

The Thaw's Provincial Margins: Place, Community and Canon in *Pages from Tarusa*

Polly Jones

University College Oxford, United Kingdom, polly.jones@univ.ox.ac.uk

In summer 1961, a group of writers gathered in the small town of Tarusa, southwest of Moscow. The almanac that they compiled there, *Tarusskie stranitsy* (*Pages from Tarusa*; hereafter, *Pages*), came out in autumn 1961.¹ Its print-run was halted halfway through, and those responsible were punished by the central and local authorities.² Regardless of this curtailed publication—or partly, because of it—*Pages* was a “sensation” and “explosion” in Soviet literature.³ “*Pages* doesn’t look all that threatening,” contributor Vladimir Maksimov later observed, “but in 1961, it was a major event.”⁴ Alongside Solzhenitsyn’s *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*, which it pre-dated by a year, and two 1956 works associated with *Pages*’ chief editor Konstantin Paustovskii (the almanac *Literaturnaia Moskva* and Vladimir Dudintsev’s novel *Not by Bread Alone*), *Pages* was a foundational moment of the Thaw. As its English translator Andrew Field explained, “it was the Tarusa writers. . .who, more than a year before Solzhenitsyn’s celebrated novel, broke the first ground in the movement away from the Victorianism of Soviet literary language.”⁵ The cultural significance of *Pages* has not faded in the six decades since publication, though its two post-Soviet sequels did not capture the zeitgeist in the same way.⁶

More specifically, *Pages* introduced an array of mostly young writers who would stretch Socialist Realism in writing about youth, war, rural life, and morality: amongst them, Bulat Okudzhava, Vladimir Maksimov, Boris Balter

The research for this article was supported by a grant from the John Fell Fund, University of Oxford. My thanks too to Jade McGlynn, Andrei Gross, Igor’ Kometchikov, Dan Healey, the participants of the Oxford 101st Kilometre workshop and the Russian Graduate seminar, and the editor and reviewers of *Slavic Review*.

1. Vladimir Koblikov, Nikolai Otten, eds., *Tarusskie stranitsy: Literaturno-khudozhestvennyi illiustrirovannyi sbornik* (Kaluga, 1961).

2. Il’ia Mil’shtein, “Kaluzhskii instident. Iz istorii sovremennosti,” *Ogonek*, 14 (April 1989): 22–25; Lisa Koenig, “Tarusskie Stranitsy: A Literary-Political Case Study” (MPhil diss., University of Oxford, 1986); and Galina Kornilova, “‘Tarusskie stranitsy.’ Vstrecha cherez piatdesiat’ let,” *Mir Paustovskogo*, 30 (2012): 121–22.

3. Igor’ Gunchenko, “Ekho ‘Tarusskikh stranits,’” *Mir Paustovskogo*, 19 (2002): 139–42; deemed “revisionism” by Marc Slonim, *Soviet Russian Literature: Writers and Problems, 1917–1967* (New York, 1967), 333; see also Edward J. Brown, *Russian Literature since the Revolution* (New York, 1969), 326.

4. John Glad, *Conversations in Exile: Russian Writers Abroad* (Durham, 1993), 239–45; “nation-wide event” (Slonim, *Soviet Russian Literature*, 333).

5. Andrew Field, *Pages from Tarusa: New Voices in Russian Writing* (London, 1964), ix; claim of more dissent than *Ivan Denisovich*: Dmitrii Bykov, *Bulat Okudzhava* (Moscow, 2009), 386.

6. Vladimir Kornilov, ed., *Tarusskie stranitsy: Literaturno-khudozhestvennyi illiustrirovannyi sbornik* (Moscow, 2003); Boris Nikolaevich Tarasov, ed., *Tarusskie stranitsy XXI vek.: Literaturno-khudozhestvennyi al'manakh* (Tarusa, 2013).

Slavic Review 80, no. 4 (Winter 2021)

© The Author(s) 2022. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of the Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2022.6

and Vladimir Kornilov.⁷ It also advanced the rehabilitation in print of figures silenced or repressed during Stalinism, with texts by and about Marina Tsvetaeva and the returnee poet Nikolai Zabolotskii, the poems of returnee Arkadii Shteinberg, and biographical sketches of the émigré Ivan Bunin and of Vsevolod Meyerhold (the latter written by the returnee Aleksandr Gladkov).⁸ Additionally, the sketches under the byline Nadezhda Yakovleva were penned by Nadezhda Mandel'shtam.

Despite this enduring fame, this landmark publication has been understood in general terms as epitomizing the spirit of the Thaw, or by extracting specific authors or literary texts out of the almanac's diverse stories, poetry, historical, biographical, and artistic works. The journalistic "sketches," even by writers as talented as Mandel'shtam, Paustovskii, and Frida Vigdorova, are widely assumed to be strategic, upping the dose of "officialese" relative to controversial elements.⁹ Meanwhile, the substantial material about local museums and cultural figures, such as the artists Vasilii Polenov and Viktor Borisov-Musatov, has been largely overlooked; so too have most of the literary works by Tarusa and Kaluga authors such as Nikolai Panchenko, Vladimir Koblikov, and Galina Kornilova.¹⁰

In fact, the almanac's diverse genres, themes and authors, and the multiple social, spatial, and cultural connections between them are key to understanding its significance. *Pages* crystallized and made public post-Stalinist intelligentsia agendas that were hitherto more inchoate or private: the canonization of new authors and re-canonization of stigmatized cultural figures; the reforging of inter-generational cultural links; and the search for "sincere" language and behavior. These agendas were intricately intertwined, and embodied both in the almanac's content, and in the behavior of the loose grouping of writers and artists who produced it. The Thaw is increasingly analyzed not only in terms of literary and artistic innovation (and rehabilitation of suppressed aesthetic traditions), but also as experiments in new forms of behavior and community.¹¹ Hopes for aesthetic, ethical, and emotional change were often inextricably intertwined, and enacted in tandem. The communities and behavior that coalesced around Thaw publications ought therefore to be analyzed in tandem with the texts themselves. This enlarged perspective also broadens the resonance of Thaw landmark texts beyond the often brief

7. Grigori Svirski, *A History of Post-War Soviet Writing: The Literature of Moral Opposition*, trans. and ed. Robert Dessaix and Michael Ulman (Ann Arbor, 1981), 163.

8. Vladislav Zubok, *Zhivago's Children: The Last Russian Intelligentsia* (Cambridge, Mass., 2009), 199.

9. "Svetovoe piatno Tarusy. Opyt gruppovogo portreta 60kh godov," in Kornilov ed., *Tarusskie stranitsy* (2003), 5–13; Svirski, *A History of Post-War Soviet Writing*, 161–62; Bykov, *Bulat Okudzhava*, 389–90.

10. A partial exception is Natal'ia Ivanova, "Skrepliaia porvannuiu tsep'," *Mir Paustovskogo*, 13 (1998): 87–97. Most focus on the fiction by writers who went on to have a national reputation (Koenig, "Tarusskie stranitsy"; Slonim, *Soviet Russian Literature*, 333; and Svirski, *A History of Post-War Soviet Writing*, 159–70).

11. Denis Kozlov and Eleonory Gilburd, eds., *The Thaw: Soviet Society and Culture during the 1950s and 1960s* (Toronto, 2013), esp. 3–84; Anatolii Pinski, *Posle Stalina: Pozdnesovetskaia sub"ektivnost' (1953–1985): Sbornik statei* (St. Petersburg, 2018).

duration of their official approval; *Pages* is a stark example, withdrawn within weeks of publication, yet influential far beyond that time.¹²

While this aesthetic *and* behavioral perspective on the Thaw is quite well-established, the role of place in shaping these multi-faceted experiments is not. Indeed, the spatial specificity of *Pages* itself, whose name advertises its provincial origins, has been largely overlooked. More broadly, the local and regional dimensions of the Thaw have long lain in the shadows of Moscow and Leningrad, whose literary, artistic and educational institutions were key hotbeds of the Thaw.¹³ So too were their domestic gatherings (*kompanii*), neighborhoods such as the Arbat, or writers' "villages" including Peredelkino.¹⁴ However, place played a crucial role in producing markedly diverse inflections of the Thaw. For example, Ukraine's *shistdesiatnyky* were crucially different from Russian *shestidesiatniki*, despite shared preoccupations with literary, ethical, and psychological renewal.¹⁵ The location of the new post-Stalinist "science city" Akademgorodok in the Siberian forest likewise shaped its inhabitants' (ultimately illusory) sense of being able to develop a more democratic and open intellectual culture.¹⁶ Small communities outside major cities could also foster intellectual and behavioral experimentation, seemingly inspired by the sense of remoteness or intimacy.¹⁷ This article analyzes more systematically how provincial space, and especially the metropolitan margins, produced experiments with new forms of post-Stalinist community and behavior, as well as aesthetic innovation and canon reformation.

Pages could not have originated anywhere but Tarusa: its inclusive authorial cohort, informal editing practices, and eclectic but cohesive final text were all crucially determined by the place of publication. This was a town

12. The community around, and long-term influence of, *Novyi mir*, are analyzed in this way in Denis Kozlov, *The Readers of Novyi Mir: Coming to Terms with the Stalinist Past* (Cambridge, Mass., 2013).

13. Kathleen E. Smith, *Moscow 1956: The Silenced Spring* (Cambridge, Mass., 2017); Benjamin Tromly, *Making the Soviet Intelligentsia: Universities and Intellectual Life under Stalin and Khrushchev* (Cambridge, Eng., 2014); Eleonory Gilburd, *To See Paris and Die: The Soviet Lives of Western Culture* (Cambridge, Mass., 2018); Emily Lygo, *Leningrad Poetry 1953–1975: The Thaw Generation (Russian Transformations: Literature, Thought, Culture)* (Oxford, 2010); and Polly Jones, *Myth Memory Trauma: Rethinking the Stalinist Past in the Soviet Union, 1953–70* (New Haven, 2013), Ch. 2.

14. Juliane Fürst, "Friends in Private, Friends in Public: The Phenomenon of the *Kompaniia* Among Soviet Youth in the 1950s and 1960s," in *Borders of Socialism: Private Spheres of Soviet Russia*, ed. Lewis Siegelbaum (New York, 2006), 229–49; Stephen V. Bittner, *The Many Lives of Khrushchev's Thaw: Experience and Memory in Moscow's Arbat* (Ithaca, 2008); Smith, *Moscow 1956*; Lev A. Shilov, *Pasternakovskoe Peredelkino* (Moscow, 2003).

15. Simone Bellezza, *The Shore of Expectations: A Cultural Study of the Shistdesiatnyky* (Toronto, 2019).

16. Paul R. Josephson, *New Atlantis Revisited: Akademgorodok, the Siberian City of Science* (Princeton, 1997). A similar dynamic developed in "science towns" outside Moscow, see Maria A. Rogacheva, *The Private World of Soviet Scientists from Stalin to Gorbachev* (Cambridge, Eng., 2017).

17. Smith, *Moscow 1956*, esp. 108–38, 169–96; Alexander Etkind, *Warped Mourning: Stories of the Undead in the Land of the Unburied* (Stanford, 2013), 102–9; and V. Kulakov, "Lianozovo (Istoriia odnoi poeticheskoi gruppy)," *Voprosy literatury*, no. 3 (March 1991): 11–34.

with a concentration of previously stigmatized and excluded cultural figures: their re-inclusion would become a key preoccupation of the almanac, enacted in its editing practices as well as the final text. Tarusa had also long been a refuge and retreat from the city, and from the pressures of official Soviet culture for metropolitan writers and artists. *Pages* was no parochial project: it arose out of migration and pilgrimage between metropole and provinces, and out of the distinctive sociability shaped by Tarusa's position on the outer limit of dacha territory and the inner edge of the 100-kilometre exclusion zone around Moscow. While the "101st kilometer" is usually associated with social, cultural, and spatial exclusion, Tarusa produced a Soviet publication that expressed an *inclusive* view of Soviet culture, inspired by local practices and styles of community-building and socializing.¹⁸ While the text itself was ephemeral, its networks and agendas had complex afterlives in Soviet and unofficial literature.

Tarusa's Traditions

Although published in Kaluga and later punished in Moscow, *Pages* was most fundamentally shaped by the cultural and social traditions of Tarusa. Tarusa is a small town with a rich history dating back to the thirteenth century, picturesquely located on the river Oka in Kaluga oblast, 137 kilometers southwest of Moscow.¹⁹ Superficially, there was little to distinguish it from countless other small towns that fell just outside the orbit of the Soviet capital.²⁰ Indeed, the provincial origins of *Pages* are often explained merely as a strategy to bypass more stringent censorship at the Soviet center.²¹ Natal'ia Ivanova ascribes more importance to place, but posits Tarusa as typically provincial, rather than playing a unique role.²² In fact, Tarusa's long-standing status as a retreat for metropolitan writers, and also as a refuge for stigmatized Soviet citizens, was crucially important to *Pages*' ethos and editing.

On the one hand, Tarusa was on the outer edge of dacha territory, necessitating a tortuous journey from Moscow, rewarded on arrival with a sense of remoteness, unspoiled nature, and traditional lifestyles.²³ These attractions, and the complex patterns of habitation and visitation that they inspired, rendered it comparable with European nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century artistic colonies: indeed, it was known as the "Russian Barbizon"

18. Al'bert Baiburin, *Sovetskii passport: Istorii, struktura, praktiki* (St. Petersburg, 2017), 136–50, see n28.

19. N. N. Gostunskii, *Tarusa: Drevnii gorod na Oke* (Moscow, 1965); Tat'iana Mel'nikova, *Tarusa—101-yi kilometr* (Moscow, 2007); and E. M. Loginova and N.S. Smirnova, *Kniga o Taruse: Ocherki, vospominaniia* (Moscow, 2009).

20. On provincial homogenization (and diversification), see Anne Lounsbury, *Life Is Elsewhere: Symbolic Geography in the Russian Provinces, 1800–1917* (Ithaca, 2019); and Edith W. Clowes, Gisela Erbslöh, and Ani Kokobobo, *Russia's Regional Identities: The Power of the Provinces* (Abingdon, Oxon, Eng., 2018).

21. Zubok, *Zhivago's Children*, 199.

22. Ivanova, "Skrepliaia porvannuiu tsep'."

23. On dacha territory, see Stephen Lovell, *Summerfolk: A History of the Dacha, 1710–2000* (Ithaca, 2003).

even before *Pages* came out.²⁴ A few enterprising writers and artists had been inspired to buy summer estates and homes in Tarusa from the late nineteenth century onwards—amongst them, Ivan Tsvetaev (father to the Tsvetaeva sisters), and the painter Vasilii Polenov.²⁵ They, together with resident artists, drew more cultural figures, including the painter Borisov-Musatov, who lived and painted at the Tsvetaev house in 1905, to summer there or reside year round.²⁶

On the other hand, Tarusa was close to the “100-kilometer ring” around Moscow, within which various categories of formerly repressed citizens were not allowed to settle.²⁷ In the 1920s, which pre-dated these passport zones, Tarusa was already considered a key 101st-kilometer town: the Polenov household, amongst others, took in exiles in this period.²⁸ After the legislation was codified in the early 1930s, larger numbers of returnees from the Gulag and forced exile made their way there, to live during the lengthy (or endless) limbo between release and rehabilitation. Some settled, while others lived there temporarily—often in friends’ spare rooms—as they awaited metropolitan residency. Even after securing it, many visited Tarusa, especially during summer.

These generations of *dachniki* and “101st kilometer-ers” (*stoperviki*) shaped distinctive forms of sociability and cultural collaboration that would later influence the almanac. The pre-revolutionary intelligentsia dacha and estate traditions of Tarusa, like those of suburban and exurban estates such as Abramtsevo, celebrated the cross-fertilization and informal performance of poetry, theatre, art, and music. Participants of gatherings in Polenovo, for example, were encouraged to be eclectic, experimenting beyond the art-form of their expertise; Polenov’s “house of the people,” opened in 1915, offered more publicly accessible versions of these evenings.²⁹ The artist and writer

24. Konstantin Paustovskii, “Pis’mo iz Tarusy,” *Pravda*, June 26, 1956; Nina Lübbren, *Rural Artists’ Colonies in Europe, 1870–1910* (Manchester, 2001); Michael Jacobs, *The Good and Simple Life: Artist Colonies in Europe and America* (Oxford, 1985).

25. Loginova, *Kniga o Taruse*, 204–13; and Lidiia Aniskovich, *Krai buziny i krai riabiny: Tsvetaevy v Taruse* (Moscow, 2004).

26. Gostunskii, *Tarusa*, 214–47; Aniskovich, *Krai buziny*; and Loginova, *Kniga o Taruse*, 113–30.

27. Baiburin, *Sovetskii passport*, 36–50; Nathalie Moine, “Le système des passeports à l’époque stalinienne. De la purge des grandes villes au morcellement du territoire, 1932–1953,” *Revue d’histoire moderne contemporaine*, 50:1 (January–March 2003): 145–69; and Gijs Kessler, “The Passport System and State Control over Population Flows in the Soviet Union, 1932–1940,” *Cahiers du monde russe*, 42, no. 2/4 (April–December 2001): 477–503. On Tarusa, see Mel’nikova, *Tarusa—101-yi kilometr*. On other “101st kilometer” communities: Baiburin, *Sovetskii pasport*, 144–50; Elena Zubkova and T. Iu. Zhukova, *Na “krai” sovetskogo obshchestva: Sotsial’nye marginaly kak ob’ekt gosudarstvennoi politiki, 1945–1960-e gg.* (Moscow, 2010), 25–28, 676–67; N. Muan, “Vnutrisoiuznye granitsy grazhdanstvennosti: Territorial’noe vyrazhenie diskriminatsii v Sovetskom Soiuze cherez pasportnuiu sistemu,” in T.S. Kondrat’eva and A.K. Sokolov eds., *Rezhimnye liudi v SSSR* (Moscow, 2009), esp. 263–64; and Vladimir A. Kozlov, *Mass Uprisings in the USSR: Protest and Rebellion in the Post-Stalin Years*, ed. and trans. Elaine McClarnand MacKinnon (London, 2015), 193–214.

28. Mel’nikova, *Tarusa—101-yi kilometr*, 71–91.

29. *Ibid.*, 34–44; Gostunskii, *Tarusa*, 214–21.

community in Tarusa also depended on open hospitality: a small number of key dachas and estates passed repeatedly between several prominent pre-revolutionary artistic families, accumulating dense cultural traditions within a small number of homes.³⁰ The help offered to stigmatized cultural figures drew on similar traditions. Before the end of the Stalin era, certain homes in Tarusa were unofficially renowned as both refuges and as cultural hubs. For example, after settling in Tarusa in 1946, the returnee doctor Mikhail Melent'ev hosted a stream of people denied metropolitan residency, and also a rich program of musical, literary, and artistic evenings, frequented by offspring of major pre-revolutionary cultural figures.³¹

These traditions of cultural cross-fertilization and sociability were thus already established before the end of the Stalin era; so too was the mixture of resident, semi-resident, and visiting artists and writers, which would make the “Tarusian” identity of *Pages* so complex. Visiting around 1956, the filmmaker Andrei Tarkovskii and Aleksandr Gordon observed that: “Tarusa is a little town of writers, poets and artists. Some have bought a house and live here year-round, others come only for the summer, and a third group are forced to live constantly in rented apartments, because they’re not allowed into Moscow, because of the law of the 101st kilometer.”³² The interaction of these groups was not unique to Tarusa: it was also a defining feature of metropolitan kompanii.³³ Nonetheless, the intimacy and density of the “little town” intensified its effects: Alexander Etkind even claims that “overcrowded with returnees, this picturesque town became the intellectual and poetic center of the Thaw.”³⁴

Much of this “overcrowding” was down to the hospitality of a small number of hosts: notably “Aunt Polia” (Pelageia Stepina) and Zoia Tsvetkova, who took in Nadezhda Mandel'shtam and members of the Tvsetaev family, amongst others.³⁵ The most famous refuge was the house of Nikolai Otten and Elena Golysheva on Tarusa's central street, completed in 1958. Otten,

30. Gostunskii, *Tarusa*, 214–47; Aniskovich, *Krai buziny*, 1–100; and Loginova, *Kniga o Taruse*, 204–13.

31. Mikhail Melent'ev, *Moi chas i moe vremia: Kniga vospominanii* (St. Petersburg, 2001); Loginova, *Kniga o Taruse*, 190–93; Mel'nikova, *Tarusa—101-yi kilometr*, 106–20; and Sergei Mikheenkov, *Taman' na Oke: Pisateli i Tarusa* (Kaluga, 2005), 41–45. Melent'ev was the great-grandfather of Maksim Osipov, a contemporary chronicler of the 101st kilometre, see Maksim Osipov, *101-i kilometr: Ocherki iz provintsial'noi zhizni* (St. Petersburg, 2019).

32. Aleksandr Gordon, *Ne utolivshii zhazhdy: Aleksandr Gordon ob Andree Tarkovskom* (Moscow, 2007), 74–75.

33. Liudmila Alexeyeva and Paul Goldberg, *The Thaw Generation: Coming of Age in the Post-Stalin Era* (Boston, 1990), 83.

34. Etkind, *Warped Mourning*, 102. On the 1950s “rebirth,” linked to returnees, see Galina Manevich, *Tsvet proshedshogo vremeni* (Moscow, 2010), 199–200; Iosif Manevich, *Za ekranom: Razoznennye listki zapisannykh naspekh razdumii nad proshlym* (Moscow, 2006), 334–38; Galina Kornilova, “V Taruse,” *Mir Paustovskogo*, 28 (2010): 126–27; Irina Al'patova, ed., *Drugoe iskusstvo: Moskva, 1956–1988* (Moscow, 2005), 15, 77.

35. Mel'nikova, *Tarusa—101-yi kilometr*, 353–70; Nikolai Panchenko, “Taruskie Matreny,” *Mir Paustovskogo*, 13 (1998): 117–18; Loginova, *Kniga o Taruse*, 204–18; Inna Shul'zhenko, “Pelagein dvor. Istoriia Tarusskoi zhenshchiny, spasavshei intelligentsiiu v 1950–1970kh.,” *Snob.Ru*, December 31, 2019 at snob.ru/entry/186523/ (accessed November 18, 2021).

an erstwhile victim of the anti-cosmopolitanism campaign and his second wife, a distinguished Anglo-Russian translator, lived in one half, while other relatives, including Golysheva's son by her first marriage, lived in the other.³⁶ Both halves frequently took in returnees (including Nadezhda Mandel'shtam, Ariadna Efron, and Aleksandr Gladkov), and artists and writers needing a room for the summer (such as Boris Balter and Frida Vigdorova), who would all feature in *Pages*.³⁷ Even before the 1960s, this "wide open" household was renowned for literary and artistic discussion.³⁸

As well as these semi-resident returnees, some former prisoners and exiles actively sought to settle there: most importantly for *Pages*, Arkadii Shteinberg. This painter-poet had grown up in Tarusa and owned a house there in the 1930s before his arrest; after a protracted legal dispute on his return from the Gulag, Shteinberg abandoned attempts to take back his former house, and bought a different one in the town center, where his old camp friend, the painter Boris Sveshnikov, lived with him for several years.³⁹ Like the Otten-Golysheva household, the "highly sociable" pair regularly hosted cultural gatherings from the mid-1950s onwards.⁴⁰ These focused on literature and painting, the twin poles of Shteinberg's own career, but also extended across the broad interests of the "great dilettante" host.⁴¹ Discussions did not avoid the camps or Stalinism, but nor—unlike some *zek* socializing—were they dominated by them.⁴² Even before publication of *Pages*, in which Shteinberg's household would play a key role, it was noted as a site where "two generations of Russian culture intersected: the past, miraculously preserved, and the new-modern, starting to emerge."⁴³

Several other returnees from the Gulag and exile were active within Tarusa's social scene by the late 1950s, and would later participate in *Pages*. They included Nadezhda Mandel'shtam, who had moved in 1958 to live in Tarusa (firstly with the Ottens) and regularly attended domestic gatherings,

36. Georgii Kizeval'ter, "Tarusa. V epitsentre iskusstva," in Georgii Kizeval'ter, ed., *Vremia nadezhd, vremia illiuzii: Problemy istorii sovetskogo neofitsial'nogo iskusstva: 1950–1960 gody: stat'i i materialy* (Moscow, 2018); Zoia Vinogradova, "Izvestnyi perevodchik v Taruse kak doma," *Vest' News* (Kaluga, August 16, 2012) at m.vest-news.ru/article/24402 (accessed November 22, 2021); Loginova, *Kniga o Taruse*, 176–84; and Mel'nikova, *Tarusa—101-yi kilometr*, 297–330.

37. Ibid.; Pavel Nerler, "Nadezhda Iakovlevna i 'Nadezhda Iakovleva' v Taruse. Vokrug 'Tarusskikh stranits,'" *Inform Prostranstvo*, no. 186, 2014 at www.informprostranstvo.ru/N186_2014/pavelnerler.html (accessed November 19, 2021); and Frida Vigdorova, *Frida Vigdorova: Pravo zapisyvat'* (Moscow, 2017), 152–78, 384–409.

38. Loginova, *Kniga o Taruse*, 180; Galina Manevich, *Opyt blagodarenii: Vospominaniia* (Moscow, 2009), 92–93; I. Manevich, *Za ekranom*, 334–38; and Stanislav Rassadin, *Kniga proshchaniia: Vospominaniia o druz'iax i ne tol'ko o nikh* (Moscow, 2004), 82.

39. Arkadii Shteinberg, *K verkhov'iam: Sobranie stikhov. O Shteinberge* (Moscow, 1997), 293, 352–68; Al'patova, "Drugoe iskusstvo," 15; and Loginova, *Kniga o Taruse*, 113–30, 253–93. On Sveshnikov's Gulag art, see Etkind, *Warped Mourning*, 89–106.

40. Loginova, *Kniga o Taruse*, 122.

41. Ibid., 277; Kornilova, "V Taruse."

42. Loginova, *Kniga o Taruse*, 274–93. On urban *zek* networks: Stephen F. Cohen, *The Victims Return: Survivors of the Gulag after Stalin* (London, 2012), 74; and Nanci Adler, *The Gulag Survivor: Beyond the Soviet System* (New Brunswick, 2012), esp. 68, 134–35.

43. Al'patova, *Drugoe iskusstvo*, 261–62.

delivering verdicts on literary works and performing drafts of her memoirs.⁴⁴ Ariadna Efron had also returned to live in Tarusa in the mid-1950s, though was less sociable.⁴⁵ The formerly repressed poet, Nikolai Zabolotskii, permitted to live in Moscow from the early 1950s, nonetheless spent the last two summers of his life in Tarusa, encouraged by his friend, Nikolai Stepanov.⁴⁶

Meanwhile, for those not directly affected by these reforms, there were also compelling reasons to congregate in Tarusa. In seeking to understand these patterns of migration, the Barbizon comparison is again instructive: in European and North American artistic colonies, resident older artists, such as Gustave Corot in Barbizon, played a key role in attracting “disciples” (often, but not always students) for summer creative work and socializing, if not permanent residency.⁴⁷ In post-Stalinist Tarusa, the principal elder “magnet figure” was Konstantin Paustovskii. A beloved mentor to many post-war Moscow literature students, he had taken up residence in Tarusa in 1955, lured by the descriptions of colleagues (including Otten), and by health concerns.⁴⁸

Soon after moving to Tarusa, Paustovskii started to draw national attention to the locale’s natural beauty and cultural traditions, but also its economic neglect, anticipating his framing of *Pages*. By this time, he was also renowned for his editorship of the controversial *Literaturnaia Moskva* almanac, and his Moscow Writers’ Union speech in defense of Dudintsev’s *Not by Bread Alone*. He was thus a key figure connecting the early Thaw in the capital and the provinces. By the late 1950s, his centrally located house was a place of pilgrimage for former students trying to establish themselves as Soviet writers, such as Balter, as well as for returnee authors, including Zabolotskii and Gladkov.⁴⁹ It hosted frequent writers’ gatherings, often centered on poetry reading.⁵⁰

Tarusa thus emerged (or re-emerged) in the early post-Stalin era as a kind of artists’ and writers’ colony comprising visitors, residents and semi-residents, bound loosely by love of nature, literature and art, and by a flexible sociability facilitated by the proximity of small-town life.⁵¹ Unsurprisingly given its

44. Nerler, “Nadezhda Iakovlevna”; Nikolai Panchenko, “Kakoi svobodoi my raspolagali,” in Nadezhda Mandel’shtam, *Vospominaniia* (Moscow, 1999).

45. Aleksandr Gladkov, *Ne tak davno* (Moscow, 2006), 552–62; Aniskovich, *Krai buziny*, 176–85; and Loginova, *Kniga o Taruse*, 204–13. Anastasia Tsvetaeva, Efron’s aunt, also regularly visited from the late 1950s.

46. Nikita Zabolotskii, *The Life of Zabolotsky*, ed. and trans. R.R. Milner-Gulland (Cardiff, 1994), 226–330; and Mikheenkov, *Taman’ na Oke*, 19–36.

47. Lübbren, *Rural Artists’ Colonies*; and Jacobs, *The Good and Simple Life*.

48. Loginova, *Kniga o Taruse*, 170–73; L. P. Kremontsov, K.G. Paustovskii: *Materialy i soobshcheniia: Sbornik* (Moscow, 1996), 163–70; Nikolai Otten, “Ona byla shchedra, gostepriimna, bezuderzhna v postupkakh (Iz knigi o K.G. Paustovskom. Vospominaniia o T.A. Evteevoi)” *Mir Paustovskogo* at web.archive.org/web/20140417232808/http://magazine.mirpaustovskogo.ru/mp-15/03-11.htm (accessed November 19, 2021); and I. Manevich, *Za ekranom*, 334–38.

49. Kremontsov, K. G. Paustovskii, 163–70; Gunchenko, “Ekho”; Gladkov, *Ne tak davno*, 552–62; S. Baimukhametov, “Kukish v karmane. Iosif Brodskii v Leninskom Znameni,” *Znamia*, 2, (2000); and Zoia Vinogradova, “Riadom s masterom,” *Mir Paustovskogo*, 29 (2011): 72–77.

50. *Ibid.*; and Vladimir Koblikov, “Naedine s osen’iu v Taruse,” *Mir Paustovskogo*, 11–12 (1998), 145–47.

51. Lübbren, *Rural Artists’ Colonies*; and Jacobs, *The Good and Simple Life*. On literary micro-communities, see Susan Cheever, *American Bloomsbury: Louisa May Alcott, Ralph*

long-standing status as a cultural dacha community, its social life resembled that of Peredelkino, Krasnaia Pakhra, Abramtsevo or Koktebel'.⁵² Stephen Lovell argues that post-Stalinist intelligentsia dacha life often modelled itself on the "intensive informal interaction and intellectual association" and "intelligentsia counter-model of country life" of pre-revolutionary dachas and estates, and Tarusa certainly had a wealth of such traditions.⁵³ Even before the death of Stalin, however, marginalized figures without a home of their own (let alone a second residence) were a familiar presence too.⁵⁴ The ways in which they were (re)integrated into the local community would shape the cohort and ethos of *Pages*.

The frequent social and cultural exchange between these populations was epitomized by the shifting membership of the three key salons of Shteinberg, Otten, and Paustovskii. While Shteinberg and Paustovskii were viewed as mentors, even as charismatic leaders of their *kruzhki*, Otten and Golysheva saw themselves more as facilitators of discussion.⁵⁵ All three households, though, fostered eclectic literary and artistic interests, and all functioned partly as forums to discuss unpublished works. Thus the kompanii of this provincial town, like their metropolitan counterparts, were cultural and social experiments.⁵⁶ Their key ingredients were a sense of informality and privacy, shared love of literature and art, and intermingling of returnees with emergent and established cultural figures. Such gatherings are often viewed as laboratories of samizdat and dissidence in the Soviet Union and the socialist bloc.⁵⁷ However, unlike the burgeoning samizdat focus of many city kompanii and of other *Podmoskov'e* communities such as Lianozovo, Tarusa's salons coalesced around a major *Soviet* publication, which reimagined Soviet literature and literary community.

The Creation of *Pages*

As a much-mythologized publication, *Pages* has several origin stories.⁵⁸ What unites them is informal socializing: Paustovskii's conversations at a Yalta writers' retreat in the late 1950s and/or his discussions in Tarusa in 1960 with local writers and editors Vladimir Koblikov, Nikolai Panchenko, and Roman

Waldo Emerson, Margaret Fuller, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and Henry David Thoreau: *Their Lives, Their Loves, Their Work* (New York, 2006); and Kenneth R. Andrews, *Nook Farm: Mark Twain's Hartford Circle* (Cambridge, Mass., 1950).

52. Vladimir Karpov, *Zhili-byli pisateli v Peredelkino: Ochen' lichnye vospominaniia* (Moscow, 2002); Shilov, *Pasternakovskoe Peredelkino*; Aleksandr Ganulich, *Vzlet i padenie "Sovetskogo pisatel'ia"* (Moscow, 2013); Jacobs, *The Good and Simple Life*; and Barbara Walker, *Maximilian Voloshin and the Russian Literary Circle: Culture and Survival in Revolutionary Times* (Bloomington, 2005).

53. Lovell, *Summerfolk*, 51, 186.

54. Dacha territory and the 101st kilometer could overlap: *Ibid.*, 146.

55. Kornilova, "V Taruse"; and Manevich, *Opyt blagodareniiia*, 95, 104.

56. Fürst, "Friends in Private."

57. Alexeyeva, *Thaw Generation*, 83–100; Jonathan Bolton, *Worlds of Dissent: Charter 77, the Plastic People of the Universe, and Czech Culture under Communism* (Cambridge, Mass., 2012), esp. 93–110, 200–20; and Etkind, *Warped Mourning*, 102–09. However, some have been conceptualized as "outside" Soviet ideology: see Alexei Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever, until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation* (Princeton, 2006), 126–59.

58. Kizeval'ter, "Tarusa."

Levita.⁵⁹ However, official institutions abetted publication too: the Kaluga oblast publishing house supported *Pages*, partly because its most controversial elements remained concealed until late in the process, but also because it saw it as an opportunity to rebut accusations of parochialism and provincial stagnation.

The Kaluga oblast publishing house was relatively new at the time that it published *Pages*, and the scandal effectively ended its operations as a stand-alone entity. Created in 1958, it was intended to promote the work of local writers on local themes, such as the oblast's industrial and agricultural progress, and local history.⁶⁰ However, delays in the thematic plan's fulfilment, linked to editorial inexperience and the lack of a local Writers' Union, meant that the first few years' output was dominated by outside assignments (*zakaznaia literatura*).⁶¹ Nonetheless, *Pages* was not its first almanac; the debut literary collection, *Literaturnaia Kaluga*, came out in the first year of the publishing house's existence.⁶² It provided the chief editor, Roman Levita, and writer-editors Vladimir Koblikov and Nikolai Panchenko, with experience in identifying and collating local literary talent that they later drew on for *Pages*. It also attracted criticism, however, for detachment from important issues of the day, a charge much amplified for their next almanac.⁶³ By the start of the 1960s, the publisher had also forged links with local historians, such as Ivan Bodrov, who would later participate in *Pages*.⁶⁴

Progress remained so slow, however, that by the early 1960s, the director, A. Sladkov, was terming it a "depression that we are suffering."⁶⁵ There were economic incentives to seek a cure; the publishers were under pressure to address poor sales and increase profitability.⁶⁶ Artistic literature represented a barely tapped resource, while local history already had an enthusiastic readership; moreover, a 1959 Central Committee resolution had urged Soviet publishers to produce more high-quality almanacs.⁶⁷ There was thus a captive audience for a distinguished collection of local literature and history, which was exactly how *Pages* was touted to the publisher.

Pages first appeared in local party and state decision-making in February 1961, when the Tarusa *raikom* asked the Kaluga publisher to approve a proposal from a "group of writers living in our town" to publish "a literary-artistic collection entitled *Tarusa*" under the editorship of Nikolai Otten (Paustovskii

59. Svirski, *A History of Post-war Soviet Writing*, 160; Bykov, *Bulat Okudzhava*, 382–83; Kornilova, "V Taruse"; Galina Kornilova, "Grazhdanin Paustovskii," *Znamia*, 5 (2017); and Kornilova, "Tarusskie stranitsy."

60. Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv dokumentov noveishei istorii Kaluzhskoi oblasti (henceforth GADNIKO), fond (f.) 6630, opis' (op.) 1, delo (d.) 3, list (ll.) 1–3, 33.

61. *Ibid.*

62. GADNIKO f. 6630, op. 1, d. 1, ll. 61–68.

63. GADNIKO, f. 6630, op. 1, d. 1, ll. 51, 61–72; GADNIKO f. 6630, op. 1, d. 2, ll. 1–7.

64. Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Kaluzhskoi oblasti (henceforth GAKO), f. R-3478, op.1, d. 14, ll. 116–17.

65. GADNIKO, f. 6630, op. 1, d. 3, l. 33.

66. GADNIKO, f. 6630, op. 1, d. 33, l. 1; and Mil'shtein, "Kaluzhskii intsident."

67. *Voprosy ideologicheskoi raboty: Sbornik vazhneishikh reshenii KPSS, 1954–1961 gody* (Moscow, 1961), 289–91.

featured prominently, but as contributing author, not co-editor).⁶⁸ The collection sought “to unite the works of writers living in Tarusa, linked to it, and also writing about Tarusa,” establishing from the start its expansive definition of local belonging. Also present from the outset was a broad range of documentary, literary, and artistic genres. “Sketches and literary pieces on the theme of Tarusa today and tomorrow” stood firmly, and strategically, atop a list that also included short stories, “new poetry,” Tarusa-themed painting, and publications from archives in and about Tarusa.⁶⁹

While both these features survived into the final version, there was a greater divergence between the proposed and final cohorts of authors. The editors did admit that, though firm agreements had been drawn up with the majority of authors, “conversation is postponed with an insignificant number of them until the collection is approved and the deadlines for submission and publication are clarified.”⁷⁰ In fact, it cited several authors not featured in the final version (including Vladimir Tendriakov and Ariadna Efron), and also omitted some who would feature (notably, Nadezhda Mandel’shtam, Bulat Okudzhava, and Marina Tsvetaeva). Perhaps in anticipation of these changes, the proposal ended with a reminder that “it is natural that in the process of preparing the collection, changes could happen in the plan—cutting down, swaps, additions—without it changing the general character and fundamental make-up of the authors.”⁷¹

It is unclear whether the almanac was accepted in early 1961, but it only appeared in the thematic plan in June. That month, the regional publisher secured permission from the RSFSR (Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic) publishing authority (Glavizdat) to make a late change, proposing a collection now entitled *Pages from Tarusa*, in place of a planned edition of Mark Twain stories that had not materialized in time.⁷² The collection promised to fulfil the literary aspirations of the publisher and its “commercial goals,” when performance on both indicators was dismal.⁷³ Assigned a substantial print-run of 75,000, it was described as a “compil[ation] of first publications of new works of famous Soviet writers, linked to our oblast. . . first publication of new tales, stories, poetry and *poemy*,” together with sketches about agricultural heroes and newly discovered pre-revolutionary art-works.⁷⁴ All of the writers named here did appear in the final version; curiously, the only one listed as rehabilitated was Zabolotskii, though the proposal named several other returnees without specifying them as such. However, the proposal once again failed to mention Okudzhava, Mandel’shtam, or Tsvetaeva, and also omitted Shteinberg or Balter, who had appeared in the original proposal. Some of these omissions were probably deliberate.

The editing of the collection was concentrated in the period after glavizdat approval, and in the center of Tarusa. One contributor, Galina Kornilova,

68. GADNIKO, f. 32, op. 37, d. 34, ll. 2–5.

69. *Ibid.*, 1. 3.

70. *Ibid.*, 1. 3.

71. *Ibid.*, 1. 5.

72. GAKO, f. R-3478, op. 1, d. 30, ll. 38–39; GAKO, f. R-3478, op. 1, d. 31, d. 47.

73. GAKO, f. R-3478, op. 1, d. 31, l. 47.

74. *Ibid.*

claimed that “the very appearance of the almanac, the idea of creating it. . . is directly linked to that inimitable creative atmosphere that formed during those hot summer days in the little town on the Oka.”⁷⁵ The “direct link” between 1961 Tarusa and *Pages* is not specified here: there was a local “atmosphere” of creativity and collaboration, at once distinctive yet resistant to articulation. In fact, “the very appearance of the almanac” can be explained by patterns of writers’ migration and socializing in Tarusa, shaped by long-term traditions that peaked in the early 1960s, but also by a less tangible ethos that came to surround the publication.

Pages was rooted in the spatial and social center of Tarusa’s intelligentsia community. Its named editors were Paustovskii, along with Koblikov and Panchenko from the Kaluga publishers, and Tarusa’s other main hosts of intelligentsia gatherings, Otten and Shteinberg.⁷⁶ Although the publisher’s editor-in-chief, Roman Levita, assumed that Paustovskii would only play a decorative role as “compiler-editor,” he has been credited as the “soul” of the almanac, assembling (even “blessing”) its authorial collective.⁷⁷ Otten also carried out significant editorial work, however, as promised in the proposal.⁷⁸ Their two households, along with the Shteinberg residence, were the key sites where work on the publication proceeded.⁷⁹ Uncredited work deepened the connection to a tiny number of key Tarusa homes: editing and correction was also carried out by Otten’s wife, Elena Golysheva, their one-time lodger Nadezhda Mandel’shtam, Frida Vigdorova, and Ariadna Efron, by that time settled in her own Tarusa house.⁸⁰ The artistic design was by M. Borisova-Musatova, daughter of Tarusa’s famed pre-revolutionary artist.

While all the key editors of *Pages* were thus deeply connected to Tarusa, the links of the broader authorial collective to the town were less clear. Otten would later try to rebut charges of a national *fronde* by claiming the collection featured writers “on the periphery with which they’re tightly connected.”⁸¹ Most were indeed linked to the town, but there was also some truth in the CC’s later criticism that *Pages* contained “things written in Tarusa, and where the author had any kind of near or distant relationship with the geographical point.”⁸² These difficulties in categorizing authors’ relationships with the town derived, ultimately, from the locality’s flexible patterns of community formation and artistic collaboration.

Nevertheless, like the editorial board, the authorial collective did have Tarusians at its heart. All named editors contributed one or more literary or

75. Kornilova, “Oдно leto,” *Mir Paustovskogo*, 11–12 (1998): 23–24.

76. Manevich, *Opyt blagodarenii*, 207; and Bykov, *Bulat Okudzhava*, 383.

77. Tat’iana Mel’nikova, “Tarusa Ivana Bodrova,” *Mir Paustovskogo*, 28 (2010): 134–36; Bykov, *Bulat Okudzhava*, 383; and Kornilova, “Tarusskie stranitsy.”

78. Mil’shtein, “Kaluzhskii instident”; Baimukhametov, “Kukish v karmane”; and “Svetovoe piatno Tarusy.”

79. “Svetovoe piatno Tarusy”; Galina Kornilova, “Oдно leto”; and Dom muzei Mariny Tsvetaevy, “Vystavka ‘Vnutrenniaia Tarusa,’” Exhibition, 2019 at www.dommuseum.ru/vistaski/fondovyye-vyistavki/tarusa (accessed November 19, 2021).

80. “Svetovoe piatno Tarusy.”

81. Quoted in Mil’shtein, “Kaluzhskii instident.”

82. Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv noveishei istorii (henceforth RGANI), f. 18, op. 2, d. 383, ll. 74–77

historical works. Joining this core of Tarusa residents were works by and about erstwhile inhabitants (such as Tsvetaeva), by local historians (such as Ivan Bodrov), and by two daughters of Polenov.⁸³ Also featured in the almanac were seasonal renters who regularly visited Tarusa, such as Nikolai Zabolotskii, Iurii Kazakov, and Boris Balter.⁸⁴ Two of the main sketch-writers were former or current occupants of the Otten-Golysheva household: Mandel'shtam and Frida Vigdorova, the famous Soviet journalist who spent her first summer in Tarusa in 1961.⁸⁵ Meanwhile, the friendship and co-habitation of the returnee Aleksandr Gladkov with Nikolai Otten was hinted at in their jointly authored screenplay in *Pages*; Gladkov also produced a substantial sketch of Meyerhold.⁸⁶ Unacknowledged in the table of contents was Ariadna Efron's editorial work on her late mother's poetry, and Mandel'shtam's authorship of several sketches.⁸⁷ Thus, even contributors who lived in Tarusa had a variety of attachments to it, ranging from home ownership, to regular dacha residency to—the almanac's unspoken subtext—the improvised, semi-temporary housing arrangements of returnees and other marginalized figures.

Overlapping with this spectrum of residential affiliations were the short visits that many more writers made to Tarusa, especially in the intensive travel between Moscow and this corner of *Podmoskov'e* that characterized the summer of 1961. What unleashed this “flood” was Paustovskii's decision to solicit manuscripts in a non-prescriptive way, demanding only “talented” unpublished writing.⁸⁸ This represented a break from the “thematic plan” model of Soviet publishing, and reflected the greater freedoms of a one-off publication (which Paustovskii already knew from *Literaturnaia Moskva*). However, a certain logic still drove the expansion beyond Tarusa's resident and semi-resident writers: a combination of Paustovskii's “charismatic” editorship and patronage of talent from his own networks, and an expansion of this circle, as friends of friends vouched for authors' suitability to join the almanac's collective.⁸⁹

Paustovskii turned firstly to the loyal and strongly bonded cohorts of his students in Moscow's Gor'kii Literary institute, which generated offerings from writers such as Iurii Trifonov, Evgenii Vinokurov, Lev Krivenko, and Vladimir Kornilov. Other contributors such as Balter, Koblikov, Panchenko, and Kazakov were doubly connected to Paustovskii, via both the Literary

83. Mel'nikova, *Tarusa—101-i kilometr*, 42; and Gunchenko, “Ekho.”

84. Mikheenkov, *Taman' na Oke*, 19–36; Lazar' Lazarev, “Sudei mezhdū nami mozhēt byt' tol'ko vremia,” *Mir Paustovskogo*, 13 (1998): 104–13; and Rassadin, *Kniga proshchaniĭ*, 112–15.

85. Nerler, “Nadezhda Iakovlevna”; Panchenko, “Kakoi svobodoi”; and Vigdorova, *Frida Vigdorova*, 152–78, 384–409.

86. Gladkov, *Netakdavno*, 552–62; and El' dar Riazanov, *Nepodvedennye itogi* (Moscow, 1997), 139–41; Gladkov did most of the work on this screenplay, with little involvement from Otten, but it was of less interest to him than Meyerhold research, see Aleksandr Gladkov, “Dnevnik,” prozhitto.org/notes?date=%221960-01-01%22&diaries=%5B22%5D (accessed November 19, 2021).

87. Mel'nikova, *Tarusa—101yi kilometr*, 137.

88. Mil'shtein, “Kaluzhskii intsident.”

89. Matthew Philpotts, “The Role of the Periodical Editor: Literary Journals and Editorial Habitus,” *The Modern Language Review*, 107, no. 1 (January 2012): 39–64.

Institute and Tarusa socializing.⁹⁰ These authors had well-established bonds of trust with Paustovskii and so felt less trepidation submitting manuscripts to him than to Soviet publishers.⁹¹ Though Paustovskii left little testimony about *Pages*, this core of barely published former students suggests that patronage of new writers was a key element of his editorial vision.

The almanac, however, also recruited participants at one or more removes from Paustovskii's pupils. Bulat Okudzhava, for example, had been a Literary institute student too, but heard about *Pages* from Boris Balter, with whom he worked at *Literaturnaia gazeta*, and who read his story in manuscript. Over a drink in Moscow, he persuaded Okudzhava to participate in the plans for *Pages*, which he called a publication by a "group of enthusiasts."⁹² Okudzhava's long-term connections to Kaluga further smoothed the path to publication.⁹³ In turn, Okudzhava spread the word to colleagues, especially from his *Literaturnaia gazeta* networks, including Boris Slutskii and David Samoilov.⁹⁴ Vladimir Maksimov also did not feel as though he belonged in Paustovskii's inner circle: "he had his own disciples at the literary institute, in particular, Lev Krivenko. . .Boris Balter and Benedikt Sarnov," he would later recall, "those were the people from our generation with whom he was genuinely intimate." He therefore attributed his involvement in *Pages* to the fact that "[he] was taken to see him by people at *Literaturnaia gazeta*: Okudzhava, Korzhavin, and Stanislav Rassadin."⁹⁵ Having never been to Tarusa, he first visited after submitting the manuscript, and subsequently lived there for several periods in the 1960s. Thus, the authorial cohort was linked by varying attachments to Tarusa, and by intricate networks of friendship and patronage stretching well beyond those of the editors. Assurances that potential members were *svoi* (our people) were crucial to this cohort's formation, but it remained a less "tightly knit milieu" than many intelligentsia groupings based around this principle.⁹⁶

Natal'ia Ivanova terms this collective the "Tarusa fraternity (*sodruzhestvo*)," a union of individuals linked by "talent and moral choice," and deliberately (if subtly) contrasted to the Writers' Union itself.⁹⁷ Her observation, echoed in a 2019 Moscow exhibition about this "special fraternity of marginal, creatively gifted and independent-thinking people," invites investigation of the practices and (perhaps unspoken) beliefs that bonded this collective, and the extent of its differences from official Soviet practices.⁹⁸ Here, again, place-specific artistic and literary groupings offer instructive parallels, since they too were not linked by an artistic manifesto or style as much as

90. Kizeval'ter, "Tarusa"; Lazarev, "Sudei mezhdou nami"; and Koblikov, "Naedine sosen'iu."

91. Kornilova, "v Taruse"; and Kornilova, "Grazhdanin Paustovskii."

92. Bulat Okudzhava, "Vse eshche vpered," *Mir Paustovskogo*, 11–12 (1998): 21

93. *Ibid.*; Roman Levita, "Eto bylo v Kaluge," *Mir Paustovskogo*, 30 (2012): 122–23.

94. Bykov, *Bulat Okudzhava*, 384.

95. Glad, *Russian Writers Abroad*, 239–45.

96. Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever*, 137; such groups could, though, be "open-ended and somewhat shifting," Yurchak, 132.

97. Ivanova, "Skrepliia porvannuiu tsep'."

98. "Vnutrenniaia Tarusa."

by the ethos of their group interactions in their characteristic locale.⁹⁹ The Bloomsbury group, for example, was linked primarily by the neighborhood in which their social interactions took place, and by an ethos of individual self-expression and intellectual excellence (inflected by their class background).¹⁰⁰ The interactions within the “Tarusa fraternity,” though more ephemeral and less prolific, can be “read” in a similar way. The summer of *Pages*’ editing is especially illuminating: Iurii Kazakov, who preferred his dacha to the town center, nevertheless recalled fondly that “the time of the most interesting encounters in Tarusa was summer 1961. That was when *Pages* was being compiled and many people arrived. It was a happy time.”¹⁰¹ His remarks capture the intertwining of editorial work and community formation in this emotionally and socially intense period of work and play. They also raise the crucial question of how new arrivals found “routes to being insiders.”¹⁰²

Such “routes” were particularly visible to Okudzhava, as a newcomer unacquainted with most of the collective when he sent in his story.¹⁰³ Encouraged by Boris Balter, he embarked on the difficult journey to Tarusa and arrived feeling nervous at the prospect of meeting the legendary author (and now editor). Paustovskii was hospitable, however, warmly welcoming all guests including newcomers, and telling anecdotes. Even though he knew some attendees from Kaluga, Okudzhava remained “silent as a novice” during the dinner, drinking, and Paustovskii’s continued story-telling. Perhaps because he remained an observer, he was sensitive to “secret signals” in the gazes, intonation and gestures of those present, which lent the gathering a “special agitated quality,” a subtext of trepidation about the innovative and potentially dangerous collection being drafted. After leaving Paustovskii’s house at the end of an evening that had featured little work on the almanac, the same group of writers reconvened in a shed in a nearby courtyard. In this second part of the evening, Okudzhava finally found his voice: as the drinking continued, a guitar was produced and he sang songs, as Balter and Paustovskii raised toasts to the emerging collective of *Pages*. Still nervous of Paustovskii, one of few present who did not know the words of his songs, Okudzhava could not remember the content of the conversation in that shed. However, the “kind attitude” of Paustovskii, his hospitality and non-insistence on hierarchy, cemented their friendship. The sociability of this free-wheeling evening epitomized the “informal editing” of *Pages*.¹⁰⁴ Okudzhava’s sensitivity to the evening’s atmosphere and mood was no accident: his account, and many others, suggest that Paustovskii saw “his usual beloved atmosphere” of intimacy and authentic self-expression as a *sine qua non* of literary collaboration.¹⁰⁵

99. Lübbren, *Rural Artists’ Colonies*.

100. Raymond Williams, “The Bloomsbury Fraction,” in *Problems in Materialism and Culture: Selected Essays* (London, 1980), 148–70.

101. Iurii Kazakov, ‘Tarusokkala,’ *Mir Paustovskogo*, 11–12 (1998): 30.

102. Walker, *Maximilian Voloshin*, 107.

103. This account is based on Okudzhava, “Vse eshche vpered!”; and Bykov, *Bulat Okudzhava*, 382–417.

104. “Vnutrenniaia Tarusa.”

105. Vinogradova, “Riadam s masterom”; and “Vnutrenniaia Tarusa.”

While Okudzhava's first party served only to bond the authorial and editorial collective, other gatherings were dedicated to honing the almanac's content. Both, however, privileged the creation of an "atmosphere" conducive to sincerity (already a key Thaw value), informality and intimacy, even for newcomers.¹⁰⁶ Many of the almanac's draft contributions were read out to the audiences at informal gatherings, the summer weather enabling leisurely outdoor meals and discussions.¹⁰⁷ Galina Kornilova remembered constant poetry and prose readings at Paustovskii's house, where the host was surrounded by pupils, but it was "merely one young and happy company, where everyone was equal"; like Okudzhava, she was struck by the "nice atmosphere."¹⁰⁸ The Ottens hosted similar "editorial" gatherings. Deepening the crossover between work and "summer fun," and between relationships of professionalism and friendship, authors would also read out new works on nature walks and fishing trips.¹⁰⁹ Such performances were accompanied by other elements of oral culture, a key index of sincerity during the post-Stalinist crisis of Soviet language.¹¹⁰ As seen above, these included guitar poetry, already common at kompanii and symbolic of a quest for authenticity.¹¹¹ Conversations were at the heart of *Pages*' editing too: they concerned not just draft works, but also a range of other intellectual interests. Also important to the "feel" of these gatherings was the disregard of generational or social hierarchies.¹¹² The exchanges between Paustovskii and his young literary acolytes seemed to make him "feel younger."¹¹³ The frequent attendance of Nadezhda Mandel'shtam, Shteinberg, and Sveshnikov reinforced this sense of creative endeavor across generations, and without regard to past stigmas.¹¹⁴

Pages was thus an emotional community with its own emotional style, as well as an editorial collective. Barbara Rosenwein argues that "subordinate emotional communities, partake[e] in the larger one and revea[l] its possibilities and its limitations," while Benno Gammerl suggests that "diverging emotional patterns and practices prevail in distinct spatial settings."¹¹⁵ These

106. Kozlov and Gilburd, *The Thaw*, 3–84; and Kozlov, *The Readers of Novyi mir*, esp. 44–88.

107. Kornilova, "Oдно leto"; Kornilova, "V Taruse"; Okudzhava, "Vse eshche vperedі"; Vinogradova, "Izvestnyi perevodchik"; Gunchenko, "Ekho"; and Aniskovich, *Krai buziny*, 180.

108. Kornilova, "Oдно leto."

109. *Ibid.*

110. Kozlov and Gilburd, *The Thaw*, 49–53; and Gilburd, *To See Paris and Die*.

111. Vinogradova, "Riadam s masterom"; Martin Daughtry, "'Sonic Samizdat': Situating Unofficial Recording in the Post-Stalinist Soviet Union," *Poetics Today*, 30, no. 1 (Spring 2009), 27–65; and Rachel S. Platonov, *Singing the Self: Guitar Poetry, Community, and Identity in the Post-Stalin Period* (Evanston, IL, 2012)

112. Kornilova, "Oдно leto"; and Naum Korzhavin, "Golos Paustovovskogo," *Mir Paustovskogo*, 11–12 (1998): 24–26. On the "feel" of hippie culture, see Juliane Fürst, *Flowers through Concrete: Explorations in Soviet Hippieland* (Oxford, 2021), esp. Ch. 6.

113. Vinogradova, "Riadam s masterom."

114. Kornilova, "Oдно leto"; and Korzhavin, "Golos Paustovskogo."

115. Barbara H. Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (Ithaca, 2006), 32; Benno Gammerl, "Emotional Styles—Concepts and Challenges," *Rethinking History* 16, no. 2 (June 2012): 161–75 (164). These have been fruitfully applied to earlier Russian cultural circles (Walker, *Maximilian Voloshin*), and to later subcultures (Juliane

models capture well how the editing in this small town set itself apart from, but not in opposition to, Soviet norms: after all, it aimed to produce a Soviet publication, albeit one that would introduce or re-introduce many unfamiliar authors. However, its editing was grounded in domestic socializing, rather than in Soviet institutional or strictly professional settings. Its vision of Soviet literature was relatively non-prescriptive and inclusive, open to writers recommended by trusted colleagues, but subjecting their works to exacting, yet friendly, scrutiny. Such scrutiny, however, was considered a form of pleasure, even leisure, for both writer and editor(s); as such, it was easy for actual leisure pursuits to blend into editorial “work,” and vice versa. If these activities were clearly distinct from Soviet publication practices, there were more similarities with metropolitan kompanii. However, the proximity and beauty of nature, the more leisurely lifestyle of writers outside the city, and the concentration of marginalized figures on the 101st kilometer all contributed to a distinctive tenor of work and play in this locale. They also skewed the almanac, controversially, towards and even beyond the limits of the Soviet literary canon.

Canon and Continuity

The almanac’s emergence out of variegated though interlinked social networks predisposed it to eclecticism; so did its non-prescriptive editorial criteria. *Pages* exemplified tolerance and openness to “creative individuality,” a scandalous stance in a publishing world still supposedly united under a single literary doctrine.¹¹⁶ The editorial framing also downplayed the almanac’s strict cohesion, highlighting instead its “diversity” of authors and themes.¹¹⁷ The almanac had a correspondingly complex structure, verging on a lack of structure. It was considerably less neatly categorized than the genre divisions that structured *Literaturnaia Moskva*, or indeed the major Soviet thick journals. After several sketches by Paustovskii—a deliberate foregrounding of a prestigious figure—*Pages* swung repeatedly between groups of journalistic sketches, “new poetry,” and prose. The only section with a designated title—the concluding “publications” section—ranged even more widely. It encompassed local history, literary and cultural studies, biographical sketches, and more poetry by the late Zabolotskii and Tsvetaeva. The sole constant across all sections was pre-revolutionary art, most by or featuring Polenov and Borisov-Musatov. The only other illustrations were photos in the publications section (a non-canonical group comprising Tsvetaeva, Meyerhold, and Zabolotskii, alongside the more orthodox Iurii Krymov), and some hero-worker head-shots.

Nonetheless, significant clusters can be identified. The extensive prose and poetry about World War II was one of its most controversial features.¹¹⁸

Fürst, “Love, Peace and Rock ‘n Roll on Gorky Street: The “Emotional Style” of the Soviet Hippie Community,” *Contemporary European History* 23, no. 4 (November 2014): 565–87; and Fürst, *Flowers through Concrete*, esp. Ch. 6).

116. “Ot izdatel’stva,” *Tarusskie stranitsy* (1961; hereafter TS): 5.

117. *Ibid.*

118. Notably Okudzhava’s “Bud’ zdorov, shkoliar!” (TS, 50–75), about a fearful young soldier. The prose and poetry of Panchenko (137–41), Krivenko (158–63), Samoilov (203–7), and Korzhavin (131–37) were also dominated by war.

A smaller number of works subtly probed the mentalities and legacies of Stalinism.¹¹⁹ The cluster about rural life encompassed nature lyrics¹²⁰ and poems and short stories about the Virgin Lands and Soviet agriculture.¹²¹ There were also some startling works about Soviet youth¹²², as well as numerous journalistic, historical, literary, and artistic texts about Tarusa and its environs.¹²³

Another way to categorize the collection is by generation. *Pages* foregrounded primarily young and/or not established writers, and older or deceased figures until recently excluded from the canon.¹²⁴ This echoed the prominence of young writers and formerly repressed figures within the “Tarusa fraternity.” While many of the texts by young writers evoked generational distinction or even alienation, the reintroduction of long-excluded writers sought instead to reforge links with the past and reintegrate figures relegated to or beyond the Soviet margins. Moreover, the textual strategies for this re-inclusion, virtually neglected to date, reveal striking intersections with the almanac’s emotional style.

Paustovskii’s *Literaturnaia Moskva* had been notable for Il’ia Ehrenburg’s pioneering analysis of Marina Tsvetaeva.¹²⁵ While Tsvetaeva was again one of the key figures within *Pages*, so too were other figures silenced or repressed under Stalinism, notably Ivan Bunin, whose works Paustovskii was editing for future publication, and Vsevolod Meyerhold, repressed under Stalin. Paustovskii and other authors also sought to evoke the artistic achievements of writers on the edge of the canon, such as Aleksandr Blok and Nikolai Zabolotskii, the latter rehabilitated and back in print already in the 1950s but with many works unpublished at the time of his 1958 death. The sections on Tsvetaeva and Zabolotskii featured numerous poems, and biographical and autobiographical sketches, while other figures received only biographical portraits.¹²⁶ However, all relied on the rich depiction of personality, and on evocations of the figure’s personal, emotional impact on the writer.

Even the most apparently orthodox sketch—Vsevolod Ivanov’s brief portrait of Tsvetaeva—encouraged readers to understand the “identity of the highly gifted and original poet,” and to approach her poetry with “deep thought,” rather than the glib categorization of the preceding decades.¹²⁷ Gladkov’s longer and more intimate sketch of Meyerhold, his close friend, mentor, and abiding focus of his post-Gulag writing, encouraged sensitive

119. B. Balter, “Troie iz odnogo goroda”; Iu. Trifonov, “Odnazhdy dushnoi noch’iu”; poems by Boris Slutskii: TS, 87–120, 202–03, 210–13, respectively.

120. A. Shteinberg, “Bolkhovskoe,” his other poems, and much of the Tsvetaeva collection: TS, 45–49, 218–23, 252–61, respectively.

121. V. Kornilov, “Shofer”; Iu. Kazakov, “Tri rasskaza”: TS, 17–27, 76–86, respectively.

122. Besides Okudzhava and Balter, see V. Maksimov, “My obzhivaem zemliu,” TS, 223–35.

123. G. Kornilova, “Letnii dozhd’ s moria”; V. Koblikov, “Golubye slezy”: TS, 235–37, 238–42, respectively; “Publikatsii” (242–312).

124. Kornilova, “Tarusskie stranitsy.”

125. Svirski, *A History of post-War Soviet Literature*, 97–115.

126. The only repressed figure without such introduction was Shteinberg, but his poetry, uniquely, featured across two sections.

127. V. Ivanov, “Poeziia Mariny Tsvetaevoi,” TS, 251.

reappraisal of a long-stigmatized figure.¹²⁸ Taking the reader inside private spaces, and into his deep friendship and “trust” with Meyerhold, Gladkov’s testimony conveyed unimpeachable authenticity.¹²⁹ Meyerhold emerged vividly as a “unique” figure, a “rich and broad” personality who could not be “[broken] into small fragments”; this “unity” of character, the life-long determination to “remain himself,” was as great an achievement as his difficult pursuit of theatrical innovation.¹³⁰ Gladkov wanted readers to “fall in love” with Meyerhold, much as “his whole generation” had succumbed to the “force of his charm” in the 1920s and 1930s.¹³¹

Both these sketches of non-canonical figures appeared in the final, “publications” section, but Paustovskii’s literary sketches, extracted from the new volume of his *Golden Rose*, set the tone of intimate and emotional portraiture from the start.¹³² His sketch of Iurii Olesha (who had died the year before) identified the author’s sharp wit as his key character trait, through vivid anecdotes of their strolls around Odessa. His sketch of Bunin, a much more marginal author, recounted visits to places associated with him before his emigration. Paustovskii’s close connection with the *genius loci* reflected his repositioning of Bunin as a writer rooted in Russia (despite these later dislocations), and as a key link between contemporary culture and its preceding phases. Paustovskii approached Blok in a similar vein, as a quintessentially Russian artist, with whom he wished to “be friends,” to compensate for the “loss” of never having met.¹³³ This wistful desire for friendship emerged out of a deeply felt reaction to his “expressive” and “miraculous” art.¹³⁴ Of the almanac’s authors, Paustovskii was the most explicit about needing to forge the “tightest link” between the cultural legacy of the early twentieth century and the literary process of the present: “one cannot know the new Russia without knowing the old one,” he ended his Blok sketch.¹³⁵ Much like Ehrenburg, he could passionately advocate for such continuity with relatively little fear of reprisals.

Through reading about these personal connections to remarkable personalities, readers were encouraged to open their hearts *and* minds to figures on or beyond the periphery of Soviet literature, in a striking echo of Tarusa’s warmth towards “excluded” figures. However, a sense of irreparable loss shadowed these deeply personal portraits. The portrayal of Zabolotskii by his friend Stepanov and by the author himself covered the 1950s and his childhood respectively, with a yawning gap for his Gulag years.¹³⁶ By the time he tried to rebuild his literary career, Stepanov explained, Zabolotskii was struggling with health problems, his arrest having cut him off in his physical and creative prime. The

128. A. Gladkov, “Vospominaniia, zametki, zapisi o V. E. Meeirkhol’de,” TS, 292–306, see n87.

129. Gladkov, “Vospominaniia,” 294.

130. *Ibid.*, 297–300.

131. *Ibid.*, 298, 300.

132. K. Paustovskii, “Glavy iz vtoroi knigi ‘Zolotaia roza,’” TS, 28–44.

133. TS, 37–41.

134. *Ibid.*, 38.

135. *Ibid.*, 40.

136. N. Stepanov, “Pamiati N. A. Zabolotskogo,” TS, 307–08; and N. Zabolotskii, “Rannie gody,” TS, 312–17.

sad impossibility of rejuvenation was underscored by David Samoilov's poem dramatizing his 1957 meeting with the dying poet.¹³⁷ Meanwhile, Ivanov's introduction to Tvsetaeva mentioned the "hard and bitter life that she was fated to live," and Gladkov's sketch of Meyerhold contrasted the creative energy of the 1920s to "the objectively historic tragedy. . .that cost Meyerhold and others dearly" in the 1930s.¹³⁸ The fact that the latter author himself required reintroduction after the Gulag deepened the sense of sadness and loss.¹³⁹

Joy at reconnecting with the past, but also anxiety about historical and cultural rupture, similarly permeated the numerous evocations of Tarusa's pre-revolutionary past. The more celebratory, and conventionally Soviet sketches of local heroes were probably inserted to balance out, or camouflage, these historically and emotionally complex pieces. The sketches about Polenov and Borisov-Musatov evoked nostalgia for the town's pre-revolutionary intelligentsia community and creativity, but subtly suggested that the revolution had disrupted them.¹⁴⁰ Such writing helped to revitalize the town's past, as did the work of local historians and museums, described in several pieces.¹⁴¹ Like the subtle historical and biographical sketches of Vigdorova and Mandel'shtam, however, it mourned the fraying of local cultural traditions, even as it hoped for their restoration.¹⁴²

Overall, then, the almanac was not just an eclectic selection of texts shaped by the open sociability of Tarusa. Like the community that formed around it, it insistently proposed that Soviet literature should revive silenced voices and traditions, and allow new voices to speak. The strategies for (re)integrating these figures expressed the key values of literary excellence, tolerance and emotional expressiveness that had also permeated editorial and authorial interactions in Tarusa. However, this more inclusive vision of Soviet literature would prove fragile and ephemeral.

Afterlives

Like many of the best-known Thaw publications, *Pages* only just squeaked into print. Local censors claimed that they had been deceived, "rushed and pressured" by the publisher and *obkom* (oblast committee), lending further credence to the idea that some local leaders may have believed that the almanac could bring reputational benefits.¹⁴³ They were proved wrong soon after

137. D. Samoilov, "Zabolotskii v Taruse," TS, 203–04; and Samoilov, "Dnevnik (1957)" at <https://prozhitto.org/notes?date=%221957-01-01%22&diaries=%5B188%5D> (accessed November 22, 2021).

138. Ivanov, "Poeziia"; and Gladkov, "Vospominaniia," 300.

139. I. Il'inskii, "Neskol'ko slov," TS, 292.

140. E. Sakharova, "Narodnyi teatr i sem'ia V. D. Polenova"; O. Polenova, "Polenovskie risoval'nye vechera"; and M. Tikhomirova, "Novye materialy o zhizni i tvorchestva V. E. Borisova-Musatova": TS, 242–49, 249–51, and 261–66, respectively.

141. Including I. Bodrov, "Tarussskie kollektionery," TS, 266–68.

142. F. Vigdorova, "Nasha babka," "Glaza pustye i glaza volshebnye"; and N. Yakovleva, "Kukolki," TS, 13–14, 142–50, and 150–58, respectively.

143. GAKO, f. 3536, op. 1, d. 54, ll. 7–8; GAKO, f. 3536, op. 1, d. 49, l. 153, 161; Mil'shtein, "Kaluzhskii intsident"; S. Baimukhametov, "Okaiannye dni Paustovskogo," *Mir Paustovskogo*, 30 (2012): 123–24.

printing started in late October; the print-run was halted halfway through, after 30,000 copies, and texts withdrawn where not yet snatched up by readers.¹⁴⁴ Criticism and punishment of the almanac escalated, provoked by the initially mixed verdict in the local and central press and by the mild rebukes first issued to the culprits.¹⁴⁵ By late 1961, the Central Committee had issued its judgement via the Bureau for the RSFSR, deeming the almanac full of “political errors and slanderous assertions,” and most works “inadequate in terms of ideological and aesthetic quality”; the “excessive praise” for Tsvetaeva’s “decadent” and “depressing” poetry was singled out.¹⁴⁶ Although the “fraternity” tried to contest this verdict through collective petitions and attendance at the key Moscow meeting, there was no scope for debate.¹⁴⁷

In response to this escalating central criticism, the obkom imposed harsher punishments on those who had failed to perceive and police *Pages*’ transgressions. They first reprimanded editors Levita and Panchenko and the director Sladkov before sacking all three from the Kaluga publishing house; the chief regional censor who had approved publication also lost his job, while the *obllit* (regional censorship office) was brought under tighter ideological and procedural control by *Glavlit* (central censorship authority) in Moscow.¹⁴⁸ The main obkom culprits, secretary Surgakov and agitprop head Anan’ev, were issued stricter penalties than the original charges, though Surgakov later successfully appealed the severity of the reprimand.¹⁴⁹

Pages was therefore a startling, singular moment: it crystallized key aspirations of the Thaw, yet dashed those hopes almost instantly. Nonetheless, its reverberations can be traced in Tarusa and the capital, in official organizations and unofficial networks, and in both Soviet literature and samizdat. The least well known of these after-effects was on local literary and publishing institutions, which effectively became “provincialized,” after their brief flirtation with national prominence and metropolitan collaboration. This provincialization began not with the punishment of *Pages*, but with the failure to learn from it. Mere months after the scandal, and despite its supposedly more rigorous leadership, the publisher erred again with a collection of poetry entitled *Kaluga-Mars* by the local poet Maksim Kravchuk.¹⁵⁰ While less ambitious and more narrowly “local” than *Pages*, its “ideologically perverse” poems provoked the second national scandal in as many years for the fledgling publishing house.¹⁵¹ Punishment for this “serious error” was swift,

144. GAKO, f. 3536, op. 1, d. 49, l. 153.

145. An especially harsh verdict appeared in the local literary newspaper: N. Kucherovskii and N. Karpov, “Vo imia chego i dlia kogo,” *Znamia* (Kaluga), December 23, 1961. The newspaper’s editor eventually became director of the publisher.

146. RGANI, f. 18, op. 2, d. 383, ll. 68–77.

147. Mil’shtein, “Kaluzhskii intsident”; and Kornilova, “Oдно leto.”

148. GADNIKO, f. 55, op. 9, d. 1114, ll. 18–21; GAKO, f. R-3467, op. 1, d. 187, l. 187; GAKO, f. 3536, op. 1, d. 53, ll. 46–48.

149. GADNIKO f. 55, op. 9, d. 1121, l. 19.

150. Maksim Kravchuk, *Kaluga-Mars* (Kaluga, 1962); and GADNIKO, f. 6630, op. 1, d. 4, ll. 21–24, 27, 34, 42–45.

151. *Ibid.*, and GADNIKO, f. 6630, op. 1, d. 4, ll. 27–28; f. 6878, op. 1, d. 19, l.13; f. 6878, op. 1, d. 20, l. 19; f. 6878, op. 1, d. 89, ll. 1–6.

sacking Koblikov (who had actually been promoted, rather than punished, in 1962) and penalizing the new director Sorokin.¹⁵²

Most consequentially, the publishing house was subordinated to the Tula regional publisher. Throughout the 1960s and the 1970s, local Soviet writers were frustrated by the lowly status of the Kaluga “appendage” to the Tula organization, resulting in chronic delays to their manuscripts’ progress and strict quotas being imposed on texts from the region.¹⁵³ The Kaluga branch of the Writers’ Union, instituted in 1963 in a further attempt to prevent scandals, could do little to change this situation. It also failed to engage the most famous Tarusa writers, though Panchenko and Koblikov did participate; the *okbom* often criticized it as apathetic and unproductive.¹⁵⁴ By the late 1960s, some leading members, such as Nikolai Voronov, had become embroiled in literary scandals and departed to Moscow.¹⁵⁵ Thus the innovations and interchange between small-town and metropolitan literary worlds that *Pages* had produced did not continue through its publisher.

However, if we look beyond official institutions, which after all had played a minor role in *Pages*, the networks and agendas of the almanac appear more robust than its curtailed existence and somewhat ineffable ethos might suggest. For much of the 1960s, Gladkov, Efron, and Nadezhda Mandel’shtam continued their attempts to restore the reputations of Tsvetaeva, Meyerhold, and Osip Mandel’shtam.¹⁵⁶ Some poetry anthologies, memoirs, and commemorative initiatives resulted, though these patchy successes were dwindling by the mid-1960s.¹⁵⁷ This work prolonged the collaboration of *Pages*, deepened friendships between contributors, and strengthened unofficial ties between Tarusa and Moscow. Gladkov, the Ottens, and Mandel’shtam regularly shuttled between the two locales, often discussing rehabilitation strategies in *kompanii* with other authors and editors of *Pages*.¹⁵⁸

Meanwhile, in Tarusa itself, there was an intensification of the socializing that had characterized the “hot summer days” of 1961, which contrasted to the stagnating local Soviet literary scene. One artist who moved there in 1962, Eduard Plavinskii, noted that *Pages* was fueling pilgrimage to the town,

152. GADNIKO, f. 6630, op. 1, d. 4, ll. 19–20; f. 6878, op. 1, d. 20, l. 19; f. 6878, op. 1, d. 89, ll. 1–6.

153. GADNIKO, f. 6755, op. 1, d. 1, l. 56; f. 6755, op. 1, d. 3, ll. 24–25; f. 6755, op. 1, d. 5, ll. 68–74; f. 6755, op. 1, d. 6, l. 42; f. 55, op. 10, d. 375, l. 111.

154. GADNIKO, f. 6878, op. 1, d. 89, l. 24; f. 6879, op. 1, d. 177, ll. 57–61; f. 6849, op. 1, d. 177, ll. 57–61; f. 55, op. 10, d. 375, l. 111.

155. GADNIKO, f. 6755, op. 1, d. 5, l. 68; f. 6755, op. 1, d. 6, l. 35; f. 6755, op. 1, d. 7, l. 12; f. 6755, op. 1, d. 8, l. 52.

156. Gladkov’s diaries of the 1960s are dominated by such activity, often with Nadezhda Mandel’shtam, see “Aleksandr Konstantinovich Gladkov, 17 Marta 1912–11 Aprelia 1976,” *Prozhito* at prozhito.org/person/229 (accessed November 22, 2021).

157. *Ibid.*; Aniskovich, *Krai buziny*, 176–220; On Mandel’shtam’s and Tsvetaeva’s rediscovery, see Andrew Kahn, “Canonical Mandel’shtam,” in Katharine Hodgson, Joanne Shelton, and Alexandra Smith, eds., *Twentieth Century Russian Poetry: Reinventing the Canon*, (Cambridge, Eng., 2017), 157–200; and Alexandra Smith, “Marina Cvetaeva in the Artistic Imagination of Russian Poets, 1960s–1990s,” in Sibelan Forrester, ed., *A Companion to Marina Cvetaeva* (Leiden, Netherlands, 2017), 239–69.

158. “Aleksandr Konstantinovich Gladkov,” <https://prozhito.org/person/229>. Guests included Slutskii, Panchenko and Balter.

and also a distinctive style amongst visitors: “The fresh, sharp, intellectual material filling the pages attracted the young intelligentsia to it. The town was filled with crowds of poetesses, their hair loose and their gaze nostalgic, and with inspired and disheveled poets.”¹⁵⁹ These fans responded to *Pages* as “sharp, intellectual” stimulation and literary education, but also as ways to style themselves as readers and writers: more relaxed, even bohemian, but still fervently “inspired” by young and rediscovered poets alike. This combination of intellectual and emotional pleasure was also captured in a sketch of 1960s Tarusa in the first post-Soviet sequel to *Pages*, where the local beach was filled with groupings of writers, film-makers, and artists, producing an “emotional concentration” as intense as the editing process.¹⁶⁰ Thus the networks, migration patterns, and “emotional style” of *Pages* survived, and even thrived, after the crackdown. The almanac expressed both aesthetic agendas and a behavioral and emotional style, which together crystallized the *shestidesiatnik* mentality.¹⁶¹ This lent Tarusa a magnetic appeal for the intelligentsia in the years after publication.

The end of the Thaw, as it played out locally, was likewise linked both to concrete events and to a less tangible emotional shift. For Nikolai Panchenko, one of *Pages*’ editors, Nadezhda Mandel’shtam’s move to Moscow and her less frequent visits to Tarusa contributed to a “colder” atmosphere in Tarusa by the late 1960s.¹⁶² Paustovskii’s death in 1968, which reunited much of the *Pages* cohort for his Tarusa funeral, also provoked sadness at the fading of this erstwhile cultural “epicenter.”¹⁶³ Mandel’shtam’s and Paustovskii’s roles here were no accident; the collaboration of these two figures, one a privileged patron and the other officially marginalized but with abundant cultural capital, had epitomized the spirit of *Pages*. What was being mourned was the realization that the breadth of the “Tarusa fraternity,” and its stretching of the limits of Soviet culture, would be limited to the “short 1960s.”¹⁶⁴

While Tarusa remained an important dacha settlement for privileged authors and artists, the crossover between this community and more marginal figures diminished sharply in late socialism.¹⁶⁵ Indicative was the growing number of unofficial artists and dissidents taking refuge in the very homes that had housed figures hopeful of (re-)entering Soviet literature and culture during the Thaw. The Shteinberg house was now most notable for its contribution to Moscow unofficial art.¹⁶⁶ The Otten-Golsyheva household largely housed samizdat authors, and dissidents barred from metropolitan residency,

159. Loginova, *Kniga o Taruse*: 280.

160. “Svetovoe piatno Tarusy.”

161. On *shestidesiatniki*, see Kozlov and Gilburd, *The Thaw*, 53–59; and Bellezza, *Shore of Expectations*.

162. Panchenko, “Kakoi svobodoi.”

163. Manevich, *Opyt blagodareniiia*, 148–50. Manevich also claims that the town “felt spiritually empty” by the late 1960s (Manevich, *Tsvet proshedshego vremeni*, 198–214).

164. On the culture and chronology of the Soviet sixties, see Aleksandr Genis and Petr Vail, *’60-e. Mir sovetskogo cheloveka* (Ann Arbor, 1988); and Anne E. Gorsuch and Diane P. Koenker, *The Socialist Sixties: Crossing Borders in the Second World* (Bloomington, IN, 2013).

165. Gostunskii, *Tarusa*, 214–47; and Loginova, *Kniga o Taruse*, 193–98.

166. Al’patova, *Drugoe iskusstvo*, 15, 261–62; and Loginova, *Kniga o Taruse*, 274–93.

who often then settled and conducted covert national work from their small-town base.¹⁶⁷ Local literary discussion often revolved around samizdat, rather than intended Soviet publications, many by *Pages* authors: Nadezhda Mandel'shtam's memoirs, Vigdorova's transcript of the Siniavskii-Daniel trial, and works by Maksimov and Kornilov, who had now largely abandoned hope of Soviet publication.¹⁶⁸ Where the party had punished the editors and publishers (rather than the authors) of *Pages*, the KGB directly targeted samizdat writers and dissidents in the 1970s and 1980s, increasing their presence in the town tenfold.¹⁶⁹

In the Khrushchev era, Tarusa's national cultural significance revolved around its inter-generational "fraternity" of published writers. In late socialism, it was most (in)famous as "a center of dissidence."¹⁷⁰ *Pages* emerged out of Tarusa's post-Stalinist salons, which were bound by emotional affinity and shared cultural and literary interests, and crucially shaped by Tarusa's position astride dacha territory and the 101st kilometer. In the early 1960s, they generated a Soviet publication that challenged the limits of Soviet literature, before being relegated beyond them. In late socialism, Tarusa's most nationally significant activity steered clear of official institutions, honing new forms of publishing, community, and collective action beyond the legal frontiers of Sovietness.

167. Mel'nikova, *Tarusa—101-yi kilometr*, 233–430; Aleksandr Ginzburg, *Russkii roman* (Moscow, 2017); Anatolii Marchenko, *My zdes' zhivem: v 3-kh tomakh* (Moscow, 2018); and Vitalii Pomazov, *Na menia napravlen sumrak nochi* (Moscow, 2013).

168. Panchenko, "Kakoi svobodoi"; Glad, *Russian Writers Abroad*, 239–45; and Shteinberg, *K verkhov' iam*, 401–07.

169. Mel'nikova, *Tarusa—101-i kilometr*; "Svetovoe piatno"; and Baimukhametov, "Kukish v karmane."

170. Baimukhametov, "Okaiannye dni Paustovskogo."