

The Exploitation of Pushkin's Image in the Making of Russian Identity

Presented To The Russian & Eurasian Studies Department
The Colorado College
In Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree
Bachelor of Arts

Tatyana Khazova

April 19, 2013

Introduction

Alexander Pushkin is considered the father of Russian literature. Works such as *Boris Godunov* and *Evgenii Onegin* help reveal his perception of what it is to be Russian, and Pushkin's relationship with Alexander I and Nikolai I demonstrate his way of attempting to reconcile the disconnect between the people and the tsar.

It is important to understand that Pushkin as a writer is different from the myth that people have associated him with. Misunderstanding who Pushkin is has made it easy for leaders such as Stalin to manipulate the idea of Pushkin in order to control and upkeep morale of the people. The following is an attempt at understanding who Pushkin was and what his beliefs were, and in doing so comprehending why it is so easy for people to elevate and equate this particular individual's life with a martyr, whose image came to represent Russian national identity.

In order to understand why Pushkin has been so central in the development of Russian national identity, it is important to understand what national identity is and how it is created. Is identity a given, or is it constructed? Is it individual or social (Culler 3)? For Russians, identity is a social concept that Russians generally take for granted to be inherently a given. The creation of the self can never be truly separated from the culture and community an individual is a part of. The process of creating a group identity is fragile, incomplete, and complicated. Political leaders play a major role in that construction. People look to the example of political leaders to determine the appropriate way to behave; they set an example and a standard that is hard to dismantle. Political leaders in Russia play as much of a role as writers do in shaping the cultural identity of the country. In *National Identity in Russian Culture*, Simon Franklin argues that the self is not a fixed entity, it changes with time, and is constructed and reconstructed over and over

(Franklin 2). Then looking at Russia and its seemingly unshakable connection to Pushkin, it is important to consider that Pushkin was present in a time when the idea of national identity was just beginning to be formed. As the idea of what is Russia and what it is to be Russian changed over time, so did the public perception of Pushkin. Just by speaking about identity "shapes and alters its objects, rendering the reality of [Pushkin] and his work the vessel through which the shifting terms of Russianness can be projected" (Franklin 8). Pushkin has been projected into many imagined realities of Russia, and Russia's political leaders have taken advantage of his work, using it to solidify their version of the identity of Russia they wanted to display to the world.

Leaders have used Pushkin's image in multiple ways, with each authority figure exploiting the idea of Pushkin to "show" the sacredness of their own designs. Stephanie Sandler in her article "National Identity in Russian Culture" argues that Pushkin's popularity has in part emerged from the fact that he has become a myth. Myths give society strength because they offer purpose to the most distinct, fragmented components of culture. Pushkin's myth symbolizes the fundamental reshaping of the view of history, storytelling, and even human relationships. During his life, Pushkin reinvented the view of the role of literature in the public and political sphere; it would only make sense that he became a myth that recreated and reshaped Russian culture. His work is perceived as "giving meaning to the nation's identity" (Franklin 197). For Russian people, who have lived through dramatic experiences such as revolutions and various regime changes, Pushkin represents hope of a better future, which is a timeless idea. Furthermore, political leaders support the Pushkin myth and have used it to their advantage because, as Pushkin's works embody a myth and a story of hope, they do not have to change their policies or interactions with their people in order to be tolerated because Pushkin has made them bearable.

He is "a symbol of integrity, creativity, and spiritual values" (Franklin 197). He is a "beacon amid the seeming morass of Russian history, a spot of light and clarity that promises to illuminate the future as well as the past" (Franklin 201). Pushkin's role in Russian identity is restorative and spiritually stirring. In popular view, national tragedy and suffering have become a part of Russian national identity, and Pushkin's role is to offer hope. For example, Pushkin's death is poetic and significant because he died in a duel fighting for the honor of the woman he loved. He died in a duel with d'Anthès, and d'Anthès at the time was courting Pushkin's wife Natalya. Pushkin suffered and fought for his love and died, but his death is significant because it represents the beginning of the formation of the myth of Russian fate being intertwined with suffering for a noble cause.

Sandler argues that the circumstances of Pushkin's death helped make him the myth that he is today. Being the first Russian professional writer, during his life Pushkin set the high standard for subsequent writers such as Ivan Turgenev and Lev Tolstoy. However, the removal of Pushkin's body from St. Petersburg and the burial in Pushkin's Mikhaloivskoe estate near the town of Pskov was the last remnant of Pushkin the man. Because Pushkin's death symbolized a "gentleman's sense of family honor" and duty, the myth of Pushkin gained power (Franklin 204). Pushkin united the people through his martyrdom and the romanticism in his work appealed to the popular tastes. Pushkin's life and work have been tightly bound to each other.

National identity during the 19th century was very new and a product of the Romanticism that had just recently reached Russia. At that point in time, for Pushkin Russian identity was found in Russia's rich history and boundless territory. This idea of boundlessness had a Romantic element of mysticism. In the beginning, to Pushkin true Russian identity lay in the simple beauty of the country, and the peasantry where the true Russian spirit was found. One of

the central ideas of Pushkin's *Evgenii Onegin* was that society added manners and poise, but duty and soul was found in the country. There was something spiritual in the Russian land for Pushkin. However, after Pushkin's initial fascination with the Romantics began to fade and ended with complete disinterest in them by the late 1820s, his understanding of identity began to center around the neo-classical ideas of the Enlightenment such as aristocracy, social hierarchy, and reason. In addition, Pushkin believed in the great potential of the Russian people, and he held that being Russian made one destined for greatness. Looking back at the powerful, spiritual destiny of Russia, demonstrated through prominent leaders such as Peter the Great, Pushkin realized that Russia could be powerful, but it was up to the people and the tsar to work together in order to make Russia a model country. Pushkin wrote about the future, and spoke of the past, but died before his hope of a better relationship between the people and the government was realized. Russia has always been in a state of "what if" that has demonstrated a hope that hasn't been realized. However, Pushkin embodying the myth and hope unrealized is a cliché because it is based on unexamined and propagandistic assertions regarding the poet's life. People must stop elevating and idealizing one person and his works in order to escape harsh reality and avoid fighting for change due to the pessimism associated with the ability to change.

Pushkin`s Identity Through His Works

Aleksandr Sergeevich Pushkin was born on May 26, 1799 in Moscow to a noble family. He attended Tsarskoe Selo Lyceum between 1811 and 1817, where he first developed his love of freedom and hatred of tyranny and oppression. Pushkin was influenced by the progressive educators of the institution, as well as later in his life during his post-graduate years by future members of the Decembrist movement and Petr Chaadaev, a philosopher and major intellectual figure in Russia. Other influences include the surge in patriotic sentiment stirred by the Napoleonic invasion of 1812.

In 1819 and 1820, Pushkin belonged to the Green Lamp, the literary branch of the Union of Welfare. The Green Lamp was a Russian literary-political circle that existed in St. Petersburg in 1819–20. The group was founded by the Decembrists S. P. Trubetskoi and N. Tolstoi. The group's meetings centered around poetry, as well as historical and political articles directed against the tsar. Frequent topics included the necessity to fight for freedom, equality, and the destruction of tyranny; these topics later became the group's mission. However, in 1820 Pushkin was banished from St. Petersburg first to Kishinev and then to Odessa in 1823 for writing and circulating political verses and epigrams (Binyon). In exile between 1820-24, Pushkin wrote *Kavkazskii plennik* (The Prisoner of the Caucasus), *Bakhchisaraiskii fontan* (The Fountain of Bakhchisarai), *Tsygany* (The Gypsies), as well as other works. From 1824-26 he was banished to his father's estate in the village Mikhailovskoe for "spreading anti-government and atheistic ideas" (Binyon). There, Pushkin worked on *Evgenii Onegin* and *Boris Godunov*.

In 1831, Pushkin married N.N. Goncharova. On January 27, 1837 Pushkin was mortally wounded in a duel with George Heckeren d'Anthes and subsequently died on January 29, 1837. He is buried in the Sviatogorsk Monastery, now known as Pushkinskie Gory in the Pskov Oblast.

Pushkin envisioned Russia's progress through the "successes brought about by education improvement of morals, and triumph of reason" rather than revolutionary upheavals. He believed the enlightened nobility had to direct this movement with the cooperation of a "wise autocrat, who would take the initiative for emancipating the serfs and introducing a series of other reforms in the interests of the working people" (Binyon). After the Decembrist uprising failed, Pushkin expressed his ideas of preserving old ideals in his works *Vo glubine sibirskih rud* (In the Depth of the Siberian Mines), *Poslanie Pushchinu* (Letter to Pushkin), and *Arion*.

Pushkin's thoughts on Russian character as well as the history at the time of the Decembrist movement was expressed in *Boris Godunov* (1824-25). He noted that the problem of the peasantry in Russia should not be settled by a spontaneous uprising of the Russian people, but rather through enlightenment. Enlightened nobility could pave the way to the freedom of the people by becoming a connection between the tsar and his subjects. Pushkin demonstrated both the inertness of the people as well as their ability to be an active political force in the play *Boris Godunov*.

Boris Godunov dramatizes the defining events in Russia at the end of 16th and the beginning of 17th centuries. In the beginning of the play when Boris comes to power he is described as having "...known, by fear, and love, and glory, how to bewitch the people" (Pushkin, "Boris Godunov" 5). From the beginning, the fact that the people can be bewitched demonstrates how easily manipulated and simple they are. Furthermore, the fact that he needs to "bewitch" the people demonstrates a dependency on them. There is a power in the people's simplicity that he needs in order to rule. Boris argues that he was "chosen by the people's will," but in reality the people had no say in the matter in the beginning of the play (Pushkin, "Boris Godunov" 12). Later on in the play, a monk speaking to Gregori reinforces this idea of the

Russians: "...our folk are dull of brain, easy of faith, and glad to be amazed by miracles and novelties. The boyars remember Godunov as he was, peer to themselves; and even now the race of the old Varyags is loved by all" (Pushkin, "Boris Godunov" 24). This is true because at the end of the play, the people believe that Gregori is the Dmitri who by some miracle lives, but yet they still do not lift the blame off of Boris for Dmitri's death (Serman 35). This is neither rational nor logical, and there is a coexistence of two ideas in the popular consciousness. This is because people believed in miracles, because it released them from seeking the rational explanation. The contradictory elements demonstrated a way of thinking. Pushkin realized the Russian people live in the *hope* of a miracle, and they do not expect history to have a favorable outcome for them. The hope was a "manifestation of the people's stagnation, inertia, inability to change" (Serman 37).

In the world of *Boris Godunov*, the people are imprisoned, tortured, or in exile. Disgrace awaits them every day, and the people have lost faith in their tsar Boris (Pushkin, "Boris Godunov" 45). Boris thinks very low of the people, stating that "the power that lives is hateful to the mob,--only the dead they love. We are but fools when our heart vibrates to the people's groans and passionate wailing" (Pushkin, "Boris Godunov" 29). His advisor Shuisky is apt to agree and suggest that "the mob is thoughtless, changeable, rebellious, credulous, lightly given to vain hope, obedient to each momentary impulse, to truth deaf and indifferent; it feedeth on fables; shameless boldness pleaseth it" (Pushkin, "Boris Godunov" 52). Boris was a chosen, elected tsar by the people, and his opinion of the people after he became tsar was unfair. Because Boris was a chosen tsar, he should have built his relationship with the people instead of destroying it by instilling fear. A Prisoner talking to Dmitri describes the situation under the tsar's rule: "They dare not talk too much there now. Of some the tongues have been cut off, of

others even the heads. It is a fearsome state of things--each day an execution. All the prisons are crammed...it is just sheer misery" (Pushkin, "Boris Godunov" 95). The tsar's coldness and lack of understanding drove the people to seek a 'miracle' and a way out of the situation, thereby preparing them to be victims of deception, of Gregory masquerading as Dmitri.

When Gregory is talking to Marina, he makes it clear that the people are ready to be manipulated. He argues, "...neither king, nor pope, nor nobles trouble whether my words be true, whether I be Dmitri or another. What care they? But I provide a pretext for revolt and war; and this is all they need" (Pushkin, "Boris Godunov" 77). The people have been driven to such desperation that they will take any excuse to revolt. Gregory is not a serious statesman like Boris, but if Boris refuses to listen to the people, in the end Russia will be governed by a pretender, who may not even care about Russia the way a tsar should about his homeland. Gregory doesn't have concrete political or social ideals, and he came to power only out of the desperation of the people. Whereas Gregory is manipulating the people for his own ends, Boris had the people's interests at heart but let his relationship with the people die. Boris states that "the granaries I made them free of, scattered gold among them, found labor for them...a fire cursed their homes; I built for them new dwellings" (Pushkin, "Boris Godunov" 29). According to Boris, he has done so much for the people and they are thankless.

Boris tried to keep tradition whereas Gregory exploited the people's belief in miracles for his own ends. Gregory represents a "violation of tradition", which is central to the Russian people (Serman 31). However, the people do not see what is happening and fall under Gregory's spell, thereby betraying themselves. Gregory doesn't care about Russia's glorious past and will "rupture with every religious and ethical tradition of Russia" because he is a foreigner out to build a better life for himself. The tragedy is that a foreigner can manipulate the people because

the relationship between the people and the tsar is ruptured; the rupture first caused by the disconnect between tsar and the people, manifested in the tsar's disregard of the people's strong potential for political influence as well as the people's lack of trust in their leader.

Basmanov, a Russian officer, thinks he will be fine if he sticks by the tsar because the tsar controls the army. Gavrila Pushkin points out that strength lies not in brute force, but rather in the people. He argues, "...dost thou know wherein our strength lies? Not in the army, no, nor in Polish aid, but in opinion-yes, in popular opinion (Pushkin, "Boris Godunov" 109). These words reflect Alexander Pushkin's view that there is a strength and a purpose to a dialogue between the people and the ruler. Gavrila Pushkin argues that the army only carried out orders dictated by Boris because the army was intimidated and afraid of the tsar. He manipulates Basmanov in this way onto the side of Gregory.

In the Public Square in Moscow Gavrila Pushkin appeals to the people: "In love, in peace Dmitri comes to you." People respond by saying, "What is to be said? The boyar spake truth. Long live Dmitri" (Pushkin, "Boris Godunov" 109). People as the political force are manipulated by boyars also. At the end of the play, Pushkin alludes to the idea that the children of Boris are killed by the boyars, so "Dmitri comes in peace" is not true. Boris began his rule in the shadows of murder and so did Gregory. The message at the end of the play is to the people to realize their value, power, and to stop letting themselves be manipulated by the people holding positions of authority. In addition, Pushkin depicted the consequences of a lack of communication between the people and their ruler to be fatal for both parties. By building a relationship with their tsar with the aid of enlightened aristocrats the people will not be left speechless and powerless in the end. People without a tsar who cares about them are just as disjointed as a tsar mistreating the people he's sworn to protect.

Alexander Pushkin's Boris parallels Pushkin's views of Peter the Great. Both tsars let their people down by overlooking their potential as a political force. Pushkin worked on the large-scale scholarly *Istoriia Petra I* (History of Peter I). According to Pushkin, Peter set Russia on the path of enlightenment and progress, portraying Peter as a great reformer. In the *Bronze Horseman* Pushkin points out that Peter the Great built a strong sea-port city on a marsh, allowing trade to flourish and bring Russia revenue and honor. He states, "I love thee city of Peter's making" and refers to Peter the Great as "he", revealing a godlike, prophetic admiration for the tsar (Pushkin, "The Bronze Horseman"). Pushkin also placed Peter in an equal position with nature, stating, "He mused: 'From here, indeed /shall we strike terror in the Swede;/ And here a city by our labor/Founded, shall gall our haughty neighbor;/'Here cut'-so Nature gives command-'Your window through on Europe stand", reinforcing the extent and level of his power (Pushkin, "The Bronze Horseman"). Peter is equal to the divine power of Nature, so much so that the "very element will surrender" to the powerful city he created (Pushkin, "The Bronze Horseman"). Pushkin continues the work by demonstrating Alexander I's inability to connect to his people and his tendency to give up on them. When the poor ask the tsar for help against the flood destroying their homes, Alexander I does little to comfort his people and ease their suffering, stating, "For tsars there is no pitting / Their power against the Lord's" (Pushkin, "The Bronze Horseman"). Here, Alexander I is painted as disconnected from his people. In addition, when the tsar finally decides to intervene, the people are "...drowning where they dwelled" (Pushkin, "The Bronze Horseman"). The tsar's lateness in helping his people expresses his lack of confidence and underlines his weakness of being indecisive. Compared to Peter, Alexander I is weak and not fulfilling the legacy Peter left him. However, the actual Peter the Great also harbored a disdain for the people and ruled as a tyrant, revealing his shortcomings. Pushkin

believed Peter's reforms to be "a violent revolutionary occurrence, which had positive effects on the historical fortunes of Russia, but also increased the oppression of the people and led to the creation of the service bureaucracy" (Binyon). The nobility had a stake in the system that privileged their own class; advocating for the peasants therefore was not in their interest. Ultimately, the reforms done by Peter led to loss of national traditions of culture (Binyon). In *The Bronze Horseman*, criticism of authority is reinforced through the character of Yevgeny, who after becoming "fear-stricken," "pitiful," and a "madman" perishes at the end of the work. He is reduced to a "chill corpse in a pauper's grave", and his treatment reveals the cruelty of the tsar (Pushkin, "The Bronze Horseman"). These mistreatments of the peasants by the nobility and monarch are paralleled in *Boris Godunov*. Boris was wrong to assume that "we can restrain the people only by unsleeping sternness...kindness is lost upon the people...extort and execute-'twill be no worse for you" (Pushkin, "Boris Godunov" 102). The rupture of the dictatorial power from the people was the main reason for Boris Godunov's failure on the throne. Pushkin's purpose in portraying the tyranny of the two rulers was not to advocate a rebellion or democracy, but for the stories to rather to serve as examples of the providential forces of history, reinforcing the idea that one's task in life is to become enlightened. He believed people had a right to learn from their history and read the signs of providence.

Both Pushkin's *Bronze Horseman* and *Boris Godunov* exude the idea that national identity is formed in part by strong leaders, and when the rulers do not have a dialogue with their people, an important part of that identity is lost. It is difficult to give a monarch the power and responsibility to represent a country when he does not know what his country truly is because he doesn't know his people. In Pushkin's letter, which was actually a draft of a letter written in French that he never mailed, to the Russian philosopher Pyotr Chaadaev written on October 19,

1836, Pushkin exposes his views on Russian national identity. Chaadaev was Pushkin's friend, free-thinking and Western-oriented. Later on in his life, Chaadaev was declared insane for his unorthodox views. Pushkin valued Chaadaev's opinion, and therefore spoke openly to him about Russian affairs. Pushkin's letter is important because it displays insight into what the author thought about the state of Russia, both historically and during his time.

In his letter, Pushkin conveys how important Russia has been historically and Russia's legendary potential despite its current state of oppressed society. Pushkin opens the letter by stating that as Russians, "we had our own special destiny (mission)" and that Russia has a "boundless territory." The idea of Russia as a powerful entity is underlined by Russia's seemingly limitless land absorbing the Mongol invasion in the mid-13th century. This was the first time Russia proved itself to be significant. Pushkin then proceeds to defending Russia's historical significance. He argues that Russians sacrificed being part of Europe because they had their own destiny. He writes, "We have had to lead a completely distinct existence...by means of our martyrdom, the energetic development of Catholic Europe was spared any interference" (Shaw 779). Russia is backward, but is powerful because it was able to sacrifice itself for Europe. This doesn't mean that Russia will not be able to catch up to Europe. Russia has sacrificed itself for Europe from this beginning, and the idea of suffering is inherent in Russians and makes them strong. In addition, Pushkin points out that "our clergy, before the end of the patriarchy in the time of Peter the Great, was worthy of respect...it would never have called for reformation at such a moment when humanity was most in need of unity" (Shaw 780). Russia goes through reformation during its own time and pace, willing to put off progress for the well-being of others.

Pushkin asks Chaadaev if he really cannot find anything in Russia that will "amaze the future historian." Pushkin mentions Peter the Great, Catherine II, as well as Alexander who led Chaadaev to Paris in order to prove how much rich history is interwoven into Russia's past. Russia's power has expanded, and all of this history cannot be brushed over lightly as if it was but "only an insipid and half-forgotten dream" (Shaw 780). While Russia's past has been connected with Europe's, it is Russia who has had to make a lot of the sacrifices.

Patriotic and proud of his country, Pushkin describes what Russia is: "Although I personally care deeply for our sovereign, I am not at all impressed with all that I see around me; as a man of letters I am annoyed, as a man with strong tastes, I am insulted, but upon my honor, not for the world would I want to change the fatherland or have a different history than that of our forefathers such as God gave us." Despite the fact that Pushkin hates what Russia has become, he would not change his country because it is his and all the trial and tribulations that brought Russia here are important and make it the country it is today. Pushkin sees the current state of things as something that can be changed as well as something Russia has to go through to grow as a country.

In his writing, Pushkin captured the idea that Russia has a heartbreaking history filled with tragedies and triumphs that cannot and should not be ignored. He also observed that currently Russia's society "is a sad thing" and that "this want of social opinion, this indifference towards any duty, injustice, or truth, this cynical disdain for human thought and dignity really can lead to despair." In his letter to Chaadaev, Pushkin demonstrates his eagerness for Russia to move on from the oppressed state it is currently under. Russia's powerful history makes this necessary and as a powerful force it is up to Russia to set an example for future countries. Pushkin argues that Russians need to learn from their great past and should not be condemned

for it. Pushkin also mentions to Chaadaev that he "did well in saying it aloud." "It" can refer to Russia's current oppressed state and problems. Pushkin suggests a country's problems should be said aloud and made known to everyone so that a change can take place. People need to be made aware of the problems in their country because they have the power to change them. However, Pushkin never actually sent the letter, making it difficult and complicated to solidify and completely understand his intentions.

The works *The Bronze Horseman* and *Boris Godunov*, as well as Pushkin's letter to Chaadaev ultimately serve as a portal for understanding a subtlety that exists in the concept of national identity as it relates to Russia and Pushkin. Pushkin lived during a time when Russian identity was based off of an empire, not a "nation" in the modern sense. It is important to make the distinction that an empire is a geographical entity in which a group of states or nations are ruled by a single monarch, in Russia's case a tsar, while a "nation" refers to a group of people intertwined into a single entity by shared culture, values, and language. While Pushkin was alive, he lived in an empire, not a nation. This difference helps illuminate why Pushkin as a myth has been able to survive as long as it has; it is because for Russia, even the modern understanding of identity has remnants of the imperial. Russia today never fully achieved the status of a "nation", remaining an empire made up of hundreds of different minorities and languages, some of which were annexed by force and then exploited for their natural resources. Even when Russia was attempting to reinvent itself post-revolution, the elements of imperialism, such as Pushkin's works that demonstrated ideas in defense of imperialism and the tsar, never left the Russian identity. Ilya Prizel argues that while Russian authors were able to challenge the "inequities of Russian society", they never critiqued imperialism. Rather, "When it came to commenting on Russia's state policy, Russian literature was consistently pro-imperial" (Prizel 170).

Consequently, Pushkin remains present in modern Russia, and the country was never able to truly reinvent itself and gain a national identity in the modern sense of the word.

Pushkin's novel *Evgenii Onegin* provides yet another insight into Pushkin's view of Russian identity. Pushkin admitted in this novel that the character Tatyana had a Russian soul, which has led scholars and readers to see this character as representative of what it is to be a Russian. Pushkin's first description of Tatyana was her name, which had "association with olden days beyond recall, with humble roots and servants' hall" (Pushkin, "Evgenii Onegin" 46). Tatyana was "a wild creature, sad and pensive, shy as a doe and apprehensive" (Pushkin, "Evgenii Onegin" 47). She was a country girl, fragile, pure, and honest. Tatyana was what the Russian woman should be at the core. This "gentle lass" who had a "gentle soul" proceeded to make a declaration of love to Onegin (Pushkin, "Evgenii Onegin" 94). Pushkin juxtaposes Tatyana's gentleness with Onegin, who Pushkin refers to as a tyrant who will crush her. Pushkin wrote that Tatyana was "doomed to perish" by giving Onegin the power (Pushkin, "Evgenii Onegin" 64).

Pushkin underlines that Tatyana is powerful in her simplicity. Her simplicity carries within it inherent nobility. Onegin describes Tatyana as having "touching valor" as well as being a trusting soul, a "Russian soul" (Pushkin, "Evgenii Onegin" 87). The first time Tatyana saw Onegin after her meeting with him in the park where he rejected her, she was hurt but kept herself poised. She couldn't look at Onegin and was trembling and unable to breath. However, "deep within her will and strength of mind were working still, and they prevailed" (Pushkin, "Evgenii Onegin" 123). She had dignity and grace and bore her pain well.

Tatyana carries strength deep within the soul. She does not cry in front of Olga or her mother (Pushkin, "Evgenii Onegin" 161). However, Tatyana is not emotionless because she has

the ability to cry, but she is a strong person because she does not show this emotion in front of everyone. However, "once inside that silent study, sealed off at last from everybody, the world for just a time forgot, Tatyana wept and mourned her lot..." (Pushkin, "Evgenii Onegin" 166). Tatyana only weeps in seclusion; she appears strong, but is also fragile. There is a balanced mix between strength and fragility in her character. At the beginning of the novel, she is representative of Romantic ideals and sentiments.

Pushkin depicts the country as the center of Russian identity with society as its weak outer shell. Russian identity is made up of two paradoxical parts: The real, unchangeable, and constant core of the Russian soul is in the country, while the outer layer is in society, prone to influence from Europe. Evgenii Onegin represents the easily changeable European. In addition, Pushkin needed foreign words to describe Onegin, but was perfectly able to describe Tatyana without difficulty because she symbolizes what it is to be Russian. Pushkin describes Onegin as being an "empty phantom", which is different from Tatyana who is bound to the land and constant, which is part of being Russian. Pushkin depicts Tatyana as having a Russian duty that "held her heart, she knew not why" to love the beautiful Russian winter (Pushkin, "Evgenii Onegin" 110). Onegin's opinion of Tatyana is changed easily, demonstrating how flighty and easily manipulated he is by a European façade. At first, Onegin rejected Tatyana because she was a simple country girl, but at the end of the novel he confessed his love and wanted the strong, confident Tatyana who was well-respected in society. When Tatyana rejected Onegin he was forsaken, "stood seared, as if by heaven's fire (Pushkin, "Evgenii Onegin" 210). He could not comprehend that the changed Tatyana could reject him. At the end of the novel, Tatyana's identity changes into something neo-classical. While Tatyana still loves the country and retains some of her fragility, she changes, grows, and learns how to appear strong and confident.

The country is open, there is freedom and possibility. When Tatyana is leaving the country for the city, she says her farewell to "celestial beauty's home" in the open fields. The term "open fields" suggests liberty and opportunity. Tatyana then sighs, "I leave your world of quiet joys for empty glitter, fuss, and noise! Farewell, my freedom, deeply cherished" (Pushkin, "Evgenii Onegin" 169). Pushkin reveals that freedom is only found in the country as well as that the country is a vital part of Russia's identity. For example, Tatyana was very close with her peasant nanny and told her all of her secrets, revealing a bond and trust with the nanny. The nanny, a serf peasant, symbolizes a pure connection to the people. Tatyana felt safe enough to share her secret thoughts, and her soul felt safe because there is something innately pure about the country. Before Tatyana writes to Onegin, only the nurse knows of Tatyana's love, and the nurse is the first person Tatyana confesses her love of Onegin to. There is simplicity in the nurse and the nurse appears insignificant because of her position, yet she is the one who keeps the most important information for Tatyana, revealing her power as well as the important role the peasants play for Russia.

Tatyana proceeds to travel from the country, the heart of the Russian identity, to Moscow, the capital and therefore the expected heart of Russia itself when foreigners look at Russia. This binary is typical for Romantic poets and shows how Pushkin was influenced by the Romantic clichés. In Moscow Tatyana finds herself in a trance, takes no part in the giddy conversation around her, and remains in silence and in meditation (Pushkin, "Evgenii Onegin" 178). She believes the people to be pallid and weary, dreary and incoherent. They lack substance and care only for meaningless gossip. Tatyana's mind finds "no spark, [her] heart no cause to beat the quicker; and even simple-minded fun this hollow world has learned to shun" (Pushkin, "Evgenii Onegin" 179). Her heart is in the country, not the city because the city has nothing

significant to offer her. Nevertheless, she does her duty, further underlying the theme of the triumph of duty over passion, which is in itself a non-romantic gesture. Her rejection of Onegin at the end of the novel is the culmination of the novel being an exploitation and then rejection of Romantic sentiments.

Even though Tatyana loathes the new world of European ideals that contain no substance, she learns to develop a new attitude (Pushkin, "Evgenii Onegin" 181). She becomes calm and dignified, and the first time Onegin sees Tatyana in this new state, he is left in mute dismay (Pushkin, "Evgenii Onegin" 194). Tatyana appears calm, free, and unconstrained. Pushkin describes her as having "lordly rank's commanding ways (Pushkin, "Evgenii Onegin" 198). It is easy for Tatyana to adapt this cold attitude and fit in with society because society is an act easily mastered, further proving that it is an outer shell easily manipulated. Onegin falls into the façade and describes Tatyana's transformation: "Tatyana... but not the timid maid who'd pleaded, that poor enamored girl he'd known-but this cool princess so resplendent, this distant goddess so transcendent, who ruled the queenly Neva's shore" (Pushkin, "Evgenii Onegin" 198). Onegin equates the new Tatyana to a queen and is in awe at the transformation of her identity from the open and fragile girl he's known. Tatyana's identity is now constructed of elements from her childhood in the country as well as the ability to act as foreign people and society expect her to. Tatyana still breaks down and retains her fragility in the end of the novel, but gains knowledge of how to be strong through socialization. At heart, Russia is very fragile, but society made Russia's outer shell appear strong.

While Tatyana represents Russian identity, Onegin represents the identity of Europe. When Pushkin described Onegin, he described him as wearing "pantaloon, gilet, and frock-these words are hardly Russian stock," suggesting that Onegin did not dress or express himself in a

Russian way (Pushkin, "Evgenii Onegin" 16). He was not simple like the Russian Tatyana, but foreign, down to the very clothes he wore. Pushkin suggests there is something unique and beautiful in simplicity when he describes Tatyana. Tatyana, with her simple heart, "passion in such an honest, artless fashion...lively mind and will, and with a spirit never still, and with a heart that's warm and tender", represents what it is to be Russian for Pushkin (Pushkin, "Evgenii Onegin" 68).

It's interesting to point out how both Pushkin and Tatyana's fate are so similar. In fact, "Pushkin's fate describes also Tatyana's, for she too quickly became the object of national veneration, an icon to be fought over, to be praised or blasphemed, but rarely to be understood" (Hasty 6). Tatyana's appearance at the ball with her husband made heads turn and people were speechless when they saw her. Pushkin's friend Kiukhel'beker notes that "for a person who has grown up with him and who knows him inside and out as I do, the feeling with which Pushkin is filled is noticeably everywhere, although he, like Tatiana, does not want the whole world to know about this feeling" (Hasty 216). Pushkin has an ease and grace like the heroin Tatyana in *Evgenii Onegin*, as well as a power that comes from simplicity. Like Tatyana, there is modesty in this poet that makes him all the more powerful.

Пушкин и Александр I

Александр Пушкин вырос и начал формировать свои политические взгляды во времена правления Александра I, который был императором России с 1801 по 1825 год. На протяжении всей русской истории Пушкин был «...одновременно консерватором, либералом, революционером, идеологом крестьянской революции, а также стилизованным православным монархистом» (Kahn 105). Использование образ этого поэта большим количеством людей, стоящих у власти, оказало огромное влияние на русскую культуру. Такие политические лидеры, как Николай I и Сталин, использовали образ Пушкина для пропаганды своих собственных начинаний и с целью отвлечь общественность от оценки подлинного состояния текущих дел в стране.

Либеральный период правления Александра I, а также Лицей, способствовали обмену различными идеями; во время своего пребывания в Лицее Пушкин разработал основу своих политических взглядов. Вооружившись идеями Шарля Монтескье, которые были сосредоточены вокруг либеральной концепции о том, что необходимо существование договора между правителями и народом, Пушкин начал размышлять о России в новом критическом ключе (Kahn 106). В это время Пушкин считал тиранию лучшей альтернативой аристократии и дворянству у власти, потому что это создало бы благоприятные условия для изменения, и, в конечном счете, «уничтожение классовых границ, распространение просвещения и свободы для народа» (Kahn 109). Пушкин утверждал, что диктатура Петра проложила путь к отмене крепостного права, и что уступка власти аристократии будет препятствовать реформам. Пушкин разделял взгляды Тургенева и считал, что сильная монархическая власть является необходимой для ликвидации оппозиции со стороны знати, а также освобождения крепостных перед

началом политической реформы. По мнению Тургенева, «Александр освободил народы Европы от деспотизма Наполеона и тем самым заработал себе бессмертную славу. Его задача сейчас - это освободить свой народ от рабства, и его слава будет увеличиваться» (Kahn 109).

Тем не менее, после окончания лицея Пушкин разочаровался в Александре и возможности реформ во время его правления. Анти-аристократическая точка зрения Пушкина 1810-х годов изменилась в 1820 году: теперь Пушкин считает, что чиновники ответственны за взаимоотношения власти и народа, а аристократии необходимо занять роль посредника. Несмотря на жестокость Петра Великого Пушкин восхищался им и уважал его за лидерство. Прадед Пушкина, Ганнибал, вырос при царском дворе. Пушкин гордился своей семьей и благородным происхождением. Однако он считая, что дворянство заслуживало право голоса в парламенте, обвинил Екатерину Великую (1762-1796) в подрыве влияния знати. Например, в Уставе дворянства в 1785 году Екатерина описала привилегии знати, где говорилось, что дворяне сохраняют неограниченный социальный и экономический контроль над своими крепостными в обмен на абсолютную политическую верность государю. С одной стороны, у элиты было больше власти над своими крепостными, но с другой стороны, она не оказывала влияния на государство, как это стало при Петре Великом (Kahn 3). Пушкин был возмущен этим фактом. В результате ложное чувство власти дворянства при Екатерине Великой, массовое недовольство Александром I и невыполнение обещания освободить крепостных крестьян подорвало веру Пушкина в способности царей прислушиваться к своим подданным. Присоединившись к движению декабристов в 1820 году, Пушкин рассматривал идею революционного переворота (Kahn 109).

Важно отметить, что разочарование Пушкина в Александре I стало дополнительным толчком для оказания поэтом поддержки декабристам. Это отношение к Александру I усугублялось тем, что образ императора, который Пушкин создал в своем уме, существенно отличался от реального образа. Впервые Александр Пушкин увидел царя еще будучи ребенком в 1811 году. Будущий поэт был в числе первых учеников нового, свободомыслящего лицея, который царь пытался создать отличным от традиционных для русской системы образования учебных заведений (Strakhovsky 17). Личное обаяние монарха, а также тот факт, что сам лицей был расположен в крыле императорского дворца с доступом к просторному саду, произвел впечатление на Пушкина и укрепил идеализированное представление о царе, которое создал в своем воображении двенадцатилетний мальчик. У Пушкина было, скорее, сыновье чувство к царю, чем страх перед верховным правителем. Таким образом, близость к императору позволила поэту поверить, что он может развивать отношения с царем, и не быть объектом его авторитарного правления. Другое действие царя, свержение Наполеона в 1814 году, вызывало чувство благородства и национальной гордости. Подобные действия были достаточными, «... чтобы разжечь огонь воображения и патриотизм мальчика тринадцати лет» (Strakhovsky 17). Позже Александр I не оправдывает ожидания повзрослевшего Пушкина, который настаивает на освобождении крестьян. Кроме того, содействие царя ссылке Пушкина ещё больше озлобляет поэта. Досада и разочарование, связанное с бездействием царя, усилились, когда тот своими действиями начал разрушать идеализированный образ, созданный Пушкиным в детстве. Дополнительным толчком для вступления в декабристское движение был тот факт, что близкие друзья и собеседники поэта были или участниками, или сторонниками движения. В конечном результате, во

время разговора в Пушкина уже со следующим царем Николаем I 1826 году, стало ясно, что Пушкин не полностью поддерживает идеологию декабристов.

Пушкин и Николай I

После провала восстания декабристов в 1825 году Пушкин получил аудиенцию у царя. Поняв, что поэта можно использовать в своих интересах, Николай I помиловал Александра Сергеевича. Отныне царь будет подвергать цензуре произведения, разрешенные Пушкину к печати. Желание царя выступать в качестве «первого читателя и цензора» Пушкина было беспрецедентным (Kahn 114). Писатель и его друзья восприняли эту встречу как добрый жест со стороны царя. Это привело к тому, что сам Пушкин отнесся к разговору с большой долей наивности. Поскольку такой шаг со стороны царя был беспрецедентным и неслыханным, Пушкин надеялся, что Николай I, наконец, позволит ему стать его советником и сделает первые шаги к предоставлению писателям и учёным право голоса. Полностью попав под обаяние царя, поэт покинул Николая I, «искренне приняв решение исправиться и стать верным подданным» (Strakhovsky 23).

В начале этого соглашения Пушкин считал себя ценным советником царя, связующим звеном между царем и народом. Он обратился к Николаю в стихотворении «Стансы», опубликованном в 1826 году (Bethea 185). В начале стихотворения Пушкин провел параллель между Николаем I и Петром Великим. Пушкин писал: «Начало славных дней Петра омрачили мятежи и казни». «Но правдой он привлёк сердца, но нравы укротил наукой» (Bethea 185). В произведении Пушкина характер Петра описывается как «дальновидный, энергичный, и великодушный» (Steiner 99). Россия имела светлое будущее с таким лидером, как Петр, который политически сформировал страну. Пушкин считал себя в состоянии изменить будущее и в культурном, и поэтическом плане, и испытывал чувство благодарности и смирения за возможность давать царю советы. В перспективе реформа была достаточно положительной в 1826 и 1827 годах. Пушкин

считал, что Николай I тоже мог стать великим лидером, если бы он прислушивался ко мнению своих советников, учёл уроки прошлого и продолжил дело предыдущих царей, в частности, Петра (Bethea 189). Пушкин призывал царя иметь «всеобъемлющую душу» и быть «рабочим на троне», работать во имя изменений и милосердия и опробовать роль благородного посредника (Bethea 189). В целом же стихотворение «Стансы» символизирует наивный призыв освободить политических заключенных. Царь не принял обращение Пушкина всерьез. Кроме того, декабристы были «шокированы его очевидными попытками оправдать в первых строках «Стансов» суровые репрессии, обрушившиеся на радикалов» (Bethea 189).

К сожалению, союз с монархом, о котором мечтал Пушкин, не получился. Пушкин подвергался жесткой цензуре и был под контролем со стороны государственных чиновников, одним из которых был Генерал Бенкендорф (Kahn 111). Пушкин не догадывался, что всё, что Николай I хотел, это централизовать свою абсолютную власть и лишить дворянство права на политическую деятельность. Намного позже, когда Пушкин наконец понимает, что «иметь царя в качестве своего личного цензора означало иметь больше, а не меньше, ограничений его поэзии и действий» (Bethea 188), и что цензура сделали Пушкина скорее марионеткой, чем советником и объединителем людей.

Леонид Страховский пишет, что Николай I восхищался Пушкиным. После разговора с поэтом в первый раз, царь сказал Д. Н. Блудову, «Вы знаете, что я только что разговаривал с самым замечательным человеком на всей территории России?» (Strakhovsky 29). Однако надо понимать, что признавать талант Пушкина и воздерживаться от манипулирования поэтом – это не две взаимоисключающие идеи. Например, Николай I послал записку Пушкину, когда тот лежал при смерти, говоря о том,

что Пушкин должен умереть христианином и не беспокоиться о своей семье, потому что царь будет заботиться о них. Сдержав своё слово, Николай заплатил долги Пушкина, назначил пенсию вдове и дочери, заплатил за образование сыновей, опубликовал его работы за счет правительства и предоставил семье одноразовое пособие в сумме 10000 рублей (Strakhovsky 29). С одной стороны, в этой ситуации Николай проявил сострадание и человеколюбие. С другой стороны, действия императора, можно также расценивать, как способ использовать великодушную щедрость, чтобы пробудить в людях преданность, манипулировать народом с целью подавления мыслей о возможном восстании. Народ любил Пушкина, и как следствие будет также любить царя из уважения и любви к Пушкину. Отвлекая народ унижением всего, что опозорило бы имя Пушкина, Николай I способствует тому, чтобы общественность запомнила только самые лучшие моменты жизни Пушкина. В результате уважение к поэту увеличивается, а роль поэта, как мученика, укрепляется.

Пушкин в Сталинскую Эпоху

На протяжении советской эпохи имя Пушкина использовалось для оправдания застойных явлений и отвлечения людей от реальной ситуации в стране. Во время революции такие поэты, как Владимир Маяковский, Павел Сакулин, Владимир Фриче и другие, поддерживавшие динамические изменения в стране, пытались разрушить миф о Пушкине. В 1912 году Маяковский призывал «выбросить Пушкина за борт парохода современности» (Kahn 204). Но не только он открыто выразил своё отношение к Пушкину, как к символу старой отжившей дореволюционной России. Еще задолго до Маяковского Дмитрий Иванович Писарев в 1865 году также говорил о Пушкине как о пройденной ступени (Кулешов 149).

В 1920 году коммунисты призывали к полному уничтожению всего, что было связано с царской Россией, в том числе литературы и Пушкина. Они утверждали, что литература была пособником царского гнета и была «в сговоре с ненавистным режимом, чтобы скрыть “язвы царизма”» (Kahn 204). В эти годы Пушкин был для коммунистов «рабским поэтом», а не фигурой для почитания и уважения, несмотря на то, что позже, в эпоху социалистического реализма, это мнение изменилось. В 20-е годы «замаскированный дворянин» Пушкин был в лучшем случае только представителем «просвещенной аристократии», моментом в истории (Kahn 205). Такое мнение наглядно демонстрирует желание полного разрыва с Пушкиным. Ненавистное отношение партии к писателю в это время объясняется ее желанием полностью уничтожить старый царский режим и построить новую идеологию с нуля. Революция в России внесла изменения в понимание и оценке новых стандартов культуры страны.

Тем не менее, строительство страны с нуля оказалось слишком трудным для коммунистической партии. Ответ от провинциального чиновника в 1920 году на сделанное ранее заявление Маяковского, преуменьшающего значение Пушкина, звучит так: «Не забывайте, что я не позволю вам говорить неуважительно о работе органов власти, я имею в виду, Пушкина и так далее» (Kahn 204). В то время как Маяковский пытался вести Россию в новом направлении, свободном от прошлых ошибок и мифов, правительственные чиновники не были готовы отказаться от одного из способов, который позволил бы повысить моральный дух народа. В 1918 году в то время, когда Пушкин был объектом нападок, власти находились не на стороне писателя, но в середине 1920-х годов чиновники поняли, что Россия слишком отстала, чтобы начинать с нуля, и нуждается в более прочном фундаменте. Таким образом, возникла новая экономическая политика, во время которой власти нашли оправдание связи Пушкина с классом буржуазии.

В начале эпохи советской власти и в первые годы после революции партии было необходимо не отставать от идей пролетариата для получения его поддержки. Военный коммунизм закончился, изменив вместе с партией свой менталитет. Теперь Маяковский считает Пушкина «товарищем», но еще не совсем большой фигурой власти. Связь Пушкина с аристократией теперь рассматривается не как его вина, а «канон, в который он был включен» (Kahn 204). Одно из оправданий коммунистической партии для Пушкина в 1924 году было основано на том, что поскольку он жил как писатель на свои доходы, он входил в состав «промежуточных слоев рабочего класса городской интеллигенции» (Kahn 205). Хотя Пушкин сам зарабатывал себе на жизнь, он всё же был дворянином, и считал, что унаследованное дворянство должно гарантировать благородство характера, интеллектуальную независимость и личную честь (Kahn 110). Пушкин не верил, что

революция будет иметь успех в России. Он боялся «бунта, бессмысленного и беспощадного» и хотел самодержавной монархии, которая бы слушалась и руководствовалась советами мыслящих консультантов для того, чтобы гарантировать стабильность в России. Пушкин рассматривал революционные действия как «преступные» и «позорные» и призывал к сотрудничеству между образованными дворянами и монархией (Strakhovsky 27). Очевидно, взгляды Пушкина были далеки от тех идей коммунистической партии, которая хотела насильственного свержения буржуазии пролетариатом.

Противники литературы царского режима, потерпев поражение в разрушении мифа о Пушкине, решили использовать имя поэта в своих целях в качестве культурно-политической силы. Если идея развенчания Пушкина сработала во время революции (люди были в отчаянии и хотели добиться изменений любыми средствами и не задумывались о последствиях), то в послереволюционной России люди утратили иллюзии и возвратились в мрачную реальность. В конце концов коммунистические лидеры, например, Владимир Ленин поняли, что Россия была слишком отсталой, чтобы правильно восстановиться и призвать другие страны к революции. Ленин понимал, что России необходимо вернуться к капитализму на какое-то время для того, чтобы она смогла улучшить свою экономику, чтобы снова стать великой державой. Это означало необходимость осуществления новой экономической политики, в которой Пушкину должно быть отведено место буржуазного специалиста в области литературы. Россия должна учиться у буржуазии. Пушкин превращается в романтического изгоя своей буржуазной среды, который «оставил свой класс и вошёл в другой без всякого представления о теории социальных классов и классовой борьбы... Его судьба стала

судьбой отщепенца, который совершил прорыв в то время, когда ещё не существовало класса, в который бы он вошёл» (Kahn 205). Таким образом, коммунисты поставили Пушкина на пьедестал и провозгласили его вдохновителем превращения России в великую нацию. Так в 1937 году по случаю столетия со дня смерти поэта Сталин устроил грандиозное всенародное празднество, создав огромную рекламу Пушкину, тем самым отвлекая народ от репрессий, происходивших в то время в стране. Кроме того, новая оценка Пушкина помогала сближению правительства с народом, так как произведения поэта были «литературой, доступной для масс» (Kahn 205). Запретить её было бы ошибкой, потому что это нарушило бы самосознание народа. Произведения Пушкина рассматривались как нечто иное, как сборник «виртуозных методов», и использовались пролетарскими писателями, художниками и композиторами в создании искусства, которое было бы «доступным для людей» и «понятным массам» (Kahn 206), пролетариат принимал Пушкина за своего. Пережить неожиданные и радикальные изменения всего правительства и образа жизни оказалось легче потому, что у народа остался Пушкин – то есть нечто фундаментальное по-прежнему сохранилось. Вот почему Пушкин сначала вернулся в культуру в качестве «буржуазного профессионала», а затем превратился в национального поэта.

Когда Иосиф Сталин взял под контроль партию, Пушкин стал использоваться как культурно-политическая сила, чтобы отвлечь людей от плохой экономической ситуации и чудовищного террора по всей стране. Пушкин продолжал проникать в повседневную жизнь с лозунгами «За Сталина, наше руководство и наш свет: в атаку! / В борьбе за Пушкина / За непобедимый флаг Ленина» (Sheikh-Zade 149). Напоминая о великом прошлом России, такие лозунги должны были вызывать гордость в сердцах россиян и

вдохновлять их на поддержку своей страны. По версии Сталина Пушкин - это «героический романтический бунтарь, декабрист, враг самодержавия и царя, преследовавшийся гений, любящий людей-изгоев общества, интернационалист и патриот» (Kahn 208).

Объявляя Пушкина национальным поэтом, Советский Союз пытается спроектировать через него своё собственное величие. Хотя реальность была такова, что общество было разобщено во время террора, а Пушкин служил объединяющей силой. Ветераны революции, дореволюционная элита, профессора и лауреаты Сталинских премий - все могли найти общий язык, разговаривая о Пушкине (Slater 416). Литература объединила общество в одно целое. Лев Копелев пишет: «В самые страшные дни и часы войны, когда смерть была очень близка, в дни жестоких бед и самых тяжелых болезней, чудесная сила слова всегда помогала мне. Я помню друзей, живых и мертвых, хороших людей, хорошие книги, и всегда Пушкина» (Briggs 237). Миф о Пушкине представляет надежды и перемены. Лидия Лебединская пишет, что «Пушкину мы посвятили стихи, эссе, и мечты. Мы мечтали о Пушкине. Мы говорили с ним, как если бы он был жив» (Kahn 207). Ее внимание к Пушкину кажется ритуальным, она возвышает его до уровня спасителя, о котором люди молятся и о ком проповедуют. Великий Пушкин был действительностью, в которую советский народ поверил. По мнению Максима Горького (1868-1936), основоположника советской литературы, мир должен увидеть Россию через глаза Пушкина. Вера в Пушкина была «психологически здоровой» (Kahn 207) и помогала людям уйти от реальности, которую правительство одобрило, потому что он сдерживал людей от восстания против коммунистического режима, а также держал их в здравом уме.

На 150-летие со дня рождения Пушкина в 1949 году было напечатано 252 издания и 10 миллионов копий его работ на русском языке; 1,5 млн. экземпляров были переведены на 76 языков. Для сравнения в дореволюционную Россию, было продано 35 тыс. копий и сделаны переводы на 13 языков (Kahn 209). Это увеличение тиража может быть связано со сталинской пропагандой, чтобы отвлечь и успокоить общественность. Пушкин был средством, с помощью которого люди боролись с депрессией. Поэт был частью утвержденной литературы: Сталин возводил и вписывал себя в историю России, связывая своё имя с именем Пушкина как можно чаще. Вот почему на 150-летие со дня рождения Пушкина 6 июня 1949 года в Большом театре ведущий советский писатель Александр Фадеев сказал: «Мы понимаем и ценим любовь Пушкина к свободе, потому что мы свободная страна, по-настоящему свободная страна, только свободная страна в мире «...» только мы можем по достоинству оценить русскость пушкинской поэзии, потому что мы свободные потомки великой нации, которая породила Пушкина. Мы находим вдохновение в изобилии его поэзии, потому что мы самый жизнерадостный и счастливый народ в мире, уверены в своей силе и в нашем будущем» (Kahn 203).

«Мы» должна была быть партия, а также сам Сталин. Слова Фадеева показывают, что миф о Пушкине стал пропагандой, которой все были подвержены. Когда он говорит о «свободе», то это выглядит так, как будто он пытается убедить себя и свою аудиторию, что он свободен. На самом деле советские люди были заключенными в их собственной стране, мучаясь от голода и террора. В творчестве Пушкина представлены свобода и счастье, в то время как реальная Россия холодная и суровая. Таким образом, было легче любить и гордиться Россией, которую создал Пушкин. Как утверждал Олдос Хаксли: «... хотя музыка Моцарта кажется веселой, это на самом деле печально. То же самое

можно сказать и о поэзии Пушкина ... художественное выражение печали, горя и трагичности так наполнены светом, таким тихим, неземным и ангельским чувством примирения и просвещения, что содержание кажется радостным» (Briggs 211). В конечном итоге поиски средств к существованию в прямом и переносном смысле привели людей к Пушкину, чьи произведения показали общественности, как бороться с жестокостью жизни. Это было крайне необходимо народу Советского Союза.

Conclusion

Pushkin's view on the topic of national identity evolved as he aged. In Pushkin's early works, he was a follower of Romanticism, but in the later works he emphasized neo-classicism. However, this evolution is fragmentary and even contradictory at times, making it difficult to pinpoint exactly what he believed. This difficulty was readily exploited by Russian political leaders and sheds light on why Pushkin was able to become so many diverse symbols for so many different people.

Alexander Blok wrote, "There are the solemn names of emperors, generals, inventors of instruments of death, tortures and martyrs; and alongside them this one bright sound: Pushkin" (Dostoevsky 46). For Russian people Pushkin is an escape from the harsh reality of their daily lives, of oppressive leaders, and the hopelessness of a situation they are powerless to change. On June 8, 1880 at the meeting of the society of lovers of Russian literature, Dostoyevsky, in his speech about Pushkin and his importance to the Russian people, proclaimed,

Without him we should have lost, not literature alone, but much of our irresistible force, our faith in our national individuality, our belief in the people's powers, and most of all our belief in our destiny...if he had lived longer, he might, through the power of his genius, have been able to immortalize the spirit of the Russian soul (Dostoevsky 68).

Россия (Russia) in Russian is feminine, and characters in Pushkin's works such as Tatyana in *Evgenii Onegin* reflect what Russia is and strives to be: simple, yet noble, elegant, and strong. Political leaders comprehended the great influence Pushkin had over the people, and manipulated his works in order to achieve their ultimate goals. Pushkin was different in reality from the myth he has become, but one thing is certain: he continues to inspire the people who read his works.

The exploration of why Pushkin has become central to Russian identity is important. While modern Russia still considers itself an empire, it is important to note that Russia has already collapsed two times in the past hundred years of being an empire. Pushkin has been an expression of imperial Russia. It is not certain if conditions will ever favor a Russia where Pushkin is not celebrated fervently and intertwined in political slogans, but Russians can learn to understand what they are celebrating is Pushkin the myth, not Pushkin the man and the beliefs he held. This realization and overthrow of the Pushkin myth can ultimately help Russia construct an identity in the modern era, perhaps a mix between the "imperial" and "national".

Works Cited

- Bethea, David M. *Pushkin Today*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1993. Print.
- Binyon, T. J. *Pushkin: A Biography*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2003. Print.
- Briggs, A. D. P. *Alexander Pushkin: A Critical Study*. London: Croom Helm, 1983. Print.
- Culler, Jonathan D. *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997. Print.
- Dostoyevsky, Fyodor, S. S. Koteliansky, and John Middleton Murry. *Pages from the Journal of an Author*. Boston: J.W. Luce, 1916. Print.
- Franklin, Simon, and Emma Widdis. *National Identity in Russian Culture: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. Print.
- Hasty, Olga Peters. *Pushkin's Tatiana*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1999. Print.
- Kahn, Andrew. *The Cambridge Companion to Pushkin*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006. Print.
- Prizel, Ilya. *National Identity and Foreign Policy: Nationalism and Leadership in Poland, Russia, and Ukraine*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. Print.
- Pushkin, Aleksandr Sergeevich, Alfred Hayes, and C. Nabokoff. *Borís Godunóv: A Drama in Verse*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1925. Print.
- Pushkin, Aleksandr Sergeevich. *The Bronze Horseman: Selected Poems of Alexander Pushkin*. New York: Viking, 1982. Print.
- Pushkin, Aleksandr Sergeevich, James E. Falen, and Aleksandr Sergeevich Pushkin. *Evgenii Onegin: A Novel in Verse*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995. Print.
- Serman, I. Z. "Paradoxes of the Popular Mind in Pushkin's 'Boris Godunov'." *The Slavonic and East European Review* 64.1 (1986): 25-39. Print.
- Shaw, Thomas J. *The Letters of Alexander Pushkin / Vol. 1-3*. Bloomington-Philadelphia: n.p., 1963. Print.
- Sheikh-Zade, O Rodine. [Moscow]:1934. Print.
- Slater, Wendy. "The Patriots' Pushkin." *Slavic Review* 58.2 (1999): 407-27. Print.
- Steiner, Lina. "'My Most Mature Poema': Pushkin's Poltava and the Irony of Russian National Culture." *Comparative Literature* 61.2 (2009): 97-127. Print.

Strakhovsky, Leonid Ivan. *Pushkin and the Emperors Alexander I and Nicholas I*. [Toronto]: n.p., 1956. Print.

Кулешов В. И. «История русской критики XVIII—XIX веков».

Пушкин А. С. «Борис Годунов».

Пушкин А. С. «Евгений Онегин».

Пушкин А. С. «Медный всадник».