

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4467/25439561KSR.24.001.20748>

ANNA KOŚCIOŁEK  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8133-0965>
Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika
w Toruniu

ANDREI MURAVIEV IN THE FACE OF DEATH. ON ITALIAN VOYAGES FROM A THANATOURISTIC PERSPECTIVE

ANDRZEJ MURAWJOW WOBEC ŚMIERCI. O WŁOSKICH WOJAŻACH Z PERSPEKTYWY TANATOTURYSTYCZNEJ

Abstract

The article, based on the findings of Sławoj Tanaś, is an attempt to present thanatouristic dimension of Italian voyages of Andrei Muraviev in 1845. The research material consists of two works: *Roman Letters* and *Appendices to "Roman Letters"*. Various death spaces visited by the writer in Italy can be divided into two categories. The first and most extensive one includes peregrinations to sepulchral spaces, i.e. places where human remains are buried (temples, cemeteries, tombs, catacombs). These were both places commemorating death of anonymous (e.g., catacombs) and particular individuals (e.g., artists' tombs). The other category includes visiting areas of natural cataclysms (Pompeii). Muraviev was a post-figurative tourist, as he was characterised by a traditional, sacralised attitude to death in various aspects of its understanding.

Streszczenie

W artykule, na podstawie ustaleń Sławoja Tanasia, podjęto próbę zaprezentowania tanatourystycznego wymiaru włoskich wojaży Andrzeja Murawjowa z 1845 roku. Jako materiał badawczy wykorzystano dwa utwory: *Listy rzymskie* i *Dodatki do „Listów rzymskich”*. Różne przestrzenie śmierci, odwiedzane przez pisarza we Włoszech, można podzielić na



dwie kategorie. Pierwsza z nich, najobszerniejsza, obejmuje peregrynacje do przestrzeni sepulkralnej, a więc do miejsc, w których gromadzone są ludzkie szczątki (świątynie, cmentarze, groby, katakumby). Były to zarówno miejsca upamiętniające śmierć anonimowych (np. katakumby), jak i konkretnych osób (np. grobowce artystów). Druga to podróże na tereny kataklizmów naturalnych (Pompeje). Murawjow był turystą postfiguratywnym, cechował go bowiem tradycyjny, zsakralizowany stosunek do śmierci w różnych aspektach jej rozumienia.

Keywords: Murawiev, thanatourism, death space, Italy, post-figurative tourist

Słowa kluczowe: Murawjow, tanatoturystyka, przestrzeń śmierci, Włochy, turysta postfiguratywny

Thanatourism is a type of cognitive (cultural) tourism, namely, travelling to places documenting and commemorating death, places of human tragedy and memory of it in historical, educational and cultural dimension.¹ Thanatouristic travel is motivated by the interest in the culture of death, its material and spiritual heritage resulting from social and cultural needs.² The term thanatourism consists of two elements: thanatos³ and tourism. It was introduced in Polish scientific circulation by Sławoj Tanaś,⁴ a Łódź geographer of tourism. He created an equivalent of the English concept of thanatourism.⁵ According to the researcher, using the Polish form “tanatoturizm”, interchangeably with the term “tanatoturystyka” (“thana-travelling”), could suggest the superiority of the first of the mentioned concepts and lead to terminological ambiguity. In English, there is no distinction between “travelling” and “tourism”.⁶ In Polish, the term “tourism”, “covering all theoretical, economic, geographical, statistical, legal, cultural and social issues related to the spa and tourist movement, is superior to travelling, which is spatial, socio-cultural and economic phenomenon, involving voluntary, temporary change of a person’s permanent place

¹ See S. Tanaś, *Przestrzeń turystyczna cmentarzy. Wstęp do tanatoturystyki*, Łódź, WUŁ, 2008, p. 142.

² See S. Tanaś, *Tanatoturystyka. Od przestrzeni śmierci do przestrzeni turystycznej*, Łódź, WUŁ, 2013, p. 165.

³ Tanatos – in Greek mythology, the son of Night and Erebus, brother of Hypnos, personification of death (W. Kopaliński, *Słownik mitów i tradycji kultury*, Warszawa, PIW, 1997, entry: “Tanatos”, p. 1167).

⁴ S. Tanaś, *Tanatoturystyka – kontrowersyjne oblicze turystyki kulturowej*, “Peregrinus Cracoviensis” 2006, no. 17, pp. 85–100.

⁵ See idem, *Przestrzeń turystyczna...*, op. cit., p. 142. English term was introduced by Anthony V. Seaton (A.V. Seaton, *From Thanatopsis to Thanatourism. Guided by the Dark*, “International Journal of Heritage Studies” 1996, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 234–244).

⁶ See S. Tanaś, *Tanatoturystyka – kontrowersyjne...*, op. cit., p. 86; idem, *Przestrzeń turystyczna...*, op. cit., p. 142.

of residence for the purposes of recreation, cognitive activity and intellectual, emotional experiences”.⁷

Tanaś’s scientific reflection on the phenomenon of thanatourism is a part of research trend on the so-called “dark”⁸ tourism. The researcher perceives thanatourism as a socio-spatial phenomenon. He deals with the use of death space in cultural tourism, “understood as a space determined by death separated from geographical space”⁹, from the perspective of cultural geography and touristic geography. In his works, he shows that the development of thanatourism is a consequence of cultural changes related to the perception of human passing, which have occurred throughout the centuries in history.¹⁰ Tanaś considers thanatourism “as a kind of bridge between death and life, between the dead and the living. The tourist is encouraged to contemplate death, which has not only a religious dimension, but also, and perhaps above all, a social one”.¹¹ According to the Polish researcher, thanatourism “affects the expansion of social awareness, discovery of human heritage by crossing cultural boundaries, awakening various needs, identifying, valuing and interpreting cultures. Contact with death space can be stimulating for the tourist, through the discovery of a world unknown to him, often incomprehensible and arousing fears”.¹² Thanatourism also contributes to the development of tourist space, understood as a part of geographical and social space.¹³

Depending on the assumptions adopted by the researchers, various classifications of thanatourism are introduced. Tanaś adopted subject criterion, which included the motive, the purpose of the journey and the subject of tourist interest. He distinguished cognitive, educational, religious and recreational motives. He considered the purposes of thanatourism travel to be: commemoration, pilgrimage, education, gaining knowledge, satisfying curiosity, and, to a limited extent, entertainment and relaxation. Taking into account the subject of tourist interest, he pointed out that thanatourism can concern both subjective death (human, animal, plant) and the death of an object (thing, place, space).¹⁴ The researcher from Łódź distinguished

⁷ Idem, *Tanatourystyka – kontrowersyjne...*, op. cit., pp. 85–86.

⁸ The concept was for the first time described by M. Foley and J. Lennon (M. Foley, J. Lennon, *Dark Tourism – An Ethical Dilemma*, [in:] *Strategic Issues for the Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure Industries*, (Ed.) M. Foley, J. Lennon, G. Maxwell, London, Cassell, 1996, pp. 153–164).

⁹ See S. Tanaś, *Tanatourystyka. Od przestrzeni ...*, op. cit., p. 10. More: idem, *Znaczenie przestrzeni śmierci w turystyce kulturowej*, “Turyzm” 2006, 16 (2), pp. 145–146.

¹⁰ See idem, *Tanatourystyka. Od przestrzeni...*, op. cit., p. 200.

¹¹ Ibidem, p. 9.

¹² Ibidem.

¹³ See ibidem, p. 11.

¹⁴ See ibidem, p.186.

five categories of thanatourism: journeys marked by the act of death itself, its documentation, memory of it, its staging and recreation.

Tanaś included journeys marked by the act of death as trips to places where the tourist is exposed to a real life threat (e.g. direct observation of warfare or other dangerous events such as cataclysms, accidents, disasters) or witnesses death, both planned (e.g. as a result of execution) and unexpected (accident, catastrophe, cataclysm, terrorist attack). The second category includes journeys marked by the documentation of death, i.e. peregrinations to places where the tourist encounters artifacts showing not only death itself, but also its causes and effects, rituals and traditions related to it (e.g. exhibitions, museums). The third group includes journeys to places commemorating life and death, i.e. to objects creating a space of memory (e.g. cemeteries, graves, crypts, catacombs, monuments, mausoleums, temples). The fourth type includes journeys during which the tourist has contact with both the consequences of real death and fictional death (e.g. historical reconstructions of battles, religious ceremonies during which the act of death is recreated, artistic performances in which death plays an important role). The last category includes recreational, leisure, contemplative stays in specific spaces of death treated as oases of peace, silence or entertainment and fun (e.g. cemeteries, memorial parks, entertainment places organized to arouse specific emotions: fear, terror, disgust, fun, e.g. horror museums, castles of fear, torture chambers).¹⁵

In the classification presented above, Tanaś used earlier findings of foreign and Polish researchers. He also created his own typology of thanatourism, depending on the level of interest in the culture of death and its tourist supply. He distinguished four types: accidental, incidental, stimulated and advanced thanatourism. Accidental thanatourism occurs when a tourist who is not interested in the culture of death comes across its products that have not been deliberately exposed. His conscious contact with them is unplanned (e.g. accidental stay at a cemetery). Incidental thanatourism occurs when a visitor interested in the culture of death comes across objects that have not been deliberately exposed, hence their conscious contact with them is accidental (e.g. discovery of an interesting tomb during a stay at a cemetery). In the case of stimulated thanatourism, a traveller who was not initially interested in the culture of death comes across deliberately exposed artefacts. His conscious contact with them depends on the extent to which they arouse his interest during direct contact (e.g. a random visit to a museum). For thanatourism to be called advanced, a tourist interested in the culture of death must come across its deliberately exposed products and have conscious and purposeful contact with them (e.g. a deliberate visit to a historic cemetery).¹⁶

¹⁵ See S. Tanaś, *Tanatourystyka. Od przestrzeni ...*, op. cit., pp.187–189.

¹⁶ See *ibidem*, pp. 193–194.

The Łódź researcher also proposed an interesting division of tourists. He divided them into three groups based on their attitude to death: postfigurative, cofigurative and prefigurative. A postfigurative tourist is characterized by a traditional, sacralized attitude to death. He does not accept modern ways of development and usage of death space. A cofigurative tourist has an indifferent view of the changing attitude to death. He draws attention to educational and upbringing interpretation of death space, which connects generations through understanding history. On the other hand, a prefigurative tourist rejects tradition. He is not interested in death in the sacred aspect, and sees it as a contribution to pop culture entertainment.¹⁷

Since the beginning of scientific reflection on journeys to places of death, two approaches can be observed among researchers. Representatives of the first one consider this type of pilgrimage as part of the cultural heritage of Western civilization, a new form of a phenomenon that has been known in culture for many centuries. Proponents of the second one, on the other hand, locate the tourist fascination with death in the postmodern era, seeing it as one of the symptoms of the condition of the modern man.¹⁸

Undoubtedly, thanatourism has gained popularity only in the last two centuries, but it has a long history. “Objects presenting, documenting and commemorating death and human suffering have been a tourist attraction since the dawn of time. Egyptians admired pyramids and participated in religious festivals that celebrated death. Greeks and Romans participated in bloody games and gladiator fights.”¹⁹ Pilgrimages to the tombs of saints can be considered one of the original forms of thanatourism in the Christian world. Over the centuries, burial places of other famous people, primarily rulers and artists, were also visited. Interest was shown in the areas where important battles had taken place (especially since Waterloo), trips to archaeological sites were popularised, exhibitions presenting suffering and death were visited, tortures and executions were attended.²⁰ In modern times, the media play an important role in popularising thanatourism.²¹

Since visits to death spaces have been known for centuries, Tanaś’s findings can be used to reflect on the works of those writers who were men of a constant journey, pilgrims and tourists, and who recorded their own travelling experiences in their works. One of them was Andrei Muraviev (1806–1874) – the most famous 19th-century Russian pilgrim. His journeys were largely thanatouristic in nature. During his

¹⁷ See *ibidem*, p. 171.

¹⁸ See M. Banaszkiwicz, *Tanatourystyka: doświadczenie, pamięć, etyka*, “Politeja” 2015, no. 3, pp. 95–96.

¹⁹ S. Tanaś, *Tanatourystyka. Od przestrzeni...*, op. cit. p. 158.

²⁰ See M. Banaszkiwicz, *Tanatourystyka...*, op. cit., p. 95; S. Tanaś, *Tanatourystyka. Od przestrzeni...*, op. cit., pp. 158–159.

²¹ See S. Tanaś, *Tanatourystyka. Od przestrzeni...*, op. cit., p. 155.

numerous pilgrimages, he visited the graves of saints and monks (e.g. in the Far and Near Caves in Kiev). On his way to Palestine in 1830, he viewed the ruins of ancient Troy.²² In the Holy Land, he visited places in the Old and New Testaments associated with death (e.g. the tombs of David and Solomon, the tomb of the Blessed Virgin Mary in Gethsemane, the place where Stephen was stoned). As particularly important spiritual experiences he mentions walking the Way of the Cross of Christ²³, as well as prayers at the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem.²⁴ In this city he also saw the burial place of two kings, the conquerors of Palestine, Godfrey of Bouillon and Baldwin.²⁵ In Kiev he prayed many times at the eternal resting place of Saint Prince Vladimir the Great in the Church of the Tithes, in Moscow at the tombstones of the rulers in the Archangel Cathedral. He called the tsars' necropolis a stone treasury of death²⁶, the heart of the Russian land²⁷ and the Valley of Josaphat of Russia.²⁸ In Egypt he visited the pyramids, in London the Tower.²⁹ The writer also visited war cemeteries in Sevastopol in Crimea.³⁰ These are just some examples.

Muraviev visited various death spaces during his trip to Italy in 1845. He described his impressions in *Roman Letters* (Римские письма, 1846) and *Appendices to Roman Letters* (Прибавления к "Римским письмам", 1847).³¹ These works will be used as research material to show the thanatouristic aspect of Muraviev's Italian travels. The findings of Slavoj Tanaš presented above will serve as a theoretical basis for the analysis.

The places associated with death most frequently visited by the writer were elements of sepulchral space which is a very important component of the heritage of a given nation. This term is used to describe "a fragment of geographical space intended for burying corpses and/or storing ashes after cremation, also used to

²² See A. Муравьев, *Путешествие ко Святым местам в 1830 году*, ч. 1, Санкт-Петербург, Типография III отд. соб. Е.И.В. канцелярии, 1848, pp. 80–85.

²³ More: A. Kościółek, *Andrzeja Murawjowa peregrynacje do kolebek chrześcijaństwa (Jerozolima, Rzym, Kijów)*, Toruń, WN UMK, 2020, pp. 141–142.

²⁴ More: *ibidem*, pp. 146–147, 151–152.

²⁵ More: *ibidem*, pp. 147–148.

²⁶ A. Муравьев, *Путешествие по святым местам русским*, ч. 1, Санкт-Петербург, Типография III отд. соб. Е.И.В. канцелярии, 1846, p. 246.

²⁷ *Ibidem*.

²⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 272.

²⁹ A. Муравьев, *Прибавления к "Римским письмам"*, Санкт-Петербург, Типография III отд. соб. Е.И.В. канцелярии, 1847, p. 172. References to this work will be given the abbreviation LRD, part and page number.

³⁰ See A. Kościółek, "Wrażenia z Sewastopola" *Andrzeja Murawjowa jako intencjonalny nośnik pamięci historycznej o wojnie krymskiej*, "Slavica Wratislaviensia" [accepted for print].

³¹ A. Муравьев, *Римские письма*, ч. I–II, Санкт-Петербург, Типография III отд. соб. Е.И.В. канцелярии, 1846. References to this work will be given the abbreviation LR, part and page number.

perpetuate the memory of the deceased through specific sepulchral art (architecture, sculpture, painting, poetry, etc.). In a broader sense, it is a space associated with death, funeral rites, burial places, and various manifestations of the cult of the dead. Its character (physiognomy, morphology) results from historical, religious, cultural, social, etc. conditions.”³²

As the authors of the cited definition, Andrzej Stasiak and Sławoj Tanaś, emphasise, in its light “sepulchral space should include primarily cemeteries, graves and tombs, funerary chapels, places of execution, mass graves, but also symbolic graves, lapidariumuri, museum exhibitions devoted to funeral customs and the space in which events related to the topic of death take place”.³³

Muraviev often made pilgrimages to the tombs of saints. He venerated relics. During his stay in Venice, he venerated the relics of St. Mark (see LDR, 5–6), in the church of St. Anthony of Padua he bowed to the remains of St. Saba, the founder of the Great Lavra near Jerusalem, in the church of St. Zacharias he venerated the relics of St. Athanasius, and in the church of John the Baptist the remains of St. John the Almsgiver (see LDR, 101–108). In Milan, in the church of St. Ambrose, he bowed to the relics of this saint (see LDR, 116; 135–136), and in Pavia he venerated the remains of St. Augustine (see LDR 144–145). In Rome, he prayed at the tomb of St. Peter (see LR I, 10–13), he paid tribute to the remains of St. Paul (see LR II, 343–354)³⁴, in the church of St. Clement he bowed to the relics of its patron saint and St. Cyril, the apostle to the Slavs (see LR II, 38–39). In the cathedral in Salerno he prayed at the tomb of the evangelist, St. Matthew, one of the twelve apostles (see LR II, 221). In Amalfi Muraviev not only adored the mortal remains of his patron saint, but also had the opportunity to venerate the relics of the crosses on which the apostles Peter and Andrew suffered martyrdom (see LR II, 309). These are just a few examples. They show the writer’s attachment to tradition. He was surprised and concerned with the indifference of Catholics towards relics, the way in which they kept them in churches, and, above all, the fact that believers were more concerned with the decoration of altars and tombs than with the particles themselves (see LR I, 293).

Another element of the sepulchral space visited by Muraviev were catacombs, which he called the “kingdom of tombs” (LR II, 298). In Rome, he visited the catacombs of St. Sebastian (see LR I, 401–406) and St. Agnes (see LR II, 1–28). He explored the latter in great detail, as his guide was the Jesuit Father Giuseppe Marchi (1795–1860), who had been the custodian of the underground cemeteries since 1841

³² A. Stasiak, S. Tanaś, *Przestrzeń sepulkralna w turystyce*, “Turystyka i Hotelarstwo” 2005, no. 8, p. 10. Cf. S. Tanaś, *Przestrzeń turystyczna...*, op. cit., pp. 77–78.

³³ A. Stasiak, S. Tanaś, *Przestrzeń sepulkralna...*, op. cit., p. 10.

³⁴ More: A. Kościółek, *Andrzeja Murawjowa...*, op. cit., pp. 208–209.

(see LR II, 1). The monk chose these catacombs because they contained more Christian remains than the catacombs of St. Sebastian or St. Lawrence (see LR II, 1). Reporting his impressions of the underground cemeteries,³⁵ the writer drew attention to the differences between pagan and Christian burials. First of all, he emphasised social inequality manifested in funeral rites. He recalled that in ancient Rome for well-known citizens after their death there were built mausoleums, magnificent tombs, urns with the ashes of wealthy people were placed in a columbarium, and the poor and slaves were buried in a common grave, even together with animals (see LR II, 12).³⁶ On the other hand, early Christians, both during life and after death, were equal to each other. According to the author of *Roman Letters*, the sense of community was manifested in the fact that separate cemeteries were not created for wealthy people and titles were not used on tombstones (see LR II, 12). If there were tombs of a family in the catacombs, it was, as he stated, due to the sacrifice of their blood, not the eminence of the family (see LR II, 13).

In Naples, Muraviev visited the catacombs of St. Januarius (see LR II, 297–299). He pointed out that they resembled Roman catacombs, but they were carved out of rock, not in the ground like those in the Eternal City (see LR II, 298). He compared them to a beehive, because the honey of Christ's teachings was collected in them (see LR II, 298).

The writer also travelled to places of public death. In Rome, he went to the area where St. Peter was crucified (see LR I, 52). In his reflections, he drew attention to the Colosseum, the amphitheatre where great numbers of gladiators died (see LR II, 360), and later Christians. He compared it to a skull with a hundred eyes (see LR I, 163), and also called it the reservoir of martyrs' blood (see LR I, 165) and the place of glory of those who rose with Christ (see LR I, 162).³⁷

Muraviev also visited tombs of famous people: in Venice tombs of Doges in St. Mark's Basilica (see LDR, 36–39), in Rome, in St. Peter's Basilica tombs of popes, in the Pantheon, of famous artists, Raphael Santi, Annibale Carracci (see LR I, 71), as well as modest tomb of Torquato Tasso in the church of St. Onuphrius on Janiculum Hill (see LR I, 116).³⁸ The writer recalled that the Renaissance poet spent the last years of his life in the monastery by this temple (see LR I, 112–113). In the monastery library he saw the poet's bust, a cast of the deceased's face (death mask) and his letters (see LR I, 116). The funerary monument of another famous artist, Virgil,

³⁵ More: A. Kościółek, *Andrzeja Murawjowa...*, op. cit., pp. 193–194.

³⁶ On funeral customs in ancient Rome, see e.g. L. Winniczuk, *Ludzie, zwyczaje, obyczaje starożytnej Grecji i Rzymu*, Warszawa, PWN, 1983, pp. 463–483.

³⁷ More: A. Kościółek, *Andrzeja Murawjowa...*, op. cit., pp. 182–183.

³⁸ At that time, there was no funeral monument for the poet that was eventually made in 1857 by Giuseppe de Fabris.

situated among laurel and orange trees,³⁹ with the inscription: *Tenet me nunc Parthenope* (LR II, 271),⁴⁰ was viewed by Muraviev during his stay in Naples.⁴¹

One sepulchral space in Rome the writer assessed totally negatively. It was an underground chapel in the Church of the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God of the Friars Minor in Rome, lined with the bones of monks. The remains of the Capuchins were arranged in the form of a reliquary, some of the skeletons were dressed in habits (see LR II, 157). After viewing this chapel, Muraviev concluded:

Можно ли было выдумать что либо более отвратительное и менее благоговейное! Во дни панихид, которые совершаются на олтарях сих подземных покоев, возжигают факелы в руках остовов, и страшно освещают их череп, с длинною белою бородой. Повсюду театральность в Риме: даже и мертвых не оставляют в покое, ради зрелища (LR II, 157–158).⁴²

The writer believed that everything in Rome was “more for the eyes than for the heart” (LR I, 159), and had a theatrical character (cf. LR I, 137). The author of *Roman Letters* can be called a post-figurative tourist, as Sławoj Tanaś put it. He was characterized by a traditional, sacralised attitude to death. He repeatedly emphasized that Catholics did not show the dead the respect they deserved.

In addition to various elements of the sepulchral space, Muraviev also visited other places marked by death. In Venice, it was the famous Doge’s Palace. The writer pointed out that it served not only as the ruler’s seat and administrative center (meetings of the Great Council and court hearings were held there), but also as a prison. He mentioned the inquisitors’ room (see LDR, 66), the cells in which prisoners were tortured (see LDR, 66), the inscriptions that the sentenced left on the walls in the dark cells (see LDR 67–68), the infamous Bridge of Sighs (see LDR, 66) which allowed transport of sentenced people between the prison and the court, as well as the corpses transported by gondola to the Orfano Canal (see LDR, 67).

During his stay in southern Italy, the poet climbed Vesuvius. Both during the climb and at the top of the volcano, he not only admired the landscapes, but also

³⁹ Currently, Virgil’s tomb is located in the Parco della Tomba di Virgilio, which was created in 1930 to mark the 2000th anniversary of the poet’s birth.

⁴⁰ “Now Parthenope holds me” (the old name of Naples).

⁴¹ In accordance with the poet’s last will, his body was transported from Brundisium to Naples and buried on the road to Puteoli. The epitaph, composed by himself, read as follows: Mantua me genuit, Calabri rapuere, tenet nunc Parthenope, cecini pascha, rura, duc. “I was born in Mantua, the Calabrians kidnapped me, today I’m Parthenope’s prisoner, I sang of the pastures, the countryside, the chiefs” (S. Stabryła, *Wergiliusz. Świat poetycki*, Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1987, p. 142).

⁴² “Could anything more disgusting and less reverent be invented! On the days of the requiems, which are held on the altars of these underground chambers, torches are lit in the hands of the skeletons, and their skulls, with their long white beard, are terribly illuminated. Theatricality is everywhere in Rome: even the dead are not left in peace, for the sake of the spectacle.”

reflected on ethical and eschatological issues, and pondered about The Second Coming. He was happy when he noticed a small hermitage on the slope of Vesuvius. It became for him a symbol of deep humility in the face of misfortunes that the inhabitants of these areas often experienced. At the same time, however, it served as a reminder of the approaching end. In his opinion, it was situated in such a setting that one should reflect more than anywhere else on death and final matters (see LR II, 292–293).⁴³

Muraviev was also very impressed by Vesuvius' two victims of 79 CE – Herculaneum and Pompeii. The first city was flooded by muddy lava, the second buried by pumice and ash.⁴⁴ The writer noted this difference (see LR II, 257). He recalled that Herculaneum was discovered under the city of Resina. He pointed out that only the theatre was excavated, because the lava had turned into hard stone, which made archaeological work difficult (see LR II, 256). In his reflections, he devoted more attention to Pompeii. He recalled the tragic fate of Pliny the Elder, who was killed by toxic gases (see LR II, 258). He wrote that the survivors probably returned to the city to recover their property (see LR II, 258).⁴⁵ He pointed out that excavations had been conducted since the mid-18th century and that at the time he visited Pompeii most of the city was still buried and about 400 skeletons of inhabitants had been discovered (see LR II, 258–259, 261).⁴⁶ He mentioned Edward Bulwer Lytton's 1834 novel *The Last Days of Pompeii*, in which the author wanted to revive the dead, forgotten world of the Roman Empire (see LR II, 259). He claimed that anyone who wanted to understand the despair of the inhabitants' situation and at the same time experience the atmosphere of the approaching end of the world should see the brilliant painting by Karl Briullov (1799–1852) *The Last Day of Pompeii* (*Последний день Помпеи*) (see LR II, 262).

Visiting the “buried alive Pompeii” (LR II, 263) was one of the mandatory points on the European travel itinerary in Italy during the Romantic period. Muraviev was probably driven by curiosity, a desire to get to know this place. In *Roman Letters* he reported his trip to the “tomb city” (LR II, 262). He noted some buildings, skeletons, in the forum. He noticed that two thirds of the city still remained to be discovered.

⁴³ More: A. Kościółek, *Neapol i okolice, czyli Campania felix Andrzeja Murawjowa*, “Slavia Orientalis” 2016, no. 2, p. 309.

⁴⁴ See R. Étienne, *Życie codzienne w Pompejach*, trans. T. Kotula, Warszawa, PIW, 1971, p. 28; R. Gostkowski, *Pompeje*, Lublin, TN KUL, 1954, pp. 73–74; M. Grant, *Miasta Wezuwiusza*, trans. H. Rowińska, Warszawa, PIW, 1986, pp. 28–32.

⁴⁵ Cf. R. Gostkowski, *Pompeje...*, op. cit., p. 77.

⁴⁶ About excavations in these cities, see e.g. R. Gostkowski, *Pompeje...*, op. cit., pp. 80–91; R. Étienne, op. cit., pp. 38–61.

The poet ended his *Roman letters* with his sonnet entitled *Italy* (Италия), in which he called Italy “the land of graves” (LR II, 392).⁴⁷ For Muraviev, the entire nineteenth-century Rome was “a magnificent cemetery, where the shadows of past centuries stroll” (LR, I, 4).⁴⁸ He was particularly interested in temples and various places associated with death. He encountered traces of the past everywhere. Walking through squares and streets, he also made a journey through the ages. He was discovering the history of the Roman Empire reading the ruins,⁴⁹ and admired works of art in galleries and museums. We are therefore dealing with an archival and museum function.⁵⁰ Visiting various monuments, Muraviev walked a lot around Rome. These walks were a time of meditation and contemplation.

The writer was primarily driven by religious motives, related to the cult of the dead and relics, but also cognitive and educational ones. He wanted to become better acquainted with the history and culture of Italy. By visiting cemeteries and monuments, he entered the space of memory, cultural heritage. To some extent, curiosity probably also motivated Muraviev. He wanted to see and remember unusual, unique places. He was a post-figurative tourist, because he was characterised by a traditional, sacralised attitude to death in various aspects of its understanding. His thanatourism was primarily of an advanced nature. He was a person interested in the culture of death, deliberately visiting its products. His contact with them can be considered conscious and purposeful. Visiting the death space was intentional, planned. He perceived it individually, which was influenced by his previous experiences and the religion he professed.

⁴⁷ The original version of the piece comes from 1827. More: A. Kościółek, *Andrzeja Murawjowa...*, op. cit., pp. 211–212.

⁴⁸ See *ibidem*, p. 178.

⁴⁹ On Muraviev’s perception of ruins: A. Kościółek, *Andrzeja Murawjowa...*, op. cit., pp. 178–179, 180–181.

⁵⁰ Cemeteries serve four functions: sacred, archival, museum and park one. The first of these is due to the fact that mortal remains of many generations are deposited and stored in a given place. A cemetery is a kind of “archive”, a collection of information about the history of local communities, their leaders, personalities, important events. It also serves as a museum. On a cemetery there are gathered works of art created by famous or anonymous artists, but they are always a reflection of their era. A cemetery is a landscape composition filled with sadness, melancholy and reflection on transience. Therefore, it can also serve as a park. See S. Tanaś, *Przestrzeń turystyczna...*, op. cit., p. 77.

References

- Banaszkiewicz M., *Tanatoturystyka: doświadczenie, pamięć, etyka* [Thanatourism: Experience, Memory, Ethics], "Politeja" 2015, no. 3, pp. 91–104.
- Étienne R., *Życie codzienne w Pompejach* [Daily Life in Pompeii], trans. T. Kotula, Warsaw, PIW, 1971, 351 pp.
- Foley M., Lennon J., *Dark Tourism – An Ethical Dilemma*, [in:] *Strategic Issues for the Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure Industries*, M. Foley, J. Lennon, G. Maxwell (Eds.), London, Cassell, 1996, pp. 153–164.
- Gostkowski R., *Pompeje* [Pompeii], Lublin, TN KUL, 1954, 380 pp.
- Grant M., *Miasta Wezuwiusza* [Cities of Vesuvius], trans. H. Rowińska, Warsaw, PIW, 1986, 276 pp.
- Kopaliński W., *Słownik mitów i tradycji kultury* [The Dictionary of Myths and Cultural Traditions], Warsaw, PIW, 1997, 1360 pp.
- Kościółek A., *Andrzeja Murawjowa peregrynacje do kolebek chrześcijaństwa (Jerozolima, Rzym, Kijów)* [Andrei Muraviev's Peregrinations to the Cradles of Christianity (Jerusalem, Rome, Kiev)], Toruń, WN UMK, 2020, 334 pp.
- Kościółek A., *Neapol i okolice, czyli Campania felix Andrzeja Murawjowa* [Naples and the Surrounding Areas, i.e. Andrei Muraviev's Campania Felix], "Slavia Orientalis" 2016, no. 2, pp. 299–311.
- Kościółek A., "Wrażenia z Sewastopola" *Andrzeja Murawjowa jako intencjonalny nośnik pamięci historycznej o wojnie krymskiej* [Andrei Muraviev's "Impressions from Sevastopol" as an Intentional Carrier of Historical Memory of the Crimean War], "Slavica Wratislaviensia" [accepted for publication].
- Murav'ev A., *Pribavleniia k "Rimskim pis'mam"* [Appendices to Roman Letters], St. Petersburg, Tipografiiia III otd. sob. E.I.V. kantseliarii, 1847, 201 pp.
- Murav'ev A., *Puteshestvie ko Sviatym mestam v 1830 godu* [A Visit to Holy Places in 1830], pt. 1, St. Petersburg, Tipografiiia III otd. sob. E.I.V. kantseliarii, 1848, 225 pp.
- Murav'ev A., *Puteshestvie po sviatym mestam ruskim* [A Visit to Holy Places of Russia], pt. 1, St. Petersburg, Tipografiiia III otd. sob. E.I.V. kantseliarii, 1846, 391 pp.
- Murav'ev A., *Rimskie pis'ma* [Roman Letters], Saint Petersburg, Tipografiiia III otd. sob. E.I.V. kantseliarii, 1846, pt. 1, 407 pp., pt. 2, 394 pp.
- Seaton A.V., *From Thanatopsis to Thanatourism. Guided by the Dark*, "International Journal of Heritage Studies" 1996, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 234–244.
- Stabryła S., *Wergiliusz. Świat poetycki* [Virgil. The Poetic World], Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1987, 234 pp.

- Stasiak A., Tanaś S., *Przestrzeń sepulkralna w turystyce* [The Sepulchral Space in Tourism], "Turystyka i Hotelarstwo" ["Tourism and Hospitality"] 2005, no. 8, pp. 9–42.
- Tanaś S., *Przestrzeń turystyczna cmentarzy. Wstęp do tanatoturystyki* [Tourist Space of Cemeteries. Introduction to Thanatourism], Łódź, WUŁ, 2008, 215 pp.
- Tanaś S., *Tanatoturystyka – kontrowersyjne oblicze turystyki kulturowej* [Thanatourism – the Controversial Face of Cultural Tourism], "Peregrinus Cracoviensis" 2006, no. 17, pp. 85–100.
- Tanaś S., *Tanatoturystyka. Od przestrzeni śmierci do przestrzeni turystycznej* [Thanatourism. From Death Space to Tourism Space], Łódź, WUŁ, 2013, 224 pp.
- Tanaś S., *Znaczenie przestrzeni śmierci w turystyce kulturowej* [The Meaning of Death Space in Cultural Tourism], "Tourism" 2002, no. 16/2, pp. 145–151.
- Winniczuk L., *Ludzie, zwyczaje, obyczaje starożytnej Grecji i Rzymu* [People, Customs, and Traditions of Ancient Greece and Rome], Warsaw, PWN, 1983, 762 pp.

Literatura

- Banaszkiewicz M., *Tanatoturystyka: doświadczenie, pamięć, etyka*, „Politeja” 2015, nr 3, ss. 91–104.
- Étienne R., *Życie codzienne w Pompejach*, przeł. T. Kotuła, Warszawa, PIW, 1971, 351 ss.
- Foley M., Lennon J., *Dark Tourism – An Ethical Dilemma*, [w:] *Strategic Issues for the Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure Industries*, red. M. Foley, J. Lennon, G. Maxwell, London, Cassell, 1996, ss. 153–164.
- Gostkowski R., *Pompeje*, Lublin, TN KUL, 1954, 380 ss.
- Grant M., *Miasta Wezuwiusza*, przeł. H. Rowińska, Warszawa, PIW, 1986, 276 ss.
- Kopaliński W., *Słownik mitów i tradycji kultury*, PIW, Warszawa 1997, 1360 ss.
- Kościołek A., *Andrzeja Murawjowa peregrynacje do kolebek chrześcijaństwa (Jerozolim, Rzym, Kijów)*, Toruń, WN UMK, 2020, 334 ss.
- Kościołek A., *Neapol i okolice, czyli Campania felix Andrzeja Murawjowa*, „Slavia Orientalis” 2016, nr 2, ss. 299–311.
- Kościołek A., „*Wrażenia z Sewastopola*” *Andrzeja Murawjowa jako intencjonalny nośnik pamięci historycznej o wojnie krymskiej*, „Slavica Wratislaviensia” [przyjęte do druku].
- Seaton A.V., *From Thanatopsis to Thanatourism. Guided by the Dark*, „International Journal of Heritage Studies” 1996, t. 2, nr 4, ss. 234–244.
- Stabryła S., *Wergiliusz. Świat poetycki*, Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1987, 234 ss.

- Stasiak A., Tanaś S., *Przestrzeń sepulkralna w turystyce*, „Turystyka i Hotelarstwo” 2005, nr 8, ss. 9–42.
- Tanaś S., *Przestrzeń turystyczna cmentarzy. Wstęp do tanatoturystyki*, Łódź, WUŁ, 2008, 215 ss.
- Tanaś S., *Tanatoturystyka – kontrowersyjne oblicze turystyki kulturowej*, „Peregrinus Cracoviensis” 2006, z. 17, ss. 85–100.
- Tanaś S., *Tanatoturystyka. Od przestrzeni śmierci do przestrzeni turystycznej*, Łódź, WUŁ, 2013, 224 ss.
- Tanaś S., *Znaczenie przestrzeni śmierci w turystyce kulturowej*, „Turyzm” 2002, nr 16/2, ss. 145–151.
- Winniczuk L., *Ludzie, zwyczaje, obyczaje starożytnej Grecji i Rzymu*, Warszawa, PWN, 1983, 762 ss.
- Муравьев А., *Прибавления к „Римским письмам”*, Санкт-Петербург, Типография III отд. соб. Е.И.В. канцелярии, 1847, 201 ss.
- Муравьев А., *Путешествие ко Святым местам в 1830 году*, ч. 1, Санкт-Петербург, Типография III отд. соб. Е.И.В. канцелярии, 1848, 225 ss.
- Муравьев А., *Путешествие по святым местам русским*, ч. 1, Санкт-Петербург, Типография III отд. соб. Е.И.В. канцелярии, 1846, 391 ss.
- Муравьев А., *Римские письма*, Санкт-Петербург, Типография III отд. соб. Е.И.В. канцелярии, 1846, ч. 1, 407 ss., ч. 2, 394 ss.