

UDK 821.161.1.09

Primljeno: 17. 05. 2020.

Izvorni naučni rad
Original scientific paper

Demir Alihodžić

WRITING THE SELF: WRITING AS POWER IN YEVGENY ZAMYATIN'S *WE*

In Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We*, the protagonist resists the regime in which he lives by engaging in writing/composition. D-503, the main protagonist, begins a journal that records his rebellious activity and movement towards individuality. The protagonist not only records rebellion, but the act of writing/composition is inextricably tied into the resistance it accompanies. In this paper, I will focus specifically on the protagonist of the novel by discussing the role of writing and language in the rebellion of the protagonist. I will also discuss the metafictional aspects of the novel and the effect of first-person narration on the production of this text.

Key words: writing; subversion; dystopia

1. INTRODUCTION

Among other things, writing and composing are universally recognized means of self-expression and for the exploration of subjectivity. It is not surprising, then, that totalitarian regimes (in the actual world) and dystopian regimes (in fictional worlds) often strive to suppress, control, or even prohibit writing/composing and access to literature. Writing, or at least composition, is central to the heretical consciousness of D-503, the main protagonist of Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We* (1924). In *We*, writing ap-

parently is allowed but tightly controlled: state poets exist to create propaganda that glorifies the state and the collectivist philosophy. Any writer who engages in open criticism of the regime or of its leader is executed, and we are witness to such an execution in *We*. Artistic expression that does not serve the state is seen as useless.

In Zamyatin's dystopia, the subversive struggle entails composition. D-503 begins his journey towards individuality by beginning to write a state-commissioned treatise on the glories of his society that quickly turns into a diary detailing his increasingly subversive activities and frightening sense of selfhood. In *We*, the first-person narrative account comprises the actual novel which ends up in the hands of the reader, in contrast to, for example, Winston Smith's diary in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949), which is a diary within a third-person narrative.

In dystopian society of *We*, what is written and what is read is controlled by the state in an attempt to ensure stability and rule out rebellion. The dystopian state's hope is that those who cannot use language for their own purposes cannot express themselves. For D-503, his text accompanies his increasing subjectivity. As he writes his journal, he also writes his "self," which illustrates the connection between language and identity.

Recognizing the power that writing has, D-503 seems to have womb envy as he fantasizes about giving birth to his text. This underlines the connection between sex and language and between the protagonist's sexual and literary/linguistic rebellion. Ultimately, though, D-503 sees his imagination as a phallus and he fears its castration.

Along with the controlling of language in a dystopia goes the controlling of names. In *We*, names are replaced by numerical designations that are supposed to be meaningless. However, men's numbers are prefixed with consonants and women's with vowels. This practice reveals the admission of gender differences. However, as D-503 begins to discern individuality, he describes people by focusing on prominent features.

My purpose in this paper is to explore the role of writing/composition in Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We*. I will consider the reasons why writing is suspect in dystopia and explore the power that language wields in a closely controlled society. I will first of all examine the role of writing within the society presented, discussing the reasons for any repression or prohibition of writing. I will discuss the way in which the protagonist begins to compose the self by rebelling against the state through the heretical act of writing or recording. I will investigate in what ways writing/recording is generated by considering the nature of the phallic pen in the novel. I will then discuss the

subversive nature of language. Dystopian societies usually assert control over the use of and access to language in order to forestall resistance. If one does not have the power to fully employ language, then one does not have the power to question or challenge the regime. However, in *We*, the protagonist manages to use language in subversive ways. In the same section, I will discuss the significance of naming within a dystopia. Personal names are closely linked with a sense of individuality and uniqueness, and so the dystopian regime often denies a meaningful name to its citizens.

2. WRITING IN DYSTOPIA

Before going further, it is important to establish that writing, at least in the sense of artistic expression, does not fit well into dystopian schemes. This will lead us to an exploration of writing as a subversive technique in dystopia. It is worth noting that in Plato's *Republic*, poets were dispensed with entirely. Why does the artist not work out in utopia? Cooke (2002) tries to answer this question:

Once utopian citizens learn to think on their own and for themselves, the end of utopia is near. [...] the arts keep challenging us to improve upon ourselves and thus never to be content. There is little wonder, then, that art is incompatible with utopia and that the subject of artistic writing comes up in so many dystopian fictions. (Cooke 2002: 166)

Any utopian state strives to achieve a state of perfection and permanence, which leads to inaction and stagnancy. With writing come new ideas and responses to ideas; a dialogue follows. Totalitarian states practice censorship to varying degrees because exposure to new ideas, or the exploration of one's own ideas, leads to questioning of state policies and practices. People will believe that they need something new, making a contradiction the state's claim to have taken care of everyone's needs. Cooke points out that "novelty [...] contradicts the predictability required by social engineering" (Cooke 2002: 167). Surely one of the central concerns, then, of dystopian writers is the preservation of their craft, both generally and within their specific fictions, when faced with the possibility of a world in which the expression of creative impulses becomes hijacked or extinct.

Of course, in Zamyatin's dystopia, writing does serve a purpose: not as art, but propaganda. If art for art's sake is dangerous in utopia, the answer is to harness creative tendencies entirely to the yoke of the state. With this goes the strictest kind of

ensorship. D-503 becomes an amateur writer at the behest of the state. He begins his treatise in response to a newspaper announcement requesting that Numbers (citizens) write propaganda pieces that would accompany the Integral as it sets out on its expedition to colonize unknown worlds on distant planets: “everyone who feels himself capable of doing so is required to compose treatises, epic poems, manifestos, odes, or other compositions dealing with the beauty and grandeur of OneState” (Zamyatin 1993: 3).

Even though the state, in this one case, makes a public appeal for testimonial writing, there are also official state poets in OneState. Surely Zamyatin took the artistic policies of early Soviet Russia, with its own puppet state poets, as his inspiration here. His essays make it quite clear what he thought of conformist artists in post-revolutionary Russia (see Zamyatin 1970). In *We*, if state poets do not produce copy that satisfies the state, or if they dare to engage in criticism of the state or the Benefactor, the punishment is execution. R-13 relates to D-503 the case of one of his colleagues who got carried away with his pen: “I had to put a verdict into verse. Some idiot... and one of us poets, too. For two years we sit next to each other and he seems okay. And then suddenly something snaps. ‘I’m a genius!’ he says, ‘A genius...above the law!’ And the stuff he wrote...ah, the hell with it” (Zamyatin 1993: 43). Apparently, if a writer realizes the power of the pen, trouble ensues. R-13 is commissioned to compose a poem on the occasion of this fellow’s vaporization at the Benefactor’s machine. D-503 relates the nature of this pencrime: “Trochees...cutting, rapid...sharp as an ax [sic]. About an unheard-of crime, about a blasphemous poem, one in which the Benefactor is called...but no, I can’t make my hand write it” (Zamyatin 1993: 47).

D-503 explains the utilitarian aims of OneState poetry: “we’ve tamed and saddled what used to be the wild nature of poetry. Poetry today is not some impudent nightingale’s piping—poetry is government service, poetry is usefulness” (Zamyatin 1993: 66-67). This underlines the notion that “wild” and untamed art will not do in utopia: all must be “tamed and saddled,” therefore, made stagnant. The poetry that exists in OneState is sufficiently mundane and benign as to suit a utopian scheme. D-503 gives the poetic example of the “wise, permanent happiness of the multiplication table”:

*Forever enamoured are two plus two,
Forever conjoined in blissful four:
The hottest lovers in all the world:
The permanent weld of two plus two. . . .* (Zamyatin 1993: 65)

No mutinous inclinations are likely to be inspired by a reading of such stale stuff. OneState's citizens, or Numbers, were brought up on "that greatest of all monuments of ancient literature that has come down to us, the *Railroad Timetable*" (Zamyatin 1993: 12). This is the most valued literature from ancient times, which is a telling satire that comments on the value of official Soviet art in Zamyatin's eyes.

In fact, D-503 explains the role of "poetry" in his society by disparaging the poetry of ancient times: "How could it have happened, I wondered, that the ancients did not immediately see how completely idiotic their literature and poetry was. The immense majestic power of the artistic word was squandered for absolutely nothing" (Zamyatin 1993: 66). Again, this underlines the utilitarian approach to writing. Nothing has value unless it is useful to the state and according to the state's own terms. As D-503 said to R-13: "Thank goodness [...] the antediluvian times of all those Shakespeares and Dostoevskys, or whatever you call them, are over" (Zamyatin 1993: 43). A bust of Pushkin exists in the Ancient House, whose "barely detectable smile" clearly annoys D-503 (Zamyatin 1993: 29). I-330 comments on the power that artists possess when she says of Pushkin, "But the fact is, you know, that people like him were rulers with more power than those who actually wore the crown" (Zamyatin 1993: 30). This is clearly the kind of unofficial and invisible power that totalitarian rulers would seek to quell by taking control of literature.

3. WRITING/COMPOSING THE SELF IN ZAMYATIN'S DYSTOPIA

In Zamyatin's dystopia, the protagonist composes his "self" as he composes his journal; by writing his commissioned treatise on OneState. In the novel, composition both initiates and records a stuttered journey towards subjectivity, the use of language allows identity.

D-503, before he began writing, never felt any sense of individuality; therefore, he never felt a need to compose a self. He begins by vowing to write realistically and to be honest with the reader, to follow the patterns of his thoughts, even if this may reveal the imperfections of OneState: "I repeat: I've imposed on myself the duty of writing without holding anything back. So, sad as it may be, I have to record here that apparently even we haven't yet finished the process of hardening and crystalizing life" (Zamyatin 1993: 25). Sometimes D-503 writes things in his journal that run contrary to OneState philosophy. Whenever D-503 has the instinct to self-edit, to revise or remove any instance where his writing does not accord with OneState dogma, he tells the reader about it but he does not censor those thoughts:

I wanted to cross all that out [hairy paws]...because that's beyond the scope of these notes. But then I decided: No, I'll leave it in. Let these notes act like the most delicate seismograph, let them register the least little wiggle in my brain waves, however insignificant. Sometimes, you never know, these are just the wiggles that give you the first warning...But that's absurd, now. I really should cross it out. We've channeled all the elements of nature. No catastrophe can happen. (Zamyatin 1993: 23)

So, without realizing it, he makes his journal an instrument for measuring his increasing subjectivity. He has taken on more than was commissioned for this piece; he seems unable to reject material that is “beyond the scope of these notes” (Zamyatin 1993: 23). He may be vaguely aware that his recorded thoughts may provide a “warning” of some psychological earthquake.

Of course, the psychological eruption that D-503 is anticipating is the emergence of the self that has been submerged by collectivism. Brett Cooke comments on how the solitary act of writing leads to self-consciousness for D-503:

D-503 is acutely aware that he is writing; his self-consciousness is renewed with each entry. Moreover, many of D-503's statements are based not on empirical reality but instead only on his thoughts. D-503 writes one entry with the blinds drawn down over the glass walls of his room; his attention is more and more directed within. His chosen genre inclines him to confession, self-reflection, and many digressions. These have the fateful result of calling subconscious aspects of his psyche, such as memory, instinctual desires, and association patterns, into a more prominent role in shaping his consciousness, thereby further compromising the objectivity of his reportage. (Cooke 2002: 174)

So then, not only does the journal, like a seismograph, record D-503's increasing sense of subjectivity, but it causes it. Where D-503 set out to write an objective account of life in OneState by recording his thoughts as they come, his journal becomes more and more subjective.

Any sense of self-consciousness or individuality contradicts what D-503 has believed all his life, and his knowledge of the connection between writing and self-consciousness is symbolized in his obsession with ink stains. O-90's tears cause an ink stain on his manuscript: “She listened in her enchantingly rosy way...and suddenly a tear fell from her blue eyes...then a second, a third...right on the page that was open (page 7). Made the ink run. So...I'll have to copy it over” (Zamyatin 1993: 20). The ink blots become symbols of imperfection, both in him and in his society. On

U's list there is an inkblot next to his name: "She made a scratch with her pen, and I saw myself on the page: D-503. And right next to it an ink blot" (Zamyatin 1993: 50). He associates this spot of ink with U's smiles: "she raised her head and dribbled one of her inky little smiles at me" (Zamyatin 1993: 50). The ink removes the clarity of D-503's previously mechanical thinking: "But that little smile worried me. That drop of ink in it made my pure solutions all cloudy" (Zamyatin 1993: 50). There was a smudge on the letter from O-90, and D-503 claims that such a thing bothers him now more than it would have before:

And another wound: In the bottom right corner of the paper is a stain where the ink has run, where a drop of something fell...I can't stand smudges, ink or any other kind, it doesn't matter. And I know that, before, this would have just been unpleasant to me, unpleasant for the eyes, this unpleasant spot. But now...how come this grayish little spot is like a raincloud, making everything darker and more leaden? Or is this just more "soul"? (Zamyatin 1993: 102)

"Soul" is D-503's term for self-consciousness and imagination, and he seems to be more and more aware of it as he goes on. He claims here that spots of ink would not have bothered him as much before, and yet he twice mentions a time in his youth when he became quite upset and cried because he had a spot on his yuny (uniform) on the Day of Unanimity (Zamyatin 1993: 128, 135). It would seem that the complicating spot was known to him before, although it was "visible to no one but himself" (Zamyatin 1993: 135), and now has grown in its proportions: "Maybe no one around me now can see the black indelible blotches all over me, but I know—I know that a criminal like me has no business being among all these wide innocent faces" (Zamyatin 1993: 135). These ink spots are described as the symptoms of disease, and certainly D-503 considers the soul to be a disease. Cooke has pointed out that the very presence of disease "indicates imperfections in the environment insofar as utopia is concerned" (Cooke 2002: 15). This is one of many indications that a regime that attempts to exercise such extreme control cannot, in reality, work.

This ink, distressing as it is for D-503, is the material with which he composes his text and, therefore, himself. As he becomes more and more isolated from the hive, he senses a need to know himself. Upon finishing his friendship with R-13 because of R's involvement with I-330, he realizes that he no longer has his family: "I don't want to see him. Finished! End of our triangle. I'm alone. Evening. A little foggy. Milky-gold cloth over the sky. What's beyond it? If only one could know. And know who I am, what I am" (Zamyatin 1993: 63). Subjectivity and individuality bring loneliness and isolation. His growing sense of isolation changes his description of the me-

chanical choreography of OneState: “Numbers were passing in rows. Thousands of feet raining down in time, a million-footed leviathan, heaving, was floating past. But I am alone – cast up by the storm on an uninhabited island, and I search and search with my eyes through the grey-blue waves” (Zamyatin 1993: 85). He begins to go through the motions now with a growing sense of emptiness where he had previously felt unity:

From a distance a metronome is ticking through the fog, and I mechanically chew to the familiar caress of its music, counting, along with everyone else, up to 50:50 statutory chews for each mouthful. And, still mechanically beating out the time, I go downstairs, and, like everyone else, check off my name in the book as one leaving the premises. But I sense that I’m living separately from everyone else, alone, surrounded by a soft, sound-proof wall, and that my world is on my side of this wall. (Zamyatin 1993: 99)

Separated from society, he begins to identify more and more with his text, and he realizes that it is not what he intended it to be but that it is something more:

But how about this? If this world is only mine, how come it is in these notes? How come these stupid “dreams,” wardrobes, endless corridors are here? I am crushed to see that instead of the elegant and strict mathematical poem in honor of OneState, it’s turning out to be some kind of fantastic adventure novel. Oh, if only this were really just a novel instead of my actual life, filled with X’s, and degradations. (Zamyatin 1993: 99)

So the text is his life, and it is also his uniqueness and his subjectivity. It becomes something he cannot destroy; it is essential to the ego: “Besides, I can’t, I no longer have the strength to destroy this painful piece of myself, which might turn out to be the piece I value most” (Zamyatin 1993: 160). It becomes his justification: “you, my unknown readers, might find here something that justifies me” (Zamyatin 1993: 167). What is interesting is that D-503 seems to be using his narrative to create an audience. So, then, for the isolated protagonist on his heretical journey in dystopia, the composition of a text results not only in the creation of the self, but in the attempt to reach an unknown (D-503’s Vesuvians).

4. THE GENDERED PEN

In *We*, the connection between the pen and sexuality is evident from the very beginning. The pen is power, both ideologically and sexually, and Zamyatin’s main pro-

tagonist at some point discusses the power of “the phallic pen.” Margaret Wise Petrochenkov states that “Zamyatin associated artistic potency with physical potency” (Petrochenkov 1998: 252), and apparently, so too does D-503. Upon first putting pen to paper, he apparently lacks virility: “My pen, accustomed to figures, is powerless to create the music of assonance and rhyme” (Zamyatin 1993: 4). New to writing, he feels a lack of poetic agency. In light of earlier discussion of the poetry of OneState, however, one could argue that all poets in this society lack agency (except perhaps those who are vaporized for writing heresy).

D-503 initially has what Petrochenkov calls “womb envy,” becoming “pregnant with his text” (Petrochenkov 1998: 252). He feels his pen to be powerless, so he feminizes the artistic process by describing art as a masculine fantasy of conception and birth:

This is probably like what a woman feels when she first senses in her the pulse of a new little person, still tiny and blind. It's me and at the same time it's not me. And for long months to come she will have to nourish it with her own juice, her own blood, and then – tear it painfully out of herself and lay it at the feet of OneState. (Zamyatin 1993: 4)

Writing here is described as a markedly female experience. As Cooke comments, “Artists commonly speak of their works as their offspring, as we noted with Zamyatin; artistic creation is often confused with biological reproduction” (Cooke 2002: 183). However, male anxiety underlies this textual pregnancy: there is also a violence in this image that is associated with D-503's concerns about his potency; it is “an image of birth as castration, violent birth that sunders mother from child” (Petrochenkov 1998: 251).

As he grows accustomed to wielding the pen, D-503 soon begins to feel textually potent, and sees himself no longer as a womb for his textual creation but as a godlike progenitor on a massive scale, creating not only his text but his audience: “And maybe you're all nothing but my shadows. Wasn't I the one that used you to populate these pages, which only a little while ago were white quadrangular deserts? Without me, would you ever have been seen by any of those that I am going to lead along behind me down the narrow paths of these lines?” (Zamyatin 1993: 115). This is a turn away from the maternal impulses as he takes a paternalistic attitude towards his reader, which accompanies his several direct references to the reader as backward, primitive, and less developed than he and his society. The text itself is no longer a foetus within a womb but an instrument with which he creates and fertilizes.

However, D-503 does not feel invincible. As he begins to feel textual potency, his fear of creative castration is greater. When he is finally forced to undergo the Great

Operation, which is more or less a lobotomy, a removal of the lobe in the brain apparently responsible for the imagination, he undergoes a castration that divorces him from the intimacy he had previously had with his text:

Could it be that I, D-503, actually wrote these 225 pages? Could it be that I ever actually felt this—or imagined that I did?

It's my handwriting. And it goes on, in the same hand, but fortunately only the handwriting is the same. No delirium, no ridiculous metaphors, no feelings. Just the facts. Because I'm well, I am completely, absolutely well. I'm smiling—I can't help smiling: they extracted a kind of splinter from my head, and now my head is easy and empty. (Zamyatin 1993: 224)

His diary is the measure of his increasing subjectivity, and he links the fear of losing that subjectivity with fear of losing his virility: “for D-503, the destruction of his creative capacity is equivalent to the destruction of his sexual potency, and therefore, any threat to his imagination and to his ability to exercise his imagination in writing is perceived as a potential castration” (Petrochenkov 1998: 251). Now that the imagination has been castrated, he can no longer claim creative potency, nor can he even imagine how it is that he once could.

5. LANGUAGE AS SUBVERSION AND THE POWER OF A NAME

Zamyatin's *We* contains an apparently classless society in which childrearing is restricted to Numbers (the citizens of OneState are so called) who meet maternal and paternal norms, and in which procreation outside the system is illegal. Children are given up to the state upon birth so that an androgynous workforce is “free” to serve the state. Sexual promiscuity is strongly encouraged but bureaucratized; one may sleep with anyone else simply by requesting a pink ticket which bears his or her number. The state devises a sexual schedule for each number that takes into account the determined sexual “need” and requests by and for other Numbers. Although all Numbers live in glass apartments, blinds may be lowered during prescribed personal hours for these approved sexual meetings. Both sexes are free to initiate an encounter, and it is illegal to refuse a liaison.

As the protagonist is initiated into a subversive movement through illegal sex acts and interaction with contraband materials that suggest all the perceived vices of twentieth century life such as lingerie, magazines, makeup, alcohol and cigarettes, the key to the dystopia's satire becomes apparent, for presumably the “ideal” society was

formed as a remedy to twentieth century life. OneState's pink ticket system was conceived to rule out jealousy and unhappiness as distractions from state allegiance.

D-503's first foray into the world of language, what he intended to be an affirmation of his allegiance to OneState, led him not only to individuality and awareness of self, but also along a path of subversive behaviour: "the very activity of putting pen to paper brings about spontaneous subversive consequences" (Cooke 2002: 181). In describing his society to beings, he assumes to be ignorant and backward, he is forced to look through new eyes at that which he had always taken for granted as obvious:

Unintentionally, D-503 commits himself to continual estrangement from major facets of the Single State. In his effort to be a proper tour guide, he is forced to imagine how a complete newcomer would look at his society, stripped of all preconceptions. [...] In other words, he can no longer take for granted what he has been taking for granted; this serves to open up his eyes. (Cooke 2002: 177)

He takes his task seriously, and he eventually places his duty as a writer before his duty as a number: "And so, in obedience to what strikes me as my authorial duty, I took an aero today at 16:00 and set off once again for the Ancient House" (Zamyatin 1993: 114). His authorial task often becomes an excuse to behave subversively; like many good journalists, he is willing to break laws to get a good story.

Along with the ability to use and control language goes the power of a name in defining a sense of individuality. In Zamyatin's dystopia, the sense of individuality is subordinated to a position within the collective. Citizens think of themselves as Numbers, not as people or individuals. As Cooke explains, Zamyatin has hit upon one of our modern anxieties:

To treat people as if they really were statistics is commonly received as dehumanizing. Each of us desires to be seen as special, unique, in some respects. With characters named D-503, R-13, I-330, and S-4711, Zamyatin reminds us of our own resistance to the application of Social Security numbers and other means of serializing human populations. (Cooke 2002: 20)

OneState's policy of assigning numbers instead of names would seem also to diminish individual differences and to serve the purpose of making the population homogeneous. However, one striking differentiating factor stands out in the alphabetic prefixes to the numbers: all males have consonants prefixed to their numbers, and females to vowels. This would seem to contradict the state's policy of neutralizing gender differences. Is Zamyatin possibly suggesting that gender differences are inevitable, even essential? There do seem to be gender stereotypes in OneState. At

first glance, I-330 is the femme fatale; O-90 is the frumpy housewife. However, it appears that these characters are actually more complex, which suggests that Zamyatin is flexible with gender representation. Perhaps what Zamyatin resists is any state attempt to control or eradicate the expression of perceived gender differences.

D-503 has never had a “real” name which he can claim for his own and long for as his subjectivity increases. These characters do not go as far as their numerically-labelled counterparts in Ayn Rand’s *Anthem* (1969), who actually rename each other upon falling in love and discerning each other’s individuality. However, when he does begin to develop a sense of the individuality of the Numbers around him, D-503 begins to label them by using symbolic descriptions of features unique to them. For example, I-330 is often depicted by her white teeth or the X on her face, O-90 by her round pink mouth, and S-4711 by his protruding ears.

6. CONCLUSION

In OneState, writing is denied most of the population because it is a vehicle for power, subjection and individuality. Citizens are required to deny individuality and submit to strict collectivism. Failure to do this will challenge the authority and stagnation of the novel’s political regime, so restrictions on writing are strictly enforced. In *We*, citizens are permitted to read, but only state sanctioned propaganda. Poets and journalists exist, but may only write in a very prescribed and authorized fashion.

In his dystopia, Zamyatin uses symbolic gender codes to suggest the underlying gender differences and sexual politics in this seemingly androgynous society. He therefore suggests that the apparent sexual equality of OneState is illusory. However, in doing this Zamyatin reinstates traditional gender distinctions.

In Zamyatin’s novel, the protagonist resists the regime in which he lives by engaging in composition. He begins a journal that records his rebellious activity and movement towards individuality. The protagonist not only records rebellion, but the act of composition is inextricably tied into the resistance it accompanies. As D-503 becomes increasingly disconnected from society, he identifies more and more with his text. The text is not only important, however, to the composition of self, but the protagonist attempts to create an audience in an attempt to bridge isolation.

By having D-503 write a heretical diary, Zamyatin addresses the loss of autonomy that a male subject may suffer under totalitarian rule and the restrictions on language that come with it. He recognizes that totalitarian regimes in the real world wield con-

trol of the populace by taking control of language and literature in an attempt to thwart before they begin any rebellious tendencies in the individual.

Ultimately, Zamyatin shows how a repressive regime attempts to control expression and communication through writing, but also that using language illegally and for seditious purposes is a central element of the protagonist's subversive journey.

REFERENCES

1. Cooke, Brett (2002), *Human Nature in Utopia: Zamyatin's We*, Northwestern UP, Evanston, IL
2. Petrochenkov, Margaret Wise (1998), "Castration Anxiety and the Other in Zamyatin's *We*", in: Brett Cooke & George E Slusser (Eds.), *The Fantastic Other: An Interface of Perspectives*, Rodopi, Amsterdam, 243-255
3. Rand, Ayn (1969), *Anthem*, Caxton Printers, Caldwell, Idaho
4. Zamyatin, Yevgeny (1970), "On Literature, Revolution, Entropy, and Other Matters", in: trans. Mirra Ginsberg (Ed.), *A Soviet Heretic: Essays by Yevgeny Zamyatin*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago & London
5. Zamyatin, Yevgeny (1993), *We*, trans. Clarence Brown (Ed.), Penguin, New York

ISPISIVANJE SEBSTVA: PISANJE KAO MOĆ U ROMANU *MI* YEVGENYA ZAMYATINA

Sažetak:

U romanu Yevgenya Zamyatina *Mi* glavni protagonist romana se bori protiv režima pod kojim živi tako što se bavi pisanjem/stvaranjem. D-503 počinje pisati dnevnik u kojem bilježi svoje buntovničke aktivnosti i svoju težnju prema individualnosti. On ne samo da u svom dnevniku bilježi buntovništvo, nego je i sam čin pisanja/stvaranja neodvojivo povezan sa činom otpora, te postaje njegovim dijelom. U ovom radu usredotočili smo se na glavnog protagonistu romana kroz raspravu uloge pisanja i jezika u kontekstu buntovništva protiv režima distopijskog društva kojim je okružen. Također su analizirani metafizički aspekti romana te utjecaj pripovjedanja u prvom licu na produkciju teksta.

Ključne riječi: pisanje; subverzija; distopija

Adresa autora
Author's address

Demir Alihodžić
Univerzitet u Tuzli
Filozofski fakultet
demir.alihodzic@untz.ba