Russian Literature Triquarterly. 1986. Vol. 19, pt. 2

Anna Lisa Crone

Remizov's *Kukkha:* Rozanov's "Trousers" Revisited

"I am not the least embarrassed in literature, because literature is simply my own trousers."
—V. V. Rozanov

Alexei Remizov's *Kukkha. Rozanovy pis'ma* is perhaps the most salacious literary memoir in Russian and undoubtedly the work which best reflects Rozanov's own spirit. This is not merely because it contains letters from Rozanov to the Remizovs. Almost all sketches and memoiristic works on Rozanov abound in quotations from the writer's work, letters, and reconstructed dialogues of supposed conversation with Rozanov.[1] Among all these works *Kukkha* stands out as especially "Rozanovian."

The title *Kukkha* was the name Remizov gave Rozanov when he dubbed him an honorary member of his fanciful "Great and Free Monkey Federation" *(Obezvelvolpal).*[2] As the title from a secret simian language serves to indicate, *Kukkha* is not an introductory essay on Rozanov. On the contrary, it is written with the typically Rozanovian tone of excessive familiarity, as if addressed to readers who are already initiates of some sort of "Rozanov cult." Of the existing reminiscences on Rozanov, this one may well contain the most information, and yet communicate the least to the general reader. The reader who knows Rozanov very well will learn the most from it.[3] By writing about Rozanov *in*

Rozanov's manner Remizov seems to espouse the view that the only "knowable" Rozanov is *his writings.* Rather than analyzing Rozanov's personality and portraying the man, the thinker, and critic, as Zinaida Gippius attempts to do, Remizov has set himself the more interesting task of (1) re-creating Rozanov's writing and (2) re-creating Rozanov, only secondarily, through the medium of that writing. Remizov's *Kukkha* is a lengthy stylization and imitation of Rozanov.

Mikhail Bakhtin in his brilliant *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* has classified the narrative word in literature in great detail.[4] Placing his emphasis on literary polyphony, Bakhtin makes the *double-voiced word*—a word which contains someone else's word—central to his study. According to Bakhtin *stylization* is an example of a *double-voiced word* which forces another person's subject-oriented word to serve its own purposes.[5] The stylizer uses another person's word as another person's, thereby casting a slight shadow of objectivization on that word. The body of devices of the other person's speech, in the present case, the other person's writing, is important to the stylizer as the expression of a particular point of view.[6] The complete substitution of another person's word for one's own, in the present case, Rozanov's word replacing Remizov's, in which the other person's word is taken completely seriously, is termed by Bakhtin *imitation.*

Remizov's *Kukkha* taken as a whole lies somewhere on the borderline between stylization and imitation, two arts at which he was extremely adept. He makes an oblique reference to this talent in *Kukkha:* "Once in my childhood in an amateur production of 'The Plagiarist' I played the title role and this coincidence amused me very much" (*K.,* p. 81).[7] The coincidence refers to a hint Remizov had dropped about his being accused of plagiarism: "On some petition or other . . . I even signed 'Plagiarist' and my last name" (*K.,* p. 82). In documenting this very striking case of intertextual connections between the work of Remizov and Rozanov, we shall limit ourselves to Rozanov's most artistically distinguished works: *Solitaria (Uedinennoe)* (1911), *Fallen Leaves. The First Basketful (Opavshie list'ia. Korob pervyi)* (1913) *Fallen Leaves. The Second Basketful (Opavshie list'ia. Korob vtoroi)* (1915), and *The Apocalypse of Our Time (Apokalipsis nashego vremeni)* (1918-1919).[8] Yet before discussing the actual texts, it is important to ask why Remizov chose to write about Rozanov in this way. Why "re-create" a writer's work through stylization and imitation? One possible answer may lie in the nature of Rozanov's late works (after 1911) which breached all established genre rules and were generally considered to be something "completely new" in Russian literature. Perhaps when confronted with such indefinable texts, such "literature of the threshold," Remizov divined that his only literary reaction to it must be another text of the same kind. Roland Barthes in *The Pleasure of the Text* defines works such as Rozanov's *Solitaria* and *Fallen Leaves* as "texts of bliss" and his ideas on how they are to be dealt with may well explain Remizov's "re-creation" of Rozanov's style and content: "With the writer of bliss (and his reader) begins the untenable text, the impossible text. This text is . . . outside criticism, *unless it is reached through another text of bliss:* you cannot speak 'on' such a text, you can only speak 'in' it, *in its fashion,* enter into a desperate plagiarism . . ."[9]

Elements of Intertextuality

The purely formal features which Remizov borrows from Rozanov in *Kukkha* are many. First of these is the inclusion of letters, a device Rozanov often used. In *Fallen Leaves I* he devotes some thirty pages to the letters of a young friend, Kostya Kudravtsev. After them there is a passage addressed directly to Kostya in which Rozanov insists that the young man, if still alive, get in touch with him immediately. The parallel with Remizov's chapter "The Moon is Shining" (*K.,* pp. 122-125), in which he addresses the deceased Rozanov, is clear here. A second similarity is the widespread use of dialogue in *Kukkha.* Ellipses and abrupt changes in the subject matter abound. There is occasionally a series of sentences or passages which appear to have no connection but which are rendered intelligible through the mediation of one Rozanov text or other.[10] This fast-moving and, at times, very elusive narrative sounds like speech or correspondence between intimates. Other features in *Kukkha* which remind one of Rozanov's writing are: (1) very expressive punctuation, employed to confer on the text an oral and "hand-written" quality which Rozanov called "manuscriptness" *(rukopisnost');* (2) the inclusion of poems such as the one in *Kukkha* on page 75; (3) the use of dashes indicating a kind of self-censorship which parallels the ellipses in Rozanov when actual official censorship has occurred; (4) diaristic entries, as in the chapter "In my Notepad" (*K.,* pp. 19-37), with strict documentation of time, place, which doctor treated Remizov, prices, etc., all of which echo Rozanov's passages on everyday life and his wife's prolonged illness, and (5) lastly, a mixing of larger philosophical, political and literary problems with the trivial concerns of the household, which Rozanov's self-proclaimed "fetishism about small things" often led him to. The themes the two writers have in common include: the friend-wife (Rozanov's and Remizov's), the self and self as writer (referring to both), literature and literary gossip, the "lost diamonds of Russian literature" (unrecognized, but great figures), Russian life, the revolution (1905 and 1917 in *Kukkha,* 1917 in *The Apocalypse of Our Time*), Russia, Russianism, and the Orthodox Church, to mention but a few.

In support of our contention that *Kukkha* has much deeper intertextual relations with Rozanov's *oeuvre* than common devices and themes would imply, some of the most interesting cases of borrowing,

stylization and intertextual dialogue or echoing will be discussed. The first such instance occurs on page 9 of *Kukkha:*

Remizov

Reader, don't be upset that, having set out to introduce Rozanov through his letters, I talk a great deal about myself too.

(*K.*, p. 9)

Rozanov **(on Leont'ev)**

... there is a hidden self-satisfied mediocrity [poshlost'] in the fact that when speaking of another, and moreover, a *beloved* person (Leont'ev), I should have spoken about him without adding "myself too." But I had to go and stick myself in.

(*F. L. I.*, p. 133)

Rozanov always "adds himself" in any substantial characterization of another person and Remizov follows this principle in *Kukkha*. The entire manner in which Remizov presents Rozanov corresponds to Viktor Shklovsky's description of Rozanov's method of characterization: "First the character is simply mentioned and then hints lead us into the middle of things. The person is given to us in pieces, in pieces taken as if from an acquaintance, and only much later do the passages fit together. The character or the situation is spread out over the course of the entire plot (*siuzhet*)."[12] Remizov had read Shklovsky's work "Rozanov" in *Plot as a Manifestation of Style* and was aware of this enigmatic, piecemeal manner of presenting characters.[13] The fourteen small chapters which, along with the dedication and word to the reader, make up *Kukkha* are "passages" presenting Rozanov, Remizov, their wives, Shestov, and others in this very manner.

As soon as Rozanov appears (*K.*, p. 13) his voice is heard. This follows Rozanov's own dictum: "One must listen to the voice in reading. He who is attuned to the voice, to the *speaking* Pushkin, divining what his live intonation was like, truly knows Pushkin. If one does not listen to the living Pushkin, it's as if he didn't read Pushkin anyway, but read someone else in his stead, but not Pushkin himself" (*F. L. I.*, p. 107-108). Remizov orients the reader towards the spoken word, the sound element of the text: "Rózinov—Rózinov! V. V. introduced himself, pronouncing Rózi, not Róza, as against the strong seminarian Rozánov" (*K.*, p. 13). Like Rozanov who loved the language of servants and the argot of thieves, Remizov was heavily oriented towards the spoken word and towards bringing it, with its sounds into literature: "Why are dirty words repulsive?/—Why is cursing involving the mother's name [*maternaia rugan'*] crude?/Well, you know, cursing with the mother's name, just like any cursing, simply as a word—bursting forth on its own, why, it's an entire foot [metric]—a foot-step of words and it is marvelous, more resonant in its sonorousness than a slap in the face....(*K.*, p. 80) Rozanov even said about thieves' language: "There's something artistic here" and of the letters of servants: "This is literature. The most remarkable literature!"

It should be mentioned here that one of the main underlying motifs of

Remizov's *Kukkha* is Rozanov's statement "Literature is simply my trousers." This equation functions as a metaphor for literature throughout the work and dictates Remizov's attitude: "You are always in them ... So why stand on ceremony with them?" *Kukkha* is a work, in Rozanov's terms, "without it's underwear on" (*F. L. II.*, p. 249) in an extended metaphor in which "underwear" signifies "all sorts of conventions invented by evil people or those who find themselves in an evil, suspicious world" (*K.*, p. 14). This extended metaphor accounts for the overwhelmingly "trouser-oriented" content of many of the examples cited here.

Early in *Kukkha* Remizov describes an act of mischief, locking a priest in a latrine, says he did it, and then immediately disclaims any part in the event. This is a typically Rozanovian device: self-accusation—direct or indirect—followed by an immediate defense of self. A good example of this is found in *Solitaria* where Rozanov claims in one paragraph: "It's amazing how I could accommodate myself to lying. Lies have never tormented me..." and in the next paragraph: "...I always wrote sincerely. I am the most truthful of writers" (*Sol.*, p. 54). A more specific case of intertextuality involving self-defense is this one:

Remizov

They wrote in the Moscow newspapers, either in *The Russian Leaflet* or else *Early Morning*, that I should be removed from the ranks of writers! What weirdos they are! Why I never even had the slightest pretension to such a title then. What sort of a "writer" was I?

(*K.*, p. 83)

Rozanov

The lack of comprehension in our critics is amazing ... I'm good-hearted, or at least, completely without malice. Nevertheless, all the articles about me begin "Demonism in Rozanov ..." I read it and don't understand a thing. It's just not *me*.

(*F. L. II.*, pp. 257-258)

In a very humorous outburst in *Solitaria* Rozanov pokes fun at his own name:

My last name is amazingly repulsive to me ... if only it were "Rudnev," "Bugaev," anything ... Once I was walking along the street. I raised my head and read:

"Rozanov's German Bakery." [*Rozan* = nose, colloquially] Yep, that's how it is. What else can such fools (with such a stupid last name) do? Worse than my last name there's only Kablukov [*Kabluk* = the heel of a shoe]. That's completely shameful.

(*Sol.*, p. 18)

Remizov joins Rozanov in this play on names, which is reminiscent of Gogol, Dostoevsky, and especially Chekhov's story "A Horsey Last Name":

A woman telling fortunes asked of a passerby:

—Your name?

—Mr. Shits-too-much. [*Zasravitjak*]

(*K.*, p. 24)

This is unmistakably a reference to Rozanov whose incontinence in that area on certain occasions is mentioned on the very next page: "Well, it was just plain impossible to hold it in any longer. He did it in his pants." (*K.*, p. 25). This incident which occurred in a European hotel is almost repeated in the chapter "Qui-Qui?" in a Parisian one. Fortunately that time Rozanov "safely reached the desired location" (*K.*, p. 104). The theme of humorous names reappears in *Kukkha* numerous times.

Another case of intertextual relations between Rozanov's works and *Kukkha* is the dialogue which Remizov uses to characterize Varvara, Rozanov's wife:

Remizov

...Varvara Dmitr'evna Rozanova, she read *The Pond* five times:

"I don't understand a thing," she said almost in tears....

"Well, Varechka, there are such things written there that one just can't make them out. It's about trunks mostly."

"What trunks do you mean?"

(*K.*, p. 46)

Rozanov **(on Varvara)**

Why doesn't she like Gogol'?

"Because I just 'don't like' this stuff."

"But what don't you like? Why, it's all *true*, Chichikov, for instance."

"So what's so true about Chichikov?"

"He's such a base person, a scoundrel."

"So what if he's a ——. She wouldn't utter the word scoundrel."

(*F. L. II.*, p. 332)

Here Remizov echoes Rozanov's characterization of Varvara, in which her main trait is a lack of cunning and trickiness, a naive, natural "moral genius." This ingenuousness, of course, precludes her understanding the satirical art of Gogol' (or Rozanov!) and the openly sexual nature of much of Remizov's writing. By including himself in the ranks of writers Varvara Rozanov could not understand or like, Remizov compares himself, as does Rozanov,[14] to Nikolai Gogol!

One of the most salient features of Rozanov's late works is the author's tendency to change the subject and tone of his writings with no apparent attempt at motivation. Not only are consecutive passages in Rozanov's works mutually incompatible, but in the cases where he noted down the place or circumstance in which the thought came to him, those notations clash with the content of the passage. The most often cited example of this is the following:

> **To a loving husband every little piece of his wife is delicious. To a loving wife every little piece of her husband is delicious.**
> **(in a cab at Suvorin's funeral, a bright sunny morning).** (*F. L. II.*, p. 300)

This reappears in *Kukkha* in the following manner:

> **A woman should not refuse a man who is in love with her, even if she doesn't love him!...**
> **2.10 They buried Trubetskoi today. They carried his body to the Nikolaevskii Station....**

> **In the evening we went to Fyodor Sologub's... And as we were coming home, it was such a marvelous night...**
>
> (*K.*, p. 24)

The presence of sexual, funereal, and weather motifs here in the same order as in Rozanov is hardly accidental.

The following borrowing from Rozanov is almost identical to the original text:

Remizov

I remember once in the vestibule—that was on Kazach'ii—V. V. showed me a whole hen-house full of tiny children's galoshes and winked—

—a wink and a smile from which his eyeglasses would fog up...

(*K.*, p. 121)

Rozanov

Between the doors there stood so many tiny galoshes, that I was amazed myself. It was impossible to count them quickly. And we both...roared with laughter:

"How many!..."

"How many!..."

(*Sol.*, p. 4)

Here again, as in the case of Trubetskoi's death, while this incident could have occurred in life, its inclusion in this memoir was most probably determined by the excerpt from *Solitaria,* rather than by an actual event.

Another interesting instance of intertextuality in *Kukkha* is the expansion of one of Rozanov's incidental characters into a whole chapter entitled "Father Ivan." Rozanov especially appreciated what he termed "good priests," by which he meant "down-to-earth," warm-hearted types:

> **How kind simple priests can (sometimes) be. Ivan Pavlinych took my head under his arm and ...said: "After all, what can we know with our *little skulls* [brains, reason, skull]?" I told him various equivocations and "doubt" of mine... And how sweet it was to kiss his hand. He would confess you quickly. People were always waiting...thanks to him. He was a dear man. Dear and intelligent (very).**
>
> **(*F. L. II.*, p. 221)**

"Father Ivan" in *Kukkha* presents a fuller character sketch, extending over two pages, but the character is the same, and is, as in Rozanov, opposed to the harsh, strict "holier-than-thou" priests who stick to the letter of the law, a type Rozanov despised. Here is the Remizov:

> **Although Father Ivan had a beard—his whole mug was overgrown,—the beard went no lower than his Adam's apple and it was some sort of blackish-grey, unwashed thing, all in wisps. And he would say the mass mumbling, so that you couldn't make out a thing. Why you couldn't catch the simplest "Mother of God" or "Our Father"...but the main thing about him was his drinking:**
>
> > **Father Ivan, when he had a load on, loved to dance and any old place would do, by the ale house, inside the Ilin wall, it was all the same. He would jump and dance and...**

Everyone confessed to Father Ivan—all the simple parishioners, that is. And the purer ones would have preferred to go to him too, except that it would have looked awkward. And then one winter day he had one too many—he caught a chill and died.
I was at the funeral.
It was a weekday but there were as many people as on St. Ilya's Feast.... They all mourned for Father Ivan. "They don't make priests like that any more," they said.
(*K.*, pp. 94-95)

To this series of examples of intertextuality, which is by no means exhaustive, we shall add two final instances. The first echoes Rozanov's thoughts on the inevitability of death:

Remizov
Suddenly we find out that our house is located in a graveyard. We went out to look and a grave has been dug at our very door. We run... And go back into the house.
(*K.*, p. 19).

Rozanov
Everything will pass, we will disappear, and our affairs too.
Love?
No.
That's what we like to think...
And there will be a world, through which people will pass. Oh, my God: the whole world is just one enormous grave.
(*F. L. I.*, p. 171)

It seems extremely likely that Remizov's metaphor for the realization of mortality is derived from the Rozanov passage as Remizov is not known to have lived in a graveyard.[15]

The final examples come from the end of *Kukkha* and deal with death and immortality. Rozanov's ideas on these matters are incorporated in the chapter "The Moon is Shining," especially as expressed in this passage about the death of Rozanov's friend, the young philosopher Fyodor Shperk:

To say that *Shperk no longer exists in the world at all* is impossible... And it's not that "Shperk's soul is immortal" but that his little red beard couldn't die. His "Byzov" (he had a friend by that name) is still waiting at the gate, and he himself... is driving over to my place on Pavlovsky Street. Everything just as it was. As far as the "immortality of his soul" is concerned, I don't know and it doesn't interest me at all.
Everything is immortal. Eternal and alive. Even the last little hole in your boot. That's better than "the immortality of the soul" which is dry and abstract.
I want to arrive in "heaven" with a hanky to blow my nose. Nothing less than that.
(*F. L. I.*, p. 89)

To this concrete "heaven" Remizov adds the things Rozanov would absolutely require in "the other world": "A little cigarette after bathing, raspberries with milk, a lightly salted pickle at the end of June, with just a tiny bit of dill..." (*F. L. I.*, p. 175), and he asks his dead friend across eternity: "Have you finally understood, Vasily Vasilevich, that that little cigarette is no use to you there?" (*K.*, p. 124). Here Remizov combines

elements from Rozanov's *The Apocalypse of Our Time* dealing with the end of Russia and Russian time with Rozanov's meditations on eternity. In a passage entitled "An Experience" Rozanov presents "the end of time" as part of a large temporal metaphor in which the end of Tsarist Russia equals "the end of days":

I rush to the train station to find out, what time...
"At *three o'clock.*"
I: "Is that by old time or new time?...."
"By new time, of course. Everything's new now." (After a silence:)
"Everything old is in the grave."
(*A. O. T.*, p. 480)

The concreteness with which Rozanov always speaks of eternity, and of spiritual matters in general, is heard in Remizov's designation of Rozanov's whereabouts which he calls a *place of residence:* "...an awakening—and nothing at all like ours: the same, yet somehow different, where the very *volo* [I want, the will] is different due to your place of residence, in eternity" (*K.*, p. 125). Then Remizov directs his question concerning time to Rozanov, an unmistakable echo of the dialogue from *The Apocalypse of Our Time* above:

Just how is it with periods of time in your—what's happening out there in eternity?
.....
"Tell me, Vasily Vasil'evich, what time is it now in eternity?"
"Is it evening?"
"Not yet?"
(*K.*, p. 125)

Of Literature and Trousers

Having reviewed in some detail Remizov's masterful stylization of Rozanov, we must look at one of the dominant motifs that runs through *Kukkha,* the equation of literature and trousers. Remizov, in re-creating a Rozanovian world of words seems to have found the following two passages central to Rozanov's attitude towards writing and his manner:

I know that I am that filth in literature which it has sucked only so forcefully that it hurls all sorts of sh-- into it [literature]...
I'm not embarrassed in literature in the least, because literature is simply my own trousers.
(*F. L. II.*, p. 336)

and concerning *Solitaria* as literature:

...it's so true that such a book *absolutely had to be written!* and the thought has even occurred to me that really all books should be just like it, i.e., "not yet combed" and "without their pants on."
(*F. L. II.*, p. 249)

In addition to the obvious attempt to be humorous and to "épater le bourgeois" the extremely candid treatment of excretion and copulation in *Kukkha* are part of the trousers-literature metaphor. This does not mean that the wealth of sexual motifs culminating in the anecdote "The Fighter of Fornication" (*K.*, pp. 108-115) and the nocturnal discussion of "sizes" with the actor Zonov (*K.*, pp. 42-43) which alludes to the erotic narrative poem *Luka Mudishchev* (I'd still like to take a look at a 7-incher . . . "*K.*, p. 41)[61] are there for their metaphorical value alone. Yet the freedom their inclusion imples, the "pants off" element, is obvious. Indeed Remizov's use of copulation and excretion for writing has as its basis Rozanov's repeated statement that speaking and writing which is another form of it, are for him a physical function, something instinctual from which he cannot refrain. Utterances and writing spew out of him in a manner perhaps best captured by the English expression "verbal diarrhea." Using the metaphor literature-trousers throughout *Kukkha* Remizov stresses the uncontrollable, involuntary element in Rozanov's writing. Another metaphor for writing, again stressing it's uncontrollable and even addictive character is taken from Rozanov: "A writer's talent—is some sort of intoxicating fate" (*F. L. I.*, p. 169) and applied to Remizov when a friend was trying to convince him to take up a more lucrative, practical line of work:

> **He spoke as if he were talking to a drunk . . .**
> **What are you going to do, I just couldn't deny myself and not write."**
>
> **(*K.*, p. 47)**

The writing function is connected with sex metaphorically, writing replaced by sex, and metonymically, writing contiguous to sex, in the following two passages in *Kukkha,* which are attributed to Rozanov.

Metaphorical treatment:

> **. . . just as semen requires a vulva, thus every talent requires a "sphere" which is approximately the same thing as a vulva, "the talented application of the self" is similar to, and even is the very same thing as copulation . . .**
>
> **(*K.*, pp. 52-53)**

Metonymical treatment:

> **And then again: Who writes how?**
> **V. V. Rozanov when he was in high spirits and pages covered with writing were dashed off as if by themselves before the ink even dried, said his . . . would stick out like a nail.**
> **And no typesetter could figure it out for the life of him!**
>
> **(*K.*, p. 23)**

The physical result of this uncontrollable function, the manuscript is thus illegible, wild, flowing, like *"kukkha"* which means "moisture" in Remizov's monkey language: "A manuscript in which all the letters have run together—a Rozanovian manuscript." (*K.*, p. 47)

The final problem which arises if one agrees that *Kukkha* is mainly about Rozanov writing and to a large extent represents a re-creation of that writing, is that of Remizov's assessment of Rozanov's verbal art. How does he perceive Rozanov as a literary phenomenon? What does Rozanov's appearance in the literary arena mean or what has it meant? Unquestionably, Remizov's assessment of Rozanov's writing is very high. He is probably the writer who most often acknowledged Rozanov's influence on his work. The passage in which he addresses the question of Rozanov's impact upon Russian letters reads, very interestingly, like a pastiche of a Futurist poem:

> **. . . you know there is not an unhappier non-person in a person, to whom all the world is an enemy—one! and what a bore! now, this very minute, having breathed in the spring air and broken out of the inhuman human mire, I burst my way through years—15 in all! 15 years?—through the revolution in which a year counts for a hundred, and through the war—an endless war!**
>
> **night, the baths,**
> **moons,—magnifying glasses,**
> **puddles,**
> **moisture through the stars—**
> **—Vasily Vasilevich!**
>
> **a wetness coming through the stars, a living moisture, Thales's *hugron,* the "outpouring" of the world, the beginning and origin of things, moving, alive, afire, furious, the height of speed, the height of celerity, the height of flight, burning, adhering . . .**
> **I shall say it in simian language with a word, a single word.**
> **kuk-kha**
> **kuk-kha!**
> **kukkha, penetrating the world through the stars, the foundation of all beneath the stars, living life itself . . . and into a man . . . from Thales to**
> **kukkha, penetrating kukkha,**
> **conscious of itself!**
> **kukkha, breaking out of itself**
> **I want to know myself!**
> **kukkha, where all is**
> **one heart**
> **one life**
> **bugs, beetles, cockroaches**
> **elephants,**
> **bears,**
> **cows,**
> **people**
> **all growing into a man**
> **into a single man**
> **into the pyramid**
> **V. V.**
> **Rozan-**
> **ov.**
>
> **(*K.*, pp. 75-76)**

Rozanov

"All my sins are wet ones."
(*F. L. II.*, p. 345)
"I simply have no form."
(*Sol.*, p. 19)
Personality = "A dull little star."
(*F. L. II.*, **p. 401)**

This Futuristic outburst is reminiscent of many in longer works of Mayakovsky, especially when the poet speaks of himself. Remizov does not allow the reader to miss the Futurist connection, as he mentions David Burlyuk[18] on the very next page of *Kukkha* (p. 77). Burlyuk bursts forth onto the artistic scene in that other "trousers-oriented" work of the same period "A Cloud in Trousers," (1914-1915) which its author, Mayakovsky, considered to be, at least in part, a catechism for the new art. Remizov was not the first to compare Rozanov's literary achievement to that of the Futurists and specifically Mayakovsky. Shklovsky had mentioned the similar use of oxymoron in Rozanov and in Mayakovsky's "To His Beloved Self the Author Dedicates These Verses" (1916) in his monograph "Rozanov" in 1921.[19] Perhaps Remizov, too, felt Rozanov to be, like Mayakovsky, a great, elemental literary force, containing the traditions of the past, conscious of them, and at the same time breaking with them and away from them. Here Rozanov's feeling that he was undermining literature, destroying it, and Shklovsky's description of Rozanov's late works as "an heroic attempt to transcend literature" come into contact with Mayakovsky's famous lines from "A Cloud in Trousers": "And I feel—/that my 'Ego'/is too small for me./Someone is breaking out of me obstinately."[20] In any case, *"kukkha"* was the "self-born word breaking out" that Remizov found to fulfill Rozanov's charge to him:

Rozanov: "Now you write this down sometime!"
Remizov: "Write it?"
Remizov: I said: "Here one needs somehow with a single..."
Rozanov: "That's it, you do it, with a single word, you know what I mean?"
(*K.*, p. 74)

And that "word" appeared in the *tour de force* that is *Kukkha.*

NOTES

1. These works include: Zinaida Gippius, "Zadumchivyi strannik," in *Zhivye litsa* (Prague: Plamia, 1925), Erikh Gollerbakh, *V. V. Rozanov: Lichnost' i tvorchestvo* (Petrograd: Poliarnaia zvezda, 1922); M. Spassovskii, *V. V. Rozanov v poslednie gody svoei zhizni* (Berlin: Russkoe natsional'noe izdatel'stvo, 1939); M. Kurdiumov, *O Rozanove* (Paris: Y. M. C. A. Press, 1929); Viktor Khovin, *Ne ugodno li-s?* (Petrograd: Ocharovannyi strannik, 1916).

2. This society is referred to in *Kukkha* on pages 38-44 and *passim.* Its full name in Russian was "Obez'ian'ia velikaia i vol'naia palata." Its creation occurred in connection with Remizov's play "The Tragedy of Judas Iscariot" (1908).

3. For the reader who is less familiar with Rozanov, Gippius's "Zadumchivyi strannik" referred to in n. 1 is the best introduction, although the portrayal is subjective and differs from some other accounts markedly. Gippius's work and *Kukkha* are two major memoirs on Rozanov which present him in a positive light. The other is the biographical sketch of Gollerbakh which has been criticized as too praiseful.

4. Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics,* E. Rotsel, trans. (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1974), Chapter V.

5. By "subject-oriented word" Bakhtin means that the other person's word is oriented toward some subject, or referent in his world. It is not directed at another word or discourse, primarily.

6. Bakhtin, p. 157.

7. All translations from *Kukkha* are my own and the page references will be noted for all works immediately after the quotations thus (*K.*, p.), etc.

8. The page numbers for Rozanov works given here come from: Wassilij Rosanow, *Ausgewählte Schriften* (Munich: A. Neimanis, 1970), a German reprint of the Russian texts. Rozanov's works will be referred to in page references with the following abbreviations: *Solitaria* = *Sol., Fallen Leaves I.* and *II.* = *F. L. I.* and *F. L. II.*, and *The Apocalypse of Our Time* = *A. O. T.* All translations are my own.

9. Roland Barthes, *The Pleasure of the Text,* Richard Miller, trans. (New York: Hill and Wang, 1975), p. 22.

10. See the example mixing sexual, funereal and weather motifs here on page 10.

11. Rozanov often said that he had a fetishism for small things.

12. By plot here is intended the Formalist *siuzhet* which Boris Tomashevsky defined as the events of a narrative as they *"are arranged* and connected according to the orderly sequence in which they are presented in the work." The reference comes from Viktor Shklovskii, "Rozanov," in *Siuzhet kak javlenie stilia* (Moscow: Opoiaz, 1921), pp. 35-36.

13. Remizov indicates that he had read Shklovsky's "Rozanov" in *Kukkha* on pages 123-124.

14. Rozanov's relationship to the art of Nikolai Gogol deserves more study. Although he outwardly claims to dislike Gogol, he constantly uses the same words to describe Gogol that he uses for himself, his wife disliked Gogol's satirical art and Rozanov's when he wrote satire, he saw Gogol and himself as great dangers for Russian literature, referred to himself and Gogol as "devils," etc.

15. The domicile mentioned in the passage is one of the St. Petersburg ones, because the date, September 18, 1905, is after the Remizovs had left Kiev. Dr. Charlotte Rosenthal of the University of Utah, who has visited all the known dwelling places of the Remizovs in St. Petersburg (Leningrad) and many of those in Berlin and Paris, informs me that she does not know of any house located in a graveyard which inclines me to interpret this as a totally literary allusion.

16. This erotic classic by Ivan Barkov represents the *erotica* of the eighteenth-century Russian merchant class. The widow there wishes to find a gallant who is an "eight-incher," but she settles for the hero, Luka Mudishchev, who is a "seven-incher."

17. *Hugron*—Greek, "moisture." According to Thales of Miletus, it is the basic world substance. For him the world originated in water, was sustained by it and floated upon it. It seems that Thales considered the world to be completely comprehensible through the idea of water—an element essential to life and motion and powerful enough, in his view, to account for every physical phenomenon. Remizov's description of Rozanov as a sort of "Thales's *hugron,*" may refer to Rozanov's essentiality for Russian literature and his complete absorption in it, as well as his great motive force and impact upon it. It is also a reference to Rozanov's fondness for the pre-Socratic philosophers, which is well-known.

18. David Burlyuk, a Futurist painter, closely connected with the Futurist movement in general.

19. Shklovskii, p. 28; see a further comparison with Mayakovsky on p. 33.

20. Vladimir Maiakovskii, "Oblako v shtanakh," in *V. V. Maiakovskii: Izbrannye proizvedeniia* (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1963), I, p. 162.