

MANIFESTOS-MESSAGES IN THE POETIC DISCOURSE OF MODERNISM: A. AKHMATOVA, V. BRYUSOV, V. MAYAKOVSKY, M. TSVETAeva AND M. VOLOSHIN

Tatiana L. Pavlova^{*}, Lyubov G. Kikhney^{**} and Vitaliy A. Gavrikov^{***}

Abstract: The relevance of the study is determined by the fact that the field of poetological messages in Russian modernism has not been studied sufficiently. Furthermore, the addressed lyrics of poets-modernists in the context of poetic manifestos have been studied little. Therefore, this article aims to reveal the mechanism of lyric addressings, firstly, in different movements of Russian modernism (symbolism, acmeism, futurism), and, secondly, in the paradigm of the Silver Age. The research methods are based on the works of the Russian philologists who have studied the addressed lyrics of Russian modernism: S.N. Broitman, L.G. Kikhney, N.V. Nalegach, and T.S. Kruglova. The article identifies a number of general patterns inherent in almost all manifestos-messages of Russian modernists: historical realities in the poetic manifestos of modern authors; the techniques of biworld; special edifying quality polemically aimed at the poetic opponents; autocommunication of poetic messages. These generalities indicate the underlying unity of Russian modernism in the poetological sphere: most lyrical manifestos are constructed on the same principles. It is the first time when the aesthetic platforms of different movements and idiopoetics of Russian modernism from the standpoint of the addressed lyrics are brought into comparison in Russian study of literature. Besides it is shown how the communicative component allows the poets to build and adjust their theoretical position in the light of solution of the most important poetological problems (sometimes in the course of discussion). The materials of the article are of practical value for literature teaching at higher and secondary school as elucidating the addressed lyrics of Russian modernism, and peculiarities of the poetic manifestos.

Keywords: Addressed lyrics, manifesto, Russian modernism, symbolism, acmeism, futurism.

INTRODUCTION

Russian modernism has striven for a new type of art. However, the issues what kind of art it would be, what it would be devoted to were being debated. It was largely due to not only the existence of different movements in Russian modernism, but the heterogeneity within these poetic schools. There were the times when the manifesto proposed by someone of the representatives of this movement was rejected by the brothers-in-’poets’ guild”.

^{*} Candidate of Philology, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Philology at the Technical Institute (branch) of the North-Eastern Federal University named after M.K. Ammosov, Neryungri, Russia. *Email: pavlova-sizykh@yandex.ru*

^{**} Doctor of Philology, Professor of the Department of Journalism History and Literature at the Institute of International Law and Economics named after A. S. Griboedov, Moscow, Russia. *Email: lgkikhney@yandex.ru*

^{***} Doctor of Philology, Professor of the Department of Management, State and Municipal Management at the Bryansk branch of the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration under the President of the Russian Federation, Bryansk, Russia. *Email: yarosvettt@mail.ru*

Besides, there were some prominent modernist poets who did not belong to any creative group, e.g., M. Voloshin, M. Tsvetaeva, B. Pasternak. Each of them formed his or her own line of reflection on the fundamental issues of art, including poetological ones. In the context of such pluralism the communicative component was increasingly important. Poets much and willingly addressed to their brothers of the “quill” to discuss the key poetological subjects. In the poetry of the first third of the twentieth century a whole array of addressed lyrics has been created, which was actively used by the poets very different in their aesthetic platforms. Russian modernism offered a wider range of lyrical addressings differing in functions and themes as compared with Russian poetry of the late nineteenth-century.

Several modernist manifestos-messages, directed to three types of recipients such as (1) an abstract or notional addressee; (2) a collective (mass, group) addressee; (3) a specific individual are considered in the article. To make relevant conclusions the texts by the representatives of all main poetic movements of Russian modernism: by V. Bryusov (symbolism), A. Akhmatova (acmeism), V. Mayakovsky (futurism), as well as the poets who do not belong to one group or another – M. Voloshin and M. Tsvetaeva are studied. The last two figures are polar in their views on art: M. Voloshin is largely a successor of the traditions of Russian poetry of the nineteenth century, as well as classical poetic forms; M. Tsvetaeva, on the contrary, in later years, is close to avant-garde poetry being the poetry of the experiment and the deliberate non-classic. Such a variety of the poets allows relevant presentation of these trends in the field of the addressed lyrics, which are formed in the depths of Russian modernism, and finding common grounds and divergence of the positions of these movements and the poets.

A number of questions related to the lyrical messages of the first third of the twentieth century are not still clarified. In particular, there are a lot of gaps in the problem of reflection of manifest and poetological issues in the lyrical mediations. In other words, the message to the brothers of the quill, the opponent, or even to an abstract or notional addressee is often the theoretical reflection on a particular problem associated with the basic settings of symbolism, acmeism, futurism. Therefore, the essence of the main areas of Russian modernism is also revealed in the addressed lyrics with its aim at dialogicity and sometimes discussing.

However such theoretical messages were not always addressed to the contemporaries: a number of them were also directed to the predecessors. Sometimes these poems were not only meditation on the relation to the original source, but the reason for self-reflection, understanding of modernity, including its literary projection.

METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

The objective of the article is the study of poetological addressings of Russian modernism so that to reveal general principles of poetic manifestos construction,

as well as to determine the specifics of each movement of the Silver Age in the given (poetological) perspective. To attain the objective it is necessary to solve the following issues. The first one is to identify the poets representing symbolism, acmeism, futurism, and the ones who did not belong to any of the movements but wrote the addressed poetry. The second is to find the poems, combining lyrical addressings and elements of poetic manifestos. The third one is to reveal the general principles inherent in most poetic manifestos of Russian modernism. The fourth is to ascertain the difference between the movements of Russian modernism as regards the lyrical addressed manifestos. The fifth one is to connect the identified specifics of poetological addressings with the guidelines of each poetic movement.

The research materials are the poetic texts of Russian modernists, written both in the Silver Age and in Soviet times. Thus, the study material includes the Russian poetry of the late XIX century (the beginning of symbolism) and till the 60-ies of the XX century (the late works of A. Akhmatova). The leading poets of different movements of Russian modernism such as V. Bryusov, A. Akhmatova, V. Mayakovsky, as well as the poets not belonging to any poetic school M. Voloshin and M. Tsvetaeva are studied. It allows the relevant covering of the whole paradigm of the Silver Age.

The article is based on two theoretical grounds. The first one is a theoretical methodology related to the analysis of semiotic objects (poetic texts, in particular). They are general humanitarian research methods such as comparative, cultural-historic, hermeneutic. These methods allow considering the addressed lyrics of Russian modernism from two perspectives: theoretical and historical, as the problem of manifestos-messages is not only the matter of poetic methodology, but the issue of the development of literary movements of Russian modernism.

The second includes the scientific works devoted to addressings and poetological issues of the Silver Age. The studies deal with both the dialogue in the poetry of the XX century on the whole and important aspects of this matter: genre peculiarities of the addressed lyrics, poetological aspects of a lyrical dialogue. An active study of this issue started in the eighties of the twentieth century. The monographs by S.N. Broitman "The Problem of the Dialogue in Russian Poetry of the First Half of the Nineteenth Century" (1983) and L.G. Kikhney "From the History of Russian Poetry Genres: Poetic Message of the Early XX Century" (1989) can be called the first major works devoted to the addressed lyrics of Russian modernism. In these papers there are theoretical foundations of the scientific study of the modernist lyric addressings. The traditional study of this issue is also developed in the works released in the 2000-ies. They are mainly the works of N.V. Nalegach "Annensky's "Poetic of Reflections" and Phenomenon of the Poetic Dialogue in Russian Lyrics of the XX Century" (2012) and T.S. Kruglova "The Addressed Lyrics of Russian Modernism: Poetological Aspect" (2013).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The consideration of the addressings of Russian modernism should be started with the first type of recipients that is abstract or notional. Within this type there are several subtypes: an address to natural phenomena (e.g., the Sun, the Night), abstract categories (e.g., poetry), and their poetological personificants (e.g., the Muse). Such types can be found in the poems of Anna Akhmatova. However, not all communications of this kind are directly related to poetological views of the poetess. That is why the texts devoted to the theoretical reflection and considered as original manifestos should be studied.

The reason for the poetess's using of these conditional addressees can be explained. The matter is that A. Akhmatova had a developed mythopoetic code that produced the particular subject-object relationship. In the era of pre-reflective syncretism the human mind could not abstract from the object. First, it was seen as directly related to the perceiving consciousness (everything reflected in everything around). Second, the whole world seemed animated, even abstract concepts could be alive, to say nothing of the objects of inanimate nature. It is therefore not surprising that the poets, who tried to resurrect neomythologism, personified the whole array of objects and phenomena in their works.

In her early years, A. Akhmatova often refers to the image of the Muse with a whole set of image details and external signs endowed. Such a sensual image was sometimes ambivalent: first it is a pompous image of a lady guest in white garments appearing in the verses, and then it is a stranger from otherness with dark skin and in a torn kerchief as a probable hint of wandering. In any case, these poems appear to be a convenient platform for expressing important theoretical foundations, as the Muse is a key personificant of the works.

Among the important poetological addressings of the early A. Akhmatova there is a poem "To the Muse" (Akhmatova, 1990a, p. 39). It is about the attitude of the lyrical heroine to such a gift as poet's works. She comprehends her selectness rather unusually: "Muse! Do you see their happiness?/Girls, women, widows.../I would rather die on the wheel,/But not these fetters" (Akhmatova, 1990a, p. 39). The painful death – breaking on the wheel – seems less frightful than possession of the "gift of singing"! This image is enhanced by the fact that the lyrical heroine, writing poetry, compares her destiny with the other women's fates and finds it the worst of all. Even widows are happier than the poetess, tormented by the throes of creation. Studying this poem A.V. Yakovlev emphasizes that the Muse is a demanding guest: "the Muse is said to "have taken away" twice in the same poem. So, it is not a voluntary sacrifice made by a person who asks to give him or her some gift. It is remarkable that the Muse has taken the God's gift, i.e. she is mightier than the divine being in a kind of way" (Yakovlev, 1992, p. 170).

In the later texts this connection with the divine theme was being developed. There are evident traces of biblical borrowings in the poem "Will they forget? What a surprise!" (Akhmatova, 1990a, p. 207). The poetess associates her poetic word (the Muse) with the Word-Logos and simultaneously with the mythical Phoenix rising from the ashes: "The Muse was losing both her sight and hearing,/And was rooting in the earth as a grain,/So that one day like a Phoenix from the ashes/to rise in the azure sky" (Akhmatova, 1990a, p. 207).

In this short fragment there is a double-explicated semantics of death and rebirth. First, it is through the gospel allusions: "Unless a wheat grain falls into the ground and dies, it remains alone; but if it dies, it produces many grains" (John 12:24.). Then it is done through the image of the mythical Phoenix rising from the ashes. The combination of two religious and mythological images in one is symptomatic: thus A. Akhmatova sacralized the Muse, drawing a parallel between her fate and suffering and subsequent resurrection of Christ.

So, through the anthropomorphic image of poetry works A. Akhmatova announces her aesthetic values. One can see that not only the Muse as a personificant of creativity is immortal, but the poet himself with his creations overcomes death and inherits eternity. This poetological thought is important for A. Akhmatova; this thesis is repeated in several other poems. Besides, the Muse gives immortality, endows the poet with special vision and extra-abilities, but the poet's payback for it is an exile, being unhappy in love, and going through various troubles. It is also important that the Muse is connected with the divine energies; the poet is a messenger of God, and his gift is a gift of the prophet and of the seer.

In the course of time, A. Akhmatova's lyrical addressee abstracts even more, the poet refers to the Death, to the Poems, "To Music" (Akhmatova, 1990b, p. 80). In the last poem there is an idea similar to those in which the lyrical heroine of A. Akhmatova has addressed to the Muse: "Don't you – bottomless –/Have any comfort for me?/I have comforted everybody for half a century,/You could follow my example" (Akhmatova, 1990b, p. 80). Here the music and the word are merging in one image, forming an anthropomorphic system of subjects-recipients under the theme of "creativity." At that there is an important idea that the poet must stoically endure all hardships and misfortunes, because his task is to comfort others, that means to sacrifice. The creator deserves awards, but he must be ready that he will not get it in this world. Moreover, the art as an "antidote" to sadness and longing in relation to the poet does not act, so he must stoically accept the harsh reality.

The second type of addressing is collective. It could be considered on the material of the poem "To the Poet" (1925) by Maximilian Voloshin (1989). In spite of the singular in the title, the poem deals with all poets. This poetic manifesto is likely to be divided into two "layers": superficial, accessible to everyone, and implicit, but nonetheless being clearly recoverable when appealing to autoquotations.

As regards the first “layer”, one can find a number of tips or imperatives in the text, which should ensure the success of the poet in the chosen art. The first thing M. Voloshin draws attention to is the need of the poet’s rapture above the crowd. The Creator does listen to the world’s elements, and does not listen to the deceptive voice of the crowd: “Blow your horn on the mountain.../so that the voice of the elements.../can muffle the interjections of people” (Voloshin, 1989).

The next imperative is the continuation of the previous one, only the motif of loneliness is more acutely actualized here: “Beware of friends, of schooling noise and glory” (Voloshin 1989). And at the end there is the idea about the poet’s destiny seen in the texts of A. Akhmatova. He, like the ancient prophets, will be persecuted and stoned: “They will pay your truth with slander, curse, and stones” (Voloshin, 1989). The image of the stone obviously adjusts to the reading of the text through the allusions from the old Testament. Thus, the entire poetic manifesto looks as if being out of time, even more appeals to the archaic character, as it contains obsolete words and concepts (horn, “wing”). But there is one exception – the word “machine gun”, which seems a strange anachronism. It is also the key to reading the hidden second layer of meaning.

Machine guns became widespread only at the junction of XIX – XX centuries. They were massively used in the First World War. In Russia this war has developed into a Civil war. This weapon is also used in another poem of M. Voloshin “Red Easter” (Voloshin, 2017) written at the same time as the text “To the Poet”: “And at night the machine guns were chattering,/Whistling, like the beach, at the meat of the naked” (Voloshin, 2017). “Red Easter” is dedicated to the unprecedented atrocities of the Bolsheviks in the Crimea, as they destroyed up to 150 thousand people in a short time. There is no doubt that in 1925 the memory of those terrible years was not just alive in the conscious of M. Voloshin, many traces of it were still before the eyes of the poet. So it is not surprising that there was their seal in the lyrics, seemingly far from the modern problematics.

The hypothesis of temporal relationships of the poem “To the Poet” (Voloshin, 2017) with the events of the Civil war is confirmed on the intertextual level, if the poem “A Revenge Angel” (1906) by M. Voloshin (Voloshin, 2017) is looked through. This work was devoted to the first Russian revolution. When compared, it turns out that two texts are connected with the whole system of autoquotations. For example: “The Sword of Justice – retributive and avenging –/I will give it to the power of the crowd” (Voloshin, 2017). Compare the text written two decades later: “In the days when the blinded Justice bares the sword” (Voloshin, 2017). The similarities of the specified image do not end with the exact coincidence in the two poems. The both texts contain the image of the blind crowd owning the “sword of justice”. There are traditional slogans typical of a revolution in the two texts: the justice has already been pointed out, besides, and there are appeals to freedom, brotherhood. One can list other less obvious allusions between the two texts.

Summing up, it should be noted that the theme of the second revolution, clearly visible in the poem “To the Poet” (Voloshin, 2017) is manifested in a number of intertextualities with the work of the first Russian revolution. So it can be acknowledged as well-established. The whole imagery of the text has changed in this “revolutionary context”: to find his gift the poet has to go through the crucible, to accept them stoically and remain faithful to his selectness. Besides, in the subtext, the poet cannot be taken from the time. Even in his timeless works, addressed to the eternal questions, the traits of the era in which he lived and worked will definitely become apparent. Accordingly, the pathos of the poem is markedly adjusted. The rejection of the blind revolutionary crowd is projected through the “anachronism” on the specific event in Russian history – on the second revolution, i.e. the October revolution.

At the junction of the generalized and specific addressee there is the type of addressing such as the address to the descendant. In some cases it refers to a specific person, as it was in the works of the futurist Vladimir Mayakovsky. However, before giving specific examples, it should be noted that the factor of Another in the futurism plays a significant role, so even the dialogue in the futurism movement was underdeveloped. This is especially significant against the background of the symbolists and acmeists.

Who do the futurists readily address to? The answer is in the name of the poetic group, originated from the Latin word “future”. The desired addressee of the acmeists is a descendant. In the poem “About That” (1923) V. Mayakovsky (1955-1961a: 176-188) addresses to a specific person, to his future reader. To clearly personify him, the poet titled the chapter of the poem as follows: “A petition to..... (please, Comrade Chemist, fill it in yourself!)” (1955-1961a: 176-188). The matter is that V. Mayakovsky does not appeal to all chemists, but to the only and specific one, who will come up with the idea to resurrect the poet.

V. Mayakovsky specifies the time when chemists will be able to resurrect people from the past, i.e. in the XXX century. The poet even sees his addressee: “Here he/with a massive forehead/a quiet chemist/frowned before the experience./The book –/“the whole earth” –/is looking for the title./The XXth age./Shall I resurrect anyone?” (Mayakovsky, 1955-1961a, p. 181). And there is a passionate plea of the lyrical hero: “I will shout/from this/current page:/do not turn over the pages!/Do resurrect!” (Mayakovsky, 1955-1961a, p. 182). There is also an implicit idea of the special status of the poet, his selectness. But then V. Mayakovsky in his usual derogatory and ironic manner says about poetry as a trifling matter. However, it is precisely this work that gives a pass to the future. This theme is only projected in the poem “About That”: “I with charades of hyperboles and/allegories/will entertain,/joking with verses”. The theme of creative immortality has already been developed in his unfinished poem “In a Loud Voice” (1929-1930), which is also directly addressed to the descendants: “Listen,/comrades-descendants,/to

the agitator,/loudmouth-ringleader./Having muffled/poetry's streams,/I will step/
through the lyrical volumes,/as a living creature/speaking with the alive./I will come
to you/in the Communist future/. . . through the heads/of poets and governments"
(Mayakovsky, 1955-1961b: 281).

In this poem, which became a kind of lyrical will of the poet, one can find a number of theses being central to a theoretical self-reflection of V. Mayakovsky. The first is the awareness of poetry as a long deed. Here and in several other poems, it is noted that it is the creativity that gives man immortality. This idea, as it can be seen, is not very original: it was reiterated by the symbolists and acmeists. However, V. Mayakovsky politicized it and made it close to this-worldly reality. Neither God, nor a mystical interlocutor, but a descendant (certainly a Communist, a comrade) is the measure of the truth, which the poet intends to convey. So the issue of immortality is solved with an atheistic position, and the poet needs a chemist of the XXX century, who has the power equal to God, because he can resurrect. The purpose of the poet is no consolation in grief and concern about the human soul and memory (as it was with A. Akhmatova), but the ideal social order of the future (communism, socialism): "die, my verse,/die, as ordinary.../let/a common monument/Built/in the battles/be a socialism" (Mayakovsky, 1955-1961b, p. 283-284).

Besides, in the poem "In a Loud Voice" there is an important poetological metaphor – poems like the army. Only a small fragment of the image, developed on a few dozens of lines, is given above. This very attitude to the poetry as to the war is found in many earlier works of V. Mayakovsky. Therefore, the aim of the poet is more utilitarian ("God's Bird"): "In our time/he is/the poet,/he is/the writer/
who is useful" (Mayakovsky, 1955-1961b, p. 111).

Starting with the third type of addressing – specific individuals, it should be noted that there are several subtypes: an appeal to the contemporary, an appeal to the predecessor, an appeal to the brother of the literary movement, an appeal to the opponent or to the "uninitiated". A lyrical dialogue with his contemporaries was an important way of ideological and creative self-determination of Valery Bryusov. In the center of the dialogue there are epistolary cycles, formed from the messages of V. Bryusov and his correspondents. V. Bryusov exchanged the poetological messages with Vyacheslav Ivanov, Andrey Bely, Konstantin Balmont, and Alexander Blok.

The lyrical communication of V. Bryusov with brothers-in-symbolism could be implemented in different forms, ranging from a kind of co-creation (styling, detailed citations), enthusiastic-madrigal exchange of civilities (a dialogue between V. Bryusov and K. Balmont) to poetic competitions, "duels" (poetry rivalry between V. Bryusov and A. Bely). Moreover, the poets' addresses often have biographical ground and reflect not only lyrical, but also personal relationships.

In the focus of some messages there is the development of biographical and autobiographical neomythology. It concerns personal and collective creative life,

which has acquired particular importance in the Silver Age. At the same time, a process of sacralization of the artistic action was observed at the symbolists. The purpose of this “theurgy” is not only mystical flash of inspiration, but the initiational transformation of human existence. Therefore, the communicative strategies of the symbolists have the spiritual-mystical basis in many ways, and possess the pronounced features of utopianism.

The lyrical conversation often develops in a “diagonal projection”, that is, between the equals. The dialogue is motivated by the desire to establish a relationship between a concrete author and a concrete addressee. A poet-symbolist could have a few artistically embodied lyrical masks. In his poetological messages V. Bryusov associated himself with the infernal knight Ruprecht, and a stubborn magician, and with Loki, a Norse God of trickery and fire. And being dialogically fixed, these namings inspired the emergence of light masks of Andrei Bely, the lyrical opponent of V. Bryusov.

In the poem addressed to “Balder Loki” V. Bryusov (1975, p. 66) distributes cultural roles in accordance with the plot of literary and life “duel” between him and A. Bely. Balder was the son of Odin and Frigg, had a pure soul, and was the God of spring and nature. In the Norse myths he is a victim of a cunning and insidious Loki. The latter kills his rival by proxy, having persuaded the blind God Hodur, the brother of Balder, to shoot an arrow at the God of Spring. In one of the fragments of the poem “Balder Loki” (1904) by V. Bryusov (1975, p. 66), Loki predicts the opponent’s death and the victory of the shadow forces (Bryusov, 1975, p. 66). Bely in his turn wrote the poem “To an Old Enemy” (1904). In this poem the addresser speaks about the final, timeless victory of the good God Balder over the dark deity Loki (Bely, 1975, p. 139-140). The work develops an autobiographical myth of each of the opponents; so it deals with an ideal image of the poet as well. Thus the symbolists express their attitude to the key poetological topics through the poetic dialogue. It means that the mythological ground allows them to comprehend theoretically such issues as the poet’s mission, the essence of the poetic gift.

Hence, the addressed lyrics of the symbolists with the energy of a dialogue could develop and transform into the lyrical Self of each of the interlocutors. At that the symbolists often refuse the predetermination of the position, forming it into a direct dialogue. The symbolist message often offers a vividly mythologized image of an artist being a sort of “symbol in the flesh”, in short, having received the body. And lyrical communication is intended to “reconstruct” the essence of this symbol.

Finally, another subtype of lyrical addressings of Russian modernism, i.e. an appeal to a particular person in historical past should be considered. From the point of view of theoretical reflection on the “trade secrets” the cycle addressed to A. Pushkin by M. Tsvetaeva appears to be one of the most illustrative. It is convenient to express the lyrical credo and general theoretical and poetic views precisely in the

dialogue with such an interlocutor, as it with an extraordinary subject, the person, who became a poet of poets for the Russian literature.

M. Tsvetaeva wrote her cycle "Poems to Pushkin" (Tsvetaeva, 1988, p. 265-75) at a mature age, so there are well-established and carefully reflected ideas of M. Tsvetaeva about the nature of the poet and poetry. In the title complex there is already a direct addressing, not thinking over the theme. It is known that firstly M. Tsvetaeva wanted to name this cycle as "A Monument to Pushkin" (Tsvetaeva, 1988, p. 273), but soon she gave up this idea as such a headline removed this poem from the sphere of direct communication. It was this living and sincere communication with a predecessor that M. Tsvetaeva sought. This cycle, conceived as a memorial one, was markedly adjusted in the way of poetology, thus becoming a convenient platform for theoretical reflection. I. Shevelenko notes the following about it: "Studying the already published worksheets of M. Tsvetaeva it is easy to see how the part of autoanalytical notes is growing in spring and summer of 1931 turning into the analytical reflections on the poet at all" (Shevelenko, 2002, p. 383).

In seven poems of the cycle there is the second addressee besides A. Pushkin, the "Pushkin's worshippers" (Tsvetaeva, 1988, p. 273), i.e. the crowd, who has canonized the poet but has not understood him has embellished him with anthologian lacquer. They are addressed with the main polemical charge: showing A. Pushkin "as it should be", i.e. "without lacquer", M. Tsvetaeva simultaneously expresses her vision of an ideal poet. Moreover, the opponents are not only the Soviet propaganda, easily signed up A. Pushkin for the revolutionaries, but the emigrant community, who considered A. Pushkin only as an advocate of the Trinity: Orthodoxy, autocracy, nationality. Neither one nor the other point of view is satisfied with M. Tsvetaeva, therefore, her passionate and accusatory replica sound with tremendous power and sarcasm: "Is Pushkin a Tutor?" (Tsvetaeva, 1988, p. 273), "Is Pushkin a Russophile?" (1988: 273), "Is Pushkin a Grave Digger?" (Tsvetaeva, 1988, p. 273).

In the poem "Scourge of Gendarmes, God of Students..." (Tsvetaeva, 1988, p. 274) M. Tsvetaeva deconstructed the image of A. Pushkin, enshrined in the popular and official discourses. The poetess will gather together all the patterns and stereotypes associated with the image of the great national poet. Having brought them together, carried them to the point of absurdity, M. Tsvetaeva debunks them, shows the inconsistency of such a view. As L. Zubova rightly stressed: "In this cycle the maximum use of the stereotype leads to a denial of the stereotype" (Zubova, 1995, p. 246).

What does M. Tsvetaeva offer instead of the mass and official "reading" of A. Pushkin? The tradition of comprehension of the poet goes back to deeply personal experiences, depicted in the early poems of the poetess. M. Tsvetaeva often calls to see, first of all, a living person in her (and in any person) with her or his impulses, anxieties, doubts. The poet of this kind, passionate, alive is dear to her. The poetess asks rhetorically and sarcastically: "Is Pushkin a mausoleum?" (Tsvetaeva, 1988, p.

274). In these lines one cannot but see something in common with V. Mayakovsky, who refers to the classic in the poem "Jubilee" (Mayakovsky, 1955-1961a, p. 64): "I love you, but the living one, not the mummy" (Mayakovsky, 1955-1961a, p. 64).

The paradox of M. Tsvetaeva's vision is the fact that the poetess rejects the features for which A. Pushkin was praised as "a standard poet": for moderation, harmony, proportionality... So A. Pushkin was considered a pattern written in some defined frame sample. M. Tsvetaeva thinks this idea wrong as any frame is small for a true poet. These thoughts give the poetess occasion to express the lyrical credo: poetry should be a great element, beating over the edge and past. The poet uses the words "sea" and "measure" consonant in the Russian language, thus creating an original image, in which sketchiness and limitedness are opposed to boundlessness and spontaneity: "Is a sense of measure? It's the feeling of the sea!" (Tsvetaeva, 1988: 273). A. Pushkin for her is a kind of free ocean, the immense space, sometimes quiet, sometimes seething.

This seemingly excessive heat of M. Tsvetaeva's polemics with her opponents indicates that it concerns not only A. Pushkin, but also her personally. Feeling a deep inner kinship with the genius of A. Pushkin, M. Tsvetaeva defends the inner freedom of each artist, thus explicating the main idea of her lyrical credo: the real creator (poet) is the element that no one is free to restrain.

The second important component of the poet's image is from the ancient times the traditional idea of him as a prophet who knows the transcendental mysteries. At that, such an image is often far from the ideals of reliable, ceremonious, and sedate ministers of religion. The poet is a madman, capable of illogical deeds, sometimes being the expressions of Providence. Therefore, there is no improper behavior for a poet: he remains himself even in the tumult and the frenzy.

Finally, the third essential component of the poet's image is his selectness as a victim. Giving A. Pushkin as an example, M. Tsvetaeva shows that the tragic fate is the lot of each of the poets-creators. Therefore, M. Tsvetaeva prays to the powers-that-be for mercy to the poets. This case is the appeal to "the democracy having thrown down the throne", implying the Soviet government: "Do not condemn to the last darkness/To total deaf-and-dumbness/The body, rudely cut,/by the scissors – in the poems" (Tsvetaeva, 1988, p. 281).

CONCLUSION

Summing up, it should be noted that it is possible to find in the poets-modernists some common ground in understanding the key poetological guidelines. It is significant that the similarities are revealed at a deep level, in the very fundamentals of the art system. And morphologically similar aspects can be solved largely different.

The first important factor is the presence in the addressed poems the signs of the historical epoch in which the poet lived. For example, M. Voloshin expresses his

poetological credo from a timeless position. He uses for it specially marked lexis, and universal images. At the same time he includes one anachronism in the text that is the key to the subtext of the poem. That is rigidly connected with the particular time, when the poem was written (the first half of the 20-ies of the XX century), and the place where the poet lived and worked (the Crimean Peninsula).

The same is observed in M. Tsvetaeva in the poetic cycle dedicated to A. Pushkin. Here is the dialogue with the poet of the past; in addition there are a number of thoughts about the fate and mission of the poet not tied to any specific time. However, M. Tsvetaeva is not satisfied with such an archaic (the past) and timeless (eternal) perspective. She cannot but include fragments associated with her epoch. Moreover, in the cycle where the poetess communicates with A. Pushkin, several contemporary addressees of her appear. Among them the especially significant appeal is to the Soviet government.

The Futurist V. Mayakovsky, whose works are intensely and exactly directed in the coming Communist paradise, nevertheless paradoxically values his time. Even speaking to progeny, he thinks not about the utopian moment of universal brotherhood, but tries to tell about himself and his time. So here, the addressee is included in the modernity through the lyrical approach of the poet.

The second common feature of messages is their peculiar biworld. Stating theoretically important theses the poets cannot remain within the framework of plane continuum, they need several points of view on poetological issues. These viewpoints can be bound with the transcendental spheres (like in works of A. Akhmatova, V. Bryusov), and then the poem is saturated with otherworldly appeal. The biworld can be realized at the junction of the real relationship between the two poets-communicants and mythological background similar lyrical contacts, as was the case with the messages of the symbolists. M. Tsvetaeva generally builds a multidimensional space of communication, referring not only to A. Pushkin declared in the title of the cycle, but also to the A. Pushkin's worshippers, to readers, to those-in-power, to other poets, etc.

The third important distinguishing feature is edifying quality. The poet, expressing his point of view on poetological questions, plays the role of a teacher, even of a preacher. This position can be expressed in the form of direct imperatives, as it was by M. Voloshin or V. Mayakovsky, or it can be veiled, implicit, in the form of a complex game, like in the works of V. Bryusov and his addressee-symbolists.

The fourth common feature is the polemical charge of the addressed messages. It is clear that they are often written not only to express the own position, but also to overthrow someone else's. More harsh and straight poets, such as M. Tsvetaeva and V. Mayakovsky, make a polemical component emphasized and explicitly expressed. Other authors, such as A. Akhmatova and M. Voloshin, leave the polemical charge

in the subtext. Expressing their own aesthetic framework, they argue with the opponents in a latent form, without resorting to “crying” imperatives. Thus, M. Voloshin, on the one hand, points to the inevitability of historical cataclysms; on the other hand, he condemns the blind crowd, making the bloodbath. He encourages the poets not to fall under the influence of the mob, being the power of blind rage. Moreover, with cipher techniques he gives the panorama of Russia in the civil war, arguing with the followers of the fratricidal conflicts. Showing the impossibility of the common revolutionary slogans (Justice! Equality! Brotherhood!), M. Voloshin acts as a poet-humanist, faithful to his aesthetic service. He appeals to other poets to be the same.

At last, the Russian modernist poets very often create not just literary manifestos, but hidden autocommunication messages. It is not surprising: the man is revealed in his creation. But it is interesting that the modernists often seek to build their own mythologized image. They broadcast on behalf of a certain force, which is greater and better than they are. In the case of the symbolists and acmeists this force is often God, as for the futurists it is the Communist idea, which is to reorganize the whole world.

References

- Akhmatova, A. (1990a). *Works*: in 2 volumes. Vol. 1. Moscow: Pravda.
- Akhmatova, A. (1990b). *Works*: in 2 volumes. Vol. 2. Moscow: Pravda.
- Bely, A. (1975). *Collected works*: in 6 volumes. Vol. 5. M.: Khudozhestvennaya Literatura.
- Broitman, S.N. (1983). *The Problem of the Dialogue in Russian Poetry of the First Half of the Nineteenth Century*. Makhachkala: Dagestan State University.
- Bryusov, V.Ya. (1975). *Collected works*: in 7 volumes. Vol. 3. M.: Khudozhestvennaya Literatura.
- Kikhney, L.G. (1989). *From the History of Russian Poetry Genres: Poetic Message of the Early XX Century*. Vladivostok: Publishing House of Far Eastern University.
- Kruglova, T.S. (2013). *The Addressed Lyrics of Russian Modernism: Poetological Aspect*: Doctoral Thesis of Philology. Moscow.
- Mayakovsky, V. (1955-1961a). *Complete works*: in 13 volumes. Vol. 4. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya Literatura.
- Mayakovsky, V. (1955-1961b). *Complete works*: in 13 volumes. Vol. 10. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1955-1961.
- Nalegach, N.V. (2012). *Annensky's "Poetic of Reflections" and Phenomenon of the Poetic Dialogue in Russian Lyrics of the XX Century*. Kemerovo: Kemerovo State University.
- Shevelenko, I. (2002). *Literary Career of Marina Tsvetaeva: Ideology-Poetics-Identity of the poet in the context of the epoch*. Moscow: New Literary Review.
- Tsvetaeva, M. (1988). *Works*: in 2 volumes. Poetry of 1908-1941. Poems. Dramatics. Vol. 1. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya Literatura.
- Voloshin, M.A. (1989). Messages. *Our Heritage*, N 1. [http://az.lib.ru/w/woloshin_m_a/text_0280.shtml].

- Voloshin, M.A. (2017). *The Burning Bush. Poems about the War and Revolution*. [<http://www.magister.msk.ru/library/poetry/volom003.htm>].
- Yakovlev, A.V. (1992). On the Semantics of Some Works by Anna Akhmatova. *Russian Literature*, 1: 170-174.
- Zubova, L. (1995). Observations on the Language of Tsvetaeva's Cycle "Poems to Pushkin". In: *Studia Russica Budapestensia: Materials of the III and IV Pushkinological Colloquium in Budapest*. Budapest, 47-52.