Postmodern Paraphrase of the Genre Tradition: Worldview Contest and Poetics

Boris Pavlovich Ivanyuk

Department of Theory and History of Literature, Institute of Philology, Yelets State Bunin University, Yelets
Lipetsk region, Russian Federation; E-mail: odinal47@mail.ru

Doi:10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n5s4p402

Abstract

The article describes the causes, the essence, and significance than the previous artistic experience postmodern attitude to tradition, in particular, the genre one. The reference of the postmodern games with archaic mythological ritual reveals their ideological "dissimilar similarity", its participation in the historical "memory of the genre", defines the value of allusions as the main figure of postmodern mnemonic practice provides an analytical overview of the genre tradition Horatian "Exegimonumentum" in Russian poetry "Monument" XVIII-XXI centuries. Their typological description reveals three trends in the history of the mnemonic paraphrase of the case text. The first is to follow the tradition of the prestigious Horatian "Monument" in the genre forms of imitation and transposition, the second—in a polemical rejection of him and follow classical models "Monument", is carried out mainly with the help of an antithesis, the third—in the game re-creation this tradition with such stylistic figures as abbreviation ("Monument"—distich by M. Gendelev), travesty (dramatic poem by L. Sukhotin "Literary Monuments"), and burlesque irony ("Monument. You see, I erected for myself in a moment..." by V. Demykin). The article presents a detailed analysis of the "Monument" by M. Gendelev and "Literary monuments" by M. Sukhotin. The study of literary texts presented the following conclusions. Classical "Monuments" are characteristic of the author's adaptation of the modality of tradition in post-classical, on the contrary, the tradition is refracted in the personal mode of the author's consciousness. The third trend—postmodern—ironic characterized by eversion canonical "monument" inside that has the effect of stylistic alienation and estrangement from mnemonic tradition of the genre, "monument" for the formation of her memory, without which it is impossible other existence in the modern history of the poetic consciousness. This is the responsibility of the designated paraphrase of postmodern genre tradition.

Keywords: genre tradition, postmodernism, poetic "Monuments"

1. Introduction

Modern humanitarian consciousness is in conflict transitional period, for which, for any crisis era, characterized by the ratio of actual to the tradition as a category axiological settlement. It has become a major subject in intentional postmodern literary practice, work out your mode of solving this problem, equidistant from the classical route, cultivation and preservation of tradition and the avant-garde of the break with it. As for the post-structuralism theory—the primary mentor of postmodernism, it is even in their methodological orientation cannot give a clear answer to the problem. On the one hand, its categorical language (deconstruction by J. Derride, simulacrum of J. Deleuze, "the death of the author" by Roland Barthes, rhizome by J. Deleuze and F. Guattari et al.) was formed from the experience of overcoming, as you know, logocentric model of thinking extends to the traditional understanding of the main object of reflection—the text as a self-sufficient artistic whole, indirectly inherited from reproducing the myth the idea of world unity. On the other hand, this theory, claiming, "tradition has exhausted itself" (Gasset, 1991), nevertheless recognizes "since the past cannot be destroyed, because its destruction leads to dumbness, it must be rethought: ironically, without naivete" (Eco, 1988). In this judgment, in our opinion, it is formulated the essence of the post-modern solution to the problem, acceptable to all literary transpective. The method of rethinking the problem of tradition, which relevant to content, was developed—the game, which, according to J. Cortazar, "is part of the modern concept of life, devoid of illusions and transcendence" (Cortazar, 1979). From the playing of instruments of dialogue typology involved postmodern thinking (comparative metaphor, appending canonical texts, etc.), the most productive for the tradition, in our opinion, is a paraphrase, that a special study is not presented in the proposed perspective on the material of Russian poetry "Monument" in the scientific literature.

2. Methodology

The contents of the problem indicated in the title of the article and the used literary material necessarily implies an appeal

to "the philosophy and philology dialogue" (Hirschman, 2006), contextual, comparative and typological method and speculative construction and structural and semantic analysis of a literary text. All the methods are used within the boundaries of the paradigm of holistic analysis of literary object.

Discussion of the problems starts with the ideological justification of the meaningfulness of postmodern games. According to M. Lipovetskiy, "within the very postmodern game in its instability it appears as the only universal value and a constant that could potentially be the basis of the integrity of the paradoxical world-making" (Lipovetskiy, 1997), and this sense it acquired a value comparable to the archaic mythic-ritual.

However, if archaic mythic-ritual reproduced the idea of unity, a total of metamorphism, or, in the words of A. Losev, "universal lycanthropy" in which "everything ... can turn into any other thing and everything can have properties and characteristics of any other thing" (Losev, 1957), then the game is characterized by the "bad infinity" of permissiveness (Hegel), relativistic weightlessness and transcendent emptiness. In this regard, postmodern game as a modern method of reproduction of general relations can be called, in fact, as inside-out mythic-ritual.

If the archaic mythic-ritual conditioned its practical realization of human suitable embeddedness in the cycle life of the world, "involvement in the sphere of laws governing certain order, good" (Toporov, 1988), thus ensuring it with "comfort predetermination" (Genis, 1997), the postmodern play on the one hand, is symptomatic expression of total alienation from the world, and on the other, becomes a regular (not to say historically the latter) post-mythological illusion of overcoming them their existential restlessness, its "transcendental homelessness" (Lukach).

If the mythological consciousness, which exists in a circular time, rhythmical and measured by ritual repetitions, to create the illusion of space continuum (in which even a cosmopolitan and theogonic events are perceived as continuing past) and causes the generic sense of involvement in human universal chronotope, the postmodern mind that mastered contemporary experience of overcoming linear concept of time, applies for a trans-ubiquity, the free interiorisation of any fragment of life of the world, but always in compliance with the distanced attitude, thus gives a "guest" presence feel in it to a man.

This fundamental difference in the life of human well-being is explainable primarily by different perceptions of tradition: mythic-ritual man is called to observe a respectful and protective attitude toward it as a timeless relevance; the post-modern man refers to it as a source material for its ironic (alienated) reproduction.

Nevertheless, he takes responsibility for the resolution of conflict, which was the tradition itself: either sympathetic mummification museum and its vocabulary or its adaptation to the modern history of consciousness.

Of course, the problem occurs in gerontological tradition, including literary and, periodically, and in the artistic practice has developed two alternative addresses for it. The first is conservation tradition, which is fraught with its epigones degeneration, the second—parody discredit it for registration in the "absolute past" (Goethe). Both of these options are futile to the tradition itself. Its creative development involves two coherent procedures to be followed—respectively—the interests of the object and subject of reflection: these are reproduction of this tradition and its modern interpretation. Both are required to implement any installation on the continuation, rather than the imitation of tradition. This condition also applies to post-modernism, and his special relationship to the tradition of the focus lies in understanding it "as if on the verge of being double" (Tjutchev, 1966)—between past and present. Such a binocular understanding produces as parody, alienation mnemonic tradition, but with the help of his playing *transcription* unlike burlesque stylization with its characteristic game *imitation* object of reflection.

As for the actual traditions of the genre, it is due to discuss the concept of "memory of the genre", entered into use by M. Bakhtin and already developed in domestic science literature. In particular, L. Kihney defines it as "the resuscitation of one or another (sometimes quite ancient) copyright plants that cause life to the canonical (fixed for them) complex of means of their formal incarnation" (Kihney, 2007).

The content of this concept includes the genetic and historical memory. The birth of the genre due to the crisis of archaic myth ritual, its dismembering into the myth-ritual content and form. Myth bequeaths the idea of universal connection of phenomena, which reincarnates in further performances of world unity. The ritual, being deprived of its substantive validity, formalized, "cornifies", but "remembers" about its former purpose—to be the language of mythic-poetic consciousness. Historical consciousness memorises archaic myth in status events, and of ritual form will produce a new current structure, preserving the genetic memory of the universal connection. The purpose of the ritual is to be a system of rules of collective behaviour, corresponding to the content of the mythological events, inherited the genre, which was originally determined from "extraliterary situation provides it with every day and cultural relevance", and later in the cultivation of artistic forms "gets the characteristics of the essence of own literary norms, codified poetics and rhetoric" (Averintsev, 1981). There is the transformation of situations—in the genre theme that has long been a feature of the matrix of the genre as a kind of social experience of a given idea of recurrence important realities of the human fabric of life, and verbal ritual behaviour—in the style of the genre as a rhetorical genre execution modality expressing stable

again, collective attitude toward the subject.

However, during this period, there remains a live connection to the mnemonic archaic myth, which could not affect the nature of the genre and its purpose. Despite its own mimetic duties, focused on contemporary history, literature focused on the myth on it, this story, not only the original one, but also the actual determinant. The artistic vision of reality was associated with its doubling: it appeared in its determinate being, and being projected onto the screen mythological, semantically unchanged in its essence. The myth shone through life, thus providing meaningful learning it, just as through the phenomenon—a word that designated it. By identifying and focusing in fact, in the essence of its plastically changing realities a repeated, regular and lasting thing, that genetically traced back to the eternal myth, literature thus arranges it, giving it the structural organization necessary for man's orientation in the surrounding world.

The collision, which turned out to contain the myth, assumed is an alternative choice—a critical judgment upon him and his nihilistic subversion, which was done at a later historically mature period thinking Socrates and his disciples with the most destructive method of sceptical reflection—dialectical in nature (in the classical sense) "Socratic dialogue", which is no coincidence then resorted to demythologizing thought (for example, Voltaire) in the crisis era of human history, including the postmodern. But the problem of myth historicizing naturally is not linked to this problem.

The transformation of the mythological consciousness in mimetic means, in essence, the transition from "pre-reflective traditionalism" to "reflective traditionalism", as S. Averintsev writes: "Hellenic classics prepared and implemented, and the epilogue of the Late Antique Classics expanded and strengthened its world-historical turn from pre-reflective traditionalism that characterized the culture of verbal and pre-literate stage and literature of the ancient Near East, and the origins of the archaic Greek literature to the reflective traditionalism, remained constant literary development of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, Baroque and Classicism and finally liquidated a victory anti-traditionalist tendencies of the industrial age. The essence of this rotation is that literature is aware of itself, and thus is the first thing it posits itself as a literature, that is, as the reality of a special kind, different from the reality of everyday life and worship" (Averintsev, 1981).

This rotation caused global changes in the structure of creative thinking. For a long time, it identified another, post-mythological type of artistic integrity of the work—mediated assimilation of international unity with the installation of "purposeful device visibility to reality" (Whitehead, 1990). It is understood that before the mimetic mind problem formulation and mode of artistic traditionalization refraction universal connections. It produced the formation of the genre, which logically and historically is the successor of the myth, its homomorphic modification.

With the formation of the structural integrity of attributive signs of genre—style and theme—its own history begins, which is the first period (Antiquity—classicism) takes place in the context of the paradigm of "reflective traditionalism". A symptom of the end of this classic period of the history of the genre becomes the disintegration of his thematic and stylistic unity provoked by Romanticism with its characteristic ironic gap between the "self and not-self" (Fichte), critical alienation from the traditional world-making and expressed revolt against the "improper" existence. Romantic nihilism is extrapolated to the genre with its stable installation on the mimetic reproduction and systematization of collective axiological themes and romantic self-centeredness, due to the world-making individualized, receives its linguistic expression in idiostyle different from the genre style.

The main consequence of anti-assimilation of the reflex unity of theme and style of the genre was the release of the modality of thematic engagement, and it gained the status of the main attributions of the genre, which witnessed the completion of the classical cyclical genre tradition and that there has been a promising value for the subsequent history of the genre now as "forms of vision and understanding of reality" (Medvedev, 1980). As for the theme, then, according to L. Ginsburg, "freed from its official position with respect to the genre, it is enriched with the illusion of personal experiences of the poet; very insistence with which the topic is resumed from the poem to the poem, as it testifies to its *objective* existence, which dominates a poet and does not leave him a choice. Since erased a specific sign of literary, and then opens an unexpected opportunity to assign elegiac sadness, separation and loneliness of the human countenance of the poet. So the loss of a literary (genre) motivation leads to a kind of *exposure* of the topic" (Ginsburg, 1929).

In the context of post-classical genre stories happening retrospective audit genre tradition, which includes two ways of perception: synthetic, which "seeks to establish in the long run, as the proceeds cultural continuity is preserved former artistic experience", and analytical, leading "to clarify what kind of laws is performed the process of forgetting past experience" (Smirnov, 1981).

The second period of the historical "memory of the genre" covers the time from the literary romanticism to postmodernism.

Both genetic and historical memories are constantly claimed in the literary practice. Let us refer, for example, to the tradition of poetic genre "Monument", started by Horace and having a long history. As a genre matrix structured the features odes ecphrasis, prayer, consolation, "the last poem", testament, the epitaph, "Exegimonumentum" by the Roman

poet was the point of reference for subsequent canonization and de-canonisation of this genre phenomenon, as a whole, to form its own genre memory. Its thematic ingredients selected and combined in various embodiments of composite and presented in poetic practice in a variety of styles and variations—High imitation to parody, from piety arrangements to travesty mimicry.

The mnemonic in its address "Monument" by Horace responded in a variety of poetic works not only to the European region: "Monument" by Ovid (Ancient Rome, I in. BC—I century AD.), "To the Muse" by P. Ronsard (France, XVI), "His poetry is his monument" by R. Herrick (England, XVII), "Monument" by A. Mickiewicz (Poland, XIX), "Do not put a stone over me ..." by the Latvian poet in XIX-XX century K. Baron, "Exegimonumentum" by Y. Tuwim (Poland, XX), "Monument" by the Slovene poet of XX century Y. Menart, "Monument" by the Ukrainian poet of XX century M. Rylskiy, "Your Monument" by the Armenian poetess of XX century S. Kaputikian etc.; typological resemblance to its genre motifs can be found in the "Conclusion" of the poem "Shahnama" by Firdousi (Persia, X-XI), in "Khosrove and Shirine" by the Azerbaijani poet XII-XIII century. Nizami, in the "Book of Lamentations" by the Armenian poet of X-XI century G. Narekatsi and others.

Russian "Monuments" are represented by a variety of names and works. It is possible to make both historical and systematic typology of the overall context diachronic dialogue with tradition, including, and genre. Thus, some of them are involved in the formation of the poetic tradition "Monument", promoting the canonization of this genre form; other characteristic polemical rejection of Horatian and follow classical models, which allows arbitrarily qualify as anti-monuments; and others are based on the traditions of the game of re-creation of the "Monument". In other words, some poets erect the "Monument", while others destroy them, and others construct new texts on their ruins.

In Russian history of mnemonic paraphrase of the case text, it is possible to outline conditionally three relevant trends. The first one is classic. It is the authoritative adherence to tradition, the main genres, which are imitation and transposition. This predominantly "Monuments" of the eighteenth century ("Yaznakbessmertiyasebevozdignul..." / "I erected a sign of immortality for me" by Lomonosov, "Monument" by G. Derzhavin), from later—"Yapamyatniksebevozdignerukotvornyi..." / "I erected an *acheiropoitos* monument to myself" by Pushkin (1836) and stylised "Monument" by Bryusov (1912). The second trend—post-classical represented by such anti-traditional, often based on dialogic repulsion from the canonical models, "Monuments", as "Moy darubog, I golosmoynegromok..." / "My gift is poor, and my voice is not loud..." by E. Baratynskiy, joking "Comfort for the poor poet" by A. Delvig, "Nonexegimonumentum" by G. Batenkov (XXth century) and the "Pamyatnik. *Vomnekonets, vomnenachalo...*" / "Monument. The end and the beginning are in me" by VI. Khodasevich, "Ironie monument" by V. Kamenskiy, "Joke (Monument)" by N. Rubtsov, "Yaves'umru..." / "I will die to the bone" by E. Vinokurov, "Pamyatnik. *Yaprizhiznibylroslyi I stroynyi...*" / "Monument. I was tall and slender when I was alive" by V. Vysotskiy, "Yapamyatnikvozdvigsebeinoi..." / "I erected another monument to myself" by J. Brodskiy, "Yapamyatnikvozdvig, no ne sebe, a Freydu" / "I erected a monument, but not for myself, but for Freud" by L. Vinogradov, "Ya – pamyatniksebe. Ogryzokkamnya..." / "I am a monument to myself, a scran of stone" by S. Podlubnaya, "Nepamyatnik. *Yapamyatniksebe – I bol'shenikom...*" / "Me—a monument to me and no one else" by I. G. Kurasand other poets of XIX–XXI centuries.

These and the previous "Monuments" have typological diversity: if the author's adaptation of the classic characteristic of the modality to the tradition, the post-classical, on the contrary, the tradition is refracted in the personal mode of the author's consciousness, which often emphasized the name of the poem or its initial verse. This explains the shift of genre rhetoric of "Monument"—the individual, due to a paradigmatic shift in the artistic consciousness, related primarily to the content authorship.

This category is known, historically relative. In accordance with the partial periodization of the literary process proposed by Averintsev, pre-author era corresponds to the notion "pre-reflective traditionalism", the first stage of the "workshop" authorship—the notion of "reflective traditionalism". At this stage, we can talk about the authorship of only the authority of the regulations, especially of the genre style. Familiar to us category of authorship is associated with the post-classical era. In the terminological follow for Averintsev, it is permissible to call this era as the era of reflective personalism. Its content is due to the reorientation of the basic epistemological purpose of consciousness—play world unity, and, above all, relations between consciousness and life itself. The essence of this reorientation can be summarized as follows: personalized understanding of consciousness in the context of universal life changed comprehension of everyone's life in the context of personalized consciousness. This personalism passed all phases of its typical age-cyclical development: "sentimental" home "sentimental education" ("childhood"), "romantic" revolt and leaving home ("youth"), "realistic" experience of life building ("maturity"), "modernist" sobering up from the illusions ("old age") and postmodern "homecoming" ("death"). That's why the "death of the author" (Barthes, 1994) declared by Roland Barthes was prepared by the entire post-classical history of artistic consciousness, and originality of R. Barthes is limited by the fact that he first announced this event as I. Newton on the law of universal gravitation. The reason for this was a modern

literary situation, namely the collision of the transitional period in which the initial impetus to the romantic life "Apotheosis of personality" (I. Turgenev), implemented in the "emancipation of the principle of subjectivity" (Averintsev, 1981) in the literature, cools in the post-modern game, and that is symptomatic evidence of the completion of an entire literary era.

In the context of the game, the third trend—postmodern—is being developed with its characteristic ironic eversion canonical "Monument" inside out. Personal mode of this eversion is shown in selecting the appropriate gaming figures, antirhetoric in its target setting, for example, the abbreviation ("Monument"—distich by M. Gendelev), travesties (dramatic poem L. Sukhotin "Literary Monuments"), and burlesque irony ("Monument. You see, I erected for myself in a moment..." by V. Demykin), etc. These and similar figures are intended to produce the effect of stylistic alienation and estrangement mnemonic genre tradition "Monument", which is correct to designate as *a memory of the genre*.

The main figure in the memory of the genre and genre traditions as a whole becomes an allusion. Indicative in this respect is the "Monument" by M. Gendelev (1996). It takes only a couplet:

*Nadlysmcherepomlubvi (Over the bald skull of love)
Soorudim is paljchev "V" (Let us make a finger "V").*

It is a comic structure is defined as "Monument". Poet, keeping solemnly pathetic way, reduces the genre structure of the poem—"Monument" to the limit, turning it into a poetic inscription (ancient epigram, which is attributed subjective modality of the author and not the content of the object of reflection). There is a linguistic simplification: Of all probable lexical set of the "Monument", the verb "soorudit"/"to erect" is saved, but not in relation to the traditional building materials of the monument.

In addition, the most important thing: Latin letter "V" gets apparent ambiguity. It expresses and victory (Victoria) and "goat" (the horns of the fingers above his head), and the opposite values in its final mutual correction create attitude towards the concealed subject of collective (Russian generation of "the Sixties") reflection—the proletarian leader.

With all the allusions in the sovereignty of postmodern literature, it refers to the attributive features cultural art of thinking as such, it is one of the representative figures of total dialogism in art, without, in particular, it is impossible to provide traditionalization for not only the genre, but a plot, style, image, etc. In this sense, its present role in ensuring "due time" is not only preserved but also increased. However, unlike previous experiences of the auxiliary use allusions to create a *context* of explaining or interpreting the object of artistic reflection, postmodern allusion designs the very object of reflection (simulacrum) using, in particular, of various shapes, text—such as a quote, cento and others.

In this regard, the exceptional interest poem by M. Sukhotin "Literary Monuments" (Sukhotin 2014). We emphasize that the poet did not once addressed the topic of "Monument" (thus, in the poem "My dear friend. Page 26" from "Pages-centos" we can find the initial verse of the "Monument" by Derzhavin, and the phrase "намообщимпамятникомбудет"/"our common monument will be" from the "First entry in the poem" by Mayakovskiy ("Breaking the Silence").

*Horace: Exegimonumentumaereperennius
Lomonosov: I Yasebevosdvigtakoizhemonumentum (I have erected the same monumentum)
Horace: Regalique situ pyramidumaltius
Lomonosov: I moivottochnotakoizhepyramidumaltius (And mine is the same pyramidumaltius)
Horace: Sumesuperbiamquaesitammeritis
Lomonosov: Quaesitammeritis, O MUZA, sumesuperbiam (Quaesitammeritis, oh Muse, sumesuperbiam)
Horace: E mihiDelphicalaurcingevolensMelpomenecomam
Lomonosov: Cingevolensmne, mne, Melpomenecomam (Cingevolens for me, for me, Melpomenecomam)*

*Ne govoryazhe o tom, (Not mentioning the fact)
chtoApollonnaGelikone, (that Apollo on Helicon)
chtobystryirazumomNevton, (that the quick-minded Newton,)
idshcher'bessmertiyatrone, (and the daughter of immortality on the throne)
chtoteleskop, polemoskop, (whether telescope, whether polemoscope)
sokrovishchnovayaIndiya, (the new India of treasures)
chto Dnepr, Volga, Lena, Ob', (whether Dnieper, Volga, Lena, Ob)
Akademiya, poesiya... (Academy, Poetry...)*

*Lomonosov: Yaznkbessmertiyasebevozdvignul (I erected the sign of immortality for myself)
Derzhavin: A yapamyatniksebevozdvigchudesnyi, vechnyi (And I erected a monument to myself, a wonderful and eternal one)
Lomonosov: Prevyshe pyramid I krepchemedi (It is higher than pyramids and harder than copper)
Derzhavin: A moymetallotvverzhe on I vyshepyramid (And mine is harder than metals and higher than pyramids)*

Lomonosov: *Vzgordisyapamyatnoyzaslugoy, muza* (Be proud with the righteous merit, Muse)
Derzhavin: *A ty, moya, gordis'zaslugoyspravedlivoy* (And you, mine, be proud of the fair merit)
Lomonosov: *I uvenchaiglavudelfiyskimlavrom* (And cover your head with the Delphic laurel)
Derzhavin: *Net, tychelovenchayzariyobessmertya* (No, you cover your brow with the dawn of immortality)

Ne govoryauzhe o tom, (Not mentioning the fact)
chtomoln'ibleshhutnadvodami, (that lightnings are shining upon the waters,)
chtosolnczlatypognistysjonm (that swarm of golden fiery suns)
vselennojdvizhetsyaputyami, (is moving along the routes of the universe)
chtovsyopadyot i propadyot, (that everything will fall and disappear,)
telesnyjpancyr'vsepecherv'sglozhet, (everyone's fleshly brigantine will be needled by a worm,)
chtoglaspiita ne umryot, (that the voice of the poet will not die)
anamnichtouzhe ne pomozhet... (and nothing can help us...)

Derzhavin: *Yapamyatniksebevozdvgichudesnyi, vechnyi* (I erected a mon-ument to myself, a wonderful and eternal one)
Pushkin: *A yapamyatniksebevozdvgignerukotvornyi* (And I erected an acheiropoitos monument to myself)
Derzhavin: *Moy metallovtvyorzhe on i vyshepyramid* (Mine is harder than metals and higher than pyramids)
Pushkin: *Zato k moemu ne zarastyotnarodnayatropa* (But the desire line to mine will never run wild)
Derzhavin: *O muza, vzgordis'zaslugoyspravedlivoy* (Oh, Muse, be proud of the fair merit)
Pushkin: *A luchshevsyo-takivelen'yuBozh'yu bud'poslushna* (However, better be obedient to the God's behest)
Derzhavin: *Chelotvoezaryoybessmertiyavenchay* (Betroth your brow with the dawn of immortality)
Pushkin: *E'touzhkakizvolish' – tytol'ko ne osparivayglupca* (That is how you will want—but never try to contest a fool)

Post Scriptum.

Chorus n.a. Pushkin: *PMTNK SB VZDVG NRKTVRN...* (RCTD N CHRPTS MNMNT T MSLF)
Horace: *EU-E-AAE-AOAYa-OA!* (E EIE IE O IE I EE U I)
Chorus n.a. Pushkin: *VZNSS VSh N GLV NPKRN...* (HS RBLLS HD SCNDD HGHR)
Horace: *AEAIOO-OA!* (A E AEAIA IA)
Chorus n.a. Pushkin: *VLN BZh MZ BD PSLShN...* (B BDNT T TH WLL F GD H MS)
Horace: *OIY-E-AA-E-EUYa-EA!* (I O EA O EEE EUIE O EA)
Chorus n.a. Pushkin: *HVL KLVT PRML RVNDShN...* (TK PRS ND SLNDR NDFRNTL)
Horace: *I-E-OAIA-UA!* (A O O OE A OO)

The title of the text contains a cultural studies allusion to the well-known book series. In an early edition of a poem called "LM (Literary Monuments)" (Sukhotin, 1990), cited in the editorial abbreviation was gone, weakening the allusion, but it refreshed metaphorical meaning of the title. Reminiscences, included in the alternate dialogue of the authors to the "Monument", as if put the word "monument" into brackets, giving it extra metaphorical meaning, rather, returned to the original, pledged Horace and seized upon his followers of the genre. Thus, the title of the poem is read not only as a "Literary Monuments", but also as the "Literary "Monuments". The two mnemonic content metaphors are formed. They are explicit and implicit nature of their presentation in the text. Their functional correlation has the structuring value—the combination of texts of different times. And if the first is a metaphor familiar to verbalize modern literary memory of the past, then the second, composite, acting out of character in the literary past dialogues, modernizes it, it is in the present that lasts, as is typical for the generic poetics of a chronotop of a dramatic work. It should be noted that, firstly, the synchronization times receptive effect is enhanced in direct proportion to the temporary removal of the conversation from one another: in the 1st quazi-verse (Horace and Lomonosov), the time is stretched, in the 2nd and 3rd (Lomonosov—Derzhavin, Derzhavin—Pushkin), it is compressed to their common historical space, in the last, Post Scriptum (Chorus Pushkin—Horace) again stretched and, more significant than in the first case (thus emerges speculative hourglass contour or graphic allegory time); secondly, in the 1st, 2nd and 3rd strophoids, time is prospective, i.e., moves on grammatical algorithm (Horace—Lomonosov—Derzhavin—Pushkin), and Post Scriptum, on the contrary, retrospective (chorus Pushkin—Horace) merges with the beginning (Horace—Horace), thereby forming, composite ring (figure of completion of the cycle).

Genre expression gets dialogic assigning space to time. In general, the text relates to such dialogical in nature and form of the European poetic genres as antiphons, debate, diatribe, invective, cantata, tenson and other genetically traced back to ancient folklore amoebia. The analysed poem is amoebic agon of poets, structured in strophic triad (stanza—antistrophe—epode) introduced in the lyrics, as you know, Stesichorus (VII-VI centuries) and used later in ancient drama. Each replica of dialogists according to purpose and sequence—or the stanza (odd) or antistrophe (even—a polemical response to the verse); dialogic staging (episodes) is interspersed by epodes, i.e. iambic and shorter choruses, in the

case of execution in a speech genre rants, and, recitative (epirrema, which along with episodium as one of the structural components of ancient Greek comedy); finally, participation of the chorus—all these indicate a free imitation of the ancient drama.

Let us refer to dialogues-episodia replacing each other like phenomena in a dramatic work. They are built on the principle of an amoebean composition, thus characterized by multi-level repeatability.

- 1) All episodica have a realized metaphor for "Talking "Monuments", but in the meaning adjusted by M. Sukhotin.
- 2) All words of dialogists contain one verse, but in this situation the hassle, this stichomythia, which is characteristic of ancient tragedy, becomes grotesque character.
- 3) In each subsequent episode the first, the protagonist is an actor, the former in the preceding—second, deuteragonist.
- 4) Quoted lines from his own "Monument" belonging to the protagonist are canonical, and those for the deuteragonist are preceded by no high words with their corresponding speech, not rhetorical tone that travesties the image of the author and his text, ironically divides them into two incarnation—every day and poetic; the rest of the text—cento.
- 5) All episodium quoted the first two and the last two verses of "Monuments", which became classical samples of his common place (kind of triangle: the Poet, the Monument and the Muse), median same verses in which the author's argument deployed its merits, are ellipted that profanes the whole idea of poetic competition in bidding.

Let us comment on each of episodica representing parody implementation Bakhtin dialogue, and the following epodov, the purpose of which, in this poem is to demonstrate the victory in a dispute with his antagonist.

Ithepisodium (Horace—Lomonosov). Petrified in Latin, "Monument", and it and its author, in contrast with the behaviour, including verbal, Russian poet. Scenic realization of literary imitation ancient authority, characteristic of the pseudo-classical poet and metaphorization macaronic his speech, as if illustrating the process of transferring Horace ode to the domestic language, settled in the mode of ironic decline. Consistently read Russian blotches ("I yasebovozdvigtakoizhe"/"And I erected the same", "I moyvottochnotakzhe"/"And mine is just the same", "o muza"/"oh Muse", "mne, mne"/"for me, me") are perceived by the student voice imitation conceited upstart, begging "muse" for the award.

Ith epode (Lomonosov) is a recitative tirade in cento technique composed of individual poems of an odes writer preserving the dominant style of his creations, copyright accents (India, Academy, Poetry) and size (4-stop pentameter). However, it is an absurd cento. Tirade, used to compensate for the author's arguments merit, ellipted in episodium, and thereby convince Melpomene to give laurel award is not only to the teacher but also his pupil, is an extended replica of the previous altercation. Outwardly, it simulates the rhetorical organization of the text: zeugma, opening a number of lines of poetry combined anaphoric polysyndeton ("what"), izometrism, rhyming according to the rules of alternation. However, the attempt eloquence turns its ironic contrast—patter expressed sinatroismus and internal asyndeton.

Indepisodium (Lomonosov—Derzhavin). In addition to the above general characteristics episodica, let us add the following. In it, Lomonosov already looks like a "monument", authority, and Derzhavin is a pupil, but arguing with his teacher and demanding to the Muse. In other words, the difference in the character and behaviour is clear both in Lomonosov's/sst and Indepisodia and in the relationship between student and teacher in the same episodica.

IInd epode (Derzhavin). According to its characteristics, it is similar to the first: is a stylised, but absurd cento made of author's strings, united by zeugma and organised by a anaphoric polysyndeton ("chto"/"what"), the same 4-stop iambus but with Derzhavin's spondees ("vsehchervsglozhet"/"everyone will be niddles by a worm") the same tirade-tongue twister with illogical connection to its episodium, "lyrical disorder" (Yu. Tynyanov) acceptable to the praises and paradoxical effect of exposure to the "Muse", etc.

IIIRD episode (Derzhavin—Pushkin). Its poetics is rather predictable due to previous replays "the inertia of expectations" (V. Shklovskiy). But he concludes poetic tournament and allows understanding the composition of episodes like gradation. In contrast to the transfer of Lomonosov and Derzhavin's paraphrase, Pushkin's "Monument" is original, it is not so much imitates genre tradition, as is its continuation. It is recognized by agonist Pushkin, which is confirmed in the text of the author's driven reminiscences, underlining the true originality of Pushkin's "Monument" in comparison with the imaginary—his poetry fellow of the eighteenth century, as well as in the Post Scriptum, independent expert Horace, quoting Pushkin. In general, this gradation is translation, paraphrase, original work is consistent with the overall pattern of gaining domestic short his artistic independence.

The originality of Pushkin's "Monument" has been discussed many times in science and literature. That is why, it is just for its representation in the analysed poem. Unlike the two presented options of the text of "Monument" by Lomonosov and Derzhavin—canonical (on behalf of the protagonist) and non-canonical (on behalf deuteragonist)—

Pushkin's option is given in one embodiment, the second, stylistically simplification compared to "a high calm" relevant to the "poet's delight" of the classicists. Simplification is expressed in "prosaicism of the verse", especially noticeable in comparison with high vocabulary and phraseology, figures of speech and other elocutive attributes of the classic style. To create this effect, in addition to input dismetric prose of Pushkin's text editing is done (in "Velen'yuBozhiyu, o muza, bud'poslushna"/"Be obedient, oh Muse, to the will of God" rhetorical appeal "o myza"/"oh Muse" disappears, book the word "Bozhiyu"/"God's" is replaced by a spoken word "Bozhiyu"/"God's", and in the line "I ne osporivayglupca"/"And do not contest the fool" the archaic verb is modernised—"osparivay"/"contest"). Similar discrepancies are observed in the reminiscences of variant texts of the Lomonosov and Derzhavin ("zarey"/"dawn" in place of the author's "zorey"/"dawn", "vozgordis"/"get proud" and "gordis"/"be proud" and others), but they are hardly noticeable in the stylistic context.

Another image of the author is created: against the backdrop of poetic narcissism of Lomonosov and Derzhavin, Pushkin is shown "in the simplicity of Greatness" (B. Ahmadullina). Its relation to the muse is different as well: both for Lomonosov and Derzhavin, it is a poetic autocrat, whose first fame begging, while the second calls for the same Pushkin, instructing her in the spirit of Christian stoicism, she, in fact—his poetic soul. In this graduation, one can view historical pattern of awareness poet self-sufficiency.

All this, taken together, in the context of a typical agonistic dialogue promotes typological contrasting images of writers—"archaist" and "innovator". Sympathy of M. Sukhotin belongs to Pushkin.

The canonical text of the Pushkin's "Monument" is reproduced in the Post Scriptum. Let us reproduce it.

Chorus: yaPaMyaTNIKSeBeVoZDVIGNeRuKoTVoRNYi (...) (i eReCTeDaNaChei-RoPoiToSMoNuMeNT To MySeLF)
Horace: k nEmUnEzArAstEtArOdnAYatrOpA ! (thEdEsIrElInEtOmlnEwllnEv-ErrUnwld)
Chorus: VoZNeSSyayVySheoNGLaVoyuNePoKoRNoy (...) (HiSReBeLLiouSHeaDaS-CeNDeDHiGHeR)
Horace: AIEksAndrl(y)skOgOstOlPa ! (thAnthEAIExAndrlAnpIIAr)
Chorus: VoLNeN'yuBoZhiyu o MuZaBuD'PoSLuShNa (...) (Be oBeDieNT To TheWILLoFGoDoHMuSe)
Horace: ObldYnEstrAshAs'nEtrEbUYavEncA ! (wlthnOfEArtOrEsEntmEnt, rE-qUIrEnOwrEATH)
Chorus: HvALu i KLeVeTuPRieMLiRaVNoDuShNo (...) (TaKePRaiSe and SLANDeRiNDIFFeReNTLy)
Horace: I nEOspArIvA(y) gIUpcA ! (And dOnOtcOntEstAfOOI)

Poetics of Post Scriptum in terminology reminiscent of stasima in ancient drama, i. e., song performed by the choir after the departure of actors and before its departure (exodus) with the participation of luminary valid, i. e. the leader of the choir or a soloist is Horace.

This part of the poem reproduces the initial and final stanza of Pushkin's "Monument", the middle of the containing copyright transfer merit is ellipted. And it is not compensated by epodes on behalf of the author, as it was in the works by Lomonosov and Derzhavin. We note, that monologic (with the same list of own merits) of Horace epodes is missing. Horace, by the way, drawing on the experience of ancient Greek iambus study, reworked and brought this poetic form in the Roman poetry, published the collection named "Epodoi". All this, taken together, suggests, as to say, objectively, without requiring the author's words in his defence, the merits of Horace and Pushkin. Arbitrary participation of the Roman poet in praise of Russia elaborates this idea in relation to Pushkin.

However, Post Scriptum is epode in its meaning. Unlike previous epodes, it is performed "not with his voice", and in this respect it is symptomatic is missing the personal pronoun "I" in the header of Pushkin's verse. However, not only this is the alienation of Pushkin from his "Monument". Selected reminiscences have undergone sound assimilation with prior meaningfulness of vowels and consonants (the first are the perfect subsistence world, the second comprises the material). The carrier of the first became Russified Horace (pronomination of the poet as such), and of the second—collective body. This distribution can be explained by a number of hermeneutical metaphors.

The consonants are associated with the retelling of the myth of the ancient fable chorus epic theatre, and vowels—with lyrics (revealing in this regard, the use of "I" in the words of Horace, as poetry, according to K. Caudwell are "continuous exclamation").

Verification of phonetic harmony Pushkin speech "algebra" is a metaphorical analogy, so to speak, dismembered poet to "ashes" (according to) and "soul in the sacred lyre" (vowels). And if the chorus builds according to the material of the monument to Pushkin for burial of his ashes, the Horace (poet)—from vowel—builds an acheiropoitos one for the immortal soul. In the context of verses, ellipted from "Monument"—"I slavenbuduya, dokol' v podlunnom mire/Zhivbudet hot'odinpiit"/"And I will be glorious, until the sublunary world/will have alive at least one poet", it becomes clear that it is "dusha v zavetnoy lire"/"soul in a cherished lyre" is a true monument to the poet, inherited, it participates in the eternal dialogical life.

Phonetic abbreviation of Pushkin's poems read by the choir and Horace as a confrontation and the crowds and the poet and the author of an authentic modern phenomenon "Monument" creates the idea of a cyclic repetition of such a

confrontation. In this regard, consonants create a metaphorical onomatopoeia around the consonant and aggressive crowd and vowels—a lone voice of the poet, always reminded of their hysterical pathos lament.

In particular the performance of the *mise en scene* of Pushkin's "Monument" consonants are replicated chorus sound metaphor for dead reading of his works, which means that—a dead memory of the poet crowd (almost Gogol inversion of live and dead). The soul of the poet, expressed solo vowels, is for polyphonic, monophonic but elusive crowd (self-epitaph of G. Skovoroda "Mir lovli menya, no ne poymal"/"The world was catching me, but did not catch"). It, slipped out the heavy embrace of "vsenarodnoy liubvi"/"national love" as "liogkoyedyhaniye"/"easy breath" (I. Bunin) finds, according to the law of reincarnation, the embodiment in the voice of a friend of the poet, others.

The last word rests with the poet, and in this respect the temporary circle, indicated two outs Horace (in the prologue and epilogue), opens up the prospect of eternal cycle of poetic soul in the world. This is, in our opinion, an attribute meaning of the analysed poem. By its nature, it is traditional, memorised, and dialogic roll call of the "Monuments" is indirect proof and II verse of Pushkin's, "Yapamyatnik sebe vozdvignu rukotvorniy..." "I have erected an acheiropoitos monument..."—is a direct one as well.

3. Results and Discussion

Thus, M. Sukhotin offers the original version of the improper, "workshop" reading of the classical "Monuments". On the one hand, it is not formed by the copyright voice, as in the traditional "Monuments", and indirectly, through dialogic play other people's texts (intertextuality), also objectified by the poetics of drama. This presentation of the tradition of "Monument" emphasizes its dialogical nature. On the other hand, the author's ironic game with the tradition of "Monument" is, in fact, its logical culmination. It manifests thus a typologically similar to the baroque combining life and death conflict between dialogue as a guarantee of the continuation of the tradition of irony and its killing. The dialectical resolution of the conflict in an ironic dialogue with tradition, worked out by postmodernism, it allows you to combine the tradition of memory and the memory of tradition, thereby to determine the author's position in relation to it—and inside it and outside. This ensures the relevance of the tradition of the border, and what is its significance for the contemporary postmodern paraphrases, transitional in nature, artistic consciousness.

The change in the functional purpose of allusions cultural continuity as a figure associated with the strategic installation of postmodernism on the game from the last culture. The game involves a genre and style, which throughout post-mythological time associated idea of the artistic integrity of the work. It is not so much in the game reproduction, often, burlesque, of various genres and styles from different historical periods of the literary process that has always been a sign of changing artistic paradigms others as was done for the sake of discrediting such approval of a new genre or style system. The fact is that the characteristic of the post-modern works of the game into a product that returns him self-esteem as a self-sufficient artistic phenomenon, is the predominant carrier of its integrity, thus freeing the genre and style of this historic long-term obligations and making themselves the object of the game. The game involves both the story of a particular genre and genre tradition in general. In this regard, appropriate to quote the line "Conversation about Dante" by Mandelstam: "Imagine a monument made of granite or marble, which in its symbolic tendency is not the image of a horse or rider, but the disclosure of the internal structure of the marble or granite. In other words, imagine a granite monument, erected in honour of granite and for allegedly disclosing his ideas..." (Mandelstam, 1967).

4. Conclusion

In general, each of these trends of mnemonic paraphrasing of the genre traditions—classical, post-classical and post-modern—has a specific meaning in its historical destiny. If we use the metaphor of the story of the prodigal son, we can build a correspondence between them and the age-phases of consciousness: The first is the life in "the house", the second is leaving it, and the third is the return to the "home" as understanding, without which a man cannot do. This understanding is the essence of postmodern paraphrases of genre tradition, wider than the tradition itself.

References

- Averintsev, S. (1981). *The ancient Greek poetics and world literature* (pp. 3-14). Moscow.
Barthes, R. (1994). *The death of the author* (pp. 384-391). Moscow: Selected works. Semiotics. Poetics.
Cortazar, J. (1979). "Winings. The novel" (p. 25-355). Moscow.
Eko, U. (1988). *Notes on "Name of the Rose"* (pp. 88-104). Moscow: Foreign Literature.
Gendelev, M. (1996). "Monument". *Jerusalem*.
Ghirshman, M. M. (2006). Donetsk Philological School: results and prospects. *Literary work in the light of philosophy and philology*

- dialogue* (pp. 6-13). Donetsk: Literary collection.
- Ginsburg, L. Y. (1929). Experience of philosophical lyrics. *Poetics: Collection of articles* (Vol. 5, pp. 72-104). Leningrad.
- Kihney, L. G. (2007). To genre hermeneutics in the lyrics. *Hermeneutics of literary genres* (pp. 36-68). Stavropol.
- Lipovetskiy, M. N. (1997). Russian postmodernism. *Essays of historical poetics*. Ekaterinburg.
- Losev, A. F. (1957). *Ancient mythology in its historical development*. Leningrad.
- Mandelstam, O. (1967). *Talks about Dante*. Moscow.
- Medvedev, P. N. (1980). The problem of genre. *From the history of the Soviet aesthetic thought* (pp. 418-424). Moscow.
- Ortegay, G. J. (1991). Art in the present and the past. *Aesthetics, Philosophy of Culture* (pp. 296-308). Moscow.
- Smirnov, I. (1981). Diachronic transformation of literary genres and motifs. Wien. Wiener slawistischer. Almanach Souderbard 4.
- Sukhotin, M. (1990). LM (Literary Monuments). *Almanac based on hand-written journals*. Moscow: Index.
- Sukhotin, M. (2104). *Centos and marginalia*. Retrieved from www.levin.rinet.ru/FRIENDS/SUHOTIN/centony.htm
- Tiutchev, F. I. (1966). "O my prophetic soul...". *Poems* (Vol. I). Moscow.
- Toporov, V. N. (1988). About ritual. Introduction to the problems. *The archaic ritual folklore and early literature monuments* (pp. 7-60). Moscow.
- Weil, P., & Genis, A. (1997). *Americana*. Moscow.
- Whitehead, A. N. (1990). *Selected works on philosophy*. Moscow.