

надежды, на который можно попасть, только если пройти сквозь туман, оказаться в нем, раствориться в нем, стать его частью.

БИБЛИОГРАФИЧЕСКИЕ ССЫЛКИ

1. Образ тумана. URL: https://ozlib.com/821006/literatura/obraz_tumana#752 (дата обращения: 08.05.2021).
2. Е.В. Науменко. Образ тумана и его место в поэтике «таинственных повестей» И.С. Тургенева // Содержание "Спасский вестник" №12. 2005 г. URL: <http://www.turgenev.org.ru/e-book/vestnik-12-2005/naumenko.htm> (дата обращения: 08.05.2021).
3. Ким Манчжун. Сон в заоблачных высях. Издательство «Гиперион», СПб, 2010.
4. Троцевич А.Ф. История корейской традиционной литературы (до XX в.). Издательство СПбГУ, 2004.
5. Ким Сын Ок. Сеул, зима 1964 года. Пер. с кор. Софии Кузиной. Гиперион, СПб, 2013.
6. 김승옥. 무진기행. 해방 50 년 한국의 소설. 2. 1960-1980. 한겨레 신문사. 서울, 1996. [Ким Сынок. Поездка в Мучжин. Корейская проза второй половины 20-го века. 2. 1960-1980. Издательство «Ханкёре Синмунса. Сеул, 1996]. (на кор. яз.)
7. Троцевич А.Ф. Несколько слов о западном влиянии в современной корейской прозе (Ким Сынок. Рассказ «Поездка в Мучжин. Путевые записи». 1964 г.) // 100 лет петербургскому корееведению. Материалы междунар. конф. — СПб., 1997. С. 60–63.
8. 송기섭. 무진의 형상들과 안개의 이미지 – 무진기행론. 국어국문학, 177, 2016.12, pp. 307-335. 국어국문학회. [Сон Кисоп. Образы Мучжина и образ тумана - обсуждая рассказ «Поездка в Мучжин». Кугокунмунхак, 177, 2016.12, стр. 307-335. Кугокунмунхакхе]. [Электронный ресурс] URL: <http://www.dbpia.co.kr/journal/articleDetail?nodeId=NODE07091428> (дата обращения: 01.02.2020) (на кор. яз.)
9. 조경란. 국자 이야기. 문학동네, 2004. [Чо Гённан. Рассказ о поварешке. Мунхак тонне, 2004]. (на кор. яз.)

JAPANESE AND SOVIET WAR LITERATURE: REPRESENTING ONE TRAUMA

A. V. Suslov

*National Research University «Higher School of Economics»
Myasnienskaya Street, 101000, Moscow, Russian, avsuslov_1@edu.hse.ru*

This article examines the main trends in the development of military prose about the Second World War in the USSR and Japan. Having, in general, a traumatic experience of participation in the Second World War, the status of the aggressor country and the victorious country predetermined the representation of the War in the literature of both countries. Nevertheless, both national literatures note similar traumatic narratives (for example, the Blockade and Hiroshima), as well as a common anti-militarist pathos. As a result, this article demonstrates that the tracks of development of Japanese and Soviet

literature were mutually directed: if the dominance of traumatic discourse is increasing in Soviet literature, then the Japanese, on the contrary, demonstrated the overcoming of traumatic discourse.

Keywords: Soviet literature; Japanese literature; war trauma; Second World War literature.

The Second World War (WWII) involved more than 60 states all over the world, left millions of lives, destroyed lots of cities and places, being the hugest disaster, humanity could ever have experienced. Thus, the experience of trauma and suffering was identical for all countries which faced heavy military actions, as the famous maxima states that “war never changes”, causing suffering both to reckless aggressors and glorious Motherland defenders. However, this trauma is differently articulated in the societies of victors and losers. This makes Soviet and Japanese postwar literature devoted to WWII surprisingly similar in its major antimilitaristic intention and rather different in their pathos. So, this study will put emphasis on the reflection of War experience in the Soviet and Japanese literature after WWII.

Thus, analyzing the representation of traumatic experience, this article aims to identify the major track of the evolution of military prose in the USSR and Japan by operationalization of trauma as concept of literature study of both countries and analysis of major structural elements of the two national literatures.

This proclaimed comparative analysis also demands the clarification of the research’s methodological principles, mostly being based on structuralism in Barthes’ interpretation, contained in his *An Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narrative* [1].

Following his approach, this study will attempt to segment prosaic texts into the major structural element. In Barthes’ terminology, the basic smallest narrative units will be segregated, which will characterize the basic behavioral model and typical characteristics of characters, basing on his definitions of function (“an act of a character, defined from the point of view of its significance for the course of the action) and the concept of the index (“personality traits concerning characters, notations of atmosphere, etc.”, necessary for plot development) allow to form typical categories of characters and ways of plot development [1, c. 15].

Thus, in this research we are not obliged to identify functions and indexes directly, but reconsider them as three (rather free from formal restrictions in analysis) categories. The first one is characters, dealing with their traits, psychology, and internal behavior. The second one is plot, uniting not only typical plot designs and plot-fabula relations, but also temporal aspect of narration. And the vaguest one is context aims to correspond the

structures with extratextual experience, like traumatic narratives. However, within the given format it is impossible to focus on these elements in detail.

War trauma in the USSR and Japan

J. Mitchell points that «a trauma, whether physical or psychical, must create a breach protective covering of such severity that it cannot be coped with by the usual mechanisms by which we deal with pain» [2, p. 121]. And new war trauma was for both countries something new in contrast of what was faced by the European «lost generation» writers. That was not mere individual soldiers experience of post-traumatic stress disorder, but a greater people loss, caused not by contradictions in social development, but absurdly rational logic of totalitarianism which brought new targeted destruction practices. That was the «novelty» faced by culture. And the previous war traumatic experience was incompatible with a new one, even in literature.

The Soviet literature had an analogical experience of Russian Civil war (1917-1922) trauma and coped with by emphasizing the revolutionary role of Red Army violence, which was represented by dominant socialist realism canon of war fiction (D. Furmanov's and A. Serafimovich's tradition). In addition, there were non-mainstream languages (returning unusual mechanism of dealing with trauma) of coping with traumatizing war stress experience in writings of I. Babel and A. Platonov, which were alike in the form of writing about «pure» absurd of Civil war. Although, estimating the language of Platonov, I. Brodsky mentioned that his language was one of the era (and Babel's language he estimated as "gourmand"), it is faithful to state that they both «lead the Russian language into a semantic dead end or, more precisely, it discovers a dead end philosophy in the language itself [...] as the presence of absurdity in grammar is not evidence of a particular tragedy, but of the humanity as a whole» [3, p. 72]. So, the Soviet literature in general used these instruments and languages, but only socialist realism was the preferable one.

As for Japan, there the situation differed, as WWII was the first traumatic war experience and a challenge for literature tradition, which previously was dealing only with rather successful Sino-Japanese, Russo-Japanese wars and Chinese campaign were successful. So, the first two were mostly analyzed in the style of Tolstoy's *Sevastopol Stories* (for example, the most prominent semi-memoirs *Human Bullets* by Sakurai Tadayoshi). The Second Sino-Japanese War, on the one hand, enriched the war literature with the genre of revitalized *jugunki* (first-person narration in the forms of diaries of military campaign from soldiers' perspective), following the patriotic attitude to military actions. The major representative of this genre was Hino Ashihei, famous for his *Soldier's Trilogy*. On the other hand, there was a powerful trend, inspired by proletarian literature, on war critics, starting from prewar *Militarized Streets* by Kuroshima Denji, and continuing with *Soldiers*

Alive by Ishikawa Tatsuzo, The Song of Mars by Ishikawa Jun, A Quest for Life by Shimaki Kensaku, etc. In general, they criticized war from the position of «lost generation» writers, demonstrating dehumanizing impact of the war on soldiers. So, Japanese literature by the war end even had a draft language for dealing with some traumatic war experience.

But a postwar trauma was different. S. Ushakin defines three major types of trauma: as loss, as symbolic matrix, and as consolidating event [4, p. 8-9], then the two final ones can be united in trauma as plot. For sure, all three were present (however narrative of loss is not something unique, moreover, both Russian as well as Japan could be characterized as «disaster subcultures» [5, p. 253]), but trauma as consolidating event was typical mostly for the Soviet literature. For example, E. Dobrenko states that «history of Victory was a state enterprise» [6, p. 45], and in literature primarily. What was the common for both literatures is plotting the trauma, especially for some core events: Khatyn, Blockade, extermination camps for the USSR and Hiroshima (Nagasaki) and Leite Island for Japan .

Structural elements of Japanese war literature

The major novelty of the Japanese postwar military fiction has been demonstrated in the pleroma of typical character types. The first postwar writers almost completely eliminated patriotic image of Hino's soldier, but started the deep psychological research, partially inspired by on-war critical realism.

Sakaguchi Ango in his *Idiot* and *One Woman and War* introduced traumatized by the war women characters, analyzing their ambiguous feeling of war emptiness, as well as Kojima Nobuo describes existential experience of unnatural pervert relationship of a soldier and his rifle in his short story *The Rifle*. Ooka Shohei developed image, which has become almost canonical, the image of mentally injured soldier in his *Fire on the Plains*. Noma Hiroshi in *Zone of Emptiness* continued war critics by developing not mentally but socially injured soldiers, dehumanized by war machine. And finally in the 1970s Agawa Hiroyuki in his *Admiral Yamamoto and Burial in the Clouds* introduces patriotic soldiers, obsessed not with their psychological sufferings of war falseness, but only with the fact that war was not suiting to the country's national interests. Thus, the Japanese characters were evolutionizing from madmen to antipatriotic troublemakers into prewar type of good, but a bit critical soldier.

The plot structure was also steadily changing: if the on-war jugunki lacked the completeness of the plot-fabula and were like a part of a serialization, the first post war military short stories rejected plot and chronos definiteness: stories of Sakaguchi and Kojima if have any order of events (in Sakaguchi's ones), their prose eliminates the normal time perception, as the

margins dividing episodes are absent, the narrative time does not stop or disappear, but becomes «dragging», a peculiar eternity. The feeling of amnesia, indicating any trauma discourse, is a key point of Ooka's narration, using which he builds the plot of *Fire on the Plains*, also imitates and revitalizes time perception of the war period. Only Agawa Hiroyuki's prose demonstrated the redemption of timeless language of the previous mainstream war fiction.

Structural elements of Soviet war literature

The massive of the Soviet war literature is much broader than Japanese one (the last one is mostly covered by *War Literature Anthology* in 6 volumes of 1972) and there are numerous critiques of this literature (the most valuable «external» one is presented by F. Ellis *The Damned and the Dead: The Eastern Front through the Eyes of the Soviet and Russian Novelists*). So, in this short part we only mention some structural features in dealing with traumatizing experience in the postwar literature.

The first characters of WWII prose were rather stereotypical: fighting youth and (in the second edition) communists in A. Fadeyev's prose, ideologically correct motherland defenders of M. Sholokhov's, soldiers, and generals of K. Simonov and so on, having complicated characters, but having only feeling of loss, but not trauma. So, these writers continued the canon of on-war military prose, mobilizing, but not healing. The so called "lieutenants prose" started the study of soldiers psychology, dealing with feeling, but mostly ignoring moral condition, which defines trauma comprehension. And only Belorussian writers, like A. Adamovich and V. Bykov (however, later they will be followed by "rural" writers like Astafyev, Kondratyev and Vorobyev) started to deal with major traumatic narratives (*Khatyn* and *Leningrad Blockade*) and to study traumatized soldiers in the conditions of moral dilemmas. However, that was maximum which could have been reached within the Soviet literature as the further dealing with trauma demanded rethinking the totalitarian experience.

Counter-tracks of war literature (conclusion)

As we attempted to demonstrate, WWII trauma was presented in both literature traditions, as loss and plot. In both countries trauma as plot was represented to deal with the previous war experience and institutionalize it, but the role of a victor ("Victory as a state enterprise") put the Soviet literature on the path of counterforcing the discourse of silence about war trauma. Thus, it moved from on-war writings in peaceful time to deepening psychologism, making literature characters from ideal soldiers to weak persons and betrayers, fighting against officialdom. On the contrary, the Japanese literature of the first postwar years started to use all the instrument of traumatized writing, from ruining plot and temporal structure of narration,

social criticism and deep psychologism, but later writings about war have become more “moderate” in terms of language. All in all, the attitudes to deal with trauma diametrically changed: the Soviet (and later Russian) literature started actively to articulate previously silent experience, while the Japanese one started to lose its traumatized language and (re)covered (from) the past.

REFERENCES

1. Barthes R. An Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narrative // *New Literary History*. 1975. Vol. 6. №2.
2. Mitchell J. Trauma, Recognition, and the Place of Language // *Diacritics*. 1998. Vol. 28. №4.
3. Бродский И. А. Послесловие к «Котловану» А. Платонова // *Сочинения Иосифа Бродского*. СПб.: Пушкинский фонд, 1998. Т. 7.
4. Ушакин С. «Нам этой болью дышать»? О травме, памяти и сообществах // *Травма: пункты* / сост. С. Ушакин и Е. Трубина. М.: НЛО, 2009.
5. Ульберг С., Харт П., Босс С. Длинная тень беды: общественная и политическая память о катастрофе // *Травма: пункты* / сост. С. Ушакин и Е. Трубина. М.: НЛО, 2009.
6. Добренко Е. Блокада реальности: ленинградская тема в соцреализме // *Блокадные нарративы*. М.: НЛО, 2017.
7. Мещеряков А. Н. Страна Япония: быть японцем. М.: Лингвистика; СПб.: Петербургское востоковедение, 2020.