mehrsprachigkeit sich ergebende transnationale Potential vom Konzept der „Multi-nationalität“ der proletarischen Literatur institutionell und ideologisch überlagert wird, wobei unterschiedliche Sprachen unterschiedliche Möglichkeitsräume vorstrukturieren. Die Realisierung transnationaler Möglichkeitsräume scheint vor allem jüdischen Autoren offen-zustehen, wie das Fallbeispiel Samuil Plaŭniks (Zmitrok Bjaduljas) zeigt.

Schlüsselwörter: Literaturhistoriographie, belarussische Literatur, 20. Jahrhundert, Transnationalität, Feldgrenzen, Institutionen, Literaturgruppierungen, Raum des Möglichen, Zmitrok Bjadulja.