

[講演]

Russian Émigrés in Poland and Dmitry Filosofov

Piotr Mitzner

In 1915, when Russians were forced to leave their western gubernias as a result of the German offensive, having earlier blown up the bridges on the Vistula river, no one expected that they would return to this place three years later as refugees. After the Bolsheviks' seizure of power in Russia, and before the Polish-Soviet border was drawn and sealed after the Riga peace treaty in 1921, whole waves of refugees were going west, many of them directly to Berlin, Paris, Belgrade, Prague or the USA. However, some of them stayed in Poland. At first, they hoped that from here the way back home would be shorter, or that it would be easier to attack and defeat the Bolshevik regime from here. In the beginning, these hopes rested on the person of Boris Savinkov, although he was not an easy ally: an ex-terrorist, a leader of the Fighting Organization of the Socialist Revolutionary Party (for which the monarchists could not forgive him), a sceptic, "a decadent on the tour of revolution" (as his party comrades believed), an ally of Piłsudski and Petlura in their war against the Bolsheviks, a supporter of the right to independence not only of Ukraine, but of all nations of the former empire, which did not gain him any support with the patriots of "the one and indivisible Russia". The problem of Savinkov and of the democratic, "third Russia"—neither Tsarist nor Bolshevik—was solved after the peace treaty with the Soviets was signed. The most influential of the émigrés were then forced to leave Poland. This was the condition for Russia to pay war reparations and return stolen works of art.

Savinkov left Warsaw together with Zinaida Gippus and Dmitry Merezhkovsky. They were furious with Piłsudski for making peace with the devil and for not chasing the Bolsheviks out of Russia. It was then that Dmitry Filosofov, a friend of the Merezhkovskys and Savinkov, returned to Warsaw (Piłsudski not only agreed to it, but most probably even asked for it).

Dmitri Vladimirovich Filosofov was born in St. Petersburg in 1872, in a noble family the roots of which can be traced to the tenth century. His father, Vladimir, was the general military prosecutor before he was "kicked upstairs" and became a member of the State Council. This was principally the result of the social activities of his wife, Anna Pavlovna (nee Diaghileva), who not only ran a literary parlour and corresponded with Turgenev and Dostoyevsky, not only organized the first higher education institution for women (the «Society for the Finance of Education Courses for Women»), but she was also in touch with members of

Narodnaya Volya and anarchists. On top of that, she was also a theosophist and the first feminist in Russia. Her son, even when he was a grown man, took his mother's counsel.

After leaving the prestigious Karl May School, he studied law in St. Petersburg and Heidelberg. Although he took his university education seriously, he started to be drawn more and more towards music, painting and theatre. On the one hand, under the influence of his school friends, distinguished artists *in spe*: Alexander Benois and Konstantin Somov, and on the other of his cousin, Sergius Diaghilev. It should be added that a journey to Venice in 1890 with Diaghilev was not only his initiation into the world of Italian art, but also to homoeroticism.

Eight years later Filosofov joined a group centred around Diaghilev, called "Mir Iskusstva" ["World of Art"], which published a periodical as well as books, and organized exhibitions. Its programme could be briefly described as being based on the cult of beauty and individual creativity, and the search for a "national style" specific for Russia. This was the most important phenomenon initiating the beginning of the Silver Age of Russian culture. The monthly "Mir Iskusstva", in which Filosofov (at that time a dandy in the manner of Oscar Wilde) was responsible for the literary column, was published till 1904, but it was as early as 1901 that Dmitry Vladimirovich started to be influenced by a slightly different circle, centred around a married couple of writers: Zinaida Gippius and Dmitry Merezhkovsky, apostles of a new Christian community, an alternative church, which was to transform the religious consciousness of Russia. He joined them to form *Troyebratstvo* (The Brotherhood of Three), also known as the "trio". Gippius, aware of Filosofov's sexuality, was in love with him and tried to move him away from Diaghilev, in which she eventually succeeded.

From 1901, the "trio" organized in St. Petersburg regular Religious-Philosophical Meetings, which three years later were banned by the Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church. Marian Zdziechowski, a Polish literary scholar and thinker, participated in them. Filosofov kept in touch with him till the end of his life.

The 1905 revolution was Filosofov's first political experience. After the massacre of the demonstrators in front of the Winter Palace, the Merezhkovskys and Filosofov organized a protest and stopped a performance in the Alexandrinsky theatre. The following events strengthened their objection to Tsarist rule, but also their fear of the revolutionary crowd. At the end of the year Filosofov quit his job in the Public Library and went with Gippius and Merezhkovsky to Paris, where they stayed for two years.

There they met with the modernist Catholics, with Henri Bergson and Anatol France, but most of all with Boris Savinkov—a repentant terrorist, whose literary ambitions they cherished, and whom they decided to convert into an angel.

Filosofov had a very complex nature, full of contradictions. Therefore, it is not surprising that some people thought that he had an iron will, while others, at the very same time, accused him of being too easily influenced: his mother thought that he had been possessed by Gippius, while she thought that he had been first subdued by the will of, at first Diaghilev, and then of Boris Savinkov.

After his return to Russia Filosofov published three volumes of his articles and essays: *Slowa i žizn'* [*Words and Life*] (1909), *Nieugasimaja lampada* [*Perennial Light*] (1912) and *Staroje i nowoje* [*The Old and the New*] (1912). As a literary critic and a journalist writing on religion he evoked contrasting opinions, perhaps because his judgments were controversial. On the one hand, he discovered new talents (he was the first one to appreciate Anton Chekhov as a playwright, against reluctant reviewers), and paved the way for the poetry of Alexander Blok). On the other hand, he was ruthless. In an article from 1907 entitled “Koniec Gorkogo” [“The End of Gorky”], he argued that politics had definitely killed an artist in Gorky. The issue of art was still important for Filosofov, and inseparable from a work of art’s metaphysical dimension.

According to him, the point of balance of Russian literature was located in Dostoyevsky, without whom one could not understand Russia, about which, its society and state structures, Filosofov was extremely critical.

After the Bolshevik revolution Filosofov gathered his mental resources, but by then it was too late for any public activities, open debates or editing independent periodicals. In December 1919, the “troika”, together with Merezhkovsky’s secretary, Vladimir Zlobin, ran away from St. Petersburg. They crossed the front line and finally (perhaps with a little help from British intelligence officers) arrived in Warsaw. Here, Merezhkovsky met with Józef Piłsudski and published his impressions of the meeting in a separate pamphlet. Savinkov also arrived in Warsaw, and from then on, he was in charge of organizing Russian forces fighting with Poles against the Bolsheviks. Filosofov directed the work of the Russian Political Committee, while Zinaida Gippius wrote for a paper started by Savinkov, “Svoboda” [“Freedom”].

The members of the “trio”, strengthened by Savinkov, understood the need to influence Polish public opinion, which they believed should drop its anti-Russian stance and should be persuaded that a “third Russia” could be created. Merezhkovsky, and later Filosofov, gave talks with this idea to Polish audiences.

Filosofov, from December 1921, edited a newspaper entitled “Za Svobodu!” [“For Freedom!”], and visited camps in which Soviet war prisoners were kept. He tried to help them, and sent reports about their tough situation to Polish authorities.

While he lived in Warsaw he kept editing and publishing “Za Svobodu” (till 1932), “Molva” [“People’s Talk”] (1932-1934), and finally “Miecz” [“Glave”] (from 1934). He was a very active columnist and wrote dozens of articles on Poland and Polish culture.

The political programme of his newspapers remained unchanged on fundamental issues: he was always anti-Bolshevik, and always full of respect for the state, which was hospitable to numerous Russian émigrés although it was not obliged to be so, as Russophobia in Poland, according to Filosofov, was justified by the long years of the partitions. Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz, a renowned Polish writer, thought that Filosofov “could never get rid of a lightly ironic smile at our struggle and our culture. He regarded all these things as ‘less important’ from the Petersburg perspective”¹.

Filosofov’s loyalty to Poland did not exclude open disagreement on some aspects of Poland’s policies towards refugees and the Orthodox Church.

On the other hand, his loyalty to Poland and his support of Ukrainian aspirations turned many Russian emigrants against him. His opponents (Russian conservatives and monarchists, and even constitutional democrats) were right on one particular issue: Filosofov, in a sense, was polonizing himself (this could even be discerned in his letters, in which, over time, he used more and more Polish words, or wrote them in a specific language of his own). He had many friends, and a few close friends in the circles of the Warsaw intelligentsia, and he would visit Piłsudski for private conversations. “Are you going to become the first Russian martyr for the Polish cause?”—Zinaida Gippius would ask him malignantly.

For Russians, the choice of Poland as a place for emigration was neither obvious nor easy. They were often treated ambivalently or with hostility. The experience of the Russian oppression lasting for more than a century was still too fresh.

The demolition of the big Orthodox church of St. Alexander Nevski in Saski Square in Warsaw was a symbolic gesture. In the 1920s Russian schools in Poland were closed, and emigrants with Russian matriculation diplomas were not allowed into Polish universities. Russian emigrants were not granted the right of free travel, and Russians from Warsaw, when they were travelling to the eastern parts of Poland, bordering the Soviet Union, had to apply for special permits. Their status varied: some remained stateless persons, and others subsequently became Polish citizens. All attempts to legalize the Russian national minority met with reluctance, even from the supporters of Piłsudski. Anyway, they stayed on in Poland, even when hopes for defeating Bolshevism evaporated. It is difficult to estimate how many Russian emigrants lived in Poland, most probably between fifty and a hundred thousand (some claim that at one time there were as many as half a million of them) out of the three million Russian émigrés scattered all over the world.

They set up educational societies and charities, published newspapers (altogether around 260 of them), and sometimes they opened publishing houses. They ran canteens and, as is usually the case with emigrants, they split into different political factions, which in a way reflected the pre-revolutionary political map of Russia. These divisions were also visible in Filosofov's closest circle.

These issues were not known by Poles, even by those who cared about Russian culture. Yet, it was exactly this interest (and at times fascination) of members of the Polish intellectual elite that Dmitry Filosofov used to build a Russian-Polish debating society "Domek w Kołomnie" ("The Little House in Kolomna").

The name of this society comes from a humorous poem by Alexander Pushkin written during his cholera quarantine in 1830.

Was the Warsaw society to be an idealized Russian little house? Filosofov, in his statements on art, as well as in his conversations and letters, was, in general, against sentimentalism. The nostalgia of émigrés, reminiscing about the loss of home sweet home, so strong in the literature of Russian émigrés after the revolution, was quite alien to him. And therefore "Domek w Kołomnie" did not become a den for nostalgia, but a place of important literary and philosophical debates, which were not immediately concerned with the current political situation (let us remember that the debating society existed in the period 1934-1936, just after Hitler took power in Germany, and the Great Terror starting in the Soviet Union), but they had a wider context, taking into account the *zeitgeist*. The participants were concerned with perennial, but also topical, dilemmas, such as a dichotomy of words and actions, the loneliness of artists, and their social responsibilities.

The little house can be conceived of as both a shelter and a workshop. During the last meeting Bolesław Miciński quoted from *A Discourse on the Method* by Descartes:

Finally, just as it is not enough, before beginning to rebuild the house in which one lives, to do no more than demolish it, make provision for materials and architects, or become oneself trained as an architect, or even to have carefully drawn up the plans, but one must also provide oneself with another house in which one may be comfortably lodged while work is in progress³.

Well known Polish writers, such as the novelist Maria Dąbrowska, and the essayist Jerzy Stempowski, claimed that "Domek w Kołomnie" was the only place in Warsaw in the middle of the 1930s where serious conversation took place.

Of course, Russian debating and literary societies existed in various places of

emigrants' residence: in Paris, Berlin, and Belgrade.

Also, in Prague, the capital of Czechoslovakia, the country which welcomed Russian refugees so warmly, there existed probably the most interesting group of poets, "Skit", the mentor of which was the distinguished philologist and critic Alfred Bem.

In the period between 1920 and 1922 Bem lived in Warsaw, where he organized, and later became the chairman of, the first Russian 'circle' in Poland, "Poets' Tavern", which existed from the end of 1921 till 1925. Its members met in the office of "Za Svobodu!". In a section named after this circle, this newspaper published translations of Russian poetry into Polish and Polish poetry into Russian, sometimes both in the original and in translation.

The 'circle' was devoid of great poets, but not of remarkable personalities. Vladimir Brand was one of them. He was to take part later in all of Filosofov's ventures.

In the middle of the 1920s Russian literary life in Vilnius started to flourish. New groups, circles and societies were launched—many of them thanks to a poet and translator of Polish poetry (mostly Romantic), Dorofiej Bochan. Unfortunately, most of his translations were never published, while the manuscripts were most probably lost after his arrest and exile to Kolyma.

In the thirties Bochan tried to forge closer links with Polish writers and scientists. He regularly invited Polish philosophers and philologists to meetings with Russian audiences.

Russian cultural life in Vilnius became much weaker in the second half of the 1930s as a result of repressions meted out by Polish local authorities, while Bochan, the *spiritus movens* of many initiatives, was locked up in the camp for political opponents in Bereza Kartuska.

In the autumn of 1929 in Warsaw Literaturnoje Sodruzestwo [Literary Commonwealth] was founded. At first it was a branch of Literaturnaja Siekcja Sojuza Russkich Pisatieliej i Žurnalistow w Polsce [Literary Section of the Society of Russian Writers and Journalists in Poland], but soon it became independent. This society organized 'meet the author' sessions, including with Polish writers, mostly poets and essayists (like Julian Tuwim).

Despite the initial successes and publishing activities⁴, after 1932 the society became less active. It was revitalized to a certain extent in the autumn of 1934 by Alfred Bem's visit from Prague; he lectured on Dostoyevsky's guiltiness and initiated a discussion about the crucial Congress of Soviet Writers, during which socrealism was proclaimed⁵.

However, during the meeting in the spring of 1935 the decision to close down the society was undertaken. *Swiato miasto pusto nie bywajel*⁶. At that time "Domek w Kołomnie" was already active.

It could be assumed that the immediate impulse which forced Filosofov to start a new 'circle' which was not only open to the Polish audience but which was created together with

Poles was the special issue of “Wiadomości Literackie” [“Literary News”] dated 29 October 1933, devoted to Soviet culture. This issue opened with an article by Karol Radek, a Soviet activist, and was most probably commissioned by the editorial team during his visit in Warsaw⁷. In this paper Radek used terms and tricks typical of Bolshevick propaganda. He opened it with praise for the Polish Great Emigration, and then attacked contemporary Russian emigrants. “Hundreds of thousands Russian capitalists, landowners, civil servants, officers, writers, wiped off by the wave of revolution from their homeland and scattered all over the world have not managed over the last fifteen years to give a single novel, a single drama, a single volume of poetry, which would deeply move the human soul”⁸. It can be parenthetically added here that because of the blockades in texts’ distributions, Russian émigré critics for a long time held a similar opinion about the literature which was written at that time in the Soviet Union. This was a distributional blockade on the side of the regime, and political as well as psychological on the side of the Russian diaspora.

Just before the special issue was published, “Wiadomości Literackie” had published a questionnaire: “Polish writers and Soviet Russia”. Many of the answers displayed naivety mixed with a prickle of excitement; others displayed an atavistic fear of Russia. There were almost no fully objective answers. Anyway, what did a Polish reader know about post-revolutionary Russia? Information about famine and terror was scattered mostly in the periodicals which readers of “Wiadomości Literackie” tended to avoid as politically backward, or even reactionary. They also could not refute Radek’s accusations against the Russian émigrés, because they did not know their texts, and they had persuasive stereotypes close at hand.

In 1932 Jerzy Stempowski wrote to Waław Lednicki, a Polish scholar of Russian literature, recommending the publication in Polish of a volume of Dmitry Filosofov’s articles.

“Polish-Russian cultural relationships have been suspended for the last twelve years. Russians know Poland from ‘Izvestia’ [News] and ‘Krasnaja Gazieta’ [Red Star]⁹, Poles know Russia from their own, so to say, newspapers. Of course, such a state of affairs, no matter how long it is going to last, should be treated as transitional. After it disappears, as a result of this or that form of evolution of Russian affairs, the relations between these two nations will be in a state of hiatus, which will be almost impossible to breach. Both sides, as far as cultural relations are concerned, will probably revert to pre-war positions, and will not find anything in their recollections of the transitional period which could familiarize them with changes made by political facts”¹⁰.

Pertinent reviews of the Soviet issue of “Wiadomości Literackie” were written by three co-founders of “Domek w Kołomnie”: Jewgieniy Weber-Hiriakov, Lew Gomolicki and Rafal

Marceli Blüth, but they had limited resonance.

It was politics that mattered more than anything else. The Soviet Union was accepted as a member of the League of Nations in 1934.

The circulation of the special Soviet issue was much bigger than the usual one. In the following year Radek¹¹ wrote another article for “Wiadomości Literackie”. This time he analysed a novel by Leon Kruczkowski, *Kordian i cham* [*Kordian and the Boor*], while in October 1934 there appeared a lengthy report from the Congress of Soviet Writers¹², during which, as is well known, social realism was proclaimed. The report was sent from Moscow. Both in form and in content it remained within the standards of the Soviet journalism of this period. A few months later “Wiadomości Literackie” had a chance to become better acquainted with the Soviet system, when a special Polish issue of “Literaturnaya Gazieta” [“Literary Newspaper”] was published in return (dated 18 July 1935, with no number). It was not only abusive, but also fictional—it was never distributed, and only a few copies were printed.

Dmitry Filosofov could not hope to get across his vision of Russia to the general Polish audience so he decided to try to influence the elite.

Literaturnoje Sodruzestwo could not be used for this purpose anymore, so a new ‘circle’ was needed. Almost a year after the publication of the special Soviet issue of “Wiadomości Literackie” the first meeting of “Domek w Kołomnie” took place in the editorial office of “Miecz” on 3 November 1934.

“Domek w Kołomnie” was to be set up on strictly defined rules. Each meeting was to be attended by about fifteen people. Filosofov would personally send invitations bearing the logo of “Domek”. The name and surname of the invited person were handwritten, and so were the date and the topic of the meeting. Some guests (particularly speakers) received two or three invitations which they could use. However, they had to consult with Filosofov who they were going to invite.

So the Warsaw ‘circle’ was, at the same time, elitist and open. As Filosofov wrote: “‘Domek w Kołomnie’ is very ‘small’, but this ‘smallness’ serves a purpose. According to our unwritten constitution, the presidium has no right to invite more than 15 guests. This is done in order to raise the cultural level of debaters¹³”. Inviting new guests (speakers and experts), who could possibly become regulars, was to enlarge the group of people who were concerned not only with the Polish, but also with the Russian point of view.

What mattered was the exchange of ideas, a debate. A very special one. At the crossroads of cultures and languages it is easier to formulate some basic questions. One can move beyond, at least to a certain degree, national or social habits and stereotypes. One is forced to speak differently than when one is with one’s own lot. One may see one’s issues and

one's culture with the eyes of the other.

A Polish-Russian dialogue was not to be about politics, and was not to be limited to solving the "Slavonic issue". It was to be about basic questions, about the crisis of Europe and of European culture. On these issues the majority of guests agreed, despite some minor differences.

The very fact that Filosofov was Russian and, as a rule, he avoided Polish quarrelling and strife, made him the perfect moderator of meetings of people who would otherwise pass one another in silence, or people who had been set at logger-heads.

The hosts and guests of "Domek" were focused on careful analysis of the pulse of time, but they were united by a reluctance to embrace literature which reacted to the immediate social problems, literature which was written without concern for form and without deeper considerations.

Starshina is a master of a trade guild, in this case of the guild of debating members of intelligentsia. And if it is the master who comes to the fore, if we have this type of ritualization (papers, reports, debates, avoiding political strife), then we may assume that we are dealing with an initiative, which is a quasi-Free Mason. When Włodzimierz Stępniewski, a philosopher, was invited to "Domek" he was convinced that he was in a masonic lodge. It should be stressed here that Filosofov was not a Free Mason, and, as he kept stressing, his views differed a lot from Free Masons. Despite this, he was on good terms with Free Masons, for example with Boris Savinkov and with Stanisław and Jerzy Stempowskis.

"Domek w Kołomnie" existed only till 1936, when Filosofov fell seriously ill. During the last meeting, he uttered a warning which was not taken seriously: "Do you realize that it would take just minor cracks in the wall which separates you from the sea of Russian Bolshevism for Poland to be swamped and to become an extra part of Soviet Russia, a part not very special at all?"¹⁴.

Filosofov died after a long illness on 5 August 1940.

One may wonder why, during his illness, no one took over "Domek w Kołomnie"—neither Lew Gomolicki, nor Jerzy Stempowski, although they would have probably been the best to do so. We do not know what Filosofov himself thought about it, but even had he agreed to such a replacement, "Domek" could not have existed without him. It was his creation.

The legend of "Domek w Kołomnie" as an extraordinary place made many researchers fall under its spell. It should be added that "Domek w Kołomnie" has for a long time drawn researchers' attention¹⁵.

Since I managed to reconstruct the real sequence of its meetings, I have often come across disbelief: Only thirteen?

Only thirteen meetings, but extremely important ones, dealing directly and indirectly (but to the point) with the key issues of that period. Maybe also of our period.

Dmitry Filosofov accomplished a lot. Overcoming his predilections for depression and passive consumption of art, he edited newspapers and wrote several hundred articles. He was a very gifted literary and theatrical critic, and an analyst of spiritual and political life. At times, he was directly involved in political actions. At the same time, he felt unfulfilled. Not of himself, but of his plans and dreams. He confessed to a specific “philosophy of failure”. This point has recently been made by a contemporary researcher¹⁶.

He complained. The world was heading in the wrong direction, the totalitarianisms were getting stronger, the intellectuals did not see threats, and newspaper proof-readers were inattentive. His delicate health started to break down too early.

“Domek w Kołomnie” was born in such circumstances. It was Dmitry Filosofov’s final work. Józef Czapski thus recollected their meeting a very short while before the war: “He was already old at that time, and I remember this extraordinary heat wave, this, wild, hot summer and this old, tired man telling me with shining eyes: ‘At least this society was a success!’”¹⁷.

“Tens of texts of a dead writer in yearbooks of yellowed newspapers. Who will collect them? To what extent will memory survive the one who stubbornly returned to his issue, and kept finding ever more perfect forms of expression for it? We are not very choosy. Life has taught us modesty. Has taught us not to muckrake in one’s psyche and not to dream about the immortality; of our name and work.”¹⁸ Jevgienia Weber, a close associate of Filosofov.

Weber committed suicide in October 1939 when the Germans moved into Warsaw. Many Russian emigrants disappeared without a trace when the Red Army entered in 1944-1945. Their fate can be guessed.

Those who survived kept low profiles. They changed their names and life stories, and ostentatiously joined the Communist Party and the Society of Polish-Soviet Friendship.

But at the beginning of the 1950s a strange change in the rulers’ strategy occurred. The existence of the Russian national minority was accepted. A periodical, “Russkij Golos” [“A Russian Voice”], started to appear, and an amateur Russian theatre was opened in Warsaw. The price for writing in one’s native language was the content. Obviously, it had to be extremely pro-Soviet. Russian intellectuals who had already found their place in Polish culture and had been writing in Polish did not want to return to their national roots. They did not publish in “Russkij Golos”, and did not come to ‘tea with a samovar’.

Despite this liberalization, in the period of the People’s Republic of Poland, that is till 1989, the topic of Russian emigration to Poland was, generally, censored and banned. I am

using the term ‘generally’, because the influence of Dmitry Filosofov on Polish intellectual elites was so strong that it was reflected in the works of the most distinguished of Polish writers: Maria Dąbrowska, Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz, and Zofia Nałkowska. It was difficult to erase him from memory, from Polish culture.

But the deepest traces of Filosofov’s presence could be found in the group of Polish post-war emigrants in France. The monthly “Kultura” (“Culture”) started to be published there in 1947. It was edited by Jerzy Giedroyc, who had been a guest in “Domek w Kołomnie”, and his closest collaborators included the co-founders of the famous society: Jerzy Stempowski and Józef Czapski, a painter and an essayist, who had been spiritually and artistically shaped by Dymitr Vladimirovich.

Filosofov had a certain vision of what Russian emigration should be like. This vision was grounded in the Polish experiences of the nineteenth-century emigration, which created great Romantic literature and a cultural infrastructure in exile. In turn, Giedroyc and his entourage could learn through the errors and mistakes of Russian pre-war emigration, and use the postulates of Filosofov, who placed several difficult and ambitious goals in front of émigrés: the preservation of national identity and, at the same time, immersion in the culture of a new homeland, a rejection of sentimentalism and delusions. Thanks to such a programme Giedroyc’s “Kultura” survived and influenced the Polish national identity, and its heritage is widely researched and still creates strong emotions. “Kultura” tried to strike an alliance with Russian emigrants. However, this turned out to be a very slow process, exactly because of the same reasons for which Filosofov was not accepted by them. It was about the rejection of imperial traditions.

It should be stressed that from the perspective of scholarly research the theme of Russian emigrants in Poland is crucial, mostly because Dmitry Filosofov was one of them. His output is the most interesting one, and in many aspects, it is still valid.

Prof. Piotr Mitzner (b. 1955) is a literary scholar, editor and poet. Since 1999 he has been teaching at the Department of Humanities at Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw. The fields of his research interests include: the works of Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz, Polish literature during WWII, and Polish-Russian contacts in the context of the Russian emigration to Poland (1918-1939) and Polish emigration to western Europe (1945-1989).

Notes

- ¹ Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz. "Rozmowy o książkach. Mereżkowsy," *Życie Warszawy* 148 (1975).
- ² Zinaida Gippius to Dmitry Filosofov Paris, IV 1921, in: D. S. Durrant, "Po materiałam archiwa D. W. Filosofova," *Lica* 5 (1994): 449.
- ³ René Descartes, *A Discourse on the Method of Correctly Conducting One's Reason and Seeking Truth in the Sciences*, transl. and intro. Ian MacLean (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 21.
- ⁴ Litieraturnoje Sodružestwo published volumes of poetry using primitive duplicators.
- ⁵ "A. L. Bem w Litieraturnom Sodružestwie," *Miecz* 21(1934).
- ⁶ "A sacred space is never empty". Old Russian proverb.
- ⁷ Karol Radek came to Warsaw in July 1933, invited by Bogusław Miedziński, a pro-Piłsudski journalist and MP. During his visit to Poland censors received a secret order to stop the publishing of strongly anti-Soviet texts. Radek's visit took place a year after the non-aggression pact between Poland and the Soviet Union had been signed.
- ⁸ K. Radek, "Kultura rodzącego się socjalizmu," *Wiadomości Literackie* 47(29 October 1933).
- ⁹ Official Soviet newspapers.
- ¹⁰ J. Stempowski to W. Lednicki. Warszawa 22 I 1932, in: J. Timoszewicz, "Fiłosofow – Czapski – Stempowski," *Kultura* 4 (1998).
- ¹¹ K. Radek, "Polska powieść rewolucyjna," *Wiadomości Literackie* 35 (26 August 1934). Reprinted from *Izwestia*.
- ¹² H. S. Kamieński, "Zjazd pisarzy sowieckich," *Wiadomości Literackie*, 41 (7 October 1934).
- ¹³ D. Filosofov, "Pri osobom mnenii. O kulturie, Dni Russkoj Kultury i niekulturnosti," *Miecz* 16 (1935).
- ¹⁴ M. Czapska, *Pamiętniki Wacława Lednickiego*, in, *Ostatnie odwiedziny i inne szkice*, ed. by P. Kądziela (Warsaw: Biblioteka „Więzi,” 2006), 159. First published in: *Kultura* 11 (1963).
- ¹⁵ Apart from the texts quoted in this book, the following ones should be mentioned: I. Obłąkowska-Galanciak, "W duchu Puszkina. Dyskusyjny klub literacki 'Domek w Kołomnie' (Warszawa 1934-1936)," *Acta Polono-Ruthenica* 3 (1998); M. Piasecki, "'Domek w Kołomnie' 1934-1936. Klub dyskusyjny Dymitra Filosofova" (M.A. disseration written under the supervision of Andrzej Mencwel, Faculty of Polish Studies, University of Warsaw, 1995); M. Piasecki, "Pszczele żądło," *Gazeta Wyborcza* 281 (2000); W. Stanisławski, "'Rycerz przegranej sprawy'? Kontakty Dymitra Filosofova z polskimi elitami kulturalnymi," *Emigracja rosyjska. Losy i idee*, edited by R. Bäcker i Z. Karpus (Łódź: Ibidem, 2002), 313-328; P. Mitzner, *Warszawski "Domek w Kołomnie": rekonstrukcja* (Warsaw: Biblioteka „Więzi,” 2014); P. Mitzner, *Warszawski krąg Dymitra Filosofova* (Warsaw: Biblioteka „Więzi,” 2015).
- ¹⁶ P. Ławryniec, "Motiw nieuspiecha w pozdniej publicystice D. W. Filosofova," *Literatūra* 2 (2006).
- ¹⁷ J. Czapski, "Mereżkowsy i Filosofov w Polsce," *Puls* 60 (1993).
- ¹⁸ E. Weber, "Pisatiel," *Miecz* 34 (1938).