**INTRODUCTION**

Anthropological turn in the science made it relevant to search for and introduce new sources of private origin, such as diaries, letters, autobiographies, memoirs, into the research field. As the authority of the official sources relevant to the Great Patriotic War in the post-Soviet historical studies decreased, the status of ego-documents, which explore the topic of “man at war” through the thoughts, emotions, feelings of common soldiers, immediate participants of combats, raised.

As noted by the contemporary Russian researchers, rather than registering historical events such “personal testimonies” create perception of them, “filling in the lacuna of official narrative and helping to get identity, which allowed to increase their status among other testimonies of the past” (SURZHKOVA, 2014, p. 6).

Subjectivity, retrospectivity and documentation are defined as principal features of ego-documents. Each of these qualities finds its own expression in different types of ego-texts: diaries, letters, autobiographies, memoirs (CHERDYMOVA et al., 2018). In modern social sciences there is a switch of perspective with regard to “subjectivity” of person-centered materials. The Soviet-era historical studies regarded sources of private origin as inferior and the “auto-texts” were considered to be secondary, additional, unreliable and dubious due to their subjectivity, while contemporary historiography does not perceive the sources of private origin as minor carriers of historical information. According to A.K. Sokolova (2004), “Everything that comes immediately from a person, his or her actions, behavior, thoughts and feelings has an advantage over, for example, laws, regulations and executive documents, over official interpretation of some events in the press” (p. 283). S.V. Kodan (2017) emphasizes this peculiarity of modern approach to ego-documents. He states that “Subjectivity is not a deficiency that prevents from using them as historical records. Moreover, it increases their value as information-carrying media in the context of providing an opportunity to study a wider range of issues” (KODAN, 2017, p. 8).

As noted by researchers, among all sources of private origin (diary, letters, memoirs, autobiography) the diary has the lowest level of subjectivity. Irina Tazhidinova claims that “The authenticity of diary is higher than that of memoirs, as it contains memory errors to a far lesser degree” (TAZHIDINOVA, 2015, p. 156). The diaries qualify as non-fiction due to the fact that they are kept simultaneously with the events described in them, “following in the footsteps of life”, sometimes with insignificant delay. Recording chronological data, precise identification of time and place, author’s relation to the event that has already occurred creates a certain retrospectivity of the diary, although less noticeable than that of the memoirs.

Modern historical studies developed methodological approaches to the examination of ego-documents. Elena Senyavskaya provided rationale for application of historical and psychological approach to the examination of ego-documents, as it “allows to bring to light the thoughts, feelings, and behavioral mechanisms of people in harsh war conditions”. (SENYAVSKAYA, 2005, p. 11). The researcher proved the effectiveness of historical and anthropological approach, which “provides an opportunity for comprehensive survey of human resource during war, including value-based and sociocultural aspects” (SENYAVSKAYA, 2005). The method of psychological reconstruction (of feelings) turned out to be extremely productive for examination of the documents of private origin, which is based on
interpretation of historical texts through recreation of the author’s inner world, diving into historical events that prompted the emergence of texts, with maximum approach to a certain psychological situation” (SENYAVSKAYA, 1999, p. 2).

Sergey Kodan refers to the development of methodology along three interconnected lines: informational, biographical and communicative (KODAN, 2017). Informational approach allows to consider the sources of private origin as the carriers of historical information, which reflect the reality of the past in writing (KODAN, 2017, p.2). Biographical approach studies the peculiarities of the author’s trajectory of life and products of creative work, using those to imagine a “warrior” (KODAN, 2017, p. 2; KUZNETSOV, 2013, p.329). Communicative approach examines the sources of private origin in terms of “the concept of individualization” through awareness of his place in co-existential and evolutionary space (KODAN, 2017, p.3).

In light of anthropological turn the contemporary Russian human science studies ego-documents in the context of problems of ethnicity, religious commitment, identity, gender, history of emotions, memory, psychology of the battlefield household activities and daily routine, psychology of combatant. Presently, the war-historical anthropology made the most remarkable progress in the study of psychological phenomena at war: the psychology of combat and soldiers’ fatalism, the peculiarities of man’s sense of self in combat environment, history of emotions (SENYAVSKAYA, 2005). The survey of sources of private origin provided insights into the psychology of the wartime daily life, frontline routine practices (TAZHIDINOVA, 2012B; KUZNETSOV, 2020; SENYAVSKAYA, 1999; MAKAROVA, 2017; VOLKOVA, 2014). It was rewarding to use ego-documents to study psychology of interpersonal relations at war: the culture of interaction between commanding officers and common soldiers, men and women (KUZNETSOV, 2013; SENYAVSKAYA, 1999; TAZHIDINOVA, 2015).

We propose to consider the possibility to work with ego-documents within the framework of these approaches using the example of a specific source, and namely, the battlefield diary of submarine sailor of the Northern Fleet G.I. Sennikov. What can science achieve through one undestroyed “auto-text” written by intermediate participant of combats?

BATTLEFIELD DIARY OF THE SUBMARINE SOLDIER GEORGIY SENNIKOV: HISTORY OF CREATION, GENRE PECULIARITIES, BIOGRAPHICAL METHOD

The Laboratory of the Folklife Culture of the Research Institute of Historical Anthropology and Philology of Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University keeps the electronic copies of 3 war-time A size copy-books written by the submarine soldier G.I. Sennikov, who was a navigation technician of “M-107” (“Novosibirskiy Komsolet”) and “M-119”. The first book covers the events of the war in the North (Murmansk, Polyarnoye - the Northern Fleet) from August 1943 until May 1944 (214 pages) and contains, among other things, the detailed description of battles, the demise and victories of submarines, the sketches of comrades-in-arms and commanding offices. (Front-line, 1943-1944). The second book is dedicated to the events in the Crimea (the Black Sea Fleet), which took place from September 1944 until August 1945. (158 pages), and the third book refers to the time from October 1945 until May 1946, the Crimea, Balaklava (157 pages) (Front-line, 1944-1945; Frontline, 1945-1946). Georgiy Ivanovich was demobilized in February of 1947. The second and the third (the Crimea) books reflect the process of withdrawal from war, allow to trace the manifestations of post-traumatic syndrome, to examine the problem of adaptation of the front-line veterans to the post-war peaceful life, provide insight into daily life of post-war Crimea.

The first question that arises when one holds these books is how the sailor could write amidst war. It is common knowledge that the commanding officers discouraged any kind of journaling on the front line. However, the submariners as well as the marines were the elite of the naval forces. Upon safe return from a military campaign Georgiy had an opportunity to read, write, draw and take photos at the submarine base in Polyarnoye (near Murmansk), which is mentioned several times in his diary.

The young sailor resorted to tricks in order to be able journalize. For example, he would hide the diary among the pages of the navigation log. Many of these rough draft pages were rewritten as a final draft. Georgiy Ivanovich did it not later than the summer of 1944 - May 1946.
There is every reason to claim that 3 books of the diary, which were kept by the Sennikovs, were written in the Crimea. The first book has been restored as a fair copy of the draft diary and describes the events of war at the North (the Northern diary).

The text of the Northern diary is characterized by overlapping of genres of the diary and memoirs. The researcher of war-time ego-documents Irina Tazhidinova noted that “The overlapping of the genres of diary and memoirs is a frequent phenomenon. Such metamorphoses could occur during the war, when a person who decided to keep a diary would retrieve memories that gravitated to the bottom of his mind through the months and years spent without journalizing” (TAZHIDINOVA, 2012A, p.40).

The diary of G.I. Sennikov can be designated as belonging to the period of individualization, as the author kept it when he was 19 to 22 years old. It is common knowledge that the process of psychological self-realization is an intrinsic part of every person’s development and it takes place within the period between 16 and 25 years old. This is exactly the period of life when many authors start writing and finish their diaries. The crew list of “M-119” restored by the authors hereof on the basis of prize papers attests to the fact that Georgiy Ivanovich Sennikov, born in 1923, was one of the youngest on the submarine. The battlefield diary of the young submarine sailor G.I. Sennikov combines the genres of battlefield diary and the diary of individualization process. This ego-document allows to take a close look at the psychology of self-realization of young combatant, trace the personality development in extreme war-time conditions. (from Murmansk during 1943-1944 to the Crimea during 1944-1946).

The biographical method allowed to trace the trajectory of the author’s life and to prove that for Georgiy Sennikov, similarly to the whole war-time generation, the war was an experience that formed personality. The analysis of diary entries showed that it was the battlefield where the young submariner formulated his ethical principles, elaborated value orientation, defined his behavioral patterns and chose his life scenario. Being placed in hostile environment, the author of the diary developed his personality by way of telling a story of his life, through self-expression and self-identification.

Reconstruction of Sennikov’s biography led us to the archives of the city of OMSK, where the authors found documents confirming that Georgiy Ivanovich Sennikov was a grand-nephew of Georgiy Efremovich Katanayev (NATIONAL HISTORICAL ARCHIVE OF OMSK REGION, Fund 16), who was famous in Omsk for being a historian, ethnographer, geographer, a member of the Siberian Branch of the Imperial Geographical Society, Lieutenant-General of the Siberian Cossack Army, the author of the books about the history of the Siberian Cossack, history of Siberia and Omsk (NATIONAL HISTORICAL ARCHIVE OF OMSK REGION, Fund 16). As the family of Katanayevs, the participants of the White movement under the leadership of Kolchak, was virtually exterminated during the Russian civil war and Stalin’s repressions, it was only through giving a name to her sons that the mother of the Sennikovs brothers could transfer the family context and family “matrix”. The name Georgiy is, on the one hand, a marker of a significant life theme, and on the other hand, a concise expression of the personal concept of destiny.

On the one side, the name Georgiy is associated with the Christian Saint George the Victorious, the warrior and the patron of warriors. This name code is identifiable in the destiny of Georgiy Sennikov, the participant of the Great Patriotic War, who cited from the memory Lermontov’s poem in his battlefield diary: “The moon rises, // Quiet and calm, //And a young warrior // Goes to the battlefield” (Battlefield records of G.I. Sennikov, 1943-1944, p.101) and identified himself with this “young warrior”. On the other hand, it is obvious that Georgiy was guided by the concept of destiny of his glorified grand-father, a researcher and Cossack, taking it as a model. After the war Georgiy Ivanovich Sennikov got his Russian Literature postgraduate degree in Herzen Pedagogical Institute in Leningrad and worked as a teacher in Perm and Magnitigorsk teachers’ training colleges. Adherence to the principles established by his famous grand-father manifested itself in a large archive of over 90 files in the Public Record Office of Perm Territory left by Sennikov (AGENCY FOR ARCHIVES OF THE PERM TERRITORY, 1950-1974), which is in some aspects similar to the archive of G.E. Katanayev (2012) in the Historical Archive of the Oms Region, although much smaller. The archives combine completed and incomplete manuscripts and typewritten works by both authors (scientific and fictional) and a great number
of extracts from books, letters, articles, essays and photographs, including those referring to the war.

The semiotic approach to the diary analysis brought us to the conclusion that the war became a kind of semantic focus in Georgiy's trajectory of life. All events of his pre-war life were interpreted as potentially leading to the situation “I am at war”, and all subsequent as reasonably following this key period of personality formation. War-time vivid memories came flooding back his whole life in conversations with his family members, in his short novels, stories and essay, in a series of oil paintings, dedicated to the submarine warfare in the Barents Sea.

The method mentioned above allows to identify the events significant for the achievement of personhood from the kaleidoscope of facts stated by the author in the diary. For the Red Navy sailor such significant for his personal history event was his transfer from the submarine “М-107” to take the place of navigation technician of “М-119” who died tragically. The young submarine underwent his baptism by fire when he participated in February 1944 operations of the submarine (SENNIKOV, 1964). He was recognized as a member of the crew by others only after this initial examination through the first military campaign and meaningful gesture of acceptance by the commanding officer: “It was such a pleasure for me to feel the handshake of the commanding officer after the first victory, the first attack, in which I participated on their submarine. By this gesture he accepted me in their family, and I remember how the eyes of the guys sparkled” (SENNIKOV, 1986, p.85)

RESULTS
Potential of the Source: The History of Emotions, Psychology of Combatants

Historical and psychological approach to study of the ego-documents contributed to defining the most crucial functions of the battlefield diary: firstly, the function of the memory, which is responsible for detailed representation of war events and one’s opinion regarding them that quite often does not coincide with the official one, and secondly, the psychotherapeutic function, allowing to overcome fear, emotions, to set oneself up for a battle, as well as to preserve one’s personality from destruction, degradation in hostile environment (POSTNIKOVA & VOLKOVA, 2020).

The study of Sennikov’s ego-documents in the line of history of emotions proved to be quite fruitful as it deepened our understanding of the phenomenon of fear at war (POSTNIKOVA & LUBETSKIY, 2020). The battlefield diary gives insight into the life of a man’s soul, tells us a story of his emotions. The young sailor does not hide his tears when facing death, he writes sincerely about his emotions: about his obsessive fear, that he feels like crying, and then suddenly he wants to hug his comrades and the commanding officer when his heart overflows with joy.

Another major theme present in the diary of G.I. Sennikov is a theme of war as a rite of passage “at the last threshold”, a theme of formidable death as initiation into mystery. Painful and unnerving experience of initiation was described by the author of the diary as a state between life and death, which is accompanied by the sense of absurdity, delirium, incomprehension of where he really was. «What was it? If it was delusional (…) I do not understand anything. Am I going crazy?» (BATTLEFIELD RECORDS OF G.I. SENNIKOV, 1943-1944, p.5). At some points, the submarine would be perceived as a coffin. The association with a coffin is encountered on multiple occasions in the diary: “Out there in the gloomy green depth the bodies of our comrades lie. Possibly right now, at this very moment we move over their steel cold coffin” (BATTLEFIELD RECORDS OF G.I. SENNIKOV, 1943-1944, p.52). The author conveys his emotional state using mythological categories and images. And a happy return from military campaign is described by him as a return from the underworld: “March 5, 1944. 04 am. We are securing to the pier of Catherinian Harbor. I feel as if I was reborn or got back from the underworld.” (BATTLEFIELD, 1943-1944, p.77). Peculiar sailors’ fatalism as a characteristic feature of the combatants’ psychology is expressed in the diary of Georgiy Ivanovich through such entry: “A submarine is a ship, which is predestined to drown to the devil, no matter how long it sails. They say so jokingly. They think so seriously” (BATTLEFIELD RECORDS OF G.I. SENNIKOV, 1943-1944, P.39).

As a specific trait of the Red Navy men’s psychology Georgy Sennikov points to the superstitiousness of the sailors’ environment: “I would probably leave this unattended, had not
the sailors with whom I’ve been mingling for four years, been so damn superstitious” (BATTLEFIELD RECORDS OF G.I. SENNIKOV, 1943-1944, p.98). The researchers had repeatedly emphasized that the war activates spontaneous religious conscience: “Any war leads to activation of religious sentiment and disposition, consolidation of the role of traditional religions. However, in atheistic societies the religiousness manifests itself through “pagan forms” (...) Moreover, common superstitions become predominant form of simplified religious conscience” (SENYAVSKAYA, 1999, p.71).

The research into the psychology of combatant as it is reflected in Sennikov’s diary allows to make interesting observations regarding the phenomenon of religiousness on the front line. The reader sees that a young man who got educated in the atheistic Soviet school, when placed in extreme conditions, suddenly starts interpreting the events of war through mythological imagery and categories of ontological myths intrinsic to folk religious conscience. The diary of Georgiy provides vivid examples of “pagan” religious conscience, such as belief of submarine sailors in evil-boding “bad luck signs”. According to the diary one of such tokens interpreted by the sailors as evil-boding sign was transfer of the commanding officer to another submarine or unexpected compulsory participation of a sailor in military campaign on another submarine. This is exactly how the diary’s author comprehends the story of the death of submarine “M-172”, whose commanding officer was legendary Israil Ilyich Fisanivich over the period from July 1941 to June 1943. The submarine participated in 20 military campaigns and died in early October of 1943 under the command of another officer. Georgiy writes: “The submarine of Fisanovich hasn’t returned. (...) All the crews consider the change of commanding officers to be the reason for the submarine’s death. Fisanovich, who was awarded the title Hero, was appointed division commander of Gorkov Malyutkas. Another commanding officer came to the submarine, and it died in the very first military campaign. The worst is that the crew apprehended the upcoming death” (BATTLEFIELD RECORDS OF G.I. SENNIKOV, 1943-1944, p.43).

The greatest part of the sailors’ superstitions, “bad luck signs” and taboo actions related to the belief in inevitable death and an attempt to keep alive through the system of bans and protective amulets. One of the defense mechanisms in the fight with the fear of death was its objectification, its association with a specific person, object or event and its banishment or elimination. Thus, the sailors had a “marked man” or “marked space” as carriers of death. For them, the fear of “the dead man’s evil eye”), did not communicate with a “marked” person. The sailors named “Slaughterhouse” (“marked space”) as the door w with the inscription “Slaughterhouse” was the threshold to the other world. The young man struggling with a harsh environment absorbed this type of “simplified daily routine” religiousness and superstitiousness of the sailors’ community with its believes in “prophetic dreams” and ghosts, “bad signs” and “lucky things”. “marked people” and “marked space”, protective amulets, system of taboos as traditional ways of protecting oneself from death, from being “contaminated” by it. (POSTNIKOVA & LUBETSKYI, 2020, P.201).
The sailors developed effective methods of fighting their fears. On multiple occasions in his diary did Georgiy put emphasis on the crucial role of laughter and humor during everyday life on the frontline: “I have noticed many times that whatever hardships we experienced on a previous day, today everyone tries to remember only humorous details” (BATTLEFIELD RECORDS OF G.I. SENNIKOV, 1943-1944, p.144).

Sennikov’s battlefield diary is a depository of sailor’s humor, due to which reading them leaves a favorable impression in spite of the tragic events described by the author. A universally applicable approach to fight the fears was creative work. Keeping a diary, drawing, as well as reading at war was an efficient means of coping with emotional pain, distress and fear of death. However, the most significant things that helped overcome fear in combat, assisted in strengthening confidence and putting new life in soldiers were the authority of commanding officers and conviction that the Soviet submariners fought for the rightful cause, freeing the world from the atrocities of fascism.

Potential of the Source: Psychology of Interpersonal Relations on the Frontline
The researchers working within the framework of war-historical anthropology identify author’s individual interpretation of human relations as one of characteristic features of battlefield diaries. Irina Tazhidinova asserts that “The analysis of the diary allows to make a conclusion about the peculiarities of battlefield diary: laconism of description of events, minimal attention is paid to practical issues, reflection about human relations in in extreme conditions of war” (TAZHIDINOVA, 2015, p.150). The analysis of G.I. Sennikov’s diary from the perspective of psychology of interpersonal relations on the frontline showed that the commanding officers and the sailors of the Northern Fleet gained invaluable experience of creating psychological climate between submarine crew members adequate for the war setting, developed methods for conflict resolution, adopted practices for diffusing tension in hostile environment. The brigade commanders of the NF submarines (“war-daddies”), as well as the NF Higher Command Personnel (“chief war-daddies”) had undisputable authority over the subordinates (HEORHE, 2012, p.112).

The text written by Sennikov is a reflection of common Red Navy sailor about human connections in extreme conditions, which provide additional material and food for thought about the problem of interrelations between commanding officers and combatants, to have a look at it from another perspective, from the subordinate’s point of view, from below, to identify the criteria for assessment of the commanding officers by the sailor, value orientation and factors affecting the establishing the authority of the commanding officer or its destruction/“the fall” in the eyes of combatants.

Application of the method of psychological reconstruction for the analysis of the diary pages dedicated to the submarines’ commanding officers allows to answer the question of what the sailors appreciate in the commanding officers. For obvious reasons one the most important criterion for assessing the commanding officer was his attitude towards the sailors. The first thing to be pointed out is a certain paternalism of power relations established between the NF submarines’ commanding officers and their subordinates. One can safely assume that there were family-like bonds between the members of the crew. The submarines called their commanding officers “batya” (a war daddy) (“Our daddy” – (BATTLEFIELD RECORDS OF G.I. SENNIKOV, 1943-1944, p.86); “Their daddy” – about the commanding officer of another submarine – (BATTLEFIELD RECORDS OF G.I. SENNIKOV, 1943-1944, p.148) or chief daddy (“oberbatya”) (“In the morning the brigade’s chief daddy Kolyshkin came” – (BATTLEFIELD RECORDS OF G.I. SENNIKOV, 1943-1944, p. 203). In his diary and short novels Georgiy emphasizes that the submarine’s crew is a family with the commanding officer being the father of the family. The sailors want the commanding officers to be strict but fair.

This accounts for repeated descriptions by the diary’s author of the situations when the commanding officer reprimanded in fatherly tone the naughty sailors for violating internal regulations. A prerequisite for establishing the commanding officer’s authority among the Red Navy sailors, an essential element in the code of honor and markers of the culture of a naval officer were the respect for the personality of the sailor, the ability to communicate with him as equals in everyday life and in strict and formal way, even in a harsh tone, during combat. Such qualities as fearlessness, bravery, valor, contempt for danger, readiness to take risk, courage,
strength increased the authority of the Navy commanding officer in the eyes of the sailors. The relevance and severity of the combatant's reflection about the commanding officer's authority, his rights and obligations, personal qualities and interpersonal relations in the military collective were motivated by both objective reasons: the life of any combatant depends on these qualities, this is, in essence, a question of life and death; and rather subjective ones: in the process of self-identification, improving one's personality it is important to have a point of reference, a positive example. In this sense the commanding officer must be a model. The most significant and vital criteria for assessing the personality of the commanding officer are his martial qualities, and namely: professionalism, knowledge of tactics for conducting a battle, short reaction time, resourcefulness in extreme situations, his performance.

The Red Navy man was cognizant of the specificity of the undersea warfare and the role and function of the commanding officer during combat: "It is no fun to sit and wait for the enemy to launch a torpedo. (…) In fact, it is only the commanding officer who fights. With the German one, one on one!" (SENNIKOV, 1986, p.117). And more to the topic: «commanding officer’s mastership is everything that matters” (SENNIKOV, 1986, p.110). In his diary Sennikov places emphasis on professional behavior of combat officers and stories of victorious military campaigns under their command. Such psychological qualities as fearlessness, courage, contempt for danger, readiness to take risks, strength were of high value in the Navy, creating a certain Navy officer splendor. These traits were present in the characters and behavior of legendary Northern Fleet commanding officers F.A. Vidyayev, I.I. Fisanovich, V.N. Khrulev, K.M. Kolosov, Admiral A.G. Golovko and were described in ego-documents of submarine sailor G.I. Sennikov, creating the Submarine Navy officer's image in the eyes of common Red Navy sailors and insuring the “indisputability” of their authority, respect and acknowledgement of subordinates.

Speaking about the general culture of interrelations of the Northern Fleet servicemen it is impossible to ignore the character and forms of the conflict resolution reflected in the ego-documents of G.I. Sennikov. It should be noted that the diary describes no conflict situations between the sailor and commanding officer of the submarine and senior officers. Two conflicts were mentioned: one between two sailors and another between two commanding officers. Unfortunately, both conflicts ended in tragedies for their participants (homicide and suicide). Subjectivity and ambiguity of some figures (N.A. Lunin, V.N. Khrulev), their “not being in line with” established canon (stereotype) can be explained by the peculiarity of the diary genre, which implies intimacy, frankness and non-public character of entries. These features of the diary also account for detailed analysis by the author of the diary of the facts related to interpersonal conflicts, and clarification of details, previously unknown to historians.

Potential of the Source: Frontline Routine Practices

Sennikov’s diary describes routine practices used by the commanding officers to ease the burden of war carried by the combatants, get them in the right mindset for emotional release and rest. Adopting the historical and anthropological approach to the study allows not only to analyze the “human resource” of war, but to make a progress in examination of wartime everyday life, to describe certain peculiarities of sailors’ daily routine as they are shown in the diary.

The frontline practices included famous “banquets with unvaried pig” for the crews of submarines who returned from the military campaign with a victory. The tradition was set up at the discretion of Fleet Commander-in-Chief Admiral A.G.Golovko. The young submariner notes: “I did not like the banquet: it was too ceremonious and formal. What a difference with a night watch, which is so warm, pure and sincere. It is unparalleled experience. <…> It was kind of weird to discover an ordinary human being who can laugh wholeheartedly telling an old joke in a grey-haired bemedaled living legend“ (Sennikov, 1986, p. 65). Ivan Alexandrovich Kolyskhin, the brigade commander of the Northern Fleet submarines from January 1943, was another person who took care of the sailors' leisure time: “Not so long ago Kolyskhin arranges a question-and-answer party. These parties are great. Obviously, every commanding officer should do that: it brings people together” (BATTLEFIELD RECORDS OF G.I. SENNIKOV, 1943-1944, p.110). Apart from victory banquets and question-and-answer parties, the author of the diary describes such forms of work with the crews as concerts, meetings with the sponsors of
the submarines, watching movies, the best monument design competition, general meetings. The ceremony of going to the Russian bath was a kind of ritual purification for the submarines upon their return on shore. Special attention is paid in the diary by the author to the reading, which is considered to be a frontline daily routine practice.

Like other front-line cultural practices, the reading at war played a role of multi-purpose defense mechanism, necessary for a person in stressful situation to support his emotional stability and fighting ability. According to ego-documents of that time, people read a lot during the war. While in the Navy, Sennikov got a nickname “the student” as he was reading, writing and drawing continually, never parted with his photographic camera. The nineteen-year-old combatant describes his impressions in the diary, which reflect his personal assessment of what he has read. The diary contains analysis, reflection and citation.

The analysis of the front-line writing practice of G.I. Sennikov shows that the most sensitive issue, which permeates the extracts from the books, is the fear of death, the fear of dying young. The author of the diary tries to cope with his traumatic experience. Thus, reading and reflection about love, the meaning of life, about healing power of the sea and “paternal” landscape may be considered as the method of recovering from such emotional trauma. Therefore, the primary function of reading at war is therapeutic.

The ego-documents of the Great Patriotic War demonstrate that reading at war contributed to relieving psychological stress, releasing trapped emotions, helped to refocus. The method of psychological reconstruction that allows interpreting through recreation of the inner world of the authors of ego-documents and getting deep into history, which was applied to the study of battlefield diaries of Georgiy Sennikov, allowed to conclude that reading and keeping a diary on the front-line were the instruments for self-preservation. The rescue of a “human in oneself” from destruction, personal degradation and self-annihilation was a major function of reading and writing at war. The diary entries of G.I. Sennikov provide us with clear insight into this function of reading at war: “December 1944. Outside on deck it is raining, windy, the sky is heavy. In the berthing space there are puffs of smoke and obscene jokes. Endless scrubbing inside the submarine. There is nothing to stir my intellect, not to touch my emotions … I even have no desire to write…” (BATTLEFIELD RECORDS OF G.I. SENNIKOV, 1943-1944, p.49).

Approximately two weeks later there is a contrasting entry. “Izmail is sitting near the rattling diesel engine, motionless, and devours books. One after another. I am reading aloud for the guys “The Crimson Sails” by Grin. After that and until the end of the day, they all move around smiling tenderly and staring dreamily at the plating” (BATTLEFIELD RECORDS OF G.I. SENNIKOV, 1943-1944, p.68). The same sailors who were telling obscene anecdotes and cursing a minute ago, have now changed. They become romantic under the influence of the book by A.Grin. The analysis of the front-line reading practice demonstrates that reading at war allowed a person to preserve his human nature, reminded him of eternal values (POSTNIKOVA; MOISEEEVA, 2018).

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSION
To conclude, the research of ego-documents dated 1943-1946 written by the Northern Fleet submarine sailor Georgiy Ivanovich Sennikov in the context of anthropology of war convincingly demonstrated that one single resource of private origin may provide significant information to deeper understand the problem of “a person at war”. The application of traditional historical methods (principals of historicism, priority of source, analytical and descriptive methods) when paired with contemporary historical psychological and historical anthropological approaches allows to look at the history of the Great Patriotic War from the perspective of personal history, related by the author in vivid forms, to identify and analyze the facts described in the diary which the official science fails to mention or facts contradicting the official information about the history of war. Biographical method offered an opportunity to both to reconstruct the biographies of Georgiy Sennikov, his comrades-in-arms and commanding officers, and to present the events of the Great Patriotic War as a determining factor of his life and creative work. Hermeneutic and semiotic approaches to the text analysis allowed to identify the semantic dominant points in the biography and creative work of G. Sennikov, to interpret the facts described by the author in his diary as important from the perspective of semiotics.
The research of the text of the battlefield diary of the submariner Georgiy Sennikov yielded important results in the context of problems of identity, history of emotions, memory, psychology of wartime daily routine, psychology of combatant, religiosity. It turned out to be highly productive to analyze the diary of the submarine sailor in the direction of psychological phenomena at war: psychology of battle and sailors’ fatalism, peculiarities of self-awareness of the sailors under the combat conditions and while on shore, history of emotions, especially of the phenomenon of fear and ways to overcome it. Georgiy Sennikov emphasizes such sailor-specific peculiarities of psychology as fatalism and superstitiousness. The young Red Navy man who got educated in the atheistic Soviet school interprets the events of war through mythological imagery and categories of ontological myths intrinsic to folk religious conscience. Common superstitions described by the sailor: belief in “prophetic dreams” and ghosts, “bad signs” predicting death, “marked” space and people, the controversy with whom will cause fatalities, good luck amulets, system of taboos and other manifestations of simplified daily routine religiosity and rituals traditional for the Navy were aimed at fighting fears and allowed to relieve internal stress and rid oneself of destructive emotions.

Another significant factor that ensured high performance during combat and banished fear was unchallenged authority of the commanding officers of submarines and properly structured relations between members of the submarines’ crews. Therefore, it was rewarding to use ego-documents to study the psychology of interpersonal relations at war: the culture of interaction between commanding officers and common soldiers, men and women. The analysis of Sennikov’s diary answered the question of what a commanding officer of the submarine should be like, and to identify the factors playing a crucial role in establishing and destruction of the commanding officer’s authority. The authority of the commanding office was established in extreme situations during military campaign, were the head of the fighting entity had to demonstrate professional competence, deep knowledge of tactics for conducting a subsurface battle, naval architecture and weaponry, as well as his ability to assume responsibility for his decisions and lives of the crew members.

The research of the battlefield diary of the submariner Sennikov proved to be productive in terms of study of psychology of wartime routine, battlefield daily practices. The diary describes practices used by the commanding officers to ease the burden of war carried by the combatants, get them in the right mindset for emotional release and rest. Such practices in the Northern Fleet included victory banquets and question-and-answer parties, concerts, meetings with the sponsors of the submarines, watching movies, creative work (for example, best monument design competition), general meetings, group reading of books, front-line newspapers and leaflets.

As directions for future research, we suggest the topic of love and sexual relations at war, the peculiarity of interpretation by the combatants of the problem of “woman at war”, since G.I. Sennikov’s diary provide interesting material, which will allow to shed light on these issues. From the perspective of historical and psychological research of the problem of combatants’ withdrawal from war, it might be productive to study the Crimea diary, which was written at the end of the war in 1944-1946. All the aforesaid entitles us to claim that the ego-documents of the Northern Fleet submarine sailor Georgiy Ivanovich Sennikov are unique, uncensored sources for historic and anthropological research dedicated to the Great Patriotic War.
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Battlefield diary as a source for war-antropological research (based on the ego-documents of submarine sailor G.I. Sennikov)

Diario de campo de batalha como fonte de pesquisa antropológica de guerra (baseado nos documentos de ego do marinheiro submarino G.I. Sennikov)

Diario del campo de batalla como fuente para la investigación guerra-antropológica (basado en los ego-documentos del marinero submarino G.I. Sennikov)

Resumo
A pesquisa é relevante pelo fato de que o estudo histórico, antropológico e psicológico de novos documentos do ego fornece um recurso significativo para a compreensão do tempo presente e das previsões sociais. O objetivo do artigo é estudar os documentos do ego escritos durante a Grande Guerra Patriótica por G.I. Sennikov, o marinheiro submarino da Frota do Norte, com a ajuda de abordagens históricas, antropológicas e psicológicas contemporâneas. A pesquisa desta fonte de origem privada provou ser produtiva no contexto das direções principais e questões-chave da antropologia histórica da guerra: psicologia do combate e dos combatentes, fatalismo dos soldados, a psicologia das interações interpessoais dos militares, psicologia da rotina diária dos tempos de guerra, a história das emoções. O método biográfico permitiu reconstruir a história de vida de Georgiy Sennikov, seus companheiros de armas e comandantes de volta e, além disso, apresentar os eventos da Grande Guerra Patriótica como um momento definidor de sua vida e trabalho criativo.

Palavras-chave: Grande Guerra Patriótica. Antropologia histórica da guerra. Psicologia dos combatentes. G.I. Sennikov.

Abstract
The research is relevant due to the fact that historical, anthropological and psychological study of new ego-documents provides a significant resource for understanding the present time and social forecasting. The purpose of the article is to study ego-documents written during the Great Patriotic War by G.I. Sennikov, the submarine sailor of the Northern Fleet, with the help of contemporary historical, anthropological and psychological approaches. The research of this source of private origin was proven to be productive in the context of principal directions and key issues of war-historical anthropology: psychology of combat and combatants, soldiers’ fatalism, the psychology of the interpersonal interactions of service members, psychology of the war-time daily routine, history of emotions. The biographical method allowed to reconstruct the life story of Georgiy Sennikov, his comrades-in-arms and commanding officers back, and moreover, to present the events of the Great Patriotic War as a defining moment of his life and creative work.

Keywords: Great Patriotic War. Ego-documents. War-historical anthropology. Psychology of combatants. G.I. Sennikov.

Resumen
La investigación es relevante debido al hecho de que el estudio histórico, antropológico y psicológico de los nuevos documentos del yo proporciona un recurso significativo para comprender el tiempo presente y la previsión social. El propósito del artículo es estudiar los documentos de ego escritos durante la Gran Guerra Patria por G.I. Sennikov, el marinero submarino de la Flota del Norte, con la ayuda de enfoques históricos, antropológicos y psicológicos contemporáneos. La investigación de esta fuente de origen privado demostró ser productiva en el contexto de las principales direcciones y cuestiones clave de la antropología histórica de la guerra: psicología del combate y de los combatientes, el fatalismo de los soldados, la psicología de las interacciones interpersonales de los miembros del servicio, la psicología de la rutina diaria en tiempos de guerra, historia de emociones. El método biográfico permitió reconstruir la historia de vida de Georgiy Sennikov, sus compañeros de armas y comandantes de regreso, y además, presentar los acontecimientos de la Gran Guerra Patria como un momento definitorio de su vida y obra creativa.

Palabras-clave: Gran Guerra Patria. Ego-documentos. Antropología guerra-histórica. Psicología de los combatientes. G.I. Sennikov.