

## The Evolution of the Poetics of Synthesis in Creative Heritage of *E. Zamiatin* and *M. Tsvetaeva*

<sup>1</sup>Valery N. Yevseyev, <sup>2</sup>Saltanat Zh. Makasheva  
and <sup>3</sup>Ida K. Tsalikova

<sup>1,2</sup>Doctor of Science (Literature), Professor,  
Tyumen State Architectural Academy, Tyumen Region, Russia

<sup>3</sup>Candidate of Science (Literature), Associate Professor,  
Ishim Ershov Teachers Training Institute, Tyumen Region, Russia

---

**Abstract:** The article follows the way of how Ye. Zamiatin and M. Tsvetaeva managed to express the polyphony of the esthetics of their time and to outline new borders in the development of the Russian literary poetic tradition using the synthesis. Their creative heritage is characterized in an ambiguous way as belonging to various currents of the Russian modernism as they were much keen on acquiring the experience of esthetic systems of the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Adoptions made by the Russian symbolists and the idea of synthesis which was originally developed, have formed individual peculiarities of their individual poetics.

**Key words:** Polyphony of the esthetics • Ye. Zamiatin • M. Tsvetaeva • Russian symbolists.

---

### INTRODUCTION

Creative work of E. Zamiatin and M. Tsvetaeva are referred to the most various currents and schools of the Russian modernism by specialists in literary studies [1].

There are certainly some grounds to characterize creative heritage of E. Zamiatin and M. Tsvetaeva who were extremely keen on innovative searches and acquiring the experience of esthetic systems of the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in such an ambiguous way.

The analysis of Zamiatin's and Tsvetaeva's writings shows that adoptions made by the Russian symbolists and the idea of synthesis which was originally developed theoretically and practically, have formed individual peculiarities of the poetics both of E. Zamiatin and M. Tsvetaeva.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

The methodology of comparative analysis of individual peculiarities of the writers' individual poetics was used.

### RESULTS

E. Zamiatin considered himself a "neo-realist" synthesizing the experience of classical realism and symbolism [6]. In a number of articles written in 1919-1924 (in particular, «O Sintetizme», 1922, «Novaia Russkaia Proza», 1923) Zamiatin acts as a theoretician of "neo-realism" (emphasizing the priority of "analysis" but not "synthesis"; integral images; using the possibilities of fiction; the method of distortion of credibility in a new picture of being represented in "Einstein's dynamic coordinates"; the requirement to depict a person's life as his existence – in new "philosophical scopes"). A literary process as a scheme is regarded by him as a triad, the movement to an artistic synthesis: "And from the point of view of dialectics realism is a thesis and symbolism is an antithesis and now there is a new one – the third component which is synthesis where there is simultaneously both the microscope of realism and telescopic glasses of symbolism which lead to infinity" [2]. The attention to life which embodies historical and national specificity of

social and personal life was inherited from realism. Symbolism gave it the ability to notice “the skeleton of the world” which is its ontological features, its spiritual and natural constants [2] behind the external noticeable, empirical reality (to which realists appealed reasoning from the principles of typology, similarity to life and generalization based on them); to notice infinite and eternal grounds of human and universal world order in everything terminal and transient.

The aspiration for synthesizing everyday reality (the reality which cannot be escaped as the complexity of the world is initially accepted) and existential one (something valuable, ontological hidden in the depth of life and its empires and defined by a symbolic image) into an artistic picture brought to life multivariability and polysemy of these pictures and images and active creative and civil position surely led to satire, polemics but in regards to synthesis it led to grotesque which was also “synthetic one”.

M.I. Tsvetaeva in her literary practice (and statements which manifested her position) was in the relations of a “dialogue” with leading currents of literary epoch at all the stages of her artistic evolution.

The poetic collection “*Milestones – I*” is revealing in this as there the voice of Tsvetaeva sounds in other way – just as it was equal to that of other creative individuals, O.E. Mandelstam, A.A. Blok, A.A. Akhmatova, T.V. Churilin in particular [2]. The collection includes poems written from January to December of 1916. M.I. Tsvetaeva indicates not only the dates (January - December of 1916) but also the place where they were created – it was in Moscow [3]. Moscow acts as a biographical and cultural topos of the life and creative work of the poet. The fate and artistic existence of the poet are realized in this cultural space (which is national, historical and poetic). The duration of this existence is followed for an annual circle, which emphasizes the peculiarity of the chronoscope of the artistic world of the collection “*Milestones – I*”. An annual cycle of poems emphasized the conception of the poems and poetic cycles being included into it and the title of the collection itself, which is definitely chronoscopic and combines in its semantics the idea of the unity of time and space, represented the image of the creative way of the poet. The title also included the symbols of a wide space open for free movement which was not a chamber and closed one (as it was in her early creations) but a historical and cultural, national one being of “textual character” where

the voice of the poet began to sound in a strong and wide way; that voice was a dialogical one addressed in certain writings and cycles dedicated to the poets who were close to her spiritually.

The cycle “*Poems about Moscow*” takes a central place in the collection as it unites the compositions of certain writings, of poems having folklore grounds and of dedicated cycles. The image of Moscow becomes sacred, it is the center of Tsvetaeva’s existence from where the voice of the poet sounds at the same time the image is explicitly or associatively in the implication connected with the majority of the poems in the collection. It is obvious that Tsvetaeva in the collection “*Milestones – I*” strove to define her own individual place in poetry connecting it not with St. Petersburg but with Moscow and that led to developing “the Moscow mythology” in the system of images in the collection [1].

When creating the image of Moscow Tsvetaeva in some way opposes it to St. Petersburg. She contrasts the Orthodoxy with its national originally Russian ideas and beliefs to the culture of the Northern capital based on the European tradition brought from the outside [4].

According to O.A. Kling the opposition Moscow-St. Petersburg allowed to Tsvetaeva to touch intuitively the stylistic and compositional center of the collection “*Milestones – I*” which could have a subtitle “*Moscow Poems*” or “*A Moscow Diary*”. It is necessary to say that this opposition to our opinion has a more dialogical character, which is a kind of poetic competition, where the specificity of Moscow and St. Petersburg poetry was established that are, on the whole, the two currents in the Russian culture.

O.A. Kling regards the influence of “the Moscow mythology” on forming the poetics of M.I. Tsvetaeva of that period done in the dialogue with the poets from St. Petersburg, Acmeist poets, first. The researcher thinks that Tsvetaeva created in that time her own variant of Acmeism, a “*Moscow one*” which was oriented on the tradition of national poetry not like the poetics of Acmeist poets from St. Petersburg [1]. The opposition developed by the researcher is an objective and certain given of Tsvetaeva’s self consciousness in the period when the collection “*Milestones – I*” was created but it is important to pay attention to the following circumstance: the texts of 1916 are addressed not only to Acmeist poets - Mandelstam, Akhmatova and partially to Kuzmin. They regard a wider context of the Russian poetry and even more – of the Russian literature [5]. They are also

addressed to a Symbolism poet Blok, to Churilin who was oriented to Futurism; they refer to national and Christian culture, make a base of it and represent here a complete, joint – both from St. Petersburg and Moscow, an elite (a bookish one) and a national (native) image of the Russian mentality, the Russian being, where belonging to Moscow and to St. Petersburg are integral parts of the whole. The dialogue but not the opposition of intersection with many phenomena of the Russian culture, including Symbolism forms the conception of the texts written in 1916. Apparently Tsvetaeva appealed to cultural esthetic and the world outlook polyphony more than to Acmeism and the unique character of her lyrics was identified on this background. In the process of Tsvetaeva's self-definition symbolism played a more significant role than Acmeism and later Avant-garde [6]. One should understand the dialogical character of Tsvetaeva as a phenomenon of synthesis, which allowed her to express individual limitations of her own lyrics. The individual character in its turn was expressed through the intersection with cultural phenomena of the widest outlook and esthetic spectrum but it did not mean the eclectic character of her outlook and poetics. The cognition of her own existence is defining the uniqueness of her Spirit which has not "a universal" but especially individual sense; this very super task given by Tsvetaeva to herself must be seen as the potential of the synthesis of poetic anthology of Symbolism and Acmeism.

## **DISCUSSION**

Using the synthesis E. Zamiatina and M. Tsvetaeva managed to express not only the polyphony of the esthetics of their time but also to outline new borders in the development of the Russian literary poetic tradition.

## **REFERENCES**

1. Yevseyev, V.N. and S.Zh. Makasheva, 2012. *Tvorchestvo E.I. Zamiatina i M.I. Tsvetaevoi v Contested Lichnostnogo Character Russkoi Filosofii Pervious Teri 21ogo Vela*. Tyumen.
2. Zamyatin, E.I., 1990. *Izbrannye Proizvedeniia* in, pp: 2-2, Moscow.
3. Kling, O.A., 2001. *Poetichesky Mir Mariny Tsvetaevoi*. Moscow.
4. Tsalikova, I.K., 2005. *Zhizn' i Tvorchestvo M.I. Tsvetaevoi v Retseptsii Zharubezhnoi Slavistiki (Angliia, America)*. Ishim.
5. Tsvetaeva, M.I., 1990. *Stihotvoreniia i Poemy*, comp. by E.B. Korkina. Leningrad.
6. Yevseyev, V.N., 2000. *Roman My E.I. Zamiatina (Aspekty Zhanra)*. Ishim.