

UDC 7.036

LBC 85.103(2)6; 85.333(2)

Andreeva Ekaterina Yu.

D.Sc. (in Philosophy), PhD (in Art History), Member of AICA, 43 Sivtsev Vrazhek Lane, Moscow, 119002, Russia
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5765-242X
ResearcherID: V-7985-2018
andreyevaek@gmail.com

Keywords: avant-garde theatre, “theatre for oneself”, OBERIU, the New Artists

Andreeva Ekaterina Yu.

The New Theatre of the New Artists Group and the Russian Avant-Garde



This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

DOI: 10.51678/2226-0072-2022-3-86-139

For cit.: Andreeva E.Yu. The New Theatre of the New Artists Group and the Russian Avant-Garde. *Hudozhestvennaya kul'tura* [Art & Culture Studies], 2022, no. 3, pp. 86–139. <https://doi.org/10.51678/2226-0072-2022-3-86-139>. (In Russian)

Для цит.: Андреева Е.Ю. Новый театр «Новых художников» и русский авангард // Художественная культура. 2022. № 3. С. 86–139. <https://doi.org/10.51678/2226-0072-2022-3-86-139>.

Андреева Екатерина Юрьевна

Доктор философских наук, кандидат искусствоведения, член Международной ассоциации критиков AICA, 119002, Россия, Москва, пер. Сивцев Вражек, 43
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5765-242X
ResearcherID: V-7985-2018
andreyevaek@gmail.com

Ключевые слова: авангардный театр, «Театр для себя», ОБЭРИУ, «Новые художники»

Андреева Екатерина Юрьевна

Новый театр «Новых художников» и русский авангард

Abstract. The multimedia practice of the Russian Avant-Garde, in which theatrical art is inseparable from literary, visual and musical art, found its continuation half a century later in the work of the New Artists group, founded by Timur Novikov in 1982 in Leningrad. This article is the first study of the so-called New Theatre of the New Artists, which is associated with the following happenings or performances: *The Ballet of the Three Inseparables*, *Anna Karenina*, *The Idiot*, and their predecessor, the literary-noise action *The Medical Concert*. The article discusses three elements of the avant-garde theatrical tradition that resonate with the New Theatre: Nikolai Evreinov's comprehensive concept of the "theatre for oneself", the musical-spatial theatrical experiments of Mikhail Matyushin and his followers, and the absurdist theatre of Daniil Kharms and OBERIU. The second and third, despite being so dissimilar to each other, share the borderline, where zaum (alogism) and absurdism converge. This very convergence creates a dynamic semantic tension that marks the ideas of both D. Kharms and T. Novikov: the tension between an uplifting absurdity, striving for the inexpressible, timeless and universal, and, conversely, a lowering, destructive absurdity. It is obvious that the distinction between the two types of absurdism is a fundamental problem of ontology not only of the Russian Avant-Garde. The New Theatre can be considered as a seismic activity that lasted for about three years at the borderline area of the avant-garde art that worked its way from Symbolism through Expressionism to Dadaism and Surrealism. On this borderline, creativity manifests itself as an impersonal or other-than-personal process that establishes a connection of a person with the rhythms of the world or, on the contrary, illustrates disintegration, deconstruction and the reassembly of society. The New Theatre that established in the Leningrad underground was not an imitation of the avant-garde practices but their rebirth, which proves that this form of creativity is organic for the culture of St. Petersburg.

Аннотация. Мультимедийная практика русского авангарда, в которой театральное искусство неотделимо от литературного, изобразительного и музыкального, нашла продолжение через полвека в творчестве группы «Новые художники», основанной Тимуром Новиковым в 1982 году в Ленинграде. Данная статья является первым исследованием так называемого Нового театра «Новых художников», с которым связаны спектакли-хепенинги «Балет трех неразлучников», «Анна Каренина», «Идиот», а также их предшественница — литературно-шумовая акция «Медицинский концерт». В статье рассматриваются три элемента авангардной театральной традиции, входящие в резонанс с Новым театром: всеобъемлющая концепция «театра для себя» Николая Евреинова, музыкально-пространственные театральные эксперименты Михаила Матюшина и его последователей, абсурдистский театр Даниила Хармса и ОБЭРИУ. Второй и третий из них, столь несхожие между собой, тем не менее имеют общую границу, где территории зауми (алогизма) и абсурдизма сходятся на общей пограничной полосе. И само пространство этого схождения создает смысловое динамическое напряжение, которым отмечены и творчество Хармса, и искусство Новикова: напряжение между абсурдом возвышающим, устремленным к невыразимому и вневременному, универсальному, и, наоборот, абсурдом понижающим, деструктивным. Очевидно, что различие двух типов абсурдизма — фундаментальная проблема онтологии не только русского авангарда. Новый театр можно рассматривать как длившуюся около трех лет сейсмическую активность этой пограничной полосы авангардного творчества, связанного в начале с символизмом и быстро отошедшего через экспрессионизм к дадаизму и сюрреализму. На этой границе творчество проявляет себя как внеличный процесс, в котором устанавливается связь человека с ритмами мира или, напротив, демонстрируется распад всех связей, деконструкция и пересборка общества. Возникший в ленинградском андеграунде Новый театр явился не подражанием авангардным практикам, но их новым рождением, что доказывает органичность для петербургской культуры этой формы творчества.

Introduction. The theatrical beginning of the history of the New Artists

The subject of the present research is the so-called New Theatre (1983—1986), which emerged in the collective creative activity of the New Artists group (1982—1987). The theatrical actions of “the New” took place on the threshold of Mikhail Gorbachev’s perestroika and in its first years, so they anticipated new artistic freedom, rather than were the fruits of the reform. Studying the New Theatre and introducing the avant-garde context in which it can find its natural continuity allows illustrating not the “academic” evolution of the artistic tradition from predecessors to successors but the very action of the avant-garde generative creative force. We focus on the actual life of the art form, not the conservative way for the tradition of the Avant-Garde to survive in the difficult Soviet conditions.

The establishment of the New Artists group in October 1982 in Leningrad was quite theatrical: it was the result of Timur Novikov and Ivan Sotnikov’s *Zero Object* action. In general, actions by T. Novikov, the initiator of all the events in the history of “the New”, were performances developing into happenings, since they had a clear idea or concept, which was later implemented through improvisation, depending on the circumstances, and implied the joint participation of the invited actors and the audience. What T. Novikov and I. Sotnikov named *Zero Object* was a rectangular aperture in an exposition stand at the exhibition of the Society for Experimental Visual Art; they attached a label bearing the corresponding title, and a photo of them looking through the *Zero Object* was taken. The *Zero Object*, or to be precise, the label, was further removed by the organising committee, and T. Novikov and I. Sotnikov were barred from entering the exhibition. T. Novikov, I. Sotnikov, and their allies, entered into correspondence with the Society for Experimental Visual Art and created the *Chronicle of the Zero Object* that resembled an absurdist script. As the *Chronicle* was unfolding, there appeared the “Zero Object guards” and the “Main Commission of the Directorate for Zero Culture”, and thus the group called “New Artists” was formed. T. Novikov enjoyed making use of his surname, which in Russian bears the idea of novelty and the new, and in 1983, contributed with this energy of novelty to the name of the New Composers group, and in 1984 — to the New Theatre of the New Artists.

Why can the *Zero Object* action be interpreted in the context of theatrical art? Because Novikov and Sotnikov, for all those present at the installation of the Society for Experimental Visual Art exhibition at the Kirov Palace of Culture on October 12, 1982, created a semblance of a theatre stage and turned other artists, and then exhibition visitors, into involuntary actors of their zeroists theatre. The photographs by Roman Zhigunov, rock musician and artist, captured the very moment of T. Novikov and I. Sotnikov appearing in the aperture of the *Zero Object* (which is absolutely scenic in essence), the stage (the views through the *Zero Object*) and the first spectators-participants of the action (Dmitri Shagin, artist, the future well-known member of the Mitki art group). T. Novikov’s theatre, as absurd as it may seem, was a direct response to the challenge of life, the elements of which Novikov used to construct symbolic images — sources of energy for the renewal of life itself. Thus, the *Zero Object* changed the depressing life circumstances of Leningrad nonconformists, whom the authorities issued defective exhibition stands, into an exciting adventure that made society think about the nature of unofficial art and, primarily, about the avant-garde freedom of vision, as the very act of posing for a photograph in the *Zero Object* could not but remind of Kazimir Malevich’s transformation in the “zero of form” that took place in 1915 on the other bank of the Neva river.

The musical and theatrical events of the New Artists and the traditions of the St. Petersburg – Leningrad theatrical avant-garde

T. Novikov had the nickname “Nol” (Russian for “Zero”), hence the “zero culture” concept. The Directorate of the Zero Culture managed the activities of the studio gallery known under the name of the “ASSA Gallery” (1981—1987) and the earliest area of zeroist activity — zero music, the history of which Novikov traced since 1980. Oleg Kotelnikov, Viktor Tsoy, Georgy Gurianov, Andrey Krisanov, members of “the New”, musicians and artists — anyone could become a zero musician if they desired so. What Novikov was striving for, despite his conspiratorial style, was creating open, democratic artistic life situations. In fact, the *Zero Object* breaking through the cultural bureaucracy of the Society for Experimental Visual Art and Soviet officials was an example of such situations, and a similar lasting opportunity for experimenting was zero music.

Shortly after, Novikov and Sotnikov arranged two musical performances for a musical instrument they created — the utiugon. It was assembled from old irons and dumbbells that hung on chords wound around the nails in the tabletop of a jugendstil table. Ivan Sotnikov mentioned that the creation of the utiugon — the phenomenon of the sounding of a chord and a tabletop — was made at his place on Pokrovskaya Square, and “its debut took place at the Club 81. Tanya Korneeva, a violinist from Moscow, who had a violin with a pickup, joined us then. We grabbed speakers with an amplifier from some Ufa or Chelyabinsk hippies, and so the mechanical utiugon turned into the electric one... The tabletop became a percussion instrument, joining the “strings”. The debut of the utiugon featured the then little-known jazz musician Sergey Kuryokhin, the underground concert performer Boris Borisovich Grebenshchikov, and the flutist called Kumpf. At the end of our duet, Timur Petrovich and I got it all moving in a special way and stepped aside for the utiugon to continue to play. It was a powerful and beautiful sight to see” [4, p. 79].

The utiugon solo concert, according to Hannelore Fobo’s research [26] based on the memoirs of Hans Kumpf, took place in August 1983 in the basement of the writers’ Club 81 on Pyotr Lavrov Street. Another event, the so-called Medical Concert at the Dostoyevsky Museum could take place either at the end of 1982 or, more likely, at the end of 1983⁽¹⁾. Novikov himself mentioned both dates. In the typewritten article *Zero Music as a Phenomenon of the New Music*, dated 1986 and published under the pseudonym of Igor Potapov (Novikov’s pseudonym for all his critical texts about the group written for propaganda purposes in 1985–1991), we read the following: “1983. The Dostoevsky Museum. The famous medical concert. This event became another overpowering zero symbol. Zero demonstrated its diversity, strength, and omnipotence. Literature / Arkady Dragomoshchenko / + new medical equipment / Aleksey Svinarsky / + the latest instruments / the utiugon, the intravenous drip/ + jazz musicians, rock and the composer Sergey Kuryokhin, + sophisticated sound recording devices + experimental subject / I. Sotnikov/ × 0 = 0” [18, p. 89]. “In his lecture *The New Artists* that Novikov delivered at the very end of his life,

(1) Ksenia Novikova in her *Chronicle* dated the Medical Concert back to December 1983 [15, p. 271].

on February 28, 2002 at the Pro Arte Institute, he roughly traced the Medical Concert back to the end of 1982 (after L.I. Brezhnev’s death) and associated the relocation of the Club 81 from the Dostoevsky Museum to the basement on Pyotr Lavrov Street with the scandalous concert: “These men [Georgy Guryanov, Ivan Sotnikov, Alexei Svinarsky, Alexei Sumarokov. — E.A.], together with Sergey Kuryokhin, Vsevolod Gakkel and Arkady Dragomoshchenko, started reciting poems and making sounds, after which the writers’ Club 81 ... was evicted from the Dostoevsky Museum and writers conceived hatred for musicians and avant-garde artists... Since then, the writers were forced to meet in a small basement on Pyotr Lavrov Street. But gradually, they came to love modern music again, and the next utiugon concert took place on Pyotr Lavrov Street” [14, pp. 73–74].

However, according to the memoirs of Arkady Dragomoshchenko, he first listened to the utiugon in the writers’ basement and later visited T. Novikov at the ASSA Gallery on Voinov Street. It was then that they hit upon the idea of performing at the Dostoevsky Museum, where from the writers were later evicted, indeed: “Club 81, where we met Timur, gave everyone, and especially the writers, a chance to exist without fear⁽²⁾. I suggested creating a theatre division there, which Erik Goroshevsky would take charge of. <...> One of the projects was poetry readings at the Dostoevsky Museum. I read the poem “I Saw a White Bomber in My Dream”, which I wrote at our office on Furshtadtskaya Street specifically for the event. And there Timur worked with all his might; for him just painting pictures was never enough. <...> By that time Timur and Vanya Sotnikov had already created the utiugon. <...> The utiugon was humming and the jittering sound of music was progressing on its own. One just had

(2) At this point it is appropriate to quote D. Volchek’s memoirs referring to August 1985, when KGB officers broke into the performance of Sergey Kuryokhin’s Pop Mechanics at E. Goroshevsky’s Theatre to arrest an American diplomat who escaped over the roofs with D. Volchek’s help: “Pop Mechanics blared, and it was some time before we could hear a knock on the door. Not a knock, to be more precise — they were breaking the door down. Frightened to death, Erik Goroshevsky ran into the hall where the performance was taking place, crying, “The place is surrounded!” It turned out that the KGB had developed a siege plan. Downstairs, they said that they had come on the request of neighbours complaining about the noise, but, having walked upstairs, they made no attempt to conceal what they were interested in. “Where are foreigners?” The detachment was led by a corpulent man wearing a light green suit: so ridiculous was his outfit that I still remember it. Panic spread through; musicians, spectators and KGB men all mixed up” [6].

to touch the edge of the table from which the flat irons were hanging on strings. It could play on its own and resonate up to half an hour... I went to Timur to see if he had anything interesting and found an old military helmet, painted yellow... We glued transfer letters on it. In Timur's gallery on Voinov Street, there was another electronic instrument, with the help of which the text that had just been read was automatically read back, in reverse. Then a group of support musicians appeared. There were many people, and for some reason all performers were wearing white medical coats. <...> We performed wonderfully. Rodion was walking around the stage. It lasted about forty-five minutes. And it all ended with Club 81 being forever evicted from the Dostoevsky Museum, because the lady in charge of the event said the following: "I can understand dissidence but not this abomination. Everyone out" [3, pp. 354–357].

T. Novikov also mentioned in his memoirs that Dragomoshchenko had seen his "frippertronics" — two connected tape recorders, the first of which repeated what was recorded by the second one: "A simple tape connection performed the function of sampling an audio signal. Additionally, in our music laboratory, we designed the instruments called the utuigon, the intravenous drip, and long strings. All this equipment was taken to the Dostoevsky Museum, as well as the medical equipment from the ambulance station called "the device for transmitting heart signals by phone" (invented to trace a patient's cardiogram on the spot and transmit it by phone to a medical centre). <...> It must be said Georgy Guryanov, future drummer of the Kino band, first appeared on stage playing exactly the drip. He was running drops on a special large pickup" [14, pp. 72–73]. In the same memoirs, Novikov mentioned the Medical Concert to be the first concert of Sergey Kuryokhin's Pop Mechanics [14, p. 72].

What calls attention in the descriptions of the Medical Concert is the equal value of participation and contribution of all the performers: professional musicians Kuryokhin, Gakkel and Buluchevsky, the future drummer Guryanov, artists Novikov and Sotnikov having no ear for music, the poet Arkady Dragomoshchenko, the doctor Svinarsky, and Sumarokov Jr, young man of no definite occupation. They all created a literary-noise confusion on the improvised stage of the Dostoevsky Museum, where in those years various concerts and performances were held, in particular, the artist Yevgeny Lukoshkov recited Daniil Kharms. Since then, out of

the entire set of zero music instruments, it is the utuigon and its replicas created in the 2010s that have been repeatedly used in concerts.

The Medical Concert and the utuigon concerts had a prototype in the avant-garde environment of Petrograd — in the musical theatre of Mikhail Matyushin and his students from the Ender family. However, it is most likely that the zero musician T. Novikov, the creator of the utuigon and long strings, was not familiar with this story of the early 1920s. In 1920–1923, in the apartment of the Ender family on Prof. Popov Street, Mikhail Matyushin organized concerts on the memorial day of Elena Guro. They were musical and poetic performances featuring both traditional instruments (piano) and a "long string", which was thrown across the rooms of the apartment, making sounds by vibrations, including those produced by disturbance of the air. As stated by A.V. Povelikhina, "the task set by Matyushin when creating performances was to break through the old academic stage, the box, and immerse the audience in an environment of colour and form" [16, p. 81]. Understood by Matyushin in his own way, zero omnipotence (if to use T. Novikov's term) is the dynamics of the world of shapes and colours in the space of free-floating sounds, apparently similar to the effect of the utuigon concerts. It is clear that "the New" did not set themselves M. Matyushin's overarching goal — to embody the space-colour rhythms of the universe, but continued his experiment in expanding the space of music into the world of noises, into zero music. This, for example, is illustrated by the experience of Boris Ender, who was engaged in the sound design of the play *Woyzeck* by Yu.A. Zavadsky, and explored the subtle sounds produced by textured surfaces and the "orchestration of boxes on a spit" [21, pp. 275–276], quite in line with the future utuigon experiments.

Since the spring of 1984, the musical arrangement of the actions by the New Artists was provided by a new group, the New Composers — Igor Verichev and Valery Alakhov, who created the new collage music based on various recordings and the noise collection of the Maly Drama Theatre. In 1983, the duo's ideologist Igor Verichev wrote a manifesto of universal collage creativity entitled *The Versification of Information*, which can be considered the sprouting of Vladimir Markov's theory of faktura in the information age. The next theatrical premiere of the New Artists, a production of *The Ballet of the Three Inseparables* by Daniil Kharms, is associated with the debut of the New Composers produced by T. Novikov. It

also bears different dates in the texts by Novikov himself and in the archival sketches by Hannelore Fobo based on a study of photographs by the artist E-E (Evgeny Kozlov), who in 1984–1985 was in charge of fashion in the New Artists group, that is, photographed the exhibitions and the fashion show at the ASSA Gallery, the stilyagi party at the concert of the Strannyye Iгры (Strange Games) band at the Ilyich Palace of Culture, the Happy New Year exhibition at the Rock Club and concerts of Pop Mechanics.

In Novikov's archive, there has been preserved the "libretto" of the "Ballet" by D. Kharms and the performances themselves are mentioned in four documents written by Novikov. One of them is the article *The New Composers*, where he wrote the following: "The first performance took place in 1984, on February 23. The music for *The Ballet of the Three Inseparables*, staged by the New Artists group, was also composed then. The premiere of the ballet was in the second part of the first concert" [17, p. 130]⁽³⁾. In the self-publish typewritten catalogue of the Happy New Year exhibition (which Novikov possibly made in 1986), Oleg Kotelnikov's biography outlines two 1985 exhibitions at the premieres of the New Theatre, where he acted as a production designer: number three on the list of group exhibitions of "the New" is "Ballet" and number four is "Anna Karenina". In Igor Potapov's special article *The New Theatre*, which Novikov later dated 1985, it is stated: "The event of the 1984–85 theatre season was the establishment of a new theatre — the New Theatre. Its first production was *The Ballet of the Three Inseparables* by Daniil Ivanovich Kharms, created in the late thirties [the libretto in Novikov's archive has the accurate date, 1930. — E.A.]. Having changed no letter in the classic work, the production team created a performance that is fresh and modern in form. The music for the ballet was written by the New Composers, Igor Verichev and Valery Alakhov, with the application of a very popular collage method. I do not know whether this work was staged during the author's lifetime, but it seems to me that he would be completely satisfied with such an approach to his work. The directors connected with the creative work of D. Kharms, noticed the subtle spirit of the master's work. The natural, lively choreography was so harmoniously combined with the pompously shy stilyagi choir and exciting

music that to end the ballet the authors had to turn off the lights, as the audience would not want the performance to be over. The parts of the tree inseparables were performed by T. Novikov, I. Verichev, and Yu. Guryanov. Moreover, those from the audience wishing to participate had a chance to do so". [18, p. 81]. In her 2018 study, Hannelore Fobo considers these three documents to refer to the same event that took place after March 5, 1985 and is documented in the photographs by Kozlov: we see him and Novikov dividing the floor into squares, Verichev and Alakhov at the soundboard, the Teddy Boys band — the singing stilyagi choir, and dancing (sitting on squares) Novikov, Guryanov and Verichev [20]. However, such dating contradicts the "inalterable" date of February 23, which was confirmed by Valery Alakhov and which in the Russian context is impossible to get wrong. Therefore, we would venture to suggest, and this assumption has been confirmed by Valery Alakhov, that two different performances of the ballet took place in Leningrad in 1984 and 1985.

Moreover, the above-mentioned work *Zero Music as a Phenomenon of the New Music* provides information on the 1985 Moscow premiere of the ballet (the photographs have been preserved): "Zero artists are also found in Moscow, even though they do not always recognize themselves as such. Alexey Tegin was the founder of hyperrealism, but lost interest in it. He is engaged in zero music, beyond all doubt. His compositions are magnificent; he recorded music for the Moscow premiere of the *Ballet of Three Inseparables* by D. Kharms, the music for the fashion show of the New fashion house Ay Lui Li and much more" [19, p. 89]. In Moscow, the parts of the inseparables were performed by Novikov, Sergei Bugaev and Oleg Kolomeychuk known as Garik ASSA, who in 1984 arrived to Leningrad from Khabarovsk, where he had worked as an actor at the Youth Theatre, soon moved to Moscow and established his own fashion house.

That means that in 1984, the New Theatre in Leningrad started functioning, and in 1985–1986, two more drama productions by the New Artists were created through the efforts of the director of the Anti-theatre, Rodion Zavernyaev. His real name is Anatoly; he was called Rodion due to his fascination with *Crime and Punishment* and a slight resemblance to G. Taratorkin as Rodion Raskolnikov. The performances of the theatre took place in the attic of Chernyshevsky Street, 3, where the theatre studio of the director Erik Goroshevsky, a student of Georgy Tovstonogov, was located. In his studio called with an allusion to OBERIU the Theatre of Real

(3) The text can be dated back to 1991, as it is dedicated to the event of this year — the triumph of the New Composers in the British charts.

Art [6; 1, pp. 94–97], Erik Goroshevsky staged various performances, for example, *Masquerade* by Mikhail Lermontov, and it is characteristic that after the experiments of the New Theatre he staged *The Bald Soprano* by Eugene Ionesco. Dmitry Volchek, a lucky spectator of both premieres, called 1984 the year when the New Theatre started. He dated both productions by Rodion Zaverlyayev, *Anna Karenina* and *The Idiot*, May–June of 1985, which is consistent with the data in T. Novikov’s article *The New Theatre* (the 1984–85 theatre season). The premiere of *Anna Karenina* was captured in photographs by E. Kozlov. T. Novikov’s archive also contains photographs of *The Idiot* performance, with Joanna Stingray as one of the Epanchina sisters. She dated this event to 1986, so we can assume that *The Idiot* was performed at either the Theatre of Real Art or the Anti-theatre twice — in 1985 and 1986. The main parts were played by the New Artists themselves: Anna Karenina and Aglaya Epanchina — by Bugaev, the “villains” Karenin and Rogozhin — by Novikov, the handsome Alexey Vronsky and Prince Myshkin — by Gurianov. Meanwhile, according to Oleg Kotelnikov, being late for the *Anna Karenina* performance, Gurianov was replaced by another actor, and when he arrived, there were two Vronskys on stage. Nastasya Filippovna was played by future soloist of the Colibri band, Natasha Pivovarova. The director Rodion Zaverlyayev took the parts of the Railroad man / Tolstoy and Dostoevsky. The archives of Novikov and Sergei Bugaev hold Rodion Zaverlyayev’s librettos for both performances, each being one A4 page, which illustrates the director’s controversial attitude to the great writers. Indeed, in his article *On the New Theatre*, R. Zaverlyayev straightforwardly stated that “it was an attempt to provide the characters of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky with an opportunity to square accounts with their creators, and on the other hand, the participants’ attempt to entertain themselves and their friends” [9, p. 83]. To pursue the first intent, the director altered the finale of *Anna Karenina* towards a relatively happy ending. The course of *The Idiot*, in turn, changed due to a performer’s outrage: “The creators of the production introduced the character of F.M. Dostoevsky himself as a guide and antagonist for Prince Myshkin. The creators believed that the production would end with the triumph of a positive character — a spiritually complete person — over the world of the Demons around him ... but all that was happening on stage provoked a reaction of a spontaneous epileptic fit

out of the actor playing Myshkin. The Prince’s personality cannot cope with the immediate situation, and neither can Dostoevsky, who, acting from the position of conformism, tries to reconcile him with the insane world. Both become the prey of Demons and fall into the City of Dis — a part of Hell intended for those who betrayed the Creator, descending into inhumanity. ... Tolstoy, according to the creators of the production, was also a conformist. Trying to defend the generally accepted attitudes towards human relations, he destroys his characters, nice people, in essence, whose real relationships run against the norms he has invented.

The creators of the production derogated from the storyline of the novel: the enmity between Karenin and Vronsky, emotionally broken by Anna’s death, develops into a homosexual love; a false character of the Railroad man — Count Leo Tolstoy is introduced. The narrative strand of relations between Tolstoy and Anna is presented, which ends with Tolstoy destroying Anna both literally and figuratively (as the author and the train driver), after which he realizes he has been in love with her. We see the tragedy of the author — a real person who has found himself dominated by the demons of social relations” [9, p. 83].

Dmitry Volchek recollected the state of a merry short-lived chaos that he had experienced during *The Idiot* performance at the New Theatre as follows: “A graceful teenager Afrika was lurching on the stage in a long dress, the actors were running into each other and the audience, Prince Myshkin was raping Nastasya Filippovna, the music of the New Composers was blaring and bottles were tinkling. What was left on the stage half an hour later was just a pile of rubbish: having fallen into a state of ecstasy, the actors destroyed a portion of the set [6]. Meanwhile, Zaverlyayev’s productions are no less chaotic and “not bound by the author’s intent” than *The Ballet of the Three Inseparables*, an amusing and chaotic performance that unfolds in a space of absolute perfection — on the sections of a semi-magic square, and as stated by Zaverlyayev himself, they reveal a direct connection with the mystical concepts of the ideal structure of the world: if we recall, in Dostoevsky’s space, Zaverlyayev opens the descent to Dis (Hades), where, according to *The Divine Comedy* by Dante Alighieri, outside the walls of the medieval city, the Furies and the Minotaur put heresiarchs, murderers and rapists to torture with hellfire.

T. Novikov, in turn, always considered the performances of the New Theatre as mummies’ games, applying the definition “a maximally

simplified folklore perception of the classics” [18, p. 82]⁽⁴⁾. Accordingly, in his review he primarily focused on the crowd scene of a racing event from *Anna Karenina*: “It was fascinating to see the Russian custom of “hobby-horsing” in the racing scene staged by the director E. Yufit (who also perfectly played the part of Vronsky’s horse). Yuri Guryanov altered his part to imitate dressing up as hussars, popular in the Urals... The part of Anna Karenina can now be considered a classic example of travesty, so popular in public merrymaking. This part was brilliantly played by the great actor Sergei Bugaev. The elements of farce acrobatics and clowning also penetrated into the performance. Actors form figures and human pyramids on stage, the folk “vacuum cleaner” game has been successfully introduced. <...> In its next production, the New Theatre reintroduced the technique of “playing” the classics, trying to attribute some properties inherent in Dostoevsky to the game. Folk performances have always been characterized by grotesque turmoil. In *The Idiot* it is taken to extremes, and it is not the text but action that conveys frenzy of Dostoevsky’s characters” [18, p. 82]. Novikov also briefly describes the musical accompaniment of the performance by the New Composers: “The music is all borrowed (popular songs — an analogue to a musical box), with the elements of skipping record, at times suddenly filled with a completely new sounding” [18, p. 81].

Another participant and at the same time the interpreter of events from among the New Artists — the artist and writer Vladislav Gutsevich (he participated in *Anna Karenina* and *The Shooting Skier* (1986) by Sergei Bugaev, the last one in the history of the New Theatre in Erik Goroshevsky’s attic) produced a more detailed genealogy of Zaverlyaev’s performances. In his article *On the New Theatre*, he follows Novikov’s (Igor Potapov’s) narrative style and easily moves from the 1922 Moscow Art Theatre studio production of *Princess Turandot* to commedia dell’arte, ritual dances of African and Australian tribes, the cults of Ancient Egypt, and Shrovetide festivities. Gutsevich briefly covers the issue of erasing the boundaries between professional theatre and theatre of the people, highlighting the fact that “professional actors work side by side with amateur ones” and the “returning of theatre from the squares and streets to the chamber

ambience, the same balagan stage” [5, p. 84]. This last point by Gutsevich, however, is in contradiction with his narration because a balagan is a street theatre and because in the previous paragraph, as a forerunner of the experiments by the New in the field of merging people’s and professional theatre, he mentions “Evreinov’s theatre ..., the stage of which is squares and city streets” [5, p. 84]⁽⁵⁾.

Meanwhile, Gutsevich was right: Nikolai Evreinov’s theatre can be considered one of the prototypes of the New Theatre, which removes the inconsistency that emerged in the text by Gutsevich due to reticence. The famous mass action *Assault on the Winter Palace* (1920) inspired not only the film *October* by Sergei Eisenstein, who completed Nikolai Evreinov’s theory and practice with his “montage of attractions”, but also a whole series of grandiose Soviet productions, in particular, flagship concerts depicting the triumph of profusion on the stage of the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in the late Soviet era. They are the ones that became the source of the chaotic Bakhtinian transformational change in Sergey Kuryokhin’s Pop Mechanics. What requires to be considered separately is Kuryokhin’s mass theatre, in which “the New” were regular participants (Novikov, Bugaev, Kotelnikov, Kozlov, Gutsevich, Gurianov, Viktor Tsoy and Andrey Krisanov as members of the Kino band, Vladislav Mamyshev-Monroe). The New Theatre traces its origin to the brilliant idea of Nikolai Evreinov and the basis of his theory, the famous “theatre for oneself”, which, as known, is brought into being by the author and the actor in one person and is inherent in nature and man, both displaying a total theatrical instinct for life transformation in the course of “expressive simplification” [7, p. 525; 8, pp. 113—406]. The playful element was characteristic of all the undertakings of the New Artists, but what distinguished their leader Novikov was theatricism of his character and behaviour. In his youth, when free time was more than enough, he enjoyed being photographed, portraying various characters either at home, on the street or even on public transport. These photographs remind of another historical precedent for the “theatre for oneself” — staged photography of Alisa Poret

(4) See, for example, a research on the “balagan tradition” of the Russian avant-garde theatre of the 20th century [24].

(5) Along with Nikolai Evreinov, the theatre reformers Vakhtangov and Meyerhold, Okhlopkov and Dikoy [apparently, A.D. Dikiy. — E.A.] are mentioned.

and Tatyana Glebova's society, in which Daniil Kharms and Alexander Vvedensky took part.

The beginning of the New Theatre in *The Ballet of the Three Inseparables* allows establishing a succession to the OBERIU theatre, although Novikov and Gutsevich did not mention either Radix or *Three Leftist Hours*, which they possibly did not think about in 1985. The OBERIU theatre⁽⁶⁾ was also the “theatre for oneself”, and was distinguished by improvisation, program multimedia, understanding absurdism as an interlink between the high and low culture, between life and art, and by zero approach to set and sound design. All these characteristic features are mentioned in the memoirs about Radix by its director Georgy Katsman and in the memoirs by Igor Bakhterev and Klimenty Mints about the *Three Leftist Hours* evening. Here is what Katsman told about the production of Kharms and Vvedensky's drama *My Mom Is All in Watches* (being prepared in 1926 at GINHUK) in his interview with Mikhail Meylakh in 1978: “Radix was conceived as a “pure theatre”, a theatre of experiment focusing not so much on the end result or the audience as on the actors themselves experiencing the pure theatrical action. Initially, no one asked if anything would ever come of it; more and more characters were introduced that had no importance for the plot, and a single text of the play was never written ... it was “montage of attractions”. The only focus in the performance was the actors' experience of theatrical forms... Radix was a conglomerate of diverse arts — theatre, music, dance, literature, and painting. When appealing to these diverse arts, the element of parody and estrangement was very important. <...> The performance was opened by the “rubber dancer” Zina Borodina. <...> Another character to stand out was Lohengrin — an “opera character”: a young man who was wearing tights, speaking tenor and tiptoeing. <...>

(6) Research on the OBERIU theatre is not numerous. Geoff Cebula discusses OBERIU in one of the chapters of his dissertation [22, pp. 88–123]. He states that improvisation in theatrical performance and scenic shifts were of great importance for Kharms, and emphasizes the connection not with professional theatre (for example, the Meyerhold Theatre, from which Kharms borrowed the montage principle), but with the amateur workers' theatre of Igor Terentiev. Analysing Terentiev's theatre, G. Cebula studies an aspect of it, equally important for both OBERIU and the New Artists, which is the “non-author”, experimental and absurd (through a productive error) development of a theatrical performance, and suggests considering these qualities of the OBERIU theatre not only as a product of the authors' youth, but also as a call to return the experimentalism of the early Avant-Garde to the reality of the ideological theatre of the “living newspapers” and academic productions. See: [23, pp. 11–27; 24].

Some “celebrities” were attracted, in particular the famous Antonio, who whistled Honegger's⁽⁷⁾ blues, but with a peculiar “Russian national colour”, which now makes one recall Igor Stravinsky's *Mavra*... Kharms... said that he would like to mix Honegger with a “real guards drum”. <...> The sets were designed by Bakhterev, including the “romantic” one depicting a “bridge over St. Petersburg”... On the background there was a Clodt's horse; in time with the exclamation of one of the actors, the dome of St. Isaac's Cathedral was turned upside down” [10, pp. 172–175]. Georgy Katsman's memoirs encourage us to relate the sound montage of Radix to the experiments of Verichev and especially Kuryokhin, and its absurdist design — to the works of Oleg Kotelnikov, Ivan Sotnikov, and Sergei Bugaev, who created sets for the performances of the New Theatre.

As it is known, the performance of the Radix theatre did not take place due to the arrest of the director Georgy Katsman. The OBERIU theatre performance was given at the second attempt, at the literary, theatre and film evening *Three Leftist Hours* in the Leningrad Publishing House (Shuvalov Palace) on January 24, 1928. Klimenty Mints, participant of the third, cinematic hour, director and co-author of the anti-war film *The Meat-Grinder* that was shown at the event, recalled it in 1984. At the end of his memoirs, Mints stated that “the management of the Leningrad circus suggested... repeating the evening...” [13, p. 205]. He also mentioned that the oberiuty had watched the famous performance *The Inspector General* at the Leningrad Publishing House directed by Igor Terentiev (1927), and at their event, they used props left from Terentiev's performance: Kharms was coming on stage atop a moving black wardrobe, which, undoubtedly, was a reference to *The Cherry Orchard*. Mints also recalled the fact that Terentiev wanted to call his theatre the “anti-artistic theatre” [13, p. 199]. This name reminds of Rodion Zavernyaev's Anti-theatre, at the height of which the polemic with the Moscow Art Theatre was no longer relevant; what still mattered was the priorities of the life theatre and the avant-garde conditional theatre over the professional and realistic theatre, that is, the priorities of the aesthetics of OBERIU and the New Artists over all forms of conventional realism.

(7) Arthur Honegger — a member of Les Six; in 1928 he visited Leningrad and communicated with Dmitry Shostakovich.

Igor Bakhterev, poet, actor and artist, immediate participant in all theatrical initiatives of OBERIU, made specific mention of actors' improvisation skills, as well as the equal value of actors and musicians, both professional and amateur, in *Elizabeth Bam* by D. Kharms performed during the second, theatrical hour of the event: "One of the main characters was brilliantly played by Charlie Manevich, a participant in self-directed activity at the "Red Putilovets"; and the poet Yevgeny Vigilyansky skilfully got into the character of Elizabeth's father" [2, p. 129]. He also highlighted the principle of collective creative activity, characteristic of the oberiuty, which was also an important one for the New Artists: "The first hour of the event — an introduction by several hosts. It was supposed to be a short speech by several people. <...> Reading it together was intended to demonstrate that OBERIU is an association of equals, with no first fiddles. We did not prepare and rehearse anything, what was to be done? If Zabolotsky or Kharms spoke, they would be perceived as leaders. At the last minute, I was chosen to speak, a twenty-year-old who looked eighteen. <...> Jazz was being played; the people had arrived and were dancing in the aisles and in the foyer... I wanted to ask Kharms or Zabolotsky for advice, but received the same answer: "Say whatever you want, it does not matter" [2, p. 135].

Conclusion

Thus, we have outlined the three elements of the avant-garde theatrical thought and tradition that are resonant with the New Theatre of the New Artists: Nikolai Evreinov's comprehensive concept of the "theatre for oneself", the musical-spatial theatrical experiments of Mikhail Matyshin and his followers, the absurdist theatre of Daniil Kharms and OBERIU. The second and third, despite being so dissimilar to each other, share the borderline, where zaum (alogism) and absurdism converge. In fact, this very convergence creates a dynamic semantic tension that is characteristic of creative work of both D. Kharms and T. Novikov: the tension between an uplifting absurdity, focusing on the inexpressible, timeless, and universal, and, conversely, a lowering, destructive absurdity. Nikolay Lossky calls this dynamics the "rejection leading to an area lower than what is being rejected, and vice versa, rejection leading to a higher area" [12, p. 75]. It is apparent that the distinction between the two types of absurdism is

a fundamental problem of ontology not only of the Russian Avant-Garde. The New Theatre can be considered as a seismic activity that lasted for about three years at the borderline area of the avant-garde art, which worked its way from Symbolism through Expressionism to Dadaism and Surrealism. On this borderline, creativity manifests itself as an impersonal or other-than-personal process that establishes a connection of a person with the rhythms of the world (the utuigon concert and *The Ballet of the Three Inseparables*) or, on the contrary, illustrates disintegration, deconstruction and reassembly of society (*Anna Karenina* and *The Idiot*). Of interest is almost a circus balancing of Novikov on this borderline, when he approaches the surreal theatrical practice of OBERIU in its rebirth and then, in the late 1980s, moves towards the ambient "neat tendencies" (a festival of neoacademism at the Pavlovsk Palace) that return the harmonic integration point of the world.

In conclusion, it is essential to highlight one more aspect of the history of the New Theatre: the controversial attitudes to the attribute "avant-garde" in the texts by Zavernyaev, Novikov and Gutsevich. In his interview with Dmitry Volchek, Rodion Zavernyaev refuses to be a follower of Beckett, that is, of the Western European Avant-Garde, reminding of the earlier tradition of OBERIU — *Elizabeth Bam* and *The Ivanovs' New Year Party* [11, pp. 252–263]. Gutsevich applies expressions like "cheap avant-gardism" and "stilted amateur art" to refer to the menacing Scylla and Charybdis the New Theatre slid between [5, p. 85]. Novikov never tired of writing about the connection between the New Theatre and the theatre of the people. This, in fact, calls to mind the productions by the Soyuz Molodyozhi (Union of the Youth) artistic group, which Novikov himself, however, does not mention. According to Novikov, the cultic, ritualistic approach was not in the nature of the neo-folk merrymaking: "The primary aim of merrymaking in recent centuries, when it lost its magical meaning, is amusement and entertainment. <...> Short accounts of famous writings and creating jokes on their basis have long been established as a separate folklore genre" [18, p. 81]. Therefore, the point at issue is not only people's theatre in the traditional sense, but also the modern urban folklore.

How can these statements by Gutsevich and Novikov be explained? On the one hand, they can be understood as an attempt to adapt to the norms of socialist realism aimed at the Higher Authorities, as long as with the beginning of perestroika, underground artists had a chance to

appear on the public stage. Novikov's articles contain parodic references to Soviet critical clichés ("a novel work, modern in form"). Nevertheless, Novikov was genuinely interested in folk, people's art. One of the reasons for his interest was undoubtedly the creative work of Maria Sinyakova-Urechina who had a great influence on Novikov's worldview in the early 1980s. Being a follower of the theorist and practitioner of the Avant-Garde V. Khlebnikov, in her paintings she presented the Avant-Garde as a new spirit of people's art with its original aspirations for beauty, joy and goodness. As for Novikov himself, a theoretician of "the New", since the mid-1980s, on repeated occasions he expressed his attitude towards the Avant-Garde, emphasizing his unwillingness to theorize. Thus, in an article about zero music he introduced a separate section entitled "The connection between zero music and the Avant-Garde", which says: "The methods listed above have long been applied in the Avant-Garde, and many musical compositions are similar in sound to zero music. The difference is difficult to understand only because fundamentally there is no real difference. It is all about the ZERO approach. The significant quest of the Avant-Garde is directly opposed to the meaningless, undocumented NON-quest of the zeroists. They have zero, and they need no more. In art and music they take anything they can get their hands on.

Ask me what is the good I have found in zero music and I will answer: NOTHING. I find nothing in it at all. It is zero. But what I am heartened by is that in culture there appears an element of the recognition of absurdity, outlandish ambitions, and inconsistency of theorizing" [19, p. 90].

As follows from the quote above, Novikov himself is by no means outside but inside the avant-garde tradition, in particular the one that developed starting from works by Kozma Prutkov to the paradoxical philosophical writings by Daniil Kharms, who could easily switch between thinking thoughts about the infinity being the answer to all questions and watching roosters and hens in the farmyard. Thus, we may speak of the consistent avant-garde patriotism of the creators of the New Theatre, their reluctance to see the avant-garde tradition as conservative (or using Novikov's words, as the tradition of "conservation in conservatoires") and then the commitment to a constant, active forward motion towards the freedom of artistic expression.

We consider the history of the New Theatre as a rebirth of the avant-garde, modernist theatre in St. Petersburg — Leningrad, functioning in the

paradoxical space of metaphysics and at the same time randomness, or at the confluence of expressionism, with its archaic-innovative universal rhythms, and surrealism, with its eccentrically montaged collective unconscious. Hence the active involvement of "the New" in the rhythm of the world, their ability to attribute vocality to the transcendental "fifth meaning of a subject", an iron or a drip, to make it sound. Hence the chaotic happenings in the "heavenly" magic square or the descent to Hades that gave the audience a chance to participate in the disconcertingly outrageous and natural (the exact words by Sergey Khrenov to characterize the New Theatre [6]) artistic act of close art colleagues, which immediately makes that period (which was still Soviet then) non-standard, that is, non-Soviet.

References:

- 1 Alekseeva A.A., Uchitel' K.A. Teatr leningradskogo andegraunda [Leningrad Underground Theater]. *Teatral'noe delo: Nauka i praktika: sb. statej* [Theatrical Business: Science and Practice: Collection of Articles], ed. L.A. Sazonova. Moscow, St. Petersburg, RIGISI Publ., Chistyj List Publ., 2017, pp. 85–106. (In Russian)
- 2 Bahterev I.V. Kogda my byli molodymi [When We Were Young]. *Daniil Harms glazami sovremennikov: Vospominaniya. Dnevnik. Pis'ma* [Daniil Kharms Through the Eyes of Contemporaries: Memoirs. Diaries. Letters], ed. A.L. Dmitrenko, V.N. Sazhin. St. Petersburg, Vita-Nova Publ., 2019, pp. 94–138. (In Russian)
- 3 Beseda s Arkadiem Dragomoshchenko [Interview with Arkady Dragomoshchenko]. *Timur. "Vrat' tol'ko pravdu!"* [Timur. "Lie Only the Truth!"], compl. E. Andreeva. St. Petersburg, Amfora Publ., 2007, pp. 353–364. (In Russian)
- 4 Beseda s Ivanom Sotnikovym [Interview with Ivan Sotnikov]. *Timur. "Vrat' tol'ko pravdu!"* [Timur. "Lie Only the Truth!"], compl. E. Andreeva. St. Petersburg, Amfora Publ., 2007, pp. 68–90. (In Russian)
- 5 Bronislavskij G. O Novom teatre [About the New Theater]. *Novye hudozhniki. 1982–1987: Antologija* [The New Artists. 1982–1987: Anthology], ed. E. Andreeva, E. Kolovskaya. St. Petersburg, 1996, pp. 83–85. (In Russian)
- 6 Volchek D. Tam, gde shurshat plat'ja [Where the Dresses Rustle]. *Teatr*, 2011, no. 4. Available at: <http://oteatre.info/tam-gde-shurshat-platja/> (accessed 27.03.2022). (In Russian)
- 7 Evreinov N.N. *Otkrovenie iskusstva* [The Revelation of Art]. St. Petersburg, Mir Publ., 2012. 776 p. (In Russian)
- 8 Evreinov N.N. Teatr dlja sebja [Theatre for Oneself]. Evreinov N.N. *Demon teatral'nosti* [Demon of Theatricality], compl., ed. and comm. A.U. Zubkov, V.I. Maksimov. Moscow, St. Petersburg, Letnij sad Publ., 2002, pp. 115–408. (In Russian)
- 9 Zavernjaev R. O Novom teatre [About the New Theater]. *Novye hudozhniki. 1982–1987: Antologija* [The New Artists. 1982–1987: Anthology], ed. E. Andreeva, E. Kolovskaya. St. Petersburg, 1996, p. 83. (In Russian)
- 10 Kacman G.N. (Vospominaniya) [Memoirs]. *Daniil Harms glazami sovremennikov: Vospominaniya. Dnevnik. Pis'ma* [Daniil Kharms Through the Eyes of Contemporaries: Memoirs. Diaries. Letters], ed. A.L. Dmitrenko, V.N. Sazhin. St. Petersburg, Vita-Nova Publ., 2019, pp. 172–175. (In Russian)
- 11 Lindon Dmitriev. Beseda s Rodionom [Interview with Rodion]. *Chasy*, 1987, vol. 68, pp. 252–263. (In Russian)
- 12 Losskij N.O. *Mir kak organicheskoe celoe* [The World as an Organic Whole]. Moscow, G.A. Leman and S.I. Saharov Publ., 1917. 174 p. (In Russian)
- 13 Minc K.B. Objeruty [OBERIUTs]. *Daniil Harms glazami sovremennikov: Vospominaniya. Dnevnik. Pis'ma* [Daniil Kharms Through the Eyes of Contemporaries: Memoirs. Diaries. Letters], ed. A.L. Dmitrenko, V.N. Sazhin. St. Petersburg, Vita-Nova Publ., 2019, pp. 192–205. (In Russian)
- 14 Novikov T.P. Novye hudozhniki [The New Artists]. Novikov T.P. *Lekcii* [Lectures]. St. Petersburg, NAIL, Galereja D137 Publ., 2003, pp. 67–96. (In Russian)
- 15 Novikova K. Novye hudozhniki. Hronika [The New Artists. Chronicles]. *Novye hudozhniki* [The New Artists], ed. and compl. E. Andreeva, N. Podgorskaya. Moscow, Maier Publ., 2012, pp. 270–289. (In Russian)
- 16 Povelikhina A. "Total'nyj teatr" M. Matjushina [Matyushin's "Total Theater"]. *Organika. Bespredmetnyj mir Prirody v russkom avangarde XX veka: Vystavka v galeree Gmurzhinska: Katalog* [Organics. The Non-Objective World of Nature in the Russian Avant-Garde of the 20th Century: Exhibition at the Gmurzynska Gallery: Catalog], ed. A.V. Povelikhina. Moscow, RA Publ., 2000, pp. 81–84. (In Russian)
- 17 Potapov I. Novye kompozitory [The New Composers]. *ASSA: Poslednee pokolenie leningradskogo avangarda* [ASSA: The Last Generation of the Leningrad Avant-Garde], compl. S. Bugaev, p. Popova. St. Petersburg, Nevidimye struktury Publ., 2013, p. 130. (In Russian)
- 18 Potapov I. Novyj teatr [The New Theater]. *Novye hudozhniki. 1982–1987: Antologija* [The New Artists. 1982–1987: Anthology], ed. E. Andreeva, E. Kolovskaya. St. Petersburg, 1996, pp. 81–82. (In Russian)
- 19 Potapov I. Nol' muzyka kak fenomen novoj muzyki [Zero Music as a Phenomenon of the New Music]. *Novye hudozhniki. 1982–1987: Antologija* [The New Artists. 1982–1987: Anthology], ed. E. Andreeva, E. Kolovskaya. St. Petersburg, 1996, pp. 88–90. (In Russian)
- 20 Fobo H. *Balet treh nerazluchnikov* [Ballet of the Three Inseparables]. Available at: <http://www.e-e.eu/Ballet-Exhibition/index.htm> (accessed 27.03.2022). (In Russian)
- 21 Ender B.V. *Dnevnik* [Diaries], ed. A. Povelikhina. Vol. 1: 1916–1936. Moscow, Muzej Organicheskoy kul'tury Publ., 2018. 428 p. (In Russian)
- 22 Cebula G. The Theater of Real Art. Cebula G. *Left Flank of the Avant-Garde: The Evolution of OBERIU Poetics*. Princeton University, 2016, pp. 88–123. Available at: <http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/dsp01dz010s54k> (accessed 27.03.2022).
- 23 Cebula G. OBERIU Theatre in the Context of Early Soviet Amateurism. *The Russian Review*, January 2019, vol. 78, issue 1, pp. 11–27.
- 24 Clayton J.D. *Pierrot in Petrograd: The Commedia dell'Arte. Balagan in Twentieth-Century Russian Theatre and Drama*. Montreal, McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993. 369 p.
- 25 Fobo H. *Timur Novikov and Ivan Sotnikov: the Utiugon*. Available at: <http://www.e-e.eu/Club-81/Utiugon.html> (accessed 27.03.2022).
- 26 Kharms D. The Oberiu Theatre (1928). *Twentieth Century Theatre: A Sourcebook*, ed. R. Drain. London, Routledge, 1995, pp. 48–50.

Список литературы:

- 1 Алексеева А.А., Учитель К.А. Театр ленинградского андеграунда // Театральное дело: Наука и практика: сб. статей / Отв. ред. Л.А. Сазонова. М., СПб.: Изд-во РГИСИ, Чистый лист, 2017. С. 85–106.
- 2 Бахтерев И.В. Когда мы были молодыми // Даниил Хармс глазами современников: Воспоминания. Дневники. Письма / Под. ред. А.Л. Дмитренко и В.Н. Сажина. СПб.: Вита-Нова, 2019. С. 94–138.
- 3 Беседа с Аркадием Драгомощенко // Тимур. «Врать только правду!» / Авт.-сост. Е. Андреева. СПб.: Амфора, 2007. С. 353–364.
- 4 Беседа с Иваном Сотниковым // Тимур. «Врать только правду!» / Авт.-сост. Е. Андреева. СПб.: Амфора, 2007. С. 68–90.
- 5 Брониславский Г. О Новом театре // Новые художники. 1982–1987: Антология / Ред. Е. Андреева, Е. Коловская. СПб., 1996. С. 83–85.
- 6 Волчек Д. Там, где шуршат платья // Театр. 2011. № 4. URL: <http://oteatre.info/tam-gde-shurshat-plateja/> (дата обращения 27.03.2022).
- 7 Евреинов Н.Н. Откровение искусства. СПб.: Мир, 2012. 776 с.
- 8 Евреинов Н.Н. Театр для себя // Евреинов Н.Н. Демон театральности / Сост., общ. ред и комм. А.Ю. Зубкова и В.И. Максимова. М.; СПб.: Летний сад, 2002. С. 115–408.
- 9 Заверняев Р. О Новом театре // Новые художники. 1982–1987: Антология / Ред. Е. Андреева, Е. Коловская. СПб., 1996. С. 83.
- 10 Кацман Г.Н. (Воспоминания) // Даниил Хармс глазами современников: Воспоминания. Дневники. Письма / Под. ред. А.Л. Дмитренко и В.Н. Сажина. СПб.: Вита-Нова, 2019. С. 172–175.
- 11 Линдон Дмитриев. Беседа с Родионом // Часы. 1987. Т. 68. С. 252–263.
- 12 Лосский Н.О. Мир как органическое целое. М.: Г.А. Леман и С.И. Сахаров, 1917. 174 с.
- 13 Минц К.Б. Обэриуты // Даниил Хармс глазами современников: Воспоминания. Дневники. Письма / Под. ред. А.Л. Дмитренко и В.Н. Сажина. СПб.: Вита-Нова, 2019. С. 192–205.
- 14 Новиков Т.П. Новые художники // Новиков Т.П. Лекции. СПб.: НАИИ, Галерея Д137, 2003. С. 67–96.
- 15 Новикова К. Новые художники. Хроника // Новые художники / Ред.-сост. Е. Андреева, Н. Подгорская. М.: Maier, 2012. С. 270–289.
- 16 Повелихина А.В. «Тотальный театр» М. Матюшина // Органика. Беспредметный мир Природы в русском авангарде XX века: Выставка в галерее Гмуржинска: Каталог / Науч. ред. А.В. Повелихина. М.: RA, 2000. С. 81–84.
- 17 Поталов И. Новые композиторы // АССА: Последнее поколение ленинградского авангарда / Авт.-сост. С. Бугаев, П. Попова. СПб.: Невидимые структуры, 2013. С. 130.
- 18 Поталов И. Новый театр // Новые художники. 1982–1987: Антология / Ред. Е. Андреева, Е. Коловская. СПб., 1996. С. 81–82.
- 19 Поталов И. Ноль музыка как феномен новой музыки // Новые художники. 1982–1987: Антология / Ред. Е. Андреева, Е. Коловская. СПб., 1996. С. 88–90.
- 20 Фобо Х. Балет трех неразлучников. URL: <http://www.e-e.eu/Ballet-Exhibition/index.htm> (дата обращения 27.03.2022).
- 21 Эндер Б.В. Дневники / Под ред. А. Повелихиной. Т. 1: 1916–1936. М.: Музей Органической Культуры, 2018. 428 с.
- 22 Cebula G. The Theater of Real Art // Cebula G. Left Flank of the Avant-Garde: The Evolution of OBERIU Poetics. Princeton University, 2016. P. 88–123. URL: <http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/dsp01dz010s54k> (дата обращения 27.03.2022).
- 23 Cebula G. OBERIU Theatre in the Context of Early Soviet Amateurism // The Russian Review. January 2019. Vol. 78. Issue 1. P. 11–27.
- 24 Clayton J.D. Pierrot in Petrograd: The Commedia dell'Arte // Balagan in Twentieth-Century Russian Theatre and Drama. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993. 369 p.
- 25 Fobo H. Timur Novikov and Ivan Sotnikov: the Utiugon. URL: <http://www.e-e.eu/Club-81/Utiugon.html> (дата обращения 27.03.2022).
- 26 Kharms D. The Oberiu Theatre (1928) // Twentieth Century Theatre: A Sourcebook / Ed. by R. Drain. London: Routledge, 1995. P. 48–50.