

SOME NEW ASPECTS OF UNDERSTANDING GRIGOL ROBAKIDZE'S "MY EXPLANATION"

Meri Mamagulishvili

Summary

In 1939, Grigol Robakidze's essay dedicated to Adolf Hitler was published. Eight years later, the author returned to the aforementioned work and wrote not a new version or an editorial, but a kind of documented confession - "My Explanation", which consists of both descriptive (autobiographical, memoir) and conceptual parts. Here the author deliberately does not touch on the well-established literary appearance of the essay, he has made the subject of necessary interpretation that which is "more than a literary work" in the essay. That is, the meaning of what is said. The essay is also a kind of anamnesis of the style and method of thinking of German society, which, from the point of view of the perception of the text, does not fully coincide with the author's potential desire. "My Confession" is an excellent example of what the author expects from his own intellectual product and what he ultimately receives. In accordance with the reader's feedback, rethinking the work within the framework of new works is not a frequent occurrence in writing. Keywords: Adolf Hitler, Myth, Metaphysics

Introduction

In Georgian writing of the twentieth century, Grigol Robakidze holds a special place in terms of both literary forms, expressive means, and the very broad, in some cases, shocking configuration of the objects of reflection.

In his thematic gallery, a number of forms of the artistic-publicistic genre

We find. Among them, a special place is occupied by the journalistic and essayistic directions. In the 1910s, Grigol Robakidze intensively published essays and publicistic letters in Russian periodicals published in Georgia. His legacy from this period was translated into Georgian and published in 2014 under the general title "War and Culture" (Robakidze, 2014). The aforementioned letters, criticism, publicistic writings and essayistics deal with a number of problems of the beginning of the twentieth century - new trends, ongoing developments, attempts to explain the spiritual essence and mission of the country, thought processes, cultural heritage, and class struggle. The geography of his analytical field of view includes both Russia and Europe, as well as the Middle East and Asia, and, what must be emphasized, concerns portraits that made a great breakthrough in the first half of the twentieth century. The main part of Grigol Robakidze, as a portraitist, in his adult essays reflected on such prominent figures as Vladimir Lenin, Joseph Stalin, Adolf Hitler, Benito Mussolini, and was also the author of portraits of Friedrich Nietzsche, Grigor Rasputin, and others. The essay entitled

“Adolf Hitler, Seen by a Foreign Poet” (1939) caused the greatest response. As translator and researcher M. Kvataya notes, the date of writing the essays is suggestive - 1938. This was the year of Hitler’s personal rise. An examination of the documentary material reveals that a certain part of the world at that time was delighted with the unexpected rise of the German Fuhrer. With lightning success, personal talent, strength and uncompromisingness. Indeed, Hitler and his supporters, during their six-year reign (1933-1939), turned the “German nothingness” of the post-Versailles period into the strongest state...” Grigol Robakidze, like a large part of the world at that time, was not indifferent to the energy of Hitler’s ambitions. He saw in it an unnatural unifying force. The hidden intention of his portrait was to devalue the individual, it was a generalized face that brought into action the specific energy of the northern race. These responses are completely unexpectedly replaced by conceptual passages, as an additional means of reflecting some "more" that the essay under consideration itself lacks the ability to convey. This additional "explanation" of the essay on Hitler allows us to reconstruct the almost nine-year resonance of the text. In the conceptual part of the essay, the author offers us definitions of those concepts that, presumably, raised the most question marks in German society. The author considers the addressees of his works (German writers' associations, German publishers, the PEN Club, and his own readers) to be German society. It is noteworthy that the motive for this “explanation” is precisely the responsibility of the above-mentioned society. The German text “Meine Erklaerung” (published in 2011. The Georgian translation of the text “My Explanation” was translated by M. Kvataia in 2012). “My Explanation” can also be considered a kind of anamnesis of the German thinking society. Here, from the point of view of understanding the mythical layer of the text, Grigol Robakidze faces a rather difficult situation, he

He regrets that the mythos is not a theory based on strictly structured logical springboards. In fact, it seems that this was precisely the general tendency of the thinking of German society, and therefore the essence of what was said did not reach the addressee, he also notes, “I assumed that others would try something in the same way, albeit in their own understanding” (M. Kvataya, “My Explanation”, 2012:24). Only one famous cultural philosopher, who leaves the author anonymous and who tried to explain the works in depth, says that he saw Adolf Hitler in the “space of the mythos”, but this is still in the “space of history” (Kvataya, 2012:34). Robakidze does not agree with the separation of psychological moment and time from each other, with the transformation of the profound combination proposed by the author into a kind of banal chronology. For him, the “space of vision” (“space of myth”) is inseparable from the “space of history”. In his thinking, concepts are not absolute, they are built on the “if” (“wenn”) construction. Accordingly, cognitive, intellectual approaches alone are not sufficient to understand Grigol Robakidze’s intellectual product; here, “meditative attention to the course of thoughts shrouded in the mystery of the works” is definitely needed (Robakidze 2012:35).

In the second part of the “Explanation”, the author sequentially offers us definitions of those concepts that, in his opinion, are not properly understood. The sequence of the concepts to be explained is as follows: “forces”, “blood”, “People”, “Blood/Race”, “Earthly Powers Awakening”, “State”, “European Question”. In this explanation

The logic of the sequence of concepts is based on the statement that the earthly, worldly components are charged with the power of the Logos and that everything that exists has not only a meaning, but also a mission; that in fact the profaned concepts - land, father, homeland, gene, race, which the main axis transfers from one to another, have the potential to be spiritual. This leads to the significance of the Jewish people as a single national component of the world's peoples. Here it must be said once again that racism enters this situation after the ages charged with the Logos are artificially weakened or completely deprived of the sign of the Logos. If we judge by the results, we must assume that it is precisely the difficulty of understanding these concepts that determines the motive for writing “My Explanation”. Another issue is noteworthy: Grigol Roakidze did not create an edition and version of the essay about Hitler, did not take care of modeling his own work (being sure of its formal and conceptual perfection), but rather offered an additional explanation of one of its layers. “My Confession” is an excellent example of what the author expects from his own intellectual product and what he ultimately receives from it. This “confession” is also a kind of intrapersonal communication of the author, directed towards himself. The author writes the “Explanation” after many years of observation, because he feels that the key moments of his essay are not fully understood. According to the reader's feedback, his letter refers to a somewhat depersonalized portrait of the work. A portrait that "attached to the catastrophe because it only

“He strengthened the earthly forces and did not move them with the sign of the Logos” (M. Kvataya, 2006:196) It is noteworthy that this scandalously and shockingly assessed essay had an ambiguous response. As it seems, its public resonance has been the subject of the author's thoughts and concerns for many years. That is why, no matter how many years after writing the essay, he returns to the mentioned topic in the form of “My Explanation” of a specifically structured essay. “My Explanation” written in 1947 was first published in Germany in 2011. It is noteworthy that “My Explanation” does not address the above-mentioned essay as a work, its artistic side, but its metaphysical essence. “As a work, it does not need an explanation, every word in it is thought out, every line is carefully considered... It is more than just a literary work. A fatal misunderstanding has arisen around this “more”, so it would be appropriate to listen to the author's word on this,” writes Grigol Robakidze in “My Explanation” (Robakidze 2012:3-4). It is precisely this combination of the visible and the “more” that determines the portrait of the author as a thinker of two different layers. That is why Grigol Robakidze perceives himself as a writer and a metaphysician at the same time. According to his explanation, what is the prerogative of the writer (the artistic sphere of literature) is in ideal order in his evaluative

essay. As for the metaphysical layer of the text, a work already written once, an essay on Hitler, still needs to be explained after eight years. This double background - writing and metaphysics - is clearly readable from the structure of "my explanation": the text can be segmented into descriptive-biographical and conceptual parts. These two types of genre data.

n the text, it can be said that there is no balance.

From the point of view of architecture, it is not strictly structured - here, descriptive, biographical narratives (short stories, facts, evaluative reflections by different persons) are used, which is not a frequent occurrence in writing and gives us the opportunity to observe such psychological moments as how the author brings his words to maximum correspondence with his internal validator, how he reacts to the backlash and criticism from society and what impact this has on his future activities; what kind of stress is the process of publication-socialization of the text associated with and how he seeks ways to cope with it with minimal losses, etc. The final part In conclusion, it can be said that in "my explanation" the subject of observation, along with the interest in the development of the idea and plot of the work under consideration, is The author's self-analysis, which is based on the degree of decoding, perception, and evaluation of the work by society.

References:

- 1 Gr. Robakidze, „Meine Erkl  rung“, Shaker Verlag Aachen, 2011
- 2 Gr. Robakidze, „War and Culture“, Tbilisi, Publishing house „Artanuj“, 2014
- 3 Gr. Robakidze, „My explanation“ „Pro domo sua“, Tbilisi, Publishing house „Artanuj“ 2012
- 4 M. Kvataya, „This scandalous Adolf Hitler“, Literary Searches N27, 2006.