

University of Tartu
Department of Semiotics

Yulia Tishkina

OBERIU: BETWEEN MODERNISM AND AVANT-GARDE

Master's Thesis

Supervisor: Prof Peeter Torop

Tartu

2022

Content

<i>Introduction</i>	3
<i>I. Basic Trends in Literary at the Turn of the 20th Century</i>	8
1. Modernism	10
2. Modern Style.....	14
3. Avant-Garde	16
<i>II. Aesthetic Manifesto as a Genre</i>	22
1. The Notion of Genre	22
2. Theories of Genre	27
3. Speech Genres and the Theory of Speech Acts	33
4. Genres of Programmatic texts	39
<i>III. The OBERIU programmatic text and poetry</i>	47
1. The programmatic text of the OBERIU	48
2. Poetics of the Chinari and the OBERIU.....	49
3. The manifesto — praxis relationships	52
<i>Conclusion</i>	54
<i>Kokkuvõte</i>	56
<i>List of Sources and References</i>	58
<i>Annex</i>	64

Introduction

The given work is dedicated to the analysis of the correlation between aesthetic programmatic text and poetic practices that existed in early Soviet literature. The issues concerning these relationships are not fundamentally new in literary theory studies, however, we suppose that the consideration of texts of aesthetic manifestos as holistic statements may allow us to reveal some features of the interconnection of theory and poetry. As the entry point is accepted the idea about the primacy of elaborated in manifesto artistic conception considering artistic text which in this case acts simply as an application of the purposes outlined in manifestos. It is important to say that this statement does not pretend to be a hypothesis (everyone who has come across any poetics or treatises on art can easily criticize this statement), although we find it quite convenient for the discussion.

In this case, a manifesto is considered as a system-forming text defining boundaries between different aesthetic systems, i. e., self-detaching – and it does not matter if we talk about a single person or group – from other individuals or unions. So, such type of texts may be accepted as an example of performative texts, by which we mean that the very fact of creating a manifesto is perceived by its author as a significant gesture transforming the space of the semiosphere. In a broader context, the issue of the function and features of programmatic text are incorporated into the *word — action* dichotomy. The juxtaposition between statements and behavior becomes more complex when we bring these relations into the sphere of art, writes Yurij M. Lotman in the published posthumously book *The Unpredictable Workings of Culture* (2010). In the article *Word and Deed*, the author creates a specific typology of cultures based on the character of relationships between statements and actions. One pole of the classifications is the situation when words are perceived as equal to deeds, while another pole represents the disconnection between these concepts which leads to the idea of freedom of expression, since a statement is not laden with symbolic power, the statement cannot be measured as a real action. Taking an artistic work as a message sent by an author to a reader, Lotman says that the whole way of the message splits into three separate processes: the creation of the artistic statement, its reception within the frames of artistic culture, and the reaction of its recipient. The author focuses mostly on the last element of the chain and shows how intentions expressed in the circumstances when political unfreedom was compensated by the explosion of literary freedom transforms into some sort of manual at the epoch when word equals actions. All literary texts are created considering certain reader's reaction determined by historical and cultural context, and that is why work

with no initial specific meaning may undergo the mechanism of resemiotisation when the contexts changes (Лотман 2010).

While Lotman is more interested in the reaction caused by an artistic work, we would like to focus more on the first element of the chain, i. e., on the intentions of a particular author or a group of artists and their views on the *word* — *deeds* relationships. We suppose that the direct expression of the first element of the opposition is programmatic text such as literary manifestos and poetic declarations, which in this sense can be analyzed as a literary genre with specific meaning, structure, and functions. So, the meaning of an aesthetic manifesto comes down to poetics per se and represents the semantic component of textual sign, while structural specifics can help to formulate the model of such programmatic text, and therefore, they constitute the syntactic component, and the pragmatic component is represented due to social function of the text. With this work, we sequentially look at each of the elements of textual sign called aesthetic manifesto and create a model of the *word* aspect of the literature in the first half of the 20th century. After creating a model, we turn to the *deeds* aspect and make an observation of the OBERIU (the Association for Real Art) poetry, the meaning and ideas expressed not in the theoretical article but in real poetic praxis. As it was already mentioned, our starting position is that programmatic text with elaborated poetics and general conceptions of a particular author who tries to follow these ideas and to create artistic texts, consistent with program statements, and hence aesthetic manifesto may be used as an assembly instruction. In the same way, as manuals do not always help people to assemble the furniture, conceptions expressed in poetics may differ from the ideas and images we see in texts. Attempts to assemble a chair following an instruction essentially illustrated the process of interpretation or translation *sensu lato*; hence we can look at the *program* — *praxis* relationships as of manifesto is a source text that needed to be translated (transformed) into a poem.

And summing up the aforesaid it is possible to specify the aims of the work. First, we try to create a model of a genre of a literary manifesto, its structure, and functions within the sphere of literary debates happening at the border of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries. The next aim concerns the OBERUI poetry and the place of this group among other numerous unions and groups during the period under discussion. Finally, the main goal of this work is to figure out the relationships between rules and conceptions expressed in poetics and particular artistic texts and works of literature.

Our questions concern the definitions used in art criticism to describe the epoche attributed to the late 19th – early 20th centuries. We admit that there are several discrepancies between different scientific and linguistic traditions, although it seems important to make at least a brief observation and comparison. The next question concerns the gap between artistic self-establishing and artistic text, i. e., how a poet realizes the interconnection between his own theoretical aesthetic conceptions and his art.

As it was stated the epoche which interests us happen at the very end of the 19th century and lasted to the first third of the 20th century and it is marked by the high degree of polemics between numerous literary and art groups. This importance of existing polemic may be illustrated with the publishing in 1924 of a compilation of the main programmatic text under one cover. Here we mean the brochure *From Symbolism to the "October"* (*Ot simvolisma do "Oktyabrya"*, 1924) which we accept as a source for analyzing the structure of literary politics of that time, on the one hand, and as a compilation of text identified as an aesthetic manifesto which helps to elaborate the model of such program statements, on the other hand. The next important source is the program text of the OBERIU group published in 1928 in the second issue of the Press Club journal, in Leningrad. To formulate the model of program text genre(s) there is a need to observe special dictionaries dedicated to literary studies.

In this work, we use methods of content analysis applicable to describe and interpret programmatic text already compiled in one brochure. To elaborate features of such types of texts as aesthetic manifestos, data from special dictionaries and encyclopedias are analyzed from the position of onomasiology, i. e., there is a given idea of program text which may be expressed with several lexical items, and our goal is to describe these items and to find differences between them. As it was mentioned, we mostly deal with models: models of genre, image of literary group, scheme of coordination between words and deeds – so, methods of contextual analysis are used. Finally, to describe the relationships between the author's concepts and their expression in poetry, we use communicative analysis which focuses on the minimal elements of communication addressee and addresser, message, context, and code.

The work consists of the introduction, three chapters, the conclusion, the list of references, and the annex with tables described in one of the chapters. The introduction gives information about the research problem and research aims, used material and methods, and provides a brief overview of the whole thesis.

The first chapter *Basic Trends in Literary at the Turn of the 20th Century* gives information about the cultural and historical context of the late 19th – early 20th centuries in Russian literature. Here there is the theoretical observation of the main terms used to describe this epoch, each of the subchapters provides definitions from epical sources to make the image of discussed cultural concept clearer.

The second part *Aesthetic Manifesto as a Genre*, as its name implies, deals with the issues of genre definition and the model of aesthetic system-forming texts within the frames of semiotics of literature and literary criticism. The first of the subchapters outlines the terms used to signify the idea of genre in different linguistic and cultural traditions: *genre*, *species*, *kind*, and *type* (in English and French); *die Gattung* and *die Art* (in German), *žanr*, *vid* and *rod* (in Russian). The next subchapter concerns the concept of genres and genre classification in the history of literary criticism, there we are focus on the unstable character of the notion, provides several anti-generic conceptions and finishes with the notion of the horizon of expectation elaborated within the frames of so-called reader-response criticism. In the other subchapter, we observe linguistic investigation of the analysis of genres' nature and functions, and especially we focus on linguistic pragmatics. The last of the subchapters is a practical analysis of the programmatic text published in the compilation *From Symbolism to the "October"* (1924), where we try to formulate a model of the avant-garde manifesto, its features, and functions.

The third part *The OBERIU programmatic text and poetry*, as the title suggests, is focused on the OBERIU group and its place among other artistic unions and official and unofficial literary organizations in the late 19th – early 20th century. In this chapter, we describe the OBERIU program statements and try to understand the connection between them and poems of oberiuty. Here, on the example of the OBERIU group make a theoretical conceptualization of the *program – praxis* interconnection. We suppose that such a connection might be accepted as a connection between the source text and its translation, and the so-called gap between aesthetic manifesto should be explained by the very nature of this transfer of meanings. It seems that the essential reason for the impossibility of complete translatability within the frame of literature is the *ludic* component of poetic art. By ludic relationships we mean the fact that concepts expressed in program statements act as rules in the communicative game, while the gaming process creates the impression of the absence of rules to make the game more interesting and complex.

The conclusion combines the interim result from each of the parts and represents the answers to the research questions. The list of references shows all materials and sources used for this work. Illustrating tables representing the texts from the compilation *From Symbolism to the "October"* (1924) classified by genre names, addressee's and addresser's images, etc. are put in the annex.

I. Basic Trends in Literary at the Turn of the 20th Century

Since this thesis is dedicated to the analysis of the *poetic — praxis* interconnection in the sphere of literature on the example of the OBERIU programmatic text and literary works, it seems important to make a short theoretical overview of the main trends in Russian literature at the beginning of the 20th century. Strictly speaking, we deal with the period of the 1920^s which is usually associated with cultural explosions manifested by the change of aesthetic paradigms. If we look at the literary processes happening at that time in Russia, we notice the high degree of polemics in the cultural sphere concerning the essence and functions of art, formal searching for expressing the ideas of novelty in art also characterizes the context. It looks like any attempt to make a strict list of the significant tendencies is a daunting task due, although we would like to make a brief observation of the main trends in Russian literature during the period under discussion.

So far it is a common issue concerning mismatches between chronological and socio-cultural boundaries of an epoque, we would like to comment on the most significant events and dates to delineate the frontiers of the observed period. In art, the 1920^s per se is quite a long-term period having its roots in 1982 when poet Dmitry S. Merezhkovsky gives a public lecture *The Causes of the Decline of the Contemporary Russian Literature and the New Trends in it* which is traditionally accepted as the manifestation of Symbolism aesthetics. This lecture and its publication in 1983 begin the polemics about new art, new forms, and the meaning of literary works, the culmination of the discussion falls in the 1910^s when innumerable literary groups, organizations, and single artists transform actively the sphere of culture. The situation drastically changes in 1917, the year of the Great October Socialist Revolution which lead to the increase of discussions about the functions and goals of literature in the new society needing new art corresponding to the creation of the proletarian state. It seems that the importance of these polemics is reflected in the fact that in 1924 there is a publication of a professionally prepared compilation of program literary declarations and manifestos *From Symbolism to the "October"* where the last word refers to the Great October Revolution (we take a closer look at the document in the next dedicated to the specificity of aesthetic program statements). Another illustration of the cultural heterogeneity of the 1920^s and the ideological importance of art for the creation of a new world is the resolution of 18 June 1925 *On the Policy of the Party in the Area of Belles-Lettres* declared by the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks). In authors of the Resolutions recognize and accept all possible artistic unions and groups if their literature can be used to execute the major project of class

revolution, and so far, it is not important whether a writer is a member of the Russian Social Democratic Party. Hence, men of the letter are classified into three major categories: proletarian and peasant writers preparing class revolution, antagonistic bourgeois writer, and so-called *poputchiki* (fellow travelers) accepting the idea of proletarian revolution without being active revolutionists themselves. The last ones are accepted as authors owing techniques of writing useful in the phase of establishing new art, but it is better for them to come to the party ideology in the nearest future (ЯКОВЛЕВ 1999a). The situation changes dramatically by the end of the 1920s identified with the end of the New Economic Policy and the setting of the system of industrialization and collectivization. In literature the course on collectivization suggests the transformation of the literary communication forms; i. e., to bring the revolution closer only collective and unified actions are needed and that is why in the sphere of art accepted formerly *poputchiki* becomes unpleasant. The final point manifesting this shift happens on 23 April 1932 when the resolution *On the Reorganization of the Literary Artistic Organizations* is declared by the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks). According to its text, the rapid increase of artistic pluralism turned to “cultivating groupism” among writers resulting in deep stagnation by the end of the 1920s, and therefore, there is a special need to elaborate right orientation for cultural evolution. The Resolution is directed against VOAP (the All-Union Federation of Association of Proletarian Writers) and RAPP (the Russian Association of Proletarian Writers) which earlier took over the LEF (the Left Front of the Arts), the Kuznitsa group (the Smithy), and some other art organizations. As the result, VOAPP and RAPP are eradicated, and a new regulatory authority is created to unite all writers supporting “the platform of Soviet rule”, i. e., the Union of Soviet Writers (ЯКОВЛЕВ 1999b). Additionally, in 1934 the First Congress of the Union of Soviet Writers is taking place in Moscow, and the orientation towards socialist realism is claimed to be the main and the only officially accepted direction for Soviet literature development. De jure it means that since 1934 there are no possibilities to create an official and independent from the Soviet powers group, and all other styles and trends – except social realism – are abandoned.

As we can see, the 1920s in Russian literature is a very intense time and it would be a big mistake to say that there are connections between periods and aesthetic movements, although there is a reductionistic temptation to use the metaphor of evolution with a successive change of styles and trends. The changes in the culture of this time are usually described with the notions of modernism and avant-garde. Modernism and avant-garde are overlapped concepts differently used in different scientific and linguistic traditions, so there is a need to define the

main features of the listed trends to make a clear understanding of whether one programmatic text reflects modernistic or avant-garde ideas.

1. Modernism

It would not be a mistake to say that most scholars talk about the misunderstandings following any attempt to elaborate a clear and unambiguous definition of modernism. Generally, modernism is described as an intuitively comprehensible but rather vague term used to designate a period in European culture established in the closing years of the 19th century and mostly, while the heyday of modernism is mostly related to the 20th century. After providing this very brief and very broad understanding which does not allow us to make a clear image of this cultural paradigm, we would like to turn to dictionaries and encyclopedic articles discussing this phenomenon.

In *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* (1999) prepared by John Cuddon, the dictionary entry dedicated to the concept under discussion is quite concise, while it outlines the general character of the terms and the issues concerning creating a holistic theory of modernism movement in Europe. The author talks about different ways to establish chronological boundaries of modernism, and while the birth of the phenomenon attributed to the very end of the 19th century is accepted in the critical tradition, the end of modernism is a debatable question. Some insist on the period of the 1920^s when the rise of modernist art immediately changed with its end, or there is another tendency to connect the completion of modernism with the late 1940^s and the development of postmodernist tendencies, although the idea of strictly constructed literary evolution with successive paradigms is not wildly accepted in contemporary literary criticism (e. g. Perkins 1992, Тынянов 2002а, Тынянов 2000b). Cuddon also highlights the national specificity of modernistic movements, and so we can speak not about one modernism, but about numerous national modernisms that lasted in different, albite close to each other, time limits:

For example, in France from the 1890s until the 1940s; in Russia during the pre-revolutionary years and the 1920s; in Germany from the 1880s and on during the 1920s; in England from early in the 20th c. and during the 1920s and 1930s; in America from shortly before the First World War and on during the inter-war period (Cuddon 1992a: 515).

The issue of the link between modernism and avant-garde as the not fully equal phenomenon is also pointed out, the concept of avant-garde here is also perceived as a non-holistic one due to the possible distinguish between “old” avant-garde (e. g., French Symbolism) and “new” avant-

garde turned to postmodernism. Strictly speaking, indeed, there is a need to differentiate the avant-garde movement that happened at the beginning of the 20th century and the set of avant-garde practices and tendencies in contemporary art, although the increase in all kinds of *-isms* number may be perceived as more confusing comparing with one intuitively comprehensible but vague notion. Cuddon estimates these modernist paradigms as the system in the center of which lays the ideas of rebellion and the demonstrative rejection of established rules and norms, as the “fresh ways of looking at man’s position and function in the universe and many (in some cases remarkable) experiments in form and style” (Ibidem: 516). As we can see, this is a really vague explanation that might be used to describe any other artistic movements.

The article in *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry & Poetics* (2012) seems to be less general due to the focus on different modernistic traditions, and this text stands in some way out from other dictionary and encyclopedic entries. Peter Nicholls links the beginning of the modernist paradigm with the shift in the hierarchy of artistic media:

For many of its protagonists, the opening phase of literary modernism signaled a decisive shift from music to painting as the privileged model for a new poetry (Nicholls 2012: 889).

According to the author, the emergence of this shift relates to the aesthetic of symbolism corresponding to the feelings of the fin de siècle decadence and provoking further encounters with other modernistic tendencies, such as “vociferous” Futurism rejecting symbolist values. On the other hand, the development of modernism resulted in the formation of more radical various avant-garde tendencies. The first association with the notion of modernism is the idea of form-oriented art seeking new possibilities for formal expression, although this association is not hundred percent true since some famous and significant figures from the history of modernist literature remained faithful to traditional meters and forms (e. g., Wysten Auden, Vladislav Khodasevich, *et al.*). Another feature of the modernist aesthetic discussed in the entry is the characteristic of the poetic subject who is also perceived as a form of “hermetically playful” experiment manifested in highlighting ontological differences between literary masks and the real author; in critics of high modernism this phenomenon is known as the mythological method or as modernist mythmaking. Nicholls points out also the focus on the rhetoric element of the modernist poetic statement, while here rhetoric may be understood as the allude to the style of symbolist poetry dealing with all kinds of periphrasis, or it may be interpreted as the cohabitation of poetics with the spheres of ideology and power (Ibidem).

The tradition of French literary studies depicts the concept of modernism (*modernité* and *modernisme*) as a complex concept that may be discussed from several perspectives, starting with the debate that occurred in France in the early 17th century and known as the quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns, and finishing with the juxtaposition of modernist and post-modernist tendencies in arts. It seems that the complexity of the notion is expressed in the ways in the *Dictionnaire des Termes Littéraires* (2005) the definition of the term is made, viz. the article traces a brief history of the opposition of two main directions under which literature should be developed, i. e., the orientation toward classic examples or the urge to look towards the future. Hence, modern or modernism can be understood only in the contrast with some past-oriented poetics: the Ancients – the Moderns, classicism – romanticism, romanticism – decadent movement being the root of modernism of the 20th century, modernism – avant-garde.

Renouveau, émancipation vis-à-vis de la tradition ou des usages en cours : « modernité » recouvre à peu près ce qu'on entend aussi par « avant-garde* », quelle que soit l'époque visée (Van Corp et al. 2005a: 309).

The renewing, the liberation of the tradition or existing practices: “modernity” more or less covers what is also understood by “avant-garde” regardless the period.

Regarding the modernist movement, we are interested in the author of the dictionary article talks only about already mentioned experiments with the form of expression or literary techniques distinctive for the art of the 1910^s–1940^s and implemented in the expressionist and the futurism movements, also in the values of cubism, dadaism, imagism, and surrealism (Ibidem).

More broad observation is presented in the *Literatura Polska XX Wieku. Przewodnik encyklopedyczny* (2000) where the tradition of modernism is genealogically linked with the phenomenon of decadence being the reaction to the cultural crisis and the new understanding of time at the period of the last quarter of the 19th century and the first decade of the 20th century. We would like to provide the whole chain of cultural transfer provided by the author of the entry:

W literaturze oznaczone tym terminem [modernizm] kierunki i stanowiska, chociaż mocno zróżnicowane i zależne od charakteru danej literatury nar., wykazują liczne cechy wspólne: poczucie nieuchronnego kryzysu kultury i moralności mieszc., wyrażające się przede wszystkim w → dekadentyzmie; związki z systemami filoz., które uzasadniały związany z dekadentyzmem pesymizm (A. Schopenhauer) lub ostro atakowały zarówno moralność burżuazyjną, jak dekadentki przeciw niej protest (F. Nietzsche); dążenie do sztuki zrywającej y XIX-wiecznym realizmem, szczególnie widoczne w → symbolizmie i teoriach → „sztuki dla sztuki”; występowanie problemu cygana artyst. i → cyganerii jako wzoru zachowania się artysty wobec skłóconego z nim środowiska filistrów (Wyka 2000).

In the literature this term [modernism] designates some trends and positions, although strongly differentiated and dependent on the nature of the national literature; these trends share numerous features, such as the sense of the inevitable crisis of the bourgeois culture and morality, expressed primarily in → decadence linked with the philosophical systems justifying pessimism associated with decadence (A. Schopenhauer), or sharply attacking bourgeois morality and the decadence protest against it (F. Nietzsche), and striving for art that breaks with the 19th-century realism, [these tendencies are] evident in → symbolism and theories of → art for art's sake; the occurrence of the problem of [role of] artistic bohemia and → bohemianism as a model of the artist's behavior being in contrast the quarrelsome milieu of the philistines.

Rather a thorough description of the notion of modernism is provided in *The Literature Encyclopedia of Terms and Concepts* (2001). The author of the article points out that traditionally, the roots of this paradigm are seen in the interbellum period and its heyday relates to the 1920s, although some scholars associate modernism with the development of the French decadence movement, and more specifically with the publishing the scandalous volume of Baudelaire's poems *Les Fleurs du Mal* (1857) where the new aesthetic ideas were expressed. The more grounded theory establishes the modernistic culture with more general philosophical and cultural transformation influenced the artistic quest for new forms allowing to express this ripened socio-cultural crisis, the apogee of which falls during the First World War. Since the previous cultural epoque is accepted as the triumph of the positivist conception of the world, the modernist aesthetic reflects the disillusion with this philosophy and acquires the new direction *a realibus ad realiora*. The author argues that the modernism being an influential and all-inclusive system did not elaborate the only one programmatic text where all its purposes would have been listed, while there are several differential criteria helping to distinguish this movement from others. Among these criteria, there are the declarative rejections of the purely mimetic nature of art, the stress on the world's conventionality, the illogic character of human life and even the game sense, and briefly speaking, the state of the epistemic uncertain. The artistic expressions of this uncertain and sometimes unsuccessful attempt to overcome it are reflected in numerous modernist schools and inner movements (Кожевников, Николаев 1987, Николюкин 2001a).

Turning to special literature focused on the issues of the establishment of modernism and its relations with another cultural paradigm, we would like to say that all observed works measure the notion as quite an unclear turn used to speak about arts established at the end of the 19th century and being influential at least during the first third of the 20th century. The book by Calinescu perceives the modernist tradition as one of coexisting aesthetics focused on the idea of novelty, among these paradigms, there are modernism per se, avant-garde, decadence, kitsch, and postmodernism. The relativism in terms used to talk about modernity, according to the

author, is due to the different critical traditions. Calinescu identifies his object of examination as the notion of modernity, and so he starts his observation with a wellknown in literary history juxtaposition of orientation toward archetypical texts already created in the past (this self-positioning may be accepted as conscious being *on the shoulders of ancient giants*), and the more radical direction toward future with attempts to elaborate unique systems. The very figure of “ancient giants” is a problematic concept because it requires defining clearly who these “giants” are. The author prefers to talk about two different modernisms, i. e., modernism₁ is *a product of scientific and technological progress, of the industrial revolution, of the sweeping economic and social changes brought about by capitalism* (Calinescu 1987a: 41), and modernism₂ is an aesthetic concept which is determined by the rejection of the bourgeois modernity₁ and its formula is articulated as *épater le bourgeois*, i. e, to shock philistines. The significant shift that happened with the concept of modernism in its second understanding relates to the paradoxes the poetics elaborated by Baudelaire:

Deprived of its previously descriptive function, “modernity” becomes an emphatically normative concept. One may even speak of an imperative: art *ought* to be modern. With Baudelaire modernity ceases to be a given condition and the idea that, for better or worse, the moderns have no choice and cannot help being moderns is no longer valid. On the contrary, to be modern *is* a choice, and heroic one, because the path of modernity is full of risks and difficulties (Ibidem: 50).

The presence of two modernisms in our regular language reflects the fact that the contradiction between being modern and being contemporary was initially featured in the concept of modernism in European culture. The first state implies a kind of longing for a holistic world, while the idea of contemporariness does not create any models of the world and this idea is strongly connected with the values of science and technical progress. We understand that this description formally contradicts one of the previously formulated statements about the collapse of time and socio-cultural disillusion with positivism. It seems important to highlight again that the intuitively comprehensible notions of modern and modernism acts differently in different cultural and linguistic traditions, and modernism as an umbrella term designate a principal systemic shift in aesthetics. There are traditions where the term modernism is used to label art tendencies established at the turn of the 20th century, and there are also theories suggesting a more particular division of European art history.

2. Modern Style

One existing but not a very common concept used to characterize tendencies of the *fin de siècle* in the culture at the turn of the 20th century is the term *Modern* (stress on the last syllable)

mostly known in the sphere of fine arts than in literary criticism discourse. Strictly speaking, the idea of the modern style is expressed with totally different terms in different traditions, in contrast to the labels of modern and avant-garde art. By this we mean not only the linguistic heterogeneity but also the national determination of the concept: *Art Nouveau* (in French) is not the same as *Modern style* or *Glasgow style* (in English), it also differs from *Jugendstil* or *Reformstil* (in Germany, some Scandinavian and Baltic traditions) and *Secession* (used in Austria, Czech Republic, Poland, and some other countries), and finally it does not equal to *Modern* (in Russian) and the aesthetic of *miriskussniki* (in Russia). The issue of interconnection between all these concepts is not a new topic of investigation in the history of architecture and fine arts, although we could not figure out whether all these terms are also applicable to the history of literature. The examination of already listed dictionary and encyclopedias show the fact that the concepts of *art nouveau* and more spread *Jugendstil* is used in literary studies, while mostly to talk about the new aesthetic of book production (Cuddon 1999c, 199d) or about journals (Van Corp et al. 2005c).

Here we would like to refer to the article by Mojmir Grygar who tries to define the meaning of the Modern style in Russian and Czech poetry. The author highlights the general heterogeneity and diversity of terms used by poets and artists themselves to establish the principal new character of their art and the fact that the meanings of all terms depend on individual intention and social context. The formation of *modern* he sees in the gradual disintegration of the symbolist aesthetic paradigm, and in the establishment of the postsymbolist poetics.

Несомненно, определить и ограничить стиль модерн в литературе еще труднее, чем в изобразительном искусстве. Надо считаться с определенной универсальностью, «стихийностью» и переходностью этого стиля. Но его признаки можно обнаружить уже в способе обработки текста как такового. Иначе говоря: стиль модерн сигнализируется переменной установкой с «*signifié*» (означаемого художественного знака) на его «*signifiant*» (означающее) (Грыгар 2007: 1000).

Undoubtedly it is even more difficult to define and limit the *Modern style* in literature than in fine arts. One must reckon with a certain universality, "spontaneity" and transitivity of this style. Its signs can already be found in the way text per se is processed. In other words, the *Modern style* is reflected by the shift of artistic attitude from the focus on *signifié* (significant artistic sign) to the *signifiant* (signifier).

The features of modern Grygar connects with the avant-garde focus on the form of artistic expression which is reflected for instance in the Russian futurists' neologisms turned to be in some sort of futuristic brand. The main difference between avant-garde and modernism lies in the way they conceptualize formal experiments with words, *viz.* modern deals with stylization as the design principle and strives for interconnection of all artistic expressions, while the postsymbolists are avant-garde artists aspiring to self-establish, to separate from other

movements and groups, moreover formal experiments in avant-garde turn to be an end itself (Ibidem).

As it was already mentioned the notion of modern is not common in literary studies and is usually used to designate some stylistic features of fine art and architecture created by the end of the 19th century in western countries. The place of the modern style in literary criticism is rather marginal. In addition, it seems important to pay attention that the years when modern style in poetry developed also correlates with the spike in interest in literary science to the formal analysis of text and the active work of the school of Russian formalism. The essence of the modern style in literature, according to Grygar, lies in the semiotic shift intentionally made by Czech and Russian futurists in the 1910^s, and the so-called formal school established in the long 1920^s. Modern (stress on the last syllable) is precisely a style and not a separate cultural paradigm.

3. Avant-Garde

Now let us turn to the notion of avant-garde fixed in the mentioned early dictionaries and encyclopedias. For instance, the *Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* (1999) describes the notion in a very broad sense:

Avant-garde An important and much used term in the history of art and literature. It clearly has a military origin ('advance guard') and, as applied to art and literature, denotes exploration, pathfinding, innovation and invention; something new, something advanced (ahead of its time) and revolutionary (Cuddon 1999b: 68).

So, the author does not provide a clear and distinctive understanding of the nature of avant-garde, i. e., whether this term is applied to talk about a movement or a tendency existing in that movement, or it refers exclusively to a style of artistic expression. We understand and share this puzzle, and it seems to be several difficulties accompanying attempts to avoid this puzzlement in a concise article designed for a common use dictionary.

In contrast, *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry & Poetics* provides a detailed overview of the concept, also starting with the origins of the word which is a linguistic borrowing of the term used to designate "the front flank of the army". Initially being borrowing from the military sphere in the political discourse, the derivative adjective expanded its semantic to the senses *responsible* and *leading*, and then this new metaphorical meaning was used to designate a particular movement associated with the figure of French poet Charles Baudelaire establishing

the cult of novelty in the literature of the last third of the 19th century. In the 1970^s another French poet Arthur Rimbaud, following the set vector and being a sympathizer of the Paris Commune of 1871, establishes avant-garde not only as a qualitative characteristic of politics or aesthetics but as a praxis, according to which life should go in conflict with everything traditional and bourgeois. The paradox of avant-garde is well perceived in the 21st century when the initial political drive faces the social so to say hierarchy and aesthetic elitism in the sphere of art (Perloff 2012). Strictly speaking, it is a very interesting example illustrating the inner logic of hemisphere elaborated by Yury M. Lotman arguing the existence of totally fixed systems, *viz.* in semiosphere, every novelty (explosion) with time passing turns to become a norm or even vanishes (Лотман 1992). In other words, the establishment of the avant-garde with its rhetoric of unruliness and revolution ended with the return to the exhibition space cruised a lot by Dadaists and surrealists.

Marjorie Perloff continues her encyclopedic article by making a distinction between the avant-garde movements of the 1920^s and the avant-garde practices and techniques reminding significant for contemporary art. The former is designated as the so-called historical avant-garde, and traditionally it refers to the traditions of Italian and “still czarist” Russian (we suppose that the author means only Russian futurists being active in the 1910^s, while some avant-garde movements existed till the 1930^s). Concerning the issue of the relationships between modernism and avant-garde, the author of the article makes a brief observation of the main tendencies in the critical discourse. Initially, says Perloff, these two were ideologically counterbalanced:

<...> a bourgeois status-quo “high” modernism (associated with particular poets like R. M. Rilke, Paul Valéry, and T. S. Eliot) was regularly distinguished from the countercultural avant-garde movements that challenged its status. But increasingly, as the century wore on, the two were seen to be on the same spectrum (Perloff 2012: 111).

The tendency to combine modernism and avant-garde in one more general paradigm is also set in the *Dictionnaire des Termes Littéraires* (2005) where the perception of both phenomena is focused on the notion of modernity (*modernité*), and so the modernist movement is seen as some sort of scale on the one poles of which avant-garde (or *avant-gardisme*) is situated due to its desire for artistic extreme (Van Corp et al. 2005b).

In the Russian tradition of literary studies, according to *The Literature Encyclopedic Dictionary* (1987) and *The Literature Encyclopedia of Terms and Concepts* (2001), the word avant-garde is replaced with its French duplet, while the spelling differs a little bit (*cf.* French *avant-*

gardisme and Russian *avangardizm* in (Кожевников, Николаев 1989; Николукин 2001b). The description we found insists on the socially engaged character of the phenomenon per se, while there is a place to distinguish avant-garde in its historical perspective, i. e., avant-garde tendencies proceeded in the 1920^s, and the avant-garde practices used in contemporary European art till 1960^s (they are combined under the title *neoavant-gard (neoavangard)*). The author of the article in The Encyclopedia argues that in contrast to modernism, avant-garde cannot be observed as a separate aesthetic movement due to the absence of the rigorous doctrine of avant-garde and due to the porous borders of the phenomena related to avant-garde.

Для школ А[вангарда]. характерна недолговечность, они часто находятся в непримиримом конфликте друг с другом, поскольку каждая притязает на уникальность предложенного ею нового пути в искусстве. Однако сама доминанта нетрадиционности и новизны художественного языка остается отличительным свойством искусства (Ibidem: 12).

For the a[vant-garde] schools the fragility is the main feature, these schools are often in inconceivable conflict with each other since each school claims the uniqueness of the new elaborated ways in arts. However, the very dominance of innovation and novelty of artistic language remains the only distinctive feature of this art.

In the book by Calinescu, one part is dedicated to the conception of cultural avant-garde. Since the author deals with the understanding of modernity in its expression in human culture, he uses the term avant-garde in a very broad sense. While the modernist paradigm is connected with time modeling, although with specific modeling, avant-garde relying on the ideas of progress creates a myth of total focus on the future, and consequently avant-garde rejects the past. Calinescu says that from the historical perspective avant-garde has its origins in the emphasis and dramatizing of some elements constituting modernity, and hence it should be perceived just as a “radicalized and strongly utopianized version of modernity” (Calinescu 1978b: 95). One of the main features of this paradigm is the rebellious and revolutionary rhetoric of heroic overcoming the temporality which ends forgetting about the future at all due to the priority of the resistance. The author highlights the fact that initially the word *avant-garde* acted as a military term designated the leading part of the troops already in the Medieval Ages, and then speeded in the Renaissance with a little shift of semantics, i. e., avant-garde became a metaphor of the progressiveness in no matter what sphere of human culture. The idea of avant-garde more or less close to the one which is accustomed to using in our daily-life conversations alludes to the Romanticism as a cultural movement that continued from the very end of the 18th century to the first part of the 19th century. As it was said the word acquires the figurative or metaphorical status within the frames of the Renaissance, and this romantic consciousness changes the function of the metaphor:

<...> the avant-garde is – or should be – *conscious* of being in advance of its own time. This consciousness not only imposes a sense of mission on the representatives of the avant-garde but confers upon them the privileges and responsibilities of leadership. To be a part of avant-garde is to be part of an elite – although this elite, unlike the ruling classes or groups of the past, is committed to a totally antitheist program, whose final utopian aim is the equal sharing by all people of all the benefits of life (Ibidem: 104).

As we can see the power of avant-garde is due to self-establishing which may correlate with the performatives discussed in the linguistic theory of speech acts. It seems that just like all speech acts can be characterized by the image of the speaking subject, similarly the avant-garde paradigm formulates the myth of the heroic and struggling poet which also turns to be a *cliché* by the decline of Romanticism. After making a brief but clear historical observation of avant-garde character, Calinescu measures this avant-garde paradigm as one of the carried to logical extreme manifestations of the modernist tendencies toward radical searching both in political and aesthetic spheres (Ibidem).

As we can see, the idea of the avant-garde – in contrast to the notion of modernism elaborated formerly – is intuitively comprehensible due to its inner form referring to the concept of novelty, although it is quite challenging to formulate an unambiguous definition of such a concept. An attempt to delineate avant-garde was made by Dmitry V. Sarabianov in his article *Towards Limiting the Notion of Avant-Garde* (2000). The art historian makes an interesting remark about the image of an avant-garde author: those who are claimed as avant-garde creators never called themselves avant-garde artists – this epithet was given further in the further tradition of description. Indeed, our main research material the compilation *From Symbolism to the “October”* consisting of programmatic texts written by Russian authors, some of whom are known nowadays as avant-garde rebels, the entity *avant-garde* is given only four times. The lexeme *avant-garde* is used in collocations proletarian *avant-garde* (1–3) and *revolutionary avant-garde* (4):

- 1) <...> в политической области только командующее положение **пролетарского авангарда**, – Р.К.П. (б), – позволило использовать сменовеховство в интересах пролетарской диктатуры.

<...> in the political sphere, only the commanding position of the **proletarian avant-garde** (Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks)) made it possible to use the Smenovekhism in the interest of the proletarian dictatorship.

- 2) <...> главной опорой **пролетарского авангарда** в области литературы является пролетарская литература <...>

<...> the main support of the **proletarian avant-garde** in literature is proletarian literature <...>

- 3) <...> группа пролетарских писателей «Октябрь», как часть **пролетарского авангарда**, стремится к созданию такой системы и считает достижение этого возможным лишь при условии создания единой художественной программы <...>

The group of proletarian writers October, as a part of *proletarian avant-garde*, strives to create such a system and considers it to be possible only if a unified artistic program is created <...>

- 4) Об'единение рабочих писателей «Кузница»—есть единственное об'единение, стоящее всецело на программе *революционного авангарда* рабочего класса и Р.К.П.

The association of working-class writers Smithy is the unique association relying entirely on the program of the *revolutionary avant-garde* of the working class and the Russian Communist Party.

All the founded and listed contexts show that the entity *avant-garde* in the period of 1890^s – 1910^s was used not to signify some aesthetic movement but to name the vanguard of the working-class, although post factum this lexeme turned to expand its meaning. The author also criticizes the idea to look at avant-garde as if it is a specific art style having its own life circle – there is a variety of texts obtaining the title avant-garde and sometimes it is quite difficult to find what unites texts from different points of this spectrum, i. e., to figure out what exactly makes all these texts avant-garde. Sarabianov makes some sort of list of features bringing avant-garde: artistic discovery, orientation toward infinite self-renewal, programmatic of artistic thought and special need to express the program in texts like manifestos and declarations, rejection of so-called classical art, and desire to find connection with more deep and even marginal old traditions, avant-garde art is a projection of new reality (Сарабянов 2000). We suppose that except fetishization of the idea of novelty (and Sarabianov also highlights that novelty itself is not enough – all art history is based on once appeared innovation turned after into tradition) having the insight about art self-renewal, “avant-gardness” lies in the sphere of performativity: it is not enough to be new, but it is more important to talk about this novelty and to show intentions to transform the world by means of this new art.

It is noteworthy that the definition of the avant-garde is tied with the notion of modernism, this connection is accepted differently in different concepts (from making a strong opposition between these movements to the refusal to accept avant-garde as a specific movement and accepting it as the radicalism of several artists). Here we would like to look at the theory of avant-garde elaborated by Peter Bürger who describes this cultural paradigm not as a stable to some extent aesthetic system but as a general direction from *imitatio naturae* principles accompanied by the increase of interest in the potentiality of artistic tools and devices. Methods of art expressions become the central category of this new paradigm rejecting the hegemony of one or another style in European art, and the intention to shock the recipient becomes significant in historical avant-garde:

<...> only the full unfolding of the thing (here, the radicalization of defamiliarization in shock) that makes recognizable the general validity of the category. This is not to say that the act of cognition is transferred to reality itself, that the subject that produces the insight is negated. What is acknowledged is simply that the possibilities of cognition are limited by the real (historical) unfolding of the object (Bürger 1984: 18–19).

According to Bürger, the accent on the formal element contributes to the expulsion of the meaning of a piece of art. In contrast to pre-avant-garde (bourgeois) traditions where the lead role belonged to artistic institutions, avant-garde tends to deal with artistic text per and thereby avant-garde artist returns art to the sphere of life and reject the supremacy of institutions taking art away from its real addressee. The goal of the well-known avant-garde protest and aesthetic scandal is to reconcile art and the recipient, to bring art back to life, and this self-criticism of the art system forms a principally new paradigm influencing modern and, contemporary neo-avant-garde art practices. After ruining institutions to return art to life, the avant-gardists seek to dismantle somehow the *art—life* opposition, i. e., to turn art into life praxis (establishment and development of design as a special sphere of art having a strict connection with human life acts as a good example of these tendencies and as a successful realization of avant-garde ideas). The public significance of an artistic text is not at the center of attention anymore, while the formal element and the recognition of the diversity of tools to produce public effect become more and more important. Moreover, the paradigm of avant-garde rejects an image of the individual author which reflects in the fact that speaking about avant-garde artists we usually bear in mind different organizations and unions. A figure of an individual recipient is also denied, and reaction to avant-garde art tending to incorporate human life is always collective.

All that remains is the individual who uses poetry as an instrument for living one's life as best one can. There is also a danger here to which Surrealism at least partly succumbed, and that is solipsism, the retreat to the problems of the isolated subject (Ibidem: 53).

As it was given formerly, initially the word *avant-garde* was used in military discourse to identify the troops being ahead of the main body of the army. Then there is an expansion of the usage due to the mechanisms of metaphorization that happened with lots of entities from the military discourse. It seems that the focus was the idea of novelty, i. e., front troops are the first who faces new circumstances and the enemy; in other discourses, this word signifies trailblazers, the ones who are the first to explore something new. But the early 20th century is an intense period, and the avant-garde status becomes kind of a label marking the sharp break from the previous (bourgeois) tradition. The great merit of avant-garde movements is the very gesture of this breaking.

II. Aesthetic Manifesto as a Genre

1. The Notion of Genre

There is no doubt that in the case of studying both modernism and avant-gardism literature we deal with numerous programmatic texts such as theoretical essays written by critics or by writers and poets themselves, any kinds of declarations, and artistic manifestos. With this work, we would not like to focus on the first of the listed categories but to elaborate on some features of programmatic texts forming the field of literature. Definitely, at some point, it is a reductionistic approach not to pay attention to timely and later critical overviews and essays providing critical a perception of forming or already formed artistic statements. Examination of reviews and essays is useful for understanding the mechanisms of literature evolution and for revealing some mechanism of the inner literary logic, but here we would like to highlight that the author of critical interpretation, despite sometimes being himself a man of letters, distances from the artist. It turns out that the writer or the poet and the literary critic or professional theorists play different roles in the whole process: the last represents the image of the ideal reader who is open to some extent to interpretations. On the other hand, programmatic texts such as declarations and manifestos prepared by poets and writers themselves are accepted as important genres of literary work, specific literary facts which help us to make a reconstruction of that what is called the author's intention.

Here we use the term *literary fact* elaborated by Yury N. Tynyanov in the essay *About Literary Fact* published in issue №2(6), 1924, of the *LEF* journal. The scholar starts his article by asking rather provocative questions about the nature of literature per se and the nature of the genre. Tynyanov continues showing the vagueness character of the notion of literature saying that, in contrast to mathematics, the literary theory deals with always transforming facts constructing together the development of the analyzed system. He illustrates this difficulty of giving unambiguous identifications of literary terms attempting to identify the genre of narrative poem (*poema*) on the examples of Alexander S. Pushkin's texts traditionally identified as narrative poems. The diachronous observation shows that the poems called *poemas* in the case of Pushkin's texts were accepted not as standard examples of the genre, but on the contrary, as exceptions to the rule:

All the revolutionary essence of Pushkin's *poema* 'Ruslan and Lyudmila' lay in the fact that it was a non-*poema* <...> This claimant to the genre of the heroic *poema* turns put to bea frivolous 'tale' of the eighteenth century, one which, however, makes no excuse for its frivolity; the critics sensed that it was

some kind of an exception to the genre-system<...> the ‘hero’, the ‘character’ in ‘The Prisoner in the Caucasus’, was deliberately created ‘for the critics’, the plot was ‘a tour de force’. And again the critics perceived this an exception to the system, a mistake, and again it was a dislocation of the system. (Tynyanov 2000: 31).

This is a representative situation reflecting the fact that such theoretical constructions as a genre are not constant and the transformation of genre-system could be perceived as some facts of the literature. Only these literary facts constitute the transformation of the literary sphere, while literature per se remains vague as well as the concept of gradual literary evolution. The transformation we use to call evolution has the character of a leap or an explosion which is perceived through certain changes in the system, and these changes are literary facts. Any kind of continuity in culture, according to Tynyanov, is strongly connected with the concepts of literary movement or imitation, while principles of real evolution are “struggle and supplanting” and the evolution turns to be a sum of literary facts. Nom de plume, literary form and genre are some types of literary facts the transformation of which is the process of changing the literary sphere (ТЫНЯНОВ 1924). In this case, we would agree that the notion of an art manifesto as a specific genre being a literary fact is a significant element to study literary and wider – cultural – history.

After accepting the concept of literary fact, it is still needed to find the identification of the notion of genre. For this purpose, let us address specialized dictionaries such as *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literature Terms* (1991) and *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry & Poetics* (2012), *Dictionnaire des Genres et notions littéraires* (1997) and *Dictionnaire des Termes Littéraires* (2005), *The Literature Encyclopedic Dictionary* (1987) and *The Literature Encyclopedia of Terms and Concepts* (2001). Actually, it is needed to say that in all listed sources we find rather extensive definitions which are determined by the very character of analyzing entity – quite in all dictionary entries we find words about the absence of the only and unequivocal understanding. This situation is quite confusing because the term *genre* is not uncommon in literary critics and the development of the genre theory is usually related to the Antique period, and more specifically to Aristotle and his *Poetics* (around 335 BC). In *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literature Terms* there is an interesting and questioning note about the origins of the word which is described as a “[f]rench term” (Baldic 1990: 90). Strictly speaking, this source is the only one that traces the etymology not to Latin language but to French, which is undoubtedly one of Romance, i.e., Latin based languages; but otherwise, the given explanation corresponds the other dictionaries. Let us cite the definition:

genre [zʁɑ̃ˈʁ], the French term for a type, species, or class of composition. A literary genre is a recognizable and established category of written work employing such common conventions as will prevent readers or audience from mistaking it for another kind (Ibidem).

The emphasis of the ambiguity of the term is made in the dictionary entry written by Max Cavitch for *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry & Poetics* (2012). This ambiguity of understanding and hence usage becomes capable of explanation due to the diachronic approach which shows that the notion of genre is historically determined and every literary epoch offers its own genre-system and own sense given to the analyzing notion (quite this idea was the starting point of the mentioned in the previous paragraph essay by Tynyanov). A literary genre is a construction or a model used to create a literary piece, and so there is a problem regarding relationships between genre and individual novelty; this issue of taxonomy the author wittily estimates as “chicken-or-egg squabble” which reflects “the human appetite for classification” (Cavitch 2012: 551). On the other hand, the intention to categorize anything seems to be rather natural: “Classifications map the world” (Perkins 1992: 61). The issues concerning the attitude toward creating taxonomies David Perkins explains with the heterogeneity of features accepted as distinctive, in most of the classifications we deal with one of following usually unelected factors: tradition, ideology, aesthetic convention, subjective allegiances and antipathies of the classificatory, quest for a career and institutional power, any sort of “similarities that the literary historian observes between authors and/or texts” (Ibidem: 69). So, the genre is perceived as a category of classification, while at the basis of this classification there might be the criterion of semantics, pragmatics, style, form, length of the text, etc. In chosen French sources, there is a well-marked focus on two basic approaches to studying genres: the first one, which we suppose is diachronic, involves the examination of fixed genres and attempting to trace the ways certain genres transformed during cultural history; and the second one which lays in the sphere of pragmatics and deals with the author-reader relationships, and conventionality (Schaeffer 1997, Van Corp et al. 2005c). Genre is a specific flexible model changing under the influence both of literary and non-literary factors, while one of the main generic functions is to give the reader ability to identify the text and to embed it in the relevant customary system:

<...> [les] déterminations, qui permettent au récepteur d'identifier l'œuvre comme exemple s'un type d'acte communicationnel spécifique (ou, dans le cas d'une œuvre fictive, comme imitation ludique d'un tel type), relèvent de conventions constituantes, en ce sens qu'en leur absence il n'y a pas de communication : elles instaurent l'œuvre comme signe verbal et sont l'objet d'un choix obligatoire en amont de la réalité textuelle proprement dite (Schaeffer 1997: 341).

<...> [the] determinations allowing the receiver to identify the artwork as an example of a certain type of communicative act (or in the case of fiction literature, as a gaming imitation of such type) come under constituent convention; the absence of the determinations means that there is no communication. These determinations establish the artwork as a verbal sign and an option to be chosen within actual textual reality.

The uncertainty of the notion of genre is given explicitly in Russian encyclopedias. According to *The Literature Encyclopedia of Terms and Concepts*, a literary genre (*žanr*) might be accepted as a designation of proper artwork within the frames of always historically determined literary canon or as a logically constructed model of certain artwork made by a certain author and in certain circumstances (Кожевников, Николаев 1987с, Николюкин 2001с). In the encyclopedic entry in *The Literature Encyclopedic Dictionary*, we find a reference to the notion which seems to be untranslatable, i. e., the concept of a genre (*žanr*) is accepted in some sense as secondary to the concept of literary form or kind (*rod*) traditionally associated with Aristotelian tradition to distinguish epic poetry, lyric poetry, and drama, while genres per se are allocated from each of these three forms. In the *Russian National Corpus*, we find the following parallel contexts reflecting this case:

If you bear this in memory you will see that art necessarily divides itself into three forms progressing from one to the next. These forms are: the lyrical form, the form wherein the artist presents his image in immediate relation to himself; the epical form, the form wherein he presents his image in mediate relation to himself and to others; the dramatic form, the form wherein he presents his image in immediate relation to others. [James Joyce. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (1917) | Джеймс Джойс. Портрет художника в юности (Мария Богословская, 1976)].

Если не забывать об этом, то неизбежно придешь к выводу, что искусство делится на три последовательно восходящих рода: лирику, где художник создает образ в непосредственном отношении к самому себе; эпос, где образ дается в опосредствованном отношении к себе или другим; и драму, где образ дается в непосредственном отношении к другим. [James Joyce. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (1917) | Джеймс Джойс. Портрет художника в юности (Мария Богословская, 1976)].

The issue of the emergence of this division seems interesting. Within the frames of literary criticism written in the Russian language, and moreover, etymologically the word *genre* which is a derivate from Latin *genus* (*birth, origin, sort, type*) and the word *rod* connected with the verb *roždat'* (*to give birth, to create*) have the same meaning. There is a suggestion that in Russian and then Soviet philological traditions, this distinction was consolidated with the name of Vissrion G. Belinsky (Хализев 2004), and precisely with his essay *The Division of Poetry into Genus and Species* (*Razdeleinie poezii na rody i vidy*) written in 1841 and inspired by Georg Hegel's *Lectures on Aesthetics* (1835). In German text, the term *der Gattung* (*genre*) is used to describe literary classification, and it is also applied to biological taxonomy in the sense of *genus*. Making a comparison between the original text of Hegel's *Lectures*, its English and Russian translations we find the following correlations:

1. *der Gattung* — *rod* (*kind*) — *kind/genre*
<...> mit einigen Bemerkungen über die historische Entwicklung dieser Gattung [die lyrische Poesie] der Poesie schließen (Hegel 2022). — <...> закончить некоторыми замечаниями об историческом

развитии этого поэтического рода [*rod*] (Гегель 1971: 494). — <...> we end with a few remarks on the historical development of this kind of poetry (Hegel :1112).

Die Gattungsunterschiede der Poesie. (Hegel 2022). — Различия родов [*rod*] поэзии (Гегель 1971: 620). — The Different Genres of Poetry (Hegel 1975: x).

2. *die Art – vid (species) – kind*

<...> die Arten angeben, welche aus dem allgemeinen Begriff der lyrischen Darschtellung hervorgehen (Hegel 2022). — <...> указать виды [*vid*], которые вытекают из общего понятия лирического изображения (Гегель 1971: 510). — <...> mention the kinds of lyrical portrayal which emanate from its essential nature (Hegel 1975:1129).

3. *die Art – žanr (species) – kind*

<...> die Verzweigung der verschiedenen Arten, zu denen die Lyrik, welche überhaupt die Besonderheit und Vereinzelung des Inhalts und seiner Formen zum Prinzip hat, sich auszubreiten vermag (Hegel 2022). — <...> разветвленное многообразие жанров [*žanr*], которая может дать лирика, поскольку принципом ее вообще является обособление и дробление содержания и его форм (Гегель 1971:509–510). — <...> the different kinds of into which lyric can expand, since it has as its principles the individualizing and particularizing of its subject-matter and its form (Hegel 1975:1129).

As we see, German *der Gattung* is translated as *rod*, while the word *die Art* corresponds to Russian *vid* and *žanr*, the first one has more broad usage and the second one is more common in the sphere of culture. So, there is a temptation to say that the emergence of the division of poetry into big groups *rod* and then into more small categories called *žanr* or *vid* is due to Belinsky himself, however, technically that is not entirely true. The point is that Belinsky did not have sought to institutionalize the words *rod* and *vid* as strict terms and that is why in the mentioned article the broad usage of the entity *rod* could be noticed:

Вообще нужно заметить, что ода, этот средний род между гимном или дифирамбом и песнею, тоже мало свойственен нашему времени <...> (Белинский 1948: 47).

Actually, it should be noticed that the ode, the middle kind [*rod*] between the hymn and the song, is also not common in our time <...>

Here the author uses the word *rod* usually denoting a more general classification of poetry into epic poetry, lyric poetry, and drama instead of the word *vid* (*žanr*) corresponding to narrower classes in each of the kinds. As discussed in the extract the ode, the hymn, and the song are quite these narrow groups related to epic poetry, and in this case, these taxons should be named with the entity *vid* or *žanr* but not with the word *rod* as it happened. The fact that in the 19th century these notions were not used as exact terms is well illustrated in the article by Vladimir Zakharov who reviews the main theoretical essays written in Russian and dedicated to the problem of *rod – žanr* relationships, and he makes several interim conclusions about the way these words obtained the status of terms and the issue concerned constructing an unequivocal taxonomy. Thus, *žanr* acts as a species concept in relation to the more general concept of *rod* (Захаров 1984).

To conclude, we would like to say that in this work we would speak about all figured meanings and for being clear we would use the term genre more common in English-speaking criticism, and when there is a special need to designate genre in a broad sense (*rod*) the word *kind* would be used. Notably, the term kind is known within the English-speaking tradition, which is reflected in David Duff's description of the key concepts in the compilation *Modern Genre theory* (2000). The author characterizes the word as "an archaic term for genre" which was more common in Renaissance literature critics passionate about modeling and structurization, but which was replaced with the descriptive composition *species of composition* by the critics of the 18th century and then with the term *genre* in the literary theory discourse of the 20th century (Duff 2000: xiv-xv).

2. Theories of Genre

Having in some sense figured out the issue concerning terms and the ways they are used in several scholarly traditions we would like to move toward a more conceptual understanding of the notion of genre. Traditionally, genology as a specific part of literary studies has its origins in Antiquity. As was already mentioned, the practice of literary genre taxonomy was elaborated by Aristotle in his treatise *On the Art of Poetry* (4 century BC) conventionally called the *Poetics*. The underlying concept for this classification is understanding the nature of art as mimetic mechanisms, and concerning this imitation, there is a classification of arts by its means, the object and the mode:

Epic poetry and Tragedy, as also Comedy, Dithyrambic poetry, and most flute-playing and lyre-playing, are all, viewed as a whole, modes of imitation. But at the same time they differ from one another in three ways, either by a difference of kind in their means, or by differences in the objects, or in the manner of their imitations (Aristotle 1952: 681).

Strictly speaking, when we deal with genres (kinds) taxonomy, we mostly pay attention only to the last criterion, while the first helps to classify different species of arts such as poetry, music, sculpture, etc., the second criterion seems to be the least elaborated and deals with the ethical evaluation of the object of imitation. In the sense Aristotle talks about the mode of mimesis, this characteristic is applied just for verbal imitation of actions, i. e., for poetry. Thus, in the case of Antique literature, there are forms of epic poetry where the narrator is not an element of the sequence of narrated events; the other form is fully about subjectivity and where the image of the lyrical subject becomes the central figure; and the last form which imitates the sequence of events with no clear focus on the narrator or the lyrical subject (Ibidem). In *Poetics*, Aristotle provides as examples lots of authors and texts, and so it feels that the treatise has a

rather descriptive than prescriptive character, but nevertheless, this became the text acting as precedent and even a model to theorize literature. By saying this we mean that for Aristotle genres or kinds are not strict categories and the thing he tried to elaborate on is to provide the flexible classification of already existing texts allocation some sort of family resemblance, whole further tradition tried to fix the limits of genres with shifting to prescriptive poetics and making attempts to elaborate strict generic features.

Theories of literary genres are an obligatory part of the great majority of poetics both ancient and contemporary. Discussing one of the existed models Tzvetan Todorov draws attention to the very nature of genre and issues concerning possible taxonomies. The object of Todorov's analysis is fantastic literature and he supposes that the word *fantastic* in the collocation *fantastic literature* acts like the definition of the genre, so the goal is to formulate the design principles shared by all texts attributed to fantastic literature. The author continues by elaborating on three main ways to understand the generic nature of a fictional text: the first one is the deductive method to formulate the genre definition on the basis of numerous precedent texts, the second one is more abstract and deals with the holistic classification of literary genres, the third one is ranked as aesthetic approach dealing with the proportion of characteristics of the genre as a model and individual features introduced by particular authorial subject. Regarding this last point, Todorov refers Benedetto Croce's aesthetic theory which might be called anti-generic and which, according to Todorov, in fact, neglects the idea of literary continuity and evolution (Todorov 1972).

In the center of Croce's theory lays the notion of aesthetics determining the production and perception of art in general. Art is described as intuitive knowledge, so real artistic knowledge being intuitive has no limits at all and that is why the very concept of distinguished arts is infeasible, i. e., art having no boundaries cannot be classified into strict types. By criticizing the ideas of art classification, Croce consequently denies the idea of remodeling artistic expressions:

The theory of the limits of the arts was perhaps at the time when it was put forward a beneficial critical reaction against those who believed in the possibility of remodelling one expression into another, as the *Iliad* or *Paradise Lost* into a series of paintings, and indeed held a poem to be of greater or lesser value according as it could or could not be translated into pictures by a painter. But if the rebellion were reasonable and resulted in victory, this does not mean that the arguments employed and the systems constructed for the purpose were sound (Croce 1965: 115).

Thus, according to Croce's anti-generic theory, a genre is a useless abstraction distorting the profound understanding of artistic nature, and the very desire to construct a holistic system of

the artistic kinds he categorically describes as “the greatest triumph of the intellectual error” (Iidem: 35). Strictly speaking, however, the philosopher does not reject classification at all, but he is against any attempt to make a taxonomy. Taxonomy in its turn is a strict scientific system, and, in its center, there should be concrete differential criteria, while the artwork is a result of aesthetic knowledge and the only possible criteria of classification are aesthetic categories that are undefinable in the strict scientific scenes (Ibidem). We suppose that provided anti-generic approach is an interesting way to think about classifications, and it seems that it would be a mistake to say that Croce is an entirely marginal figure, and that rejection of genres is a negligible part of modern theories. Admittedly, there is a tendency to criticize his view explicitly (Todorow 1976, Jauss 1982b, Perkins 1992), while the very idea of rejecting genre as a specific unit is well presented in structuralist works by Gerard Genette and in the deconstructive paradigm of Jacques Derrida, but none of them takes Croce’s aesthetic criteria as the basic one.

For the deconstructive paradigm elaborated by Jacques Derrida, the concept of genre is not more than a language construction showing its inadequacy with a thorough examination. In his essay *The Law of Genre* (1980), the philosopher points out that by naming something a genre the speaking subject constitutes the nature of the named genre and more over describes it as a fixed construction. By announcing something to be a genre, this something immediately turns to be a pure and immutable object. Limiting one genre, the speaking subject distinguishes this genre from another one, then these generic entities differ one from another, and consistent with this logic, each text possesses generic characteristics. Derrida criticizes the normative logic of genericity saying that some texts could not be put within the narrow confines of one taxonomy, this principle of generic “impurity” is called the law of genre:

Every text participates in one or several genres, there is no genreless text; there is always a genre and genres, yet such participation never amounts to belonging. And not because of an abundant overflowing or a free, anarchic and unclassifiable productivity, but because of the *trait* of participation itself, because of the effect of the code and of the generic mark. Making genre its mark, a text demarcates itself. If remarks of belonging belong without belonging, participate without belonging, then genre-designations cannot be simply part of the corpus (Derrida 2000: 230).

Even though anti-generic theories seem interesting from the philosophical point of view, we suppose that admitting such notion as the genre is important if we deal with literary criticisms and established by Derrida the law of genre might be explained within the historical approach. That is why we would like to turn back after that small step aside and continue discussing the notion of genre and its nature based on literary theorists’ works. Despite the complexity of

genre entity well represented in the reviewed concepts, commonly the word genre is associated with rather a rigorous model of genre hierarchy known after prescriptive Renaissance and Classicist poetics. Regarding such understanding and the development of generic hierarchy, Alastair Fowler uses the notions of the kind or the historical genre. In his *Kinds of Literature* (1982), Fowler offers different theoretical approaches used to describe the notion of genre and to build comprehensive structures. His starting point is the fact in the history of literary criticism the concept of the genre was the central element organizing the field of fictional literature and, despite its central role, it was usually taken for granted. This approach is described as traditional but rather narrow due to the quest for elaborating countable characteristics of each genre paying no attention to the fact that definitions of particular genres are not stable throughout the whole literary history, e. g., the characteristics of Shakespeare's tragedy *Hamlet* differs from Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus*, the Italian sonnet differs from English sonnets, etc. The extension of the generic definition is accepted by the author as a more productive approach that needed some modifications. At the center of such broad understanding, there is Dugald Stewart theory of family resemblance in literary texts which was further elaborated by Ludwig Wittgenstein with his understanding of language games compared with games in general. This definition represents a genre as a group of texts having some similarities sharing some similarities called family resemblance; or more precisely, we are talking about some sort of grading scale reflecting rich or poor manifestation of a feature. Such understanding, according to Fowler, considers "the fertility of literary invention" but omits the diachronic aspects reflected in the concept of generic resemblance, i. e., genres as it was mentioned are not stencils but temporally determined construct.

In literature, the basis of resemblance lies in literary tradition. What produces generic resemblances, reflection soon shows, is tradition: a sequence of influence and imitation and inherited codes connecting works in the genre. As kinship makes a family, so literary relations of this sort form a genre (Fowler 1982: 42).

So, the adequate study of genres should always balance between diachronic and synchronic analysis, or between kinds and contemporary for analyzed system genres. The maps of generic systems and hierarchy provided by Fowler and close reading of prescriptive poetics of the past well illustrate that, despite being accepted as something stable, genres are entities in progress and each step of this development characterizes conventions of a particular literary epoche.

As we can conclude, diachronic observations are taken in literary studies as a challenge to theoretical generalization and as a very productive way to analyze genres. This idea is well

illustrated by the works written within the frames of reception-oriented approaches in literary criticism. One of the most famous, however, debatable figures in the reader-response criticism (*Rezeptsästetik*) is Hans Robert Jauss who reconciled Marxist literary scholar and the tradition of formal analysis focusing on immanent features of text. In his key essay *Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory* (1967), the theorist shows the need to observe literary history not only as predetermined shifting aesthetical categories or a sum of literary facts but as a history of literary text reception with putting the figure of reader in the central position. Giving the active role to the reader, the scholar postulates that each text placed in a particular historical and cultural context possesses in advance some reader's expectations which are due to the context per se. These expectations preceding the process of reading and conditioning interpretations are called the horizon of expectation, and each reader or listener (in the case of oral literature) belonging to some context has a specific understanding of a text. The generic characteristic of text acts here as one of the components forming the horizon of expectation (Jauss 1982a). The case study work titled *Theory of Genres and Medieval Literature* (1970) perfectly illustrates the concept due to the distance between medieval and contemporary readers. Jauss shows that the division into three "natural forms of literature" is helpless concerning the medieval tradition of genre allocating with its issue of literariness, thus he prefers renouncing the very term *genre* and turns to speak about groups or historical families of texts:

<...> they [genres] cannot be deduced or defined, but only historically determined, delimited, and described. In this they are analogous to historical languages, for which it likewise holds that German or French, for example, do not allow themselves to be defined, but rather only synchronically described and historically investigated (Jauss 1982b: 80).

There is a possibility to perceive the fact of the shift of literary tradition in terms of alteration or transformation of a presumed horizon of the reader's expectation. As it was already mentioned this concept resonates with the theory of literary facts changing, and it seems that the examples provided by Tynyanov are also can be accepted as a good illustration, while Tynyanov himself insisted on the immanent characteristics of a masterpiece but not on the image of the reader making up the whole system. The scholar argues formalists' commitment to stay within the immanent level of analysis. For Tynyanov the idea of literary evolution is non-linear and has an explosive character, while Jauss uses a vegetative metaphor by making a parallel between Darwinian selection and literary development; the formalists' concept of dominant is accepted by Jauss.

Actually, we can acknowledge that such a historical shift in literary studies, as it is described by Jauss, enriches theoretical generalizations: quite diachronic investigations emphasize the instability of genre boundaries (and understanding the semantic content of the notion of *imaginative literature*) due to analysis of concrete texts written and discussed in particular culture epoches (Орпакі 2000, Аверинцев 1996, Лихачев 1971). The identification of the genre of a text helps, on the one hand, to discover its individuality, and on the other hand, it reflects the whole history of literary evolution. As it was already mentioned, the origins of genre and genres systematization were given within Antiquity and are strongly associated with Aristotle's treatise, albeit there is another tradition that refers to the efforts of Callimachus and other librarians at the Great Library of Alexandria (Colie 2000). Callimachus being himself a Hellenistic poet is also famous for preparing a bibliographical catalog of the library of Alexandria, in his *Pinakes* (3 century BC, now lost) the librarian divided papyrus scrolls into several categories based on thematic organization and author, although there were other criteria of division such as metrical and topical characteristics and even size. It turned out that this kind of literary classification was taken for granted by further Roman tradition. Rosalie Colie in her essay *Genre-Systems and the Functions of Literature* says about this succession the following:

The fact that the *concept* of generic form was taken for granted is more important than any definition of a specific generic norm could ever be, I think Propertius seems to be speaking in thoroughly known categories when he tells us that he left the 'buskin' of Aeschylus for his own 'poems turned on a smaller lathe' – that is, his love-elegies (Ibidem: 1514).

Colie traces the way Greek and Roman literature was accepted by civic humanists who started with imitation of antique templates and ended with elaborating their own principles of new European literature. The scholar describes the Renaissance tradition as large genres oriented because the transfer of antique values was accompanied by the transfer of ancient generic forms. These processes seem to be the reason why vernacular literature was excluded from any classifications for a long time and, according to the author, only at the beginning of the 17th century the first steps to fit vernacular literature with modern systems was made by Pieter Cornelisz Hooft in his *History of Netherlands*. Talking about certain *artes poeticae*, Colie describes the issue concerning mixed genres in literary tradition which are perceived by the scholar as modes of thought. Antique and Renaissance cultures used to deal with separated kinds of art, so appeared the problem of *genus universum*, i. e. general perception of the world, the total kind. Thus, genre, on the one hand, is a format of human thinking and it reflects the connection between literary topics and "treatment within the literary system", but on the other hand, such an entity as genre shows the way literary kinds related the *genus universum* (Ibidem).

We could continue to provide other theories, in so far as genology is an interesting field of study with a quite long history and still being under debate. Although here we would like to stop and make an interim conclusion about the nature of the discussed notion. Hence, if we accept the existence of genres, we can say that genre is a specific historically determined model of (fictional) text, this average model reflects similarities between one text and other texts related to the same genre, but furthermore, it is a model in the process due to possible canonization of initially individual features of the taken text. Traditionally, there are three basic genres, such as epic genres, lyric genres, and dramatic genres; these basic categories are divided into more limited numerous subgroups also called genres. In some literary traditions, these basic literary genres have a special designation (*vid* in Russian, *rodzaj literacki* in Polish, *literárny druh* in Slovak) which differs from the standard designation of smaller groups called genres (*žanr* in Russian, *gatunek literacki* in Polish, *žaner* in Slovak), hence there is the *kind — species* relationships between the basic genres and subgenres. The importance of the genre classification is due to one of the main functions of genres, i. e., they set reader's horizon of expectation, while being in an infinite process of transformation thereby fulfilling the law of the genre. After providing this brief explanation of genre within the frames of fictional literature theory, we would like to move from fictionality to broader understanding.

3. Speech Genres and the Theory of Speech Acts

It seems quite important to observe the concept of the genre also from the linguistic perspective which allows us to look at the (literary) texts as a specific form of message within the communication between the addressing and the addressee. Although we would like to point here not the individual features of such message, characteristics of genres combining various texts under so to say labels corresponding to the names of genres. This extended perception of the genre is provided in Mikhail M. Bakhtin's essay *The Problem of Speech Genres*. The essay was published piecemeal in the issue №1 of the journal *Literary Studies (Literaturnaya Ucheba)* in 1978, and it seems that there is no finished clean copy. The editors of the Complete Works of Bakhtin suppose that draft versions of the text were prepared in mid-1950s and the text per se was oriented toward the contemporary reader who knew about the criticism of Nikolay Y. Marr's Japhetic linguistic theory, Viktor V. Vinogradov's concepts of language stylistics, and emerging Soviet structuralism (Гоготишвили 1997). The main principles of the speech genres theory were set out in the book *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* (1929) where, *inter alia*, the theory of utterance is established. As pointed out by Lyudmila

A. Gogotishvili who is one of the editors of Bakhtin's Complete Works, the word utterance was used as a term, although it did not have a concrete and unambiguous definition and was used by different authors in completely different ways. Traditional for that time understanding of utterance as an entity at the level of *parole* being in parallel with a sentence as an entity of *langue* is not fully accepted by Voloshinov and Bakhtin who insist on the importance of the ideological (social) aspect of the communication:

Utterance, as we know, is constructed between two socially organized persons, and in the absence of a real addressee, an addressee is presupposed in the person, so to speak, of a normal representative of the social group to which the speaker belongs. *The word is oriented toward an addressee*, toward *who* that addressee might be a fellow-member or not of the same social group, of higher or lower standing (the addressee's hierarchical status), someone connected with the speaker by close social ties (father) brother, husband, and so on) or not. There can be no such thing as an abstract addressee, a man unto himself, so to speak. With such a person, we would indeed have no language in common, literally and figuratively (Vološinov 1975: 85).

So, human communication consists of utterances that are separate one from one another and which are semantically complete. The holistic character of utterance lies in the very center of the concept of speech genres, and it seems that the boundaries of an utterance correspond to the boundaries of a particular speech genre.

Now we would like to return to the text of *The Problem of Speech Genre*. The essay is started by criticizing some sort of introversive character of literary studies focused mostly on fictional texts (and here we can remember the issue of *genus universum* described by Colie), while there is a special need to expand the frames and to look at the notion of the genre from the linguistic point of view. Such a shift is reasonable because all literary texts share verbal or language nature and so there is a possibility to combine literary and non-literary verbal texts to figure out more general mechanisms of genre being. Language, as we already mentioned, exists in forms of individual utterances, no matter oral or written, and these utterances are not absolutely unique, but they reflect specific conditions of human communication and the goals of the speaking subject by having particular content and linguistic style of the given utterance per se. Bakhtin describes the notion of linguistic style as a process of selection of lexical and grammar expressions, but not less important is the selection of compositional structure. So, every written or pronounced utterance consists of the chosen topic (content), linguistic style, and compositional structure. And then the author proposes the term *speech genre* which refers to the understanding of "relatively stable type of utterances".

Bakhtin is quite radical in speaking about the distinguishing all the utterances into primary (simple) and secondary (complex) speech genres, where the first ones relate simple phrases of

general everyday communication (such as rejoinders of everyday dialogues, everyday narration, all kinds of comments, commands, etc.) and the second ones constitute absorbed and interconnected primary genres which lost the link to extralinguistic circumstances.

The difference between primary and secondary (ideological) genres is very great and fundamental, but this is precisely why the nature of the utterance should be revealed and defined through analysis of both types. Only then can the definition be adequate to the complex and profound nature of the utterance (and encompass its most important facets). A one-sided orientation toward primary genres inevitably leads to a vulgarization of the entire problem (behaviorist linguistics is an extreme example). The very interrelations between primary and secondary genres and the process of the historical formation of the latter shed light on the nature of the utterance (and above all on the complex problem of the interrelations among language, ideology, and world view) (Bakhtin 2000: 85).

In the article *The Outstanding Issues in the Theory of Speech Genres* (1997), Mikhail Y. Fedosyuk highlights the existence and more or less discussed parallel between the Bakhtinian speech genres and the descriptive linguistic theory of speech acts proposed by John Austin and further elaborated by John Searle at the mid of the 20th century. This theory depicts the process of verbal expression as a process composed of three distinctive phases having specific purposes; these are locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act. Locutionary component is a component that refers to the production of meaningful sentences which means the choice of entities and their pronunciation, locution is strongly connected with the idea of sense and *word* — *world* reference, so talking about this phase we deal with the cognitive component of speech. The next is the illocutionary phase which relates to the intention and aims of the speaking subject, illocution is due to illocutionary force of the utterance where this force is the aims and modes of speaking. The perlocutionary act is about the expected impact on the addressee (Austin 1962). Let us provide an example from the handbook by George Yule who proposes the phrase “I have just made some coffee”; locution component is the very fact of verbalization, illocutionary component is the intention of pronounces phase like statement, explanation, offer or anyone else aim, and the perlocution effect which is to recognize the intended impact may be in paying attention to the coffee smell or in the hearer’s decision to join the speaker to drink coffee, etc. (Yule 1996).

Strictly speaking, Austin focuses on the second of the components, i. e., on the illocution considering performative verbs pronouncing which the speaker at the same time performs an action. Initially, Austin’s hypothesis that at the level of illocution we may distinguish constatives which just describe the status quo and can be measured from the point of validity, while performatives cannot be described via this criterion due to their strong connection with the actions performed by the speaker at the very time of pronunciation. Then the philosopher

proposes a very general list of performative illocutionary utterances: 1) the verdictives, 2) the exercives, 3) the commissives, 4) the behabitives and 5) the expositives. The verdictives, such as *to acquit, to convict, to grade* at al. express a verdict “by a jury, arbitrator or umpire”; exercives resemble verdictives but differ due to the authoritative status of the speaking subject, so the exercives “are exercising of powers, rights or influence”; the commissives are to make the hearer commit an action, “but include also declarations or announcements of intention, which are not promises”; the behabitives in Austin’s conception are like etiquette form regulating social behavior; the last ones are the expositives which are “difficult to define” and which are used to structure the utterance. We would like to point out one more time to the fact that provided classification is not estimated as a strict class, hence there are several complexities in making one hundred percent division. Thus says Austin concerning his classification:

The last two classes are those which I find most troublesome, and it could well be that they are not clear or are cross-classified, or even that some fresh classification altogether is needed. I am not putting any of this forward as in the very last definitive. Behabitatives are troublesome because they seem to miscellaneous altogether: and expositives because they are enormously numerous and important, and seem both to be included in other classes and at the same time to be unique in a way that I have no succeeded in making clear even to myself. It could well be said that all aspects are present in all my classes (Austin 1962: 151).

Further development of the theory of speech acts was made by Austin’s student Searle in the work *A Classification of Illocutionary Acts* (1976). Searle highlights quite an important problem which was in some sences omitted in his teacher’s examination, *viz.* the intuitive association of illocutionary speech acts with types of illocutionary verbs, so provided by Austin list of illocutionary acts technically is a classification of English illocutive verbs. That is why Austin’s classes are not approved by Searle who also points out Austin’s inconsistent categorization, and then Searle proposes his own classification consisting of the declarations, the representatives, the expressives, the directives, and the commissives. Based on this article Yule creates a small table (Yule 1996: 55) which is quite representative, in that regard we would like to align the table accompanying it with comments.

Speech act type	Direction of fit	S = speaker X = situation
Declarations	words change the world	S causes X
Representatives	make words fit the world	S believes X
Expressives	make words fit the world	S feels X
Directives	make the world fit words	S wants X
Commissives	make the world fit words	S intends X

The first of the classes is the declarations that are strongly connected with extralinguistic circumstances, i. e., the performance of declaratives brings the propositional content of the utterance close to reality. In other words, performing a successful declaration the speaking subject changes the world via words. That seems notable that, according to the author, the verbs usually associated with declarations may also act as indicators of the representatives. The aim of the representatives is to fix the speaker's responsibility for given information, so concerning the declarations, we are able to talk about the validity of the statement.

[The possibility to overlap the representatives and the declarations] is because in certain institutional situations we not only ascertain the facts but we need an authority to lay down a decision as to what the facts are after the fact-finding procedure has been gone through (Searle 1976: 15).

The next class is the expressives and their aim is to state the feelings and emotions of the speaker, they can be caused either by the speaker's or by the hearer's actions, although expressives are always about the feelings of the first of them. The illocutionary point of the directives is the expression of the speaker's will to make the addressee perform an action, among directives Searle points the commands, the orders, the suggestions, etc. The last of the listed groups is the commissives reflection of the speaker's intention to do something, Searle accepts the understanding of commissives provided by Austin (Ibidem). Strictly speaking, this classification of speech acts is also based on the typology of language propositions, although Searle himself insists on the principal absence of equality between illocutionary acts and the meaning of the proposition.

Fedosyuk in the mentioned earlier article compares these theories and concludes by saying that speech genre is a more text-oriented concept, while speech acts are more focused on the extralinguistic situation, and this focus is well perceived due to Austin's and Searle's keen interest in performatives directly connected with real circumstances of the communicative situation. It is noteworthy that in contrast with the theory of speech acts, Bakhtin's concept allows to investigate more the nature of utterances and human communication in general, whereas Austin discusses separate rejoinders mostly revolving around predicates (for this Austin's theory was also criticized by Searle). Indeed, the Bakhtinian theory does not provide developed terminological apparatus due to its draft character and the theory of speech acts is stricter and more scientific. The Bakhtinian communicative intention is in parallel with the more accepted illocutionary goal of the speaking subjects, although the illocutive goal is not the only component forming illocutionary force (Федосюк 1997).

An attempt to allocate other elements of illocutionary force is made by Shmelyova within her concept of the profile of speech act expressed in her articles *The Speech Act. Capacity of Description and Application in Language Instruction* (1990) and the more concise *The Model of Speech Genre* (1997). The author starts by describing the intuitively comprehensible for all speakers understanding of the notion of speech genre (although strictly speaking, this intuitiveness has an illusionary character), then there comes a statement elaborated by Bakhtin about the genre reflection inherent to linguistic personalities. Shmelyova accepts the Bakhtinian understanding of speech acts as models of utterances, and so, the investigation of them may be continued in two dimensions, i. e., in the taxonomy of all types of speech acts and in the realization of certain speech acts in human communication. According to the linguist, the profile of speech acts consists of six substantive and one formal point: 1) the communicative goal, 2) the image of the author (speaker), 3) the image of the addressee, 4) the image of the past and 5) the visions of the future, 6) the dictum (event-related) component, 7) the linguistic embodiment.

Now let us review them in detail starting with the constitutive characteristic of speech acts, viz. the communicative goal which reflects the intention of the speaker. At the level of communicative intention, Shmelyova distinguishes 1) the informative which is focused on all operations the speaker makes with information (demanding information, accepting or disavowing it, etc.); 2) the imperative which makes the hearer do something; 3) the etiquette aiming to implement any action within social sphere of communication implying some etiquette norms of human interaction (these are the forms of apologizing, expressions of gratitude or felicitations, etc.); and 4) the estimate utterances aiming to relate actions the communicants to a common scale of values. The next of the mentioned points is the image of the speaker reflected in certain speech act, Shmeleva does not provide the holistic classification. In the article published in 1990 there are several sub-groups concerning the image and the function of the author: the first characteristic reflects the way the image of the speaking subject related to his performative role (whether the speaker makes the hearer perform some actions, or he promises to perform himself, or there is about coercion of the speaker and the addressee); the next characteristic concerns the speaker's responsibilities (whether he has power or not); from the point of the speaker's motivation Shmelyova distinguishes requests and advises; the next author's characteristic is persistence – caution (cf. the following rejoinders *Could you please call him to phone?* and *I charge him to complete the instruction in ten days*); and the last described criterion is the speaker's diplomacy – categoricalness (cf. the utterance *Could you,*

please, give us a second? with the phrase *Get out of here immediately!*). Hence, every speech act reflects an image of the speaker, even if it is expressed implicitly. The next characteristic of speech acts concerns the image of the recipient or the image of the addressee, which is connected, according to Shmelyova, with the communicative intention of the speaker and the social relationships between the speaker and the hearer. Two other characteristics are about the images of the past due to the connection of one utterance with the previous, and the image of the future related to the perlocutionary effect of the communication (in terms of Austin). The dictum parameter reflects the requirements of the genre for the object of communication and its complexity, e. g. a novel implies a chain of events, while an apology is mostly about one event. And finally, the last of the listed parameters is the linguistic embodiment of the speech genre where we deal with intonation and modes of expression (Шмелева 1990, 1997).

After observing the profile of speech acts, we would like to point out that this modeling might be linked to the concept of the horizon of expectations proposed by Jauss and described in the previous sub-chapter. While Jauss talks about some models existing in the head of the reader placed in specific cultural circumstances, Shmelyova following Bakhtinian ideas talks about the model of primary speech genres used to build secondary genres, such as literary text.

4. Genres of Programmatic texts

The objects of our examination are programmatic texts manifesting certain literary groups and unions that emerged in the early 20th century. At the first glance, there is a one-way connection between art development and the appearance of aesthetic manifestos used to describe the development, although the situation is more complex. The period of the first third of the 20th century well illustrates that the relationships between creating a program self-establishing text and doing artistic praxis may be very different: of course, there are texts made to form the horizon of the reader's expectation and which precede publishing belle lettres, while there are also manifestos written after the literary praxis was elaborated and the author became recognizable, and there are some examples showing that a programmatic text is a high-priority issue whereas there are no accompanying texts realizing the program. Even though there is no real literature practice after formulation of the main principles of the artistic process according to an author or a group, declarations and manifestoes are representative to studying the inner mechanisms of individual literature evolution and the place where authors of such texts pose themselves in the sphere of actual cultural life.

Once we pointed out the role of artistic declarations and manifestoes in the literature process, we would like to turn to the observation of the constitutive characteristics common to such programmatic texts. Firstly, there is a need to list the genres accepted as programmatic texts, to do this we address the compilation *Literary Manifestos: From Symbolism to the "October"* (1924) created by Nikolay L. Brodsky and Nikolay P. Sidorov. That is important to say that this source was chosen not only because of the fact of programmatic text compilation but also because it helps to understand the model of programmatic texts formed by "the long 1920s". This brochure seems to be a representative sample showing what sort of texts were accepted as literary manifestos by 1924 (let us remind that the OBERIU programmatic text published in 1927) and – rigorously – if there is only one model or there are several so to say subgenres of the aesthetic manifesto. Here it is important to make one another remark about the texts analyzed within this work: we take only genre-specified texts which means that the genre status should be indicated by the authors creating the text in the title or in the body of the text, and it does not matter if the indicated genre is unique (like the charter, the oath construction, and the percept) or not. To figure out the model of such self-establishing statements we create tables given in the appendix. We proceed from the fact that an aesthetic manifesto is a specific message given by an artist to a recipient, and so, to understand its functions and aims we should identify the images of the addressee and addresser, describe its formal characteristic and structure, to list keywords. Analysis of the compilation *Literary Manifestos: From Symbolism to the "October"* show that that most of statements are labeled as declarations (*The Declaration of Zaum Language*, the imaginalists' *Declaration*, *Almost a Declaration*, *The Declaration Luminist*, *The Declaration of Formlibrism*, *The Declaration of the Neoclassics*, *The Declaration of Emotionalism*, *The Declaration of the Writers' Union "Literaturnyj Front"*, *The Declaration of the Proletarian Writers "Kusnitsa"*), manifestos are few in number (*The Manifesto of Psycho-Futurism*, *The Manifesto from Nichevoki*), other texts has unique genre identification such as charter (*The Charter Expressionists*), decree (*The Decree about Nitschevoki of Poetry*), oat construction (*The Oath Construction of the Poets-constructivist*), percepts (*The Percepts of Symbolism*), platform (*The Ideological and Artistic platform of the group "Oktyabr"*), proclamation (*The Proclamation of Luminism*), program (*The LEF Program*), resolution (*The resolution at the First All-Russian Conference of the Proletarian Cultural-Educational organizations suggested by A. Bogdanov*) and thesis (*The Ways of Ptoletarian Art*). Although it is a mix-up situation when the title provides one genre identification and in the body of the texts or in remarks another genre label is given: *The Oath Construction of the Poets-constructivist* actually turns to be a declaration, and the imaginalists'

Declaration is also described by its authors as a manifesto – these characteristics are also mentioned in the tables, and this confusion is significant because it reflects, on the one hand, the closeness of the discussed concepts, and on the other hand, the label oat construction used instead of manifesto illustrates the desire to be unique, to be the first in the new sphere, i. e., to be in the artistic avant-garde.

To figure out the system forming characteristics of the listed genres, we address the *Oxford Paperback Dictionary* providing definitions of genre titles. Let us list all the definitions:

charter n. **1** a document granted by a ruler or government, by which an institution such as university is created or its rights are defined (Soanes 2001: 139).

precept /pree-sept/ n. a general rule about how to behave or what to think (Ibidem: 694)

declaration n. **1** a formal statement or announcement (Ibidem 223).

manifesto n. (pl. **manifestos**) a public declaration of the policy and aims of a group such as a political party (Ibidem: 544).

platform n. <...> **4** the stated policy of a political party (Ibidem: 675).

programme (US program) n. <...> **4** a sheet or booklet giving details about a play, concert, etc. (Ibidem: 708)

resolution n. <...> **2** a formal expression of opinion or intention by a law-making body (Ibidem: 764).

thesis /thee-siss/ n. (pl. **theses** /thee-seez/) **1** a statement or theory put forward to be supported or provided (Ibidem: 944).

The word *proclamation* is absent, but being a derivate from the verb *to proclaim*, it can be defined in the base of the verb's semantics:

proclaim v. **1** announce officially or publicly. **2** declare (someone) officially or publicly to be (Ibidem: 706).

We suppose that there is a possibility to combine these generic names into two groups due to the illocutionary aims, one is the declaration where we put the declaration per se, the platform, the proclamations, and the thesis; and the another is the manifesto uniting the charter, the percept, the manifesto per se, the program. To reflect the differences based on texts from the compilation we also provide two tables where a sort of genres profiles are described.

To find clearer definitions of the terms *declaration* and (*artistic*) *manifesto* in literary studies we address specialized materials. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literature Terms* (1991), the fourth edition of *The Penguin Dictionary of Literature Terms and Literature Theory* (1999), *A New Handbook of Literature Terms* (2007), the fourth edition of *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry & Poetics* (2012), *Literatura Polska XX Wieku. Przewodnik encyklopedyczny* (2000) prepared by the PWN *The Literature Encyclopedic Dictionary* (1987) edited by Vadim M. Kozhevnikov and Piotr A. Nikolaev, and *The Literature Encyclopedia of Terms and Concepts* (2001) edited by Aleksander N. Nikolyukin were taken as basic sources for this reviewing. It turned out that the term *declaration* is missing in all listed sources, while the notion of the *manifesto* is missing only in *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literature Terms* and in *A New Handbook of Literature Terms*. The entry dedicated to the entity *manifesto* in *The Penguin Dictionary of Literature Terms and Literature Theory* is quite concise, so we would like to cite the definition:

manifesto (L *manu festus*, ‘struck with hand’) A public declaration, usually of political, religious, philosophical or literature principles and beliefs. Literature movements are also given to publish manifestos. For instance, Wyndham Lewis’s *Blast: The Review of the Great English Vortex* (1914–15), a manifesto for Vorticism (*q.v.*), and André Breton’s *Manifeste du surréalisme* (1924) (Cuddon 1999e: 490).

As can be seen, John A. Cuddon takes the word *sensu lato*, i.e., the entity *manifesto* acts as a hypernym for all kinds of declarations regardless of the sphere of its functioning and form of expression accepted by the author of the statement. A more extensive definition of the notion *manifesto* is given in *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry & Poetics* (2012), in the corresponding article written by Mary A. Caws. The author highlights that usually *manifesto* is accepted as an umbrella term for different forms of public self-positioning, while there is a special need to make distinguish between political declarations and aesthetic manifestos that are “of course, modeled on the political [manifestos]” (Caws 2012: 842). Aesthetic manifesto in its turn is perceived as a specific genre that has revolutionary nature due to its main function, to make someone new visible in the field of cultural life:

As the heights of aesthetic movements, the manifesto is common as an insistence on what is new about the movement one wants to celebrate, what is opposes and casts off, and what it would like to do now (Ibidem).

The author continues claiming that for this genre the collective character of declared statements comes to the fore and that “I”-speak is not a common mode of expression, although the literature process possesses some exceptional examples. Generally, in this dictionary entry, the author does not reconstruct the whole history of aesthetic manifestos but highlights that the flourishing of such texts – articles and poems as well as painting-manifestos – is a substantial characteristic

of the 20th-century culture. “A great movement of manifesto-madness” if we use M. A. Caws’ words starts with the publication of the *Manifesto del Futurismo* (the *Futurist Manifesto*) in 1909 (Ibidem). A brief overview of the emergence and further development is made in *The Literature Encyclopedia of Terms and Concepts* (2001) where the description of the studied concept may be divided into two blocs: the first and rather brief part provides information about the term, while the second one shows in detail the general line of manifestos emergence and development. Here we would like to focus on the definition per se. Before quoting the description, we would like to pay attention that the text in this definition part is approximately the same text we can find in the corresponding dictionary entry in the earlier published *Literature Encyclopedic Dictionary* (1987).

МАНИФЕСТЫ ЛИТЕРАТУРНЫЕ – программные высказывания об эстетических принципах литературного направления, течения, школы. Термин М.л. вошел в обиход в 19 в.; он условен, весьма широк, применим к целому ряду явлений – от развернутых деклараций до эстетических трактатов, статей, предисловий, программных стихотворений поэтов <...> Нередко М.л. и реальное содержание литературной школы не совпадают [выделение – Ю. Т.]. В целом М.л. — результат оживленной общественной жизни, отражающей напряженные идейно-художественные поиски и процесс формирования новой литературы (Кожевников, Николаев 1987с: 496).

LITERARY MANIFESTOS are program statements about aesthetic principles of literary movement and literature school. The term literature manifesto came into use in the 19th century; this term is very broad and applies to a number of phenomena – from extensive declarations to treatise on aesthetics, essays, prefaces, program poems written by poets <...> Quite often literature manifesto do not match real principles of a literary school [our emphasis]. Generally, literature manifesto is a result of vibrant social life, it reflects tense ideological and artistic quests, and the process of formatting new literature.

We make here an emphasis “[q]uite often literature manifesto do not match real principles of a literary school” to point out that in this tradition manifestos are perceived also as a kind of fictional literary text which corresponds to the principles applied toward poetics: when the text is finished, it separates from the author and starts its own life, its functions may be changed during the reading and interpreting processes. Initially, we supposed that programmatic texts, such as declarations and aesthetic manifestos, are just a frame within which the poet creates, just some sort of self-description which can be replaced by the new credo when the self-identification is changed. Although now it turns that the relationships between program statements and poetics reveal the essence of literary development, it is now a one-sided movement, but the manifesto establishes the frames of poetics and the fictional literature being the process of gaining experience transforms the artist, and there for his or her self-positioning.

Concerning the very frame of the literary manifesto as it is given in the mentioned dictionaries, we should say repeat that the very word is accepted as an umbrella term for all forms of self-

establishing, the power of the cultural game is important enough and that is why discussing literary programmatic texts we face examples of stylization:

MANIFEST LITERACKI, forma publicystyki pisarskiej, wypowiedź głosząca konieczność zmiany aktualnego system norm i ocen artyst., inicjująca nowy kierunek lub postulująca odrodzenie starych teorii sztuki <...> Styl m.l. łączy często elementy prozy dyskursywnej, wyznania lirycznego i satyry; liryzm cechuje fragmenty poświęcone procesowi twórczemu, satyra pojawia się w partiach polemicznych ("czarno-biały" schemat wartości, karykatura, hiperbola itp.). Istotną rolę odgrywa tu stylizacja: m.l. stylizuje się np. na traktat z poetyki (T. Peiper *Metafora terażniejszości* 1922, J.M. Rymkiewicz *Czym jest klasycyzm?* 1963), naśladuje orędzie polit. (B. Jasiński *Do narodu polskiego...* 1921), nawiązuje do piśmiennictwa filoz. (S. Przybyszewski *Confiteor* 1899); stylizowany na odę (np. J. Przyboś *Więcej o manifest* 1962) – stawia znak równości między sztuką i teorią sztuki. (Balcerzan 2000).

LITERARY MANIFESTO, a form of publicistic writing, a statement announcing the need to change the current system of norms and artistic assessments, initiating a new direction or postulating the revival of old theories of art <...> Style of l.m. often combines elements of discursive prose, lyrical confession and satire; lyricism is characterized by fragments devoted to the creative process, satire appears in polemical parts ("black and white" scheme of values, caricature, hyperbola, etc.). The stylization plays an important role here: l.m. looks like the treatise on poetics T. Peiper *Metafora terażniejszości* 1922, J.M. Rymkiewicz *Czym jest klasycyzm?* 1963), it imitates the political message. (B. Jasiński *Do narodu polskiego...* 1921), refers to the writings of philosophers. (S. Przybyszewski *Confiteor* 1899); it is stylized as an ode (eg. J. Przyboś *Więcej o manifest* 1962) – l.m. equates art with the theory of art (Balcerzan 2000).

To continue the analysis of the texts from the compilation *Literary Manifestos: From Symbolism to the "October"*, we would like also to pay attention to the connection between the type of programmatic text and the character of the group which elaborated on this text. By this, we mean that the poetic groups having a strong orientation toward novelty and trying to be in the vanguard of art life tend to express themselves in a form of the manifesto (futurisms, imaginism, expressionism, nothingists), while poets who are less radical (luminism, neoclassicism, proletarian poetry, emotionalism et al.) tend to express their ideas in declarations having no specific addressee. While declarations just fix the status quo, manifestos are to change this status and to implement art in life which is, according to Bürger, the main goal of avant-garde art (Bürger 1984: 51). Maybe it is possible to say that the very intention to get rid of numerous institutions and to return art back to the common social life requires some sort of radicality because this return cannot be seamless. Producing a manifesto is a gesture or a sign whose content is subject to the idea of the new in art and the idea of the "New First Unexpected" in general, and quite the image of the novelty differs several art groups and unions.

The model of aesthetic declaration elaborated after some texts were analyzed is the following: poetic declarations written in early Soviet period are usually rather long texts (an average number of words in declaration texts is 654,2 words) which set out main ideas in separate items, and that is why the sentences are long enough (the average number is 19,3), the most common speech acts are constatives, declaratives and representatives, the most used verbal mood is the

indicative mood, the speaking subject might be not presented explicitly in the texts but also the sender might be represented as an inclusive group which is reflected by the usage of the pronoun “we” and the second person plural verbal forms, declaration as a message does not have an explicitly expressed addressee which means that addressers supposed to send their messages for everybody, the most common words in the analyzed declarations are *art, creativity, material, new, proletarian, own, word, form, main, life, law, class*.

On the other hand, the model of poetic manifesto is the following: aesthetic manifestos are a little longer than standard declarations (an average quantity of words is 845,8 words), the text of manifesto is a number of connected logically organized ideas, the sentences are also quite long (an average number is 16,4 words per sentence), in contrast with declarations, poetic manifestos are expressive texts and the role of the recipient is important which is reflected in the fact that in manifestos the imperative and optative verbal forms are prevalent and also in the fact that the image of the addressee is usually concrete (like *the young poet* in *The Percepts of Symbolism*, other poets and groups, and also there might be acts of auto-communication like in the LEF Program), almost all analyzed texts depict an individual speaking subject, the most frequent words are *own, art, due, life, poetry, futurism* which highlights the ideological sense of the new art, returned back to the recipient from bourgeois institutions.

Probably, it would be a careless statement to say that the genre of manifesto aimed to influence the reader is more typical of radical art statements common in the avant-garde paradigm, but it seems to be a real correlation between the speech genres and artistic paradigm. There is also a reasonable remark about the word usage, i. e., we have already seen the possibility of the genre-labels mixture on the example of the imaginalists’ Declaration signified with the lexeme declaration in the title, but which is called by its authors to be a manifesto in the body of the text. The programs of modernism claim new forms of artistic expression and the scandalous character of it aims to shock philistines included in the institutional art system, while the avant-garde rebellion attacks the bourgeois art institutions by making flamboyant performances *sensu lato*. Irina N. Karasik in her article dedicated to the phenomenon of the avant-garde manifesto also makes a conceptual distinction between symbolists’ programs and avant-garde self-establishing texts. The author insists on the fact that in the new cultural avant-garde paradigm art manifesto becomes itself a piece of art equally significant as paintings, performances, and poetry; and the *word — deed* issue is the focus of attention. New manifestos have a performative function, while the content and the theoretical explanations of art or style are not such important

as the loud statements and scandalous behavior. The act of “play of theory”, according to Karasik, should be accepted as an initiation ceremony (Karasik 2000). In Europe, continues the author, the climax of such attitude towards manifestos creating is reflected in the Dada’s statement:

I am writing a manifesto and I don't want anything. I say however certain things and I am on principle against manifestoes, as I am also against principles (half-pints for judging the moral value of each sentence-too easy; approximation was invested by the impressionists) (Tzara 2001: 300–301).

III. The OBERIU programmatic text and poetry

After making a theoretical observation of certain specific literary terms and analyzing different types of programmatic texts elaboration on individual or group poetical identity, we would like to look precisely at the case of the OBERIU group. OBERIU is an interestingly composed abbreviation of the Association for Real Art (Obedinenie Real'nogo Iskusstva) that existed at the end of "the long 1920s" and claimed to be the last Soviet avant-garde poetic union. This choice of such an object of analysis is dedicated to the personal interest in this poetic group and the unique character of the association officially organized within the institutional system of Soviet writers and then obtained quite a marginal and unofficial status. In this chapter, we analyze the OBERIU programmatic text that was published in issue №2 of the Leningrad journal *Affiches of the Publishing House* (Afishy Doma Pechati) and observe the most significant ideas expressed in the poetry by oberiuty.

The time when the writers and artists formed this union is a very intense period in early Soviet history that was caused by the cultural fuse that happened at the turn of the 20th century. We described the chronological and cultural borders in the introductory part, but it seems worthless to repeat some main ideas. In the case of Russian literature, the beginning of the cultural changes is signified by Merezhkovsky's lecture *The Causes of the Decline of the Contemporary Russian Literature and the New Trends in it* about the Symbolism aesthetic that was given and then re-worked into an eponymous brochure in 1983. These events should be accepted as the point when the polemics on literature and on art in general began, and they also caused some sort of cultural blast in the 1910s when innumerable literary groups, organizations, and single artists were actively involved in the process of creating a new culture. This situation of artistic freedom changed in 1917, the year of the Great October Socialist Revolution that led to the great split in the society, and the new society demanded new art systems and institutions to form the social agenda. The active searches at the beginning of "the long 1920s" ended by forming the orientation toward proletarian art, while the authors who do not support the Revolution were called *poputchiki* and were accepted insofar their art stayed within the paradigm of social demand elaborated by the LEF theoretics at the end of this "long 1920s". The plurality of artistic expressions that existed in some form in the mid-1920s becomes officially abandoned in 1932 when the resolution *On the Reorganization of the Literary Artistic Organizations* was declared by the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), two years later, in 1934, the First Congress of the Union of Soviet Writers took

place in Moscow and, hence, de jure only one tendency in art became acceptable, viz. the social realism trend. In the background of the late 1920^s, the OBERIU group appeared.

1. The programmatic text of the OBERIU

The OBERIU programmatic text published in issue №2 of the Leningrad journal *Affiches of the Publishing House* (Afishy Doma Pechati), the program manifestation does not have an initially explicitly expressed genre definition. To understand the genre, we analyze the structure of the text, the main verbal forms of expression, and delineate the keywords, i. e., crates the profile of this text following the scheme we used to describe aesthetic manifestos and declarations, in the second chapter of this work.

The programmatic text under discussion is quite a long source consisting of 1882 words, the average number of words per sentence is 13,1. The text is divided into several thematic blocks dedicated to different aspects of art, the first block represents the main idea of the OBERIU art, i. e., to elaborate on the new approach to express the world in art, and the authors suggest this elaborating approach as a universal. The radicality of the tone and the sharp rejection of other methods and trends bring this text together with the early avant-garde positive programs oriented to getting away from the language and utterances belonging to several institutions. It is important to say that, initially, the authors of the texts thought about themselves in the left revolutionary paradigm, which was also reflected in the list of guests invited to the first poetical performance in 1928 among which there were rather famous left avant-garde artists like Mikhail Matiushin, Nikolai Suetin, Pavel Filonov, etc. (Жаккар 1995:89) The next block describes the conceptualization of the art of poetry, as is usual in avant-garde manifestos, here is a break with the previous tradition. The OBERIU criticizes the transrational language to put themselves in the sphere of artists of that time and also in order to highlight the fact that they (especially Kharms with Vvedensky) who was before with the futurist poet Alexandr Tufanov focused on zaum, separate from his group the *Order of the zaumniki DSO*. The next two blocks are dedicated to the art of drama and the novelties in the sphere of cinema, and that fact helps to finally put the OBERIU into the camp of avant-garde artists aimed to expand and mix different arts, to bring the art back in social life.

The image of the speaking subject and the image of the recipient. Although we know post factum that the second part of the OBERIU programmatic text was written only by Zabolotsky who soon enough distanced himself from the group (Ibidem: 195), in the text we face the image

of the collective speaker aimed to influence the reader by using imperative verbal forms. Here it is an interesting situation occurred with the image of the author: in the text, there are the names of several poets and writers, although it is quite difficult to delineate the whole membership of the group which, according to the texts, consists not only of poets but also of film directors, artists, and playwrights. The image of the recipient is also explicit and the ones who make this manifestation require the public to interact actively and to be involved in the process of the new art creation.

The speech acts used in the texts are the constatives, the directives, the expressives, the declaratives. The text is quite expressive and its aim to represent the new artistic group, to outline actively their role in the sphere of literature at the 1920^s. The text is quite an expressive speech which is acceptable in the avant-garde paradigm (viz. rather provocative texts by the *Manifesto of Psycho-Futurism*, the *Imaginists' Declaration*).

The key words are not so standard comparing with other programmatical texts and among the most common like *own, art, new*, we also see *object, name, plot, OBERIU, time, scene, action* that reflects the fact the despite the intention to be significant in the literature, theater, and cinema familiar to the mass addressee. This point shows out the inner intention for reconsidering the very essence of art and not just by renewing the formal element.

2. Poetics of the Chinari and the OBERIU

According to Yakov S. Druskin, the history of OBERIU is in a strong connection with one unofficial group of friends called Chinari. Strictly speaking, the last one is not an association of writers working on new forms and functions of the art, but it is a group of people sharing common interests in literature and philosophy. Among the members of this group of friends, there are philosophers Druskin (the author of the essay) and Leonid Lipavsky, poets Alexander Vvedensky. Daniil Kharmis and Nicolay Olejnikov, and Nicolay Zabolotsky who was quite close to them but was not included in the Chinari's company as a permanent member and started to work independently quite early. Moreover, when we talk about a social group, we usually think about the characteristics of this group, i. e., why all these people cooperate and what regulates their social communication. It looks more important if this social group is a literary community suggesting strong even unarticulated rules, but the point is the Chinari did not share any rules regulating their meetings and all the members have strong individuality staying within the group.

Что же объединило на многие годы столь разных на первый взгляд поэтов и философов? Это было литературно-философское содружество пяти человек, каждый из которых, хорошо зная свою профессию, в то же время не был узким профессионалом и не боялся вторгаться в «чуждые области», будь то лингвистика, теория чисел, живопись или музыка (Друскин 2021: 352).

And what united for many years the poets and philosophers so different at a first glance? It was a literary and philosophical community of five people, each of whom, knowing his own profession well, was not at the same time a narrow professional and was not afraid to invade “alien areas”, whether it is linguistics, number theory, fine arts, or music.

Hence, the Chinari should be accepted not as an official community or artistic union but as a meeting with friends to have an interesting conversation about anything. Moreover, according to Druskin, the humorous nicknames (*chinar*) was not actively used by all the friends, and only Vvedensky and Kharms signed their early texts with “chinar’ avto-ritet bessmyslitsy” (chinar’ autho-riety of the nonsense) and “chinar-vziralnik” (*vziralnk* is a non-existed noun formed from the verb *vzirat* meaning *to gaze*). But what does the very entity *chinar* mean? In the tradition of the OBERIU studies, there are several different theories. For Druskin who was also a part of the group, *chinar* acts as a derivate from the word *chin* meaning the *rank* or the *ecclesiastical post* which makes to think about another group of writers and poets called the Serapion Brothers formed in 1921. Probably, this was not an intentional link, but the parallels become more evident when we look at the artistic manifesto *Why are We the Serapion Brothers?* (Лунц 1924) where the Russian word *brat* (*bratja* in plural) may refer to the English word *brother* and at the same time to the word *brethren* used in ecclesiastic discourse. And in some sort of parallel, we read how Druskin describes the process of entering the Chinari group in terms of initiation into a brotherhood (Друскин 2021). Another version is proposed by Aleksandr A. Kobrinsky who connects the nickname *chinar* with the slang word used to call a cigarette stub (Кобринский 2009:36). Rather a detailed observation is made by Jean-Philippe Jaccard in his monography dedicated to Kharms and his surroundings. Jaccard criticizes the ideas elaborated by Anatoly A. Aleksandrow who insisted on the exceptionally buffoonish character of the Chinari self-calling and the change of the union name was due to the inevitable growing up process. This version is concerned by Jaccard as untenable and even wrong because there was no strict continuity from the Chinari to the OBERIU that were parallel although crossing groups. The idea, according to which the *chinar* acts like any non-existed in reality *zaum* words is also rejected, because such an understanding reduces the complexity of the general philosophical goal of the Chinari which was not to create a new language and to express the ideas difficult to express by means of standard lexicon but an intention to be verily free in literature (Жаккар 1995).

Surely, there is a parallel between zaum word play and the Chinari's individual styles, but the resemblance is external, formal. In the *Declaration of Transrational Language* (1921) written by Alexei Kruchenykh, the futurist poet talks mainly about phonetic experiments as an infinite source for poetry. The transrational language, also known as zaum, is an attempt to express not fully formed and reflected feelings:

К заумному языку прибегают: а) когда художник дает образы еще не вполне определившиеся (в нем или во вне); б) когда не хотят назвать предмет, а только намекнуть <...> с) когда теряют рассудок <...> д) когда не нуждаются в нем (Крученых 1924: 153).

One resorts to transrational language: (a) when the artist wants to convey images not fully defined (within himself or without himself), (b) when he does not want to name the object, but only to hint at its transrational feature <...> (c) When one loses one's reason <...> (d) When one does not need it-religious ecstasy, love <...> (Kruchenykh 1988).

Of course, zaum in the way described by Kruchenykh connects with the nonsense and absurd in literature, although in the poetical praxis of the Chinari the category of absurd becomes a self-contained element of the fictional world. The entities of the transrational language are multidimensional signs having an infinite number of meanings due to random coincidences, while the multidimensional metaphors favorite in the Chinari's and later in the OBERIU poetics have more or less fuzzy boundaries of interpretation set by a certain text. This multidimensionality of a sign in the absurd of Vvedensky's fictional world is described with the term hieroglyph elaborated by Lipavsky. It seems that the notion of hieroglyph is a good metaphor to describe the specificity of a verbal sign in poetry: hieroglyph is a material object available for human perception and possesses more than one meaning.

Иероглиф двузначен, он имеет собственное и несобственное значение. Собственное значение иероглифа – его определение как материального явления – физического, биологического, физиологического, психо-физического. Его несобственное значение не может быть определено точно и однозначно, его можно передать метафорически, поэтически, иногда соединением несовместимых понятий, то есть антиномией, противоречием, бессмыслицей (Друскин 1988: 551)

The hieroglyph is ambiguous, it has its own proper and improper meaning. The proper meaning of the hieroglyph is its definition as a material phenomenon (physical, biological, physiological, psycho-physical). Its improper meaning cannot be defined precisely and unambiguously, it can be conveyed metaphorically, poetically, sometimes by combining incompatible concepts, that is, by antinomy, contradiction, nonsense.

In this case, the process of reading poetry is equal to the procedure of hieroglyphs decoding. According to Jaccard, the OBERIU poetics initially had the seeds of the existential and only then the aesthetical crises that differ the OBERIU and most of avant-garde artistic groups having some positive programs to transform the art discourse in the context of Russian culture (Жаккар 1995: 189). This existential crisis seems to be caused by the desire to understand the

relations between things in the world, the reality of things is spoiled by the essence of the human language ordering the reality and taking us away from the real interconnections. That is why the abbreviation OBERIU is exposed as the Association of Real Art, where the collocation *real art* leads to the intention not to recreate the reality as we perceive it through material objects but to explore in artistic texts the reality as it is. This intention is reflected in the absurdism of situations in the poetic world by Kharms, Vvdensky in his turn focuses mostly on the human language to show the conventionality of the verbal sign, Lipavsky in his philosophical texts tries to explain the disconnection between the world and words. Hence, poetry in the case of the OBERIU group is an act of destruction of perceived reality to approach first-degree reality (Ibidem: 91).

The history of the OBERIU group that was badly accepted by the recipients is a good illustration of the paradox initially and unintentionally laid in the very idea of the avant-garde. Despite that fact of the consistent rejection of the previous traditions, avant-garde artists focused on experimental actions and forms, strictly speaking, made a “historical loop” and returned to the national ancient traditions that had not been socially accepted in the status of art earlier: wooden “primitive” figurines captured European artists, the folk-lore forms and different kinds of naïve literature influenced poets and writers. The pathos of the rebellion overshadowed the intentions to elaborate on the new existential and probably more complex principles of art. Kharms and Vvedensky was not accepted seriously, the OBERIU experiments were too radical for the time of the late 1920^s when the Soviet government tried to create one comprehensible system of the ideological art. The accent on the unstable links between human language and reality was not needed to create proletarian society and to make the world revolution, although some of the oberiuty became successful in the sphere of literature for children who were ready to understand the complexity of the word – world relationships. One more point concerns the essential intention of the avant-garde art, i. e., we accept Bürger’s social theory of the historical avant-garde art saying that one of the main goals of avant-garde movement was to return the art back to human life, to get rid of numerous art institutions having a monopoly for human tastes and feelings. The initial freedom in the literary sphere ended with a huge number of groups and associations pretending to express the right way to percept and create new art.

3. The manifesto — praxis relationships

Strictly speaking, it seems that this issue has two directions to be solved. The first one is elaborated by the already mentioned article by Lotman *Word and Deed* where the author pays

attention to the pendular movements and compensatory mechanisms of the semiosphere self-regulations. It means that our rules are not constant and even if there is a feeling that some forms are fixed and we know well how these forms should act, there is always a possibility that in other cultural paradigms these forms acted another way. Hence, the very genre of the artistic manifesto is a historically determined structure, by which we mean that in certain periods of human history this type of document was strict enough to make artists follow prescribed rules, or in other periods there is a presupposition that the genre of artistic manifesto or declaration are descriptive sources where an artist can find ideas for further development. In this case, manifestos and other programmatical texts do not have to be strict instructions but they reflect the cultural shifts.

Another direction seems to be also useful to understand the *theory — praxis* relationships. If we accept the primacy of the general concepts and then say that certain text is just a realization of the elaborated earlier concepts, we turn to the field of translation theory and the issue of the possibility of total translation by which is meant the possibility for adequate and full replacement of the element of the source texts with the elements constructing the target text (Топон 1995: 10). In such a case, the text of manifesto or declaration is a source text, while the written fictional pieces of art become the target text. In thus situating, the total translation is impossible due to the very essence of artistic activity. In Lotman's work *The Structure of Artistic text* there is a typology of texts based on the type of the reader's horizon of expectation: there are texts with very fixed structure from which the reader expects to find by him- or herself all the required structural elements, and there is another type of texts aimed to destabilize the whole cultural system by not following once formulated rules but proposing the new ideas and forms (Лотман 1970). This stabilization may be explained with the notion of the play elaborated Johan Huizinga in the work *Homo Ludens*. On the part of the work is dedicated to the analysis of the ludic component is the poetry, the art of poetry (and it seems that we can speak here about a poetry *sensu lato*, i. e., about the literary sphere of human action). Huizinga insist on the play origins of the poetry due to the close relationships of the ancient poetry and religion as a sacred play. Let us provide one of the numerous definitions of the play made by the author:

It [a play] is an activity which proceeds within certain limits of time and space, in a visible order, according to rules freely accepted, and outside the sphere of necessity or material utility (Huizinga 1980: 132).

All the creative mechanism, in this case, should be explained by this concept, and even the avant-garde aesthetic rebellion becomes a part of this play that initially suggests the absence of rigorous rules. In contrast, the very fact of the rule violation is due the essence of this play.

Conclusion

The work was dedicated to the analysis of the *theory – praxis* relationships on the example of the OBERIU aesthetic manifesto and the main concepts expressed in the texts written by the members of the group. The work consists of the introduction, three chapters, the conclusion, the list of references, and the annex with tables illustrating our analysis.

The introduction gives information about the research problem and research aims, used material and methods, and provides a brief overview of the whole work. Our starting point was the issue of the links between the words and the deeds elaborated by Lotman, this understanding of cultural types of texts allows us to look precisely at the more concrete examples such as the genre of the poetic manifesto and declarations having an unbroken connection with the poetic action expressed with the creation fictional texts.

The first chapter provided a theoretical description of the main aesthetic paradigms of the first third of the 20th century. We sequentially analyze the concepts of modernism, modern (the accent is on the second syllable), and avant-garde. The models of the aesthetic movements that happen at the period under discussion are not totally definite and even certain national language traditions have different descriptions of the one phenomenon, the theories about modernism and avant-garde art may overlap due to the status of the last one: whether avant-garde is a separate cultural paradigm, or it is a realization of the most radical ideas and experiments. Within this work we make a separation between these tendencies due to the difference in the social function of the modernist and the avant-garde art, by which we mean that despite all possible formal experiments made by modernists, the authenticity of the avant-garde is in its mass social orientation (at least in theory). The avant-garde paradigm is a difficult phenomenon to describe there is no one specific style called to be avant-garde, but the principal novelty of this type of culture is its critical orientation towards itself. The avant-garde art is the art taken from the institutions and returned to life, and the form of expression, in this case, is not important. Historical avant-garde turned out to be some sort of label used to discuss the most unusual and original works created in the 20th century. The next chapter deals with the terms used in the literary critical discourse to speak about the typology of texts. There we provide definitions of the words that designate the genres of programmatic texts, we finish with making an analysis of the programmatic texts from the compilation *From Symbolism to the “October” (Ot simvolisma do “Oktyabrya”, 1924)* to elaborate the main features of the theoretical self-establishing texts written at the period 1890^s – 1920^s and understand what models were active

and common in Russian literature at the moment the OBERIU artists appeared. The next chapter is quite a brief observation of the OBERIU aesthetic manifesto, and the main ideas expressed on the art *praxis*. We explain that the *theory* — *praxis* relationship is not a stable model and that is why we cannot speak about the unique mechanism of the theory transformation into poetical *praxis*. This gap might be conceptualized by the notion of a playing activity: a manifesto acts like a prescription, a rule in social games, while the way the player act is not always prelimited by this rule, and as the result of rules violation (this might be called creativity) we have the mechanism of artistic development, and further – the transformation of the semiosphere.

Kokkuvõte

OBERIU: Modernismi ja Avangardi vahel

Käesolev töö on pühendatud *teooria — praktika* suhete analüüsile kirjanduses. Peamise näitena on käsitletud seoseid OBERIU (Reaalse Kunsti Ühendus) poeetilise manifesti ja sellesse rühmitusse kuuluvate autorite loomingu peegelduvate põhikontseptsioonide vahel. Töö koosneb sissejuhatuses, kolmest peatükist, kokkuvõttest, kirjanduse loetelust ja lisast, mis sisaldab tehtud analüüsi illustreerivaid tabeleid.

Sissejuhatuses sõnastatakse uurimuse teema ja probleem, kirjeldatakse ülesandeid, kasutatud materjale ja meetodeid, kirjeldatakse lühidalt kõiki käesoleva töö osi. Alustame Juri Lotmani käsitlusest sõnade ja tegude suhetest ning tema pakutud kultuuritüpoloogiast, et määratleda sõnades väljendatud ideede ja tegude kokkulangemise probleemi analüüsivuse viis. Pakutud kirjeldusmudel võimaldab pöörata suuremat tähelepanu poeetilise manifesti žanrile (kõige avaramas tähenduses), millel on otsesed seosed reaalse poeetilise praktikaga, konkreetsete kunstiteostega.

Esimene peatükk sisaldab 20. sajandi esimest kolmandikku iseloomustavate põhiliste kultuuriparadigmade teoreetilist kirjeldust: modernism, juugendstiil ja avangard. Nende kultuuriparadigmade mõistmise teeb keeruliseks loomuliku keelega ümberkäimise erilisus, millega seoses kirjeldavad modernismi ja avangardi teooriad samu nähtusi kas kattuvate või põhimõtteliselt vastandlike kultuurinähtustena. Käesolevas töös vaatleme, kuidas erinevates teoreetilistes mudelites selgitatakse modernismi ja avangardi tunnuseid, kuidas käsitletakse modernistliku ja avangardistliku kunsti funktsioone. Järgmine peatükk on pühendatud põhimõistetele, mida kirjanduskriitikas kasutatakse tekstide tüpoloogia kirjeldamiseks. Keskendumine žanri mõistele üldiselt ja sel taustal eraldi programmiliste tekstide žanri mõistele. Antud teoreetilisest taustast lähtuvalt on läbi viidud 19. sajandi lõpu – 20. sajandi alguse vene luuletajate poeetiliste manifestide kogumiku "Sümbolismist „Oktoobrini“" (1924) analüüs, mis kajastab 1890–1920-ndate aastate peamisi kirjandusrühmitusi ja organisatsioone. Just selle kogumiku tekstide analüüsi põhjal loome OBERIU kujunemisajale iseloomuliku poeetilise manifesti mudeli. Järgmine peatükk on OBERIU manifesti ülevaade, selle žanritunnuste määratlemine ja OBERIU luuletajate teoste põhiideede käsitlemine. Usume, et on võimatu väita, et poeetiline praktika peegeldab otseselt programmilistes tekstides väljendatud teooriat. Omapärast lõhet, vastuolu teooria ja poeetilise praktika vahel võib kontseptualiseerida

järgmiselt: esteetilise manifesti tekst toimib ettekirjutusena, sotsiaalse mängu reeglite sätestajana, kuigi tegelikult ei piirdu see mäng nende reeglite järgimisega ja pigem vastupidi, selle olemus seisneb nende reeglite rikkumises. Selliseid rikkumisi seletatakse kunsti olemusega ja neid on võimalik tõlgendada „loovuse“ mõiste abil. Kunstilooliselt on mängureeglite rikkumise analüüs oluline nii üksikute rühmituste kui ajastu kultuurilise semiosfääri dünaamika mõistmiseks

List of Sources and References

- Aristotle 1952. Poetics. In: Benton, William (publisher). *The Works of Aristotle*. Vol. 2. Chicago, London, Toronto, etc.: The University of Chicago, 677–699.
- Austin, John L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail 2000. The Problem of Speech Genres. In: Duff, David (ed.). *Modern Genre Theory*. Harlow: Longman, 82–97.
- Balcerzan, Edward 2000. Manifest literaczki. In: *Literatura Polska XX Wieku. Przewodnik encyklopedyczny*. Tom 1. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN S.A., 409.
- Baldic, Chris 1990. *The Oxford Concise Dictionary of Literature Terms*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bürger, Peter 1984. *Theory of the Avant-garde*. Minneapolis: Manchester University Press, University of Minnesota Press.
- Derrida, Jacques 2000. The Law of Genre. In: Duff, David (ed.). *Modern Genre Theory*. Harlow: Longman, 219–231.
- Calinescu, Matei 1987a. The Idea of Modernity. *Five Faces of Modernity: Modernism, Avant-garde, Decadence, Kitsch, Postmodernism*. Durham: Duke University Press, 13–92.
- 1987b. The Idea of the Avant-Garde. *Five Faces of Modernity: Modernism, Avant-garde, Decadence, Kitsch, Postmodernism*. Durham: Duke University Press, 95–148.
- Cavitch, Max 2012. Genre. In: Green, Roland & Cushman, Stephen (eds.). *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry & Poetics* (fourth edition). Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press, 551–554.
- Caws, Mary Ann 2012. *Manifesto*. In: Green, Roland & Cushman, Stephen (eds.). *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry & Poetics* (fourth edition). Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press, 842–843.
- Colie, Rosalie 2000. Genre-System and the Functions of Literature. In: Duff, David (ed.). *Modern Genre Theory*. Harlow: Longman, 148–166.
- Croce, Benedetto 1965. *The Aesthetic as the Science of Expression and the Linguistic in General* (translated by Ainslie, Douglas). S. l: The Noonday Press.
- Cuddon, John A. 1999a. Modernism. *The Penguin Dictionary of Literature Terms and Literature Theory* (fourth edition). London: Penguin Books, 515–516.
- 1999b. Avant-garde. *The Penguin Dictionary of Literature Terms and Literature Theory* (fourth edition). London: Penguin Books, 68–69.

- 1999c. Art Nouveau. *The Penguin Dictionary of Literature Terms and Literature Theory* (fourth edition). London: Penguin Books, 67.
 - 1999d. Jugendstil. *The Penguin Dictionary of Literature Terms and Literature Theory* (fourth edition). London: Penguin Books, 439.
 - 1999e. Manifesto. *The Penguin Dictionary of Literature Terms and Literature Theory* (fourth edition). London: Penguin Books, 490.
- Cushman, Stephen (eds.). *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry & Poetics* (fourth edition). Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press, 842–843.
- Duff, David 2000. *Modern Genre Theory*. Harlow: Longman.
- Fowler, Alastair 1982. *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Green, Roland & Cushman, Stephen 2012. *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry & Poetics* (fourth edition). Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich 2022. Die Gattungsunterschiede der Poesie. Vorlesungen über die Ästhetik. URL: <https://www.textlog.de/5775.html> (05.04.2022).
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich 1975. The different Genres of Poetry. *Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art* (translated by T. M. Knox). Vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1035–1237.
- Jauss, Hans Robert 1982a. Literature History as a Challenge to Literature Theory. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 3–45.
- 1982b. Theory of Genres and Medieval Literature. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 76–109.
- Kruchenykh, Alexei 1988. Declaration of Transrational Language. In: Lawton, Anna (ed.). *Russian Futurism through Its Manifestos, 1912–1928*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 182–183.
- Mikics, David 2007. *A New Handbook of Literature Terms*. New Heaven, London: Yale University Press.
- Nicholls, Peter 2012. Modernism. In: Green, Roland & Cushman, Stephen (eds.). *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry & Poetics* (fourth edition). Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press, 889–894.
- Opacki, Ireneusz 2000. Royal Genres. In: Duff, David (ed.). *Modern Genre Theory*. Harlow: Longman, 118–126.
- Perkins, David 1992. *Is Literary History Possible?* Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Perloff, Matjorie 2012. Avant-Garde Poetics. In: Green, Roland & Cushman, Stephen (eds.). *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry & Poetics* (fourth edition). Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press, 110–113.
- Schaeffer, Jean-Marie 1997. Genres littéraires. In: *Dictionnaire des Genres et notions littéraires*. Paris: Albin Michel, 339–344.
- Searle, John 1976. A classification of Illocutionary Acts. In: *Language and Society*, vol. 5, no. 1 (Apr. 1976), 1–23.
- Soaness, Catheride 2001. *The Oxford Paperback Dictionary, Thesaurus, and Wordpower Guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Todorov Tzvetan 1972. *Les genres littéraires. Introduction à la littérature fantastique*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 7–27.
- The Origin of Genres. In: Duff, David (ed.). *Modern Genre Theory*. Harlow: Longman, 193–209.
- Tynyanov, Yury 2000. The Literary Fact. In: Duff, David. *Modern Genre Theory*. Harlow: Longman, 29–49.
- Tzara, Tristan. Dada Manifesto, 1918. In: Mary Anna Caws (ed.). *Manifesto: A Century of Isms*. Lincoln, London : University of Nebraska Press, 297–304.
- Van Corp, Hendrik et al. 2005a. Modernité, modernisme. In: *Dictionnaire des Termes Littéraires*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 308–309.
- 2005b. Avant-garde, avant-gardisme. In: *Dictionnaire des Termes Littéraires*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 56.
- 2005c. Jugenstil. In: *Dictionnaire des Termes Littéraires*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 267.
- 2005e. Genre. In: *Dictionnaire des Termes Littéraires*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 219–221.
- Vološinov, Valentin N. 1973. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. New York, London: Seminar Press.
- Wyka, Kazimerz 2000. Modernizm. In: *Literatura Polska XX Wieku. Przewodnik encyclopedyczny*. Tom 1. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN S.A., 433.
- Yule, Gorges 1997. Speech Acts and Events. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 47–58.
- Аверинцев С. С. 1996. Историческая подвижность категории жанра: опыт периодизации. *Риторика и истоки европейской литературной традиции*. М.: Языки русской культуры, 101–114.

- Бахтин М. М. 1997. Проблема речевых жанров. *Собрание сочинений в семи томах*. Т. 5. М.: Русские словари, 159–206 – *cited in* Bakhtin 2000.
- Белинский В. Г. 1948. Разделение поэзии на роды и виды. *Собрание сочинений*. Т. II. *Статьи и рецензии 1841–1845*. М.: ОГИЗ, 5–67.
- Бродский Н. Л., Сидоров Н. П. 1924. От символизма до «Октября». М.: Новая Москва.
- Гоготишвили Л. А. 1997. Проблема речевых жанров [комментарий] // Бахтин М. М. *Собрание сочинений в семи томах*. Т. 5. М.: Русские словари, 535–555.
- Грыгар М. 2007. К определению стиля модерн в русской и чешской поэзии // *Знакомство: Семиотика русского авангарда*. СПб.: Издательский проект, ДНК, С. 90–136.
- Друскин Я. С. 2021. Чинари // А. Введенский. *Всё*. М.: ОГИ, 348–361.
- 1988. Звезда бессмыслицы // Дмитриенко А. Л., Друскина Л. С., Машевский А. Г. Сажин В. Н. «...Сборище друзей, ставленных судьбою». Т. 1. М.: Ладомир. С. 549–642.
- Жакар Ж.-Ф. 1995. Даниил Хармс и конец русского авангарда. М.: Академический проект.
- Захаров В. Н. 1984. К спорам о жанре // Гин М. М. *Жанр и композиция литературного произведения*. Петрозавоск, 3–19
- Карасик И. Н. 2000. Манифест в культуре русского авангарда // Мейлах М. Б., Сарабьянов Д. В. *Поэзия и живопись: Сборник памяти трудов Н. И. Харджиева*. М.: Языки русской культуры, 129–138.
- Крученых А. Е. 1924. Декларация заумного языка // Бродский Н. Л., Сидоров Н. П. *Литературные манифесты*. I. Россия. От символизма до «Октября». М.: «Новая Москва», 248–252.
- Кожевников В. М., Николаев П. А. 1989а. Модернизм // *Литературный энциклопедический словарь*. М.: Советская энциклопедия, 153–154 — *cited* Kruchenykh 1988
- 1989б. Авангардизм // *Литературный энциклопедический словарь*. М.: Советская энциклопедия, 9–10.
- 1989с. Жанр // *Литературный энциклопедический словарь*. М.: Советская энциклопедия, 106–107.
- Лихачев Д. С. 1971. Поэтика древнерусской литературы. Л.: Художественная литература, 24–94.

- Лотман Ю. М. 1970. Текст и внетекстовые художественные структуры // *Структура художественного текста*. М.: Искусство, 343–359.
- 2010. Слово и дело // *Непредсказуемые механизмы культуры*. Tallinn: TLU Press, 125–133.
- Лунц Л. Н. 1924. Почему мы Серапионовы братья // Бродский Н. Л., Сидоров Н. П. *Литературные манифесты. I. Россия. От символизма до «Октября»*. М.: «Новая Москва», 248–252.
- Николюкин А. Н. 2001а. Модернизм // *Литературная энциклопедия терминов и понятий*. М.: НКП «Интелвак», 566–571.
- 2001б. Авангардизм. // *Литературная энциклопедия терминов и понятий*. М.: НКП «Интелвак», 11–14.
- 2001с. Жанр // *Литературная энциклопедия терминов и понятий*. М.: НКП «Интелвак», 253–265.
- ОБЭРИУ = «Афиша Дома печати». Журнал. Ленинград. 1928, № 2. На стр. 13 программа театрализованного вечера обэриутов в Доме печати 24 января 1928 г. // РГАЛИ Ф.3145. Оп. 2. Ед. хр. № 405.
- Сарабьянов Д. В. К ограничению понятия «авангард» // Мейлах М. Б., Сарабьянов Д. В. *Поэзия и живопись: Сборник памяти трудов Н. И. Харджиева*. М.: Языки русской культуры, 83–91.
- Тороп Пеэтер 1995. Тотальный перевод. Tartu: Tartu University Press.
- Тынянов Ю. Н. 1924. О литературном факте // *ЛЕФ №2(6)*. 1924, С. 101–116 — *cited in* Тупуанов 2000.
- 2002а. О литературной эволюции // *Литературная эволюция: Избранные труды*. М.: Аграф, С. 167–188.
- 2002б. Промежуток. *Литературная эволюция: Избранные труды*. М.: Аграф, С. 415–454.
- Федосюк М. Ю. 1997. Нерешенные вопросы теории речевых жанров // *Вопросы языкознания №5*, 1977. М.: Наука, 102–120.
- Хализев В. Е. 2004. Родовая принадлежность произведения // Чернец Л. В., Хализев В. Е., Эсалнек А. Я. и др. *Введение в литературоведение*. М.: Высшая школа, 134–142.
- Шмелева Т. В. 1990. Речевой жанр. Возможности описания и использования в преподавании языка // *Russistik №2*. 1990. С. 20–32.
- 1997. Модель речевого жанра // *Жанры речи № 1*. 1997. С. 88–98.

Яковлев А. Н. 1999а. Постановление политбюро ЦК РКП(б) «О политике партии в области художественной литературы» 18 июня 1925 г. // Власть и художественная интеллигенция: Документы ЦК РКП(б) – ВКП(б) – ВЧК – ОГПУ – НКВД. 1917–1935. М.: МФД. С. 53–57.

— 1999б. Постановление политбюро ЦК ВКП(б) «О перестройке литературно-художественных организаций» 23 апреля 1932 г. // Власть и художественная интеллигенция: Документы ЦК РКП(б) – ВКП(б) – ВЧК – ОГПУ – НКВД. 1917–1935. М.: МФД. С. 172–173.

Annex

Table 1 (Declarations)														
Original title	Year	Translated title (in English)	Genre given in the collection	Identified genre	Structure	Number of words	Average words per sentence	Speech acts (Austin and Searle)	Verbal mood	Type of speaking subject	Address	Key words (in English)	Pages	Movement
Декларация шумного языка	1921	Declaration of Zaum Language	declaration		7 items	305	21,8	constatives	indicative	no explicit speaking subject	no explicit addressee	abstruse, abstruse, language, e.g. give, express, wild, here, meaning, name	153-154	Futurism
Поэты декларация	-	Almost a declaration	declaration		separate unnumbered items, short paragraphs	678	14,7	representatives	indicative and imperative forms	"we"-exclusive (group)	no explicit addressee	image, its own, year, era, art, culture, great, instead, time, to speak	208-211	Imagism
Декларация лозунжества	-	Declaration Luminism	declaration		9 separate items and "frame"	240	12	declaratives and directives	indicative	"we"-exclusive (group)	no explicit addressee	lumen, life, word, sun, verse, step, lumen, one, world, needed	227-228	Luminism
Прокламация лозунжества	1921	Proclamation of Luminism	proclamation	declaration		965	18,9	constatives	indicative and imperative forms	"we"-exclusive (group)	explicit addressee (you, "brave voyagers")	light, word, gold, dead, vital, rhythm, black, shaft, granite, dynamics	228-232	Luminism
Декларация форм-либретто	1922	Declaration of Formlibrisim	declaration		separate unnumbered items	274	14,4	constatives	indicative	no explicit speaking subject	no explicit addressee	material, pulse, sound, sonority, create, consciousness, meter, rhythm, creativity, demand	236-237	Form-librisim
Декларация неоклассицизма	1923	The Declaration of the Neoclassicism	declaration		20 items	539	20	constatives	indicative and imperative forms	no explicit speaking subject	no explicit addressee + implicit addressee (poet)	neoclassicism, creativity, artists, art, literary, content, main, achievement, field, work	244-247	Russian neoclassicism
Декларация эмоционализма	1923	Declaration of Emotionalism	declaration		11 items	284	17,8	constatives	indicative	no explicit speaking subject	no explicit addressee	unique, general, law, art, love, creativity, form, singular, material, emotionalism	253-254	Emotionalism
Краткая конструкция аконструктивизма-поэта	-	The Oath of Poets-constructivist	oath construction	declaration (given in the body of the text)	separate unnumbered items	673	16,4	declaratives, representatives, commissives	indicative and imperative forms	"we"-exclusive (group)	intercommunication	construction, material, form, constructivism, constructivism, organization, main, image, law, reception	258-261	Constructivism
Пути пролетарского искусства	1920	Ways of Proletarian Art	thesis	declaration	12 items	1050	22,3	constatives	indicative	no explicit speaking subject		work, creativity, method, proletarian, collectivism, life, new, first, art, effort	267-271	Proletarian poetry
Декларация союза писателей "Литературный фронт"	1923	Declaration of the Writers' Union (Literary Front)	declaration		separate unnumbered items, short paragraphs	322	21,5	declaratives and representatives	indicative and imperative forms	"we"-exclusive (group)	no explicit addressee, implicit addressee (artists interested in the program)	art, front, literary, struggle, spiritual, intelligentia, new, revolution, own, word	276-277	Proletarian poetry
Декларация пролетарских писателей "Кумуш"а	1923	The Declaration of the Proletarian Writers «Kumush»	declaration		19 items	1867	14,1	representatives, declaratives and expressives	indicative and imperative forms	"we"-exclusive (group)	explicit addressee (artists)	art, class, own, worker, form, artist, proletarian, society, proletarian, new	277-285	Proletarian poetry
Идеологическая и художественная платформа группы пролетарских писателей "Октябрь"	1923	The Ideological and Artistic platform of the group October	platform	declaration	13 paragraphs and 9 items	1490	38,2	constatives	indicative	no explicit speaking subject	no explicit addressee	proletarian, literature, proletarian, bourgeois, forms, artists, group, literary, region, revolution, class	286-292	Proletarian poetry
General model of declaration					statements put in separate items	654,27	17,63	constatives + declaratives and representatives	indicative	"we"-exclusive (group)	no explicit addressee	art, creativity, material, new, proletarian, own, word, form, main, life, law, class		

Table 2 (Manifestoes)

Original title	Year	Translated title (in English)	Genre given in the collection	Identified genre	Structure	Number of words	Average words per sentence	Speech acts (Austin and Searle)	Verbal mood	Type of speaking subject	Addressee	Key words (in English)	Pages	Movement
Заветы символизма	1916	The Percepts of Symbolism	percept	manifesto	2 descriptive blocs and 1 bloc containing appellation	1280	28,4	constatives	indicative and imperative forms	"we"-implicite ("we" instead of "I")	explicit addressee (young poets)	poet, poetry, word, own, symbol, symbolic, life, god, inner, art, personality	75-80	Symbolism
Манифест психофутуризма	1914	The Manifesto of Psycho-Futurism	manifesto		11 items	309	9,1	constatives, declaratives, expressives, representatives	indicative, imperative and optative forms	"we"-exclusive (group)	explicit addressee (you)	peace, eternal, spirit, psycho, psychotic, born, self, want, ego, great	150-151	Futurism
Программа (Левф)	1923	The LEF Program	program	manifesto (allusion on the genre of party manifesto)	3 blocs with laconic propositions (each bloc has own authors)	1713	11,3	constatives	indicative and imperative forms	"we"-exclusive (group)	one of parts - auto-communication (LEF), other part - futurists, constructivists, industrial poets, OPOJAZ, disciples	art, leaf, work, revolution, left, fight, become, due, futurist, aesthetic	161-169	Futurism
Декларация [имажинизма]	1919	Declaration (Imagism)	declaration	manifesto (given in body of the text)	no separate items, text is logically structured	1047	13,1	constatives, expressives, representatives, declaratives, directives	indicative, imperative and optative forms	"we"-exclusive (group)	explicit addressee (you, artists, simbolists and passsists, reader)	art, futurism, image, content, speak, work, your own, everyone, should, know	170-174	Imagism
Хартия экспрессиониста	1919	The Charter Expressionists	charter	manifesto	9 items	529	12,8	constatives, declaratives		we-exclusive (group)		Imagism, Futurism, Imagist, Old, Year, Mayakovsky, New, Verse, France, Expressionist	212-214	Expressionism
Манифест от ничтоков	1920	The Manifesto from Nothingism (Nichevoki)	manifesto		no separate items, text is logically structured	197	19,7	constatives, representatives and behabitive	indicative and imperative forms	"we"-exclusive (group)	explicit addressee (poet Shershenevich)	poetry, his, vadm, coffin, daring, life, sound, gloomy, death, your	232-234	Nothingists
General model of manifesto					no separate items, text is logically structured	845,83	16,24	constatives, declaratives, representatives, expressives	imperative, indicative	"we"-exclusive (group)	explicit addressee	own, art, due, life, poetry, futurism		

Non-exclusive license to reproduce the thesis and make the thesis public

I, Yulia Tishkina

1. grant the University of Tartu a free permit (non-exclusive license) to reproduce, for the purpose of preservation, including for adding to the DSpace digital archives until the expiry of the term of copyright, my thesis “OBERIU: Between Modernism and Avant-garde” by Peeter Torop.
2. I grant the University of Tartu a permit to make the thesis specified in point 1 available to the public via the web environment of the University of Tartu, including via the DSpace digital archives, under the Creative Commons license CC BY NC ND 4.0, which allows, by giving appropriate credit to the author, to reproduce, distribute the work and communicate it to the public, and prohibits the creation of derivative works and any commercial use of the work until the expiry of the term of copyright.
3. I am aware of the fact that the author retains the rights specified in points 1 and 2.
4. I confirm that granting the non-exclusive license does not infringe other persons' intellectual property rights or rights arising from the personal data protection legislation.

Yulia Tishkina

23/08/2022