

# Social Networks of Russian Emigrants' First Wave according to Bunins' Diaries: Analysis and Interpretation

Elizaveta Senatorova

## Introduction

From 1928 till 1939, the literary field of Russian emigrant writers in Paris was undergoing significant changes. Traditionally the community of writers was divided into two generations, the older and the younger one. At the beginning of the 1920th writers from the first generation, such as D. Merezhkovsy, V. Khodasevich, Z. Gippius, I. Bunin, dictated the tone of the prose and poetry. They were mentors and role models for young writers, who emigrated to Europe from the USSR only in the middle of the 1920th, and of course, they organized specific literary societies around themselves (f.e. *Perekrestok*, *Noviy Dom*, or *Noviy Korabl'*). Moreover, they had a mission – to preserve Russian literature heritage and create a new line of Russian literary evolution away from their homeland. Hence, they had a dominant position at the literary stage. However, this situation changed when the younger generation felt their power and started to diverge from the literary tradition, creating a new prose and poetry format and feeling the European authors' influence. That happened exactly in the earlier mentioned period.

The main goal of this research is the visualization of first-wave emigrants' relationships. Expressing in Pierre Bourdieu's terms from the article *Le champ littéraire* [Bourdieu 1991], I aim to explore which niche was occupied by whom in the literary field, which communities existed, is it possible to observe clusters on the graph, were there any evident leaders centering emigrants around themselves, did they replace each other over time, and did the symbolic capital influence their position in the network.

For such kind of study, the most relevant approach is social network analysis (SNA), based on the ego-documents, diaries, letters, or other sources of information. In this case, the role of the data's primary source is going to Bunins' diaries, written in the period from 1928 to 1939. It would be curious to observe if the emigrant society's image is objective through the Bunins' prism of perception. Moreover, this research's central question is if the Bunins' circle was stable over 12 years or transformed.

## Methodology

The network analysis allows depicting relations among actors to analyze further the social structures that emerge from the recurrence of these relations. Many articles are dedicated to this subject, but most of them are based on social nets, such as Facebook or Twitter, which reserve big data. However, it is possible to find pertinent studies among the abundance of research, which could underlie the actual topic.

First and foremost, the model approach is offered by B. Orekhov, P. Uspenskij, and N. Faynberg in the article called *Tsyfrovye podhody k "Kamer-*

*furierskomu zhurnalu*” V.F. Khodasevicha [Orekhov, Uspenskij, and Fajnb erg 2018]. Among the Russian-language articles, this one, placed at the periphery of philology, sociology, and digital humanities, is unique. Analyzing Khodasevich’s journal, which consists of numerous relatively short and terse notes, written at the turn of the 20th and 30th of the XX century, the researchers managed to construct several statistical bar charts and graphs of relationships between emigrant writers. That allowed them to observe how Khodasevich’s social circle was changing during the extended period. This article, significant for the present study, offers a suitable methodology and creates the expecting results’ image. Moreover, it works as a litmus paper: if the present research results about Bunins’ diaries correlate with this study’s idea about Khodasevich, that will mean that the sociological process’s perception in the literary emigrant community was comparatively objective.

Based on the corpora of letters, other works give the flavor of how the research’s technical side should be organized. By now, such a project as *Six Degrees of Francis Bacon* [*Six Degrees of Francis Bacon* n.d.] seems to be unattainable, but the idea of how these graphs of relationships could look is clear. Another example of professional work with network analysis – the article *From Entity Description to Semantic Analysis: The Case of Theodor Fontane’s Notebooks* [Iglesia and Göbel 2015]. The authors encode the corpus of letters according to TEI standards and visualize social networks. In my research, TEI markup would play the most significant role. The technical part is described in the appendix.

Finally, not only the methodology has a crucial value in this study, but also the skill of the results’ interpretation. Obviously, for the latter issue,

knowledge about the cultural situation in Paris during the period from 1928 to 1939 is essential. Therefore, the current study relies on *How It Was Done In Paris* [Livak 2003] and *Nina Berberova et La Mythologie Culturelle de L'Emigration Russe en France* [Livak 2002], written by Leonid Livak, and Irina's Kaspé fundamental work "*Iskusstvo otsutstvovat*": *Nezamechennoe pokolenie russkoi literatury* [Kaspé 2005].

Approaching the Bunins' corpus, it should be emphasized that their diaries were initially fragmented notes, preserved in the archive of close family friend Leonid Zurov. After his death, Militsa Grin, the researcher and the keeper of Bunins' heritage, united notes into a three-volume edition called *Ustami Buninyh* and published in 1977 in the publishing house "Posev." The chosen diaries belong to the second ("Chuzhbina" [Bunin 1981]) and the third ("Na ishode" [Bunin 1982]) parts of the third volume.

The crucial reason for working exactly with these texts is that they are perfectly structured and detailed. Many emigrants' diaries contain private notes or political-cultural-philosophical essays (f.e. diaries of Z. Gippius, B. Zaitsev, and B. Poplavsky). Still, the amount of diaries describing "meetings" is relatively small - besides Bunins, only Khodasevich's *Kamer-furiersky Journal* [Khodasevich 2000, 2002] can be considered as an acceptable source. The composition of diaries is facile - they are separated by years, which, in its turn, are separated into dated notes. A noteworthy fact is that Grin united Bunin's and Muromtseva's notes with the argument that the authors complement each others' lacunae. Of course, she strove to eliminate repetitions and comment on gaps in the narration (a part of Bunin's diaries was destroyed) and surnames of mentioned people. However, the edition is incomplete - the

text is full of intentional cuts, "required shortenings," according to Grin. To my regret, I could not check what was omitted because a significant part of Bunins' archive is repositied in Great Britain. Therefore, for objective reasons, I do not claim the absolute completeness and accuracy of my data.

## Analysis of the Common Graph

To begin with, the literary field, consisting of critics, poets, writers, journalists, publicists, and editors, accounts for 47% of the graph. As expected, Bunins are generally surrounded by people from the older generation (62.5% of the total number of literary figures). Young authors occupy approximately 21% of the literary field. The remaining 17% of people do not fall under this division due to the combination of literature with other activity areas.

53% of the total number of networks' nodes include doctors, professors, musicians, artists, actors, relatives, religious figures, politicians, and, finally, people of liberal professions (lawyers, tailors, etc.). Most of them had encounters with Bunins no more than twice. Thus, the circle of Bunins interactions is quite diverse, although this research is focused only on the artistic part of it.

Before the network visualization, I contemplated that Bunins' communication circle in the emigration would consist of several predominant communities. First of all, it had to be the circle of literati, related to the earliest and the long-standing emigrant journal *Sovremennye zapiski* ("Contemporary Papers"), published in Paris in 1920-1940. As M. Ginzburg writes in the introduction to M. Vishnyak's memoirs, "*The magazine played a role,*

*which had no precedents in the annals of Russian journalism - the role of a cultural center that brought together almost all prominent representatives of the Russian intellectuals in exile*" [Vishnyak 1957]. Actually, the editors (Vishnyak and I. Bunakov-Fondaminsky, Bunin's close friend, as will be visible on my graph) successfully achieved the ambitious goal: D. Merezhkovsky, Z. Gippius, B. Zaitsev, A. Kuprin, M. Osorgin, I. Shmelev, A. Bely, and others of the brightest representatives of Russian emigrant literature were the columnists in the journal. Bunin was no exception: such masterpieces as *Life of Arsenyev* (perhaps Bunin's principal work in exile), *Mitya's Love*, and *Sunstroke* were firstly published in *Sovremennye zapiski*.

The second community should have been formed around Gippius and Merezhkovsky, whose role in emigration is problematic to overestimate. On the one hand, they initiated the engagements of *Zelyenaya Lampa* ("Green Lamp") from 1927 up to 1939. The editors of *Sovremenny Zapiski* and Bunin himself were also among the participants of these meetings. On the other hand, Gippius and Merezhkovsky, unlike Bunin, assumed the role of mentors for the younger generation of the émigré writers: Gippius was the founder and the patroness of the journals *Novy Korabl* ("New Ship") and *Novy Dom* ("New Home"). Further, it will be shown on the graph that the younger generation, represented by N. Otsup, I. Odoevtseva, N. Berberova, G. Adamovich, G. Kuznetsova, and L. Zurov, has the joint edges with them. There was only one of the younger generation who did not get into this cluster. It was V. Nabokov (Sirin), who occupied a unique position in the émigré literature.

Finally, according to my hypothesis, there should be a third community

depicting Bunins' family circle. I expected that G. Kuznetsova, M. Stepun, L. Zurov, N. Roshchin, L. Zhirova, and her daughter Olga would enter it because all of them lived in Bunins' house in Grasse (France) at one time or another.

After the graph automatic processing and filtering, 11 communities were detected. The following five persons compose the centers of the communities, and their nodes have the highest rate of betweenness centrality (**BC**) and weighted degree (**WD**):

- M. Aldanov (Landau), [**BC** = **126.95**, **WD** = **51**] - the clusters that he unites are partially structured around people who occupy the leading positions in *Sovremennye Zapiski*. Among them is Fondaminsky, Vishnyak, Zaitsev, Khodasevich, Tsetlin, Teffi. Surprisingly, he has no connections with the Merezhkovskys;
- Gippius [**BC** = **32.67**, **WD** = **58**] and Merezhkovsky [**BC** = 18.92, **WD** = 52] - as mentioned earlier, they are associated with those few of the younger generation who were mentioned in the selected diaries. Besides, they have access to some of the "elders" - Tsetlin and Khodasevich, for example. The latter is associated with S. Sokolov, the symbolist and ideologist of the "white movement," and V. Unkovsky, the doctor and literary figure. All of them attended the funeral of Sokolov's wife, Nina Petrovskaya;
- Kuznetsova [**BC** = **48.47**, **WD** = **79**] - as the center of Bunins' home circle, she has a tight connection with family members. Besides, she is partially associated with the people mentioned above, the Nobel family (with whom the Bunins met in 1933 during the award), and Oleinikov, Bunin's doctor;





18 nodes. This backbone will be formed by the above-mentioned people, the leaders among the older generation of writers, and close friends - M. Aldanov, I. Fondaminsky, F. Stepun (editor of the religious and philosophical journal *Novy Grad*), Teffi, Zaitsevs, Merezhkovskys, Tsetlins, Khodasevich, the Bunins' family and E. Lopatin. The latter had known Bunin since 1897, and it was she who introduced him to V. Muromtseva.



Fig.2. 18 nodes with the highest edge weights over 12 years

It should be highlighted that the network density is extremely low - only half a percent. Only the spouses and the triplet Galina Kuznetsova-Marga Stepun-Leonid Zurov have contact with each other (in addition to the Bunins, connected with everyone). It does not mean that all these people did not communicate with each other. Moreover, this is virtually impossible since all of them were published in *Sovremennye Zapiski* (except for the Zhirova and Stepun, who had nothing in common with literature). Instead, it emphasizes the authors' desire to fix personal ties with the circle of emigrants, which in

general is an integral feature of such a genre as diaries. Thus, it is hard to describe the Russian diaspora's sociology in Paris based on the Bunin diaries. However, personal relationships, in the center of which are the Bunins, is possible to portray. The evolution of their relationship with a close circle of writers is visibly apparent in the consistent analysis of graphs for each year.

## Analysis of graphs by years

I would prefer to begin with the "Sovremennye Zapiski" circle, whose members have been surrounding the Bunins for almost 12 years. It seems that the graphs of the late 1920s are the most diverse, but in fact, the same authors of the journal appear in them - Merezhkovsky, Khodasevich, Adamovich. It is noteworthy that Adamovich, who positioned himself as an ideologist of the "younger" and who was a literary opponent of Khodasevich, is in the same cluster with N. Berberova, Khodasevich's wife, who belonged to the younger generation of emigrants. Khodasevich, however, does not enter this cluster. He is mainly associated with those who left Russia at the beginning of the 20s - Zaitsev, Teffi, and Merezhkovskys. Later, even though he had a relatively trusting relationship with the Bunins (Bunin showed Khodasevich's poems to A. Belich so that the poet could receive any subsidies, Khodasevich shared with Bunin his distrust of the Merezhkovsky), he drops out of the network. Probably it is provoked by the breakup of Khodasevich and Berberova in April 1932, after which the poet withdrew into himself and limited his social circle. After 1932, he does not appear in the network.





in the section "Analysis of the Common Graph," and therefore let me focus on the relationship with Aldanov.

Bunin called Aldanov "the last gentleman of the Russian emigration." He highly appreciated his writing talent, and after receiving the opportunity to nominate a candidate for the Nobel Prize (note - thanks to Aldanov, who appealed to his international literary connections to help Bunin get it), he more than once used this chance. As a result, Aldanov was nominated 13 times. After 1933, Aldanov, however, dropped out of the network for two years. It seems that the diaries, in this case, are not very representative, because, judging by the letter from Aldanov to Vera Nikolaevna, he met Bunin more than once: *"...I rarely see Ivan Alekseevich. Once he dined with us, three times we were together in coffee houses (no, more, five times, but almost always in a large company), and recently we spent an evening at the Tsetlins"* [Aldanov 1965].

Thus, the core of *Sovremennye Zapiski* is preserved in the Bunins' network up to 1939. It is remarkable that Vishnyak, one of the journal editor-in-chief, is mentioned once in the diaries, while in his memoirs, he pays much attention to Bunin. Particularly, the confrontation between the writer and the Merezhkovskys in the literary arena falls into his field of vision.

Without a doubt, Bunin and Merezhkovsky were the leading émigré writers, recognized as "coryphaei of Russian literature." According to Vishnyak, *"They took first places in the emigration, they both played the first violin, but they had different surroundings and resonance"* [Vishnyak 1957]. Their interaction can be described as a tactical alliance of Russian culture in exile. In fact, this union was very wavering. When viewing the graphs, it is evident

that their communication intensity is gradually fading away: the weighted degree parameter, which equals 16 for Merezhkovsky and 23 for Gippius, reaches zero in 1933. They will appear in the network again only in 1937 and 1939, and at this time, the Bunins' attitude towards them is ambiguous. On the one hand, in 1937, Muromtseva denying them the organization of the lecture, arguing that the sale of tickets is impossible (from the context, it seems that Muromtseva does not want to be an usherette, although she almost certainly implies a pre-war economic crisis experienced by both representatives of the Russian diaspora and the Parisians themselves). On the other hand, Muromtseva's note from 1939 about her concern is very touching and pitiful: *"I am worried about Lenya, and the "young ladies" ("baryshen"), and the Merezhkovskys. How do they run to the shelter at night? After all, Z.N. sees nothing and hears nothing."* In any case, such a complicated relationship does not seem random.

First of all, from 1930 and until the mentioned date, Sigurd Agrell, professor of Slavic languages at Lund University, had been nominating Bunin and Merezhkovsky for the Nobel Prize. As a result, Merezhkovsky (who had been nominated ten times since 1914) loses to Bunin. This defeat was probably perceived by the Merezhkovskys more acutely than it seems at first glance.

Secondly, Bunin dissented the Merezhkovskys in the question of ideology. With his love for Tolstoy, Chekhov, and Kuprin, he was not ready to reconcile decadence, mysticism, esotericism, and symbolism, which the Merezhkovskys just propagated: *"...in the emigration of the 20s and 30s, literary and poetic achievements were not enough for Merezhkovsky and Merezhkovskaya-Gippius. They laid claim to more: the leading literary and artistic, religious*

*and philosophical, social and political*" [Vishnyak 1957]. The Merezhkovskys, in turn, parried Bunin's attacks with harsh criticism of his works, calling their author a "descriptor." Vishnyak, describing this rivalry, seems to be on Bunin's side, although he agrees that Bunin was a writer of existence (nature, man, everyday life, love, death), and not other worlds and divine providence.

Finally, the Merezhkovskys were among those who nurtured the "change," the young generation of Russian emigrants. This position was unacceptable for Bunin (owing to various circumstances). Earlier I have stated that V. Nabokov (at that time published under the pseudonym Sirin) was the exception among younger emigrants because he was not in the Gippius and Merezhkovsky cluster. It is curious that even in the assessment of his work, the Bunins parted with the Merezhkovskys. Judging by the notes of Vera Nikolaevna, the families adhered to absolutely polar ideas on Nabokov's style. In a conversation on November 15, 1930, Merezhkovsky spoke about Nabokov's work in the following manner: *"I am afraid that all this is mimicry [...] We only need a writer who introduces something new, even small [...] I am only interested in boring books, only they are interesting. Here is "The Captain's Daughter" - you eat it like candy, and Marx or Kant - reading them is the same as inserting a knife into the insides and turning there"* [Shraer 2014]. Muromtseva, on the other hand, appreciates Nabokov for the facility of the style: *"October 10 [1931]. I read Sirina. What lightness he has and how modern he is. He is more modern than many foreign writers. He is the one who [...] has an "ironic attitude towards life." He is the one who will soon be a candidate for the Nobel Prize."* It is noteworthy that she

immediately saw the young writer's potential, who was nominated for the award several times in the 60s. Bunin, in his turn, believed that Nabokov "discovered the whole world" in Russian literature.

Nabokov himself, whose patron was Khodasevich, was greatly influenced by Bunin. The excerpt from a noted conversation with I. Fondaminsky, who argued that Nabokov "*adores I. Al. [i.e., Bunin]*", affirms it. This statement can also be supported by the fact that a young writer read Bunin's poems at a literary evening on December 31, 1933. However, as can be seen on the graphs, Bunins' meetings with Nabokov were only in 1933 (just at the mentioned evening) and 1937 (now at the evening of Nabokov himself). I am inclined to believe that this is not provoked by the little contact between Bunin and Nabokov (moreover, it is known that for 20 years the writers were in active correspondence, 23 letters of which have been preserved in University of Leeds archives). Rather, the problem lies in the presence of cuts in the published diaries. Despite this, it is obvious that of the two poles, Nabokov gravitated towards Bunin. Who knows if his choice somehow influenced the relationship between the Bunins and the Merezhkovskys. It is more crucial that he did not choose any of the "schools" and thus, as it seems, earned the respect of Bunin.

The remaining young writers, represented on the graphs, were divided into two groups: those who fall under the influence of the Merezhkovskys, and those who live side by side with the Bunins in Grasse and form a home circle. In general, the latter community is consistently present on the graphs. Zurov and Kuznetsova have incredibly high indicators of the weighted degree (the maximums for them are 22 and 17, respectively). The situation changes



again in 1933 when Margot Stepun appears. If this year she is still in the cluster with Fyodor Stepun, then in 1934, she goes to the group of Zurov and Kuznetsova (at this time, she visits the Bunins in Grasse and lives with them). In 1935 Kuznetsova and Stepun separated into an independent group, and Zurov fell into the Bunin's cluster. On the graph for 1936, the family circle disappears altogether. The only ones with whom the Bunins communicate this year are the "Sovremennye Zapiski" circle and the Zaitsevs, isolated throughout the years. The latter are also the only ones (except the girl Olga Zhirova, whom Muromtseva looked after) with whom the Bunins were in contact in 1938. The reasons for such a distance from the home circle were indicated above. Kuznetsova and Stepun will not appear on the network until 1939. Zurov, on the other hand, will join the Bunins' social circle, then again fall out of it. Thus, thanks to visualization, the changes taking place in the Bunin family and having a specific background are visible. The Bunins' home circle, which, as it seemed, could become the most stable of all, collapsed by 1940.

Finally, it remains to comment on the last community - the art field forming around Teffi. As it turned out, it is illusory: when examining the graphs over the years, it is clear that whenever a writer appears on the graph (and she appears exceptionally rarely - in 1928, 1929, and 1937), she is directly related to the "Sovremennye Zapiski" circle. The situations in which composers and artists appeared together were unique. Although Teffi had high characteristics of the weighted degree and betweenness centrality on the general graph, she does not link the supposed communities (her betweenness centrality in the above years is in the range 0 to 5).

## Conclusion

In the cluster analysis of Bunins' diaries, I faced several significant problems. First of all, the essential part of diary entries is not accessible for an ordinary reader. The fragmented edition of it could not provide an accurate account of Bunins' circle; hence the outcomes are representative not in all cases. For more detailed analysis, one should request the Bunins' correspondence with the Russian diaspora members. Nevertheless, it is not an allegation that people with whom Bunins had close contact are depicted in the constructed network. Based on this, I could draw a conclusion about presumptive communities, which Bunins entered during the interwar period.

Secondly, an enormous part of Bunin's diaries was lost. Consequently, the analyzed diaries mostly consist of notes written by Muromtseva, who, although was Bunin's wife, objectively had less number of contacts with the literary society of Russian emigration. I am of the opinion that Muromtseva discussed with Bunin their mode of life as much as literary issues, which allowed her to represent a common for her and her husband's view on specific problems. In the cases when I hesitated, I appealed to other sources and research. In the future, it would be worth looking at what percentage of the diaries we analyze are Bunin's notes. It is almost impossible to do but manually.

Despite the enumerated problems, the outcomes have significant value. First and foremost, with the aid of constructed graphs, it is possible to predict which clusters the emigrant literary community consisted of. Although the global conclusion about emigrant sociology is early to draw, I can assess

Bunin's attitude to the literary processes portrayed (or not) on the generated graphs.

For instance, the younger generation's appearance on the literary stage, which is visible in the network analysis of Khodasevich's *Kamer-furiersky Journal*, is almost not represented in Bunins' diaries. Only at the end of the 20-s, some young writers' positions in the literary field are dotted. In general, they either intentionally isolated (like Sirin) or situated near the Bunins' (like Roshin, Zurov, and Kuznetsova). Instead of the generational process, it can be observed on the graph that the leading position among literary journal belongs to *Sovremennye Zapiski*, whose authors replace each other in the Bunin's surrounding. Moreover, the graph visualization allows deducing that Bunins' relations with the emigrant community were unstable both in general and with particular individuals (like Gippius and Merezhkovsky).

The crucial moment in the writer's life is 1933 - the year of winning the Nobel Prize. As it could be recognized in the network, all communities' density and the number of people sharply reduce after this event. On the one hand, the low number of diary entries promote this trend. On the other hand, many people disagreed with the Nobel Committee's solution to award the Nobel Prize in Literature to Bunin.

M. Tsvetaeva, for example, believed that either Gorky or Merezhkovsky (who a couple of years before had proposed to Bunin to sign an agreement on the division of the cash prize in case one of them was nominated) should have been nominated. She wrote about this in a letter to A.A. Teskova on November 24, 1933 : *"I do not protest, I just do not agree, because Gorky is incomparably greater than Bunin: greater, and more human, and more original,*

and more necessary. [...] However, the third candidate was Merezhkovsky, and he also undoubtedly deserves the Nobel more than Bunin [...] his influence in Russia and abroad is incomparable with Bunin, who had absolutely no influence either here or there" [Tsvetaeva 1969]. Moreover, Bunin's relations with other émigré writers deteriorated. Even though a part of the cash prize Bunin donated to benefit Russian writers living in exile, some remained dissatisfied. According to the memoirs of Ksenia Kuprina, daughter of A. Kuprin, Teffi quipped that it was necessary to create an "*Association of people offended by Bunin*" [Kuprina 1979]. Muromtseva described the emotions experienced that year in the following manner: "*November 9. It has passed equally a year since the call from Stockholm rang out, and everything started to turn. The commotion has gone, and we have not still found peace. Fame, money, congratulations, delight, envy, demands, resentment, a joy that you can help, grief, disappointment, powerlessness, flattery - these are the feelings that either we experienced or those around us.*" It is remarkable that Muromtseva noticed both personal and other people's insults and envy.

It seems that these years Bunin starts to position himself as an orphan despite the existence of like-minded people in emigration. Filtering social circle intentionally or losing people coincidentally (for instance, due to the nasty temper), Bunin allegedly manifested his loneliness. This behavioral strategy will pay off in the future when in the range of memoirs, the figure of Bunin will take a central stage (for example, in Muromtseva memoirs, *The Grasse Diary* by Kuznetsova, and *Bunin in house robe* by A. Bachrach).

## References

- Aldanov, M.A. (1965). *Pis'ma M. A. Aldanova k I. A. i V. N. Buninyam* [M.A. Aldanov's Letters to I.A. and V.N. Bunins]/ *Publikaciya i kommentarii Milicy Grin*. New York: The New Review. Vol. 80 and 81.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1991). "Le champ litteraire [The Literary Field]". In: *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, №89, pp. 3–46.
- Bunin, I.A. (1981). *Ustami Buninyh. V trekh tomah. Tom II / Pod redakciej Milicy Grin*. Frankfurt am Main: Posev.
- (1982). *Ustami Buninyh. V trekh tomah. Tom III / Pod redakciej Milicy Grin*. Frankfurt am Main: Posev.
- Iglesia, Martin and Mathias Göbel (2015). "From Entity Description to Semantic Analysis: The Case of Theodor Fontane's Notebooks". In: *Journal of the Text Encoding Initiative*, Issue 8.
- Kaspe, I.M. (2005). *'Iskusstvo otsutstvovat': Nezamechennoe pokolenie russkoj literatury* [Skill of Absence: Unnoticed Generation of Russian Literature] / *Pod red. V. Gasparova*. Moscow: NLO.
- Khodasevich, V.F. (2000, 2002). *Kamer-fur'erskij zhurnal* [Camer-Fourier Journal]/ *Vstupitel'naya stat'ya, podgotovka teksta, ukazateli O. P. Demidovoj*. Moscow: Ellis Lak.
- Kuprina, K.A. (1979). *Kuprin – moj otec* [Kuprin - My Father] // *Izdanie vtoroe, ispravlennoe i dopolnennoe*. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura.
- Livak, Leonid (2002). "Nina Berberova et La Mythologie Culturelle de L'Emigration Russe en France". In: *Cahiers du monde russe*, 43.2-3, pp. 463–478.

- Livak, Leonid (2003). *How It Was Done In Paris: Russian Émigré Literature and French Modernism*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Orekhov, B., P. Uspenskij, and N. Fajnberg (2018). "Tsyfrovye podhody k 'Kamer-fur'erskomu zhurnalu' V.F. Khodasevicha [Digital Approach to 'Camer-Fourier Journal' of V.F. Khodasevich]". In: *Russkaya literatura*, №3.
- Shraer, M.D. (2014). *Bunin i Nabokov. Istoriya sopernichestva [Bunin and Nabokov. A History of Rivalry]*. Moscow: ANF.
- Six Degrees of Francis Bacon* (n.d.). URL: [http://www.sixdegreesoffrancisbacon.com/?ids=10000473&min\\_confidence=60&type=network](http://www.sixdegreesoffrancisbacon.com/?ids=10000473&min_confidence=60&type=network). (accessed: 01.05.2020).
- Tsvetaeva, M. (1969). *Pis'ma k A. Teskovej [Letters to A. Teskova]*. Prague.
- Vishnyak, M.V. (1957). "Sovremennye zapiski". *Vospominaniya redaktora [Contemporary Papers. Memoirs of the Editor]*. Indiana University Publications Slavic and East European Series, p. 333.

## Appendix

The technical part of the research could be divided into several steps, which are described below:

1. Downloading diaries from the Internet, converting them into plain texts, and storing in two files with a different type of data: the first one would contain the text of diaries, while the second one – the list of names and surnames, which were mentioned in the notes;

2. Automatic cleaning up the file with diaries from unnecessary punctuation;
3. Manual cleaning up the file with surnames from initials and non-relevant people (who had died by 1928);
4. Creating a code for the dictionary with Russian and English surnames with *Python* and the module *transliterate*;
5. Working up the list of tags for further markup;
6. Automatic markup of the diaries with python and modules *MyStem* and *re*;
7. Manual cleaning up of the output data;
8. Creating a code for the diary parsing with python and module *bs4*;
9. Creating a code for graphs of the relationships;
10. Creating the table with Bunins' companions' meta-data;
11. Uploading all the data into *Gephi* (program for graph visualization) and creating graphs of relationships;

Code, cleaned and marked up texts of diaries, tables with meta-data and other materials could be found in my repository:

<https://github.com/TonLeon/Coursework-2020>