

UDC 821.161.1

Interpretation of A.S. Pushkin's personality and creativity in Prishvin's "Diaries"

Alieva Raisa Radzhabovna

PhD (Philology),

Associate Professor of the Department of History of Russian literature,

Dagestan State University,

43a, Gadzhieva str., Makhachkala,

Dagestan, 367000, Russian Federation;

e-mail: dagalieva@mail.ru

Abstract

This paper focuses on the interpretation of the creative heritage of the great Russian poet Alexander Pushkin in M.M. Prishvin's "Diaries". It is revealed a beneficial effect of Pushkin's personality here, high ideals of freedom, truth, goodness and beauty of his work on the formation of character, position in life, moral, aesthetic, philosophical beliefs of Prishvin. The originality of Pushkin's talent: sincerity, simplicity of a high sample is defined by him as "totality." Reflections on Pushkin, the nature of his talent led Prishvin to understanding of the true nature of creative talent and its role in society. M.M. Prishvin due to the influence of Pushkin managed to historically and truly, objectively comprehend and understand modern life, her "painful" problems and tragic situations. For Prishvin, Pushkin was the personification of the spiritual power of Russia, its national culture.

Keywords

Power of the creative personality, "totality", despotism and the problem of "a mask", philosophical category of freedom and necessity, thundery power of silence, the strength of resistance of a small, two types of a "little man", the opposition of "power" and "personality", a great disguise, Pushkin's aphorism.

"While Pushkin continues to exist in Russia, blizzards will not snuff out the candle"
(D. Samoilov)

Introduction

For the first time from 1991 to the present time in Russia has been carried out a multi-volume edition of the "Diaries" of M.M. Prishvin, which he has kept for nearly fifty years. Most of them were not and could not be published during the writer's life, as in Soviet times their "sober truth" was dangerous and unacceptable to the authorities. Only now, more than half a century after the death of Prishvin all his grand creation first revealed to readers and researchers, has become a unique monument of complex and difficult times experienced by Russia and the Soviet people in the 1st half of the XX century. Undoubtedly right was a wife and comrade of the writer V.D. Prishvina when recognized that the "Diaries" is probably his highest art" [Prishvin, Prishvina, 2003, 73].

Reading diaries convinces of extraordinary erudition and wide knowledge of M.M. Prishvin, depth and diversity of his reader interests, the breadth of the thematic range of his recordings.

Deepest aesthetic, philosophical, moral, and social problems and their solving have been constantly in the purview of his vision, attention and reflection throughout life, he spoke not only to his own life experience, but also to the works of Russian and foreign writers, philosophers, art historians, memoirists, critics. Many of them he reads over the years, quotes, interprets, recalls; they have become eternal companions, the contents of his inner world.

As can be seen from Prishvin's diary notes, Pushkin along with Gogol, Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky, Shakespeare and other classical writers has always lived in his memory and consciousness. He believes that Pushkin together with Tolstoy and Dostoevsky are the personification of Russia, its spiritual power. "While the world has Leo Tolstoy, Pushkin and Dostoyevsky, Russia will not perish" – wrote Prishvin as far back as World War I. [Prishvin, 2007, 545] And in the period of the most disturbing days in November 1941, he again called Pushkin as one of the best representatives of the Russian people and Russian culture. "These days of the Court of all our people, our entire culture, our Pushkin, our Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, Gogol, Peter the Great..." [Prishvin, 1986, 313]. Prishvin admitted that Pushkin is seamless for Russia, that

Russia cannot be represented without Pushkin. "I've never been concerned of Pushkin because it always seemed that Pushkin is exactly what it stands to reason" [Ibid].

He remembered the many lines of the poet, quoted him, compared his thoughts about life, its global issues. High ideals of freedom, truth, goodness and beauty, embodied in the works of Pushkin, were consonant to Prishvin's outlook and had a beneficial influence on its formation ("from the youth burned into me and made it possible to self-determination"). He remembers the poet's birthday, the anniversary of the lyceum, experiencing the tragedy of his premature death. On February 25, 1940, he wrote in the "Diary": "From the deadly wound was lying Pushkin, he was shot in the stomach, which was present in every human... But no one had such soul as Pushkin..." [Ibid, 73].

The writer admitted Pushkin's direct impact on his own creativity. Recorded on February 4, 1937, he noted that this influence is manifested, first, in the process of perception of images of natural phenomena, i.e. the ability to show the nature of the move, "phenomenologically". Secondly, it is the impact of the creative manner of the author of the novel "Eugene Onegin" upon the

method of narration in the novel "The Chain of Kashchei", more truly, on the nature of the relationship of the author and the hero.

Here Prishvin reveals originality of Pushkin's talent. It comes out in his sincerity, directness, simplicity of high standards called the "entirety". He writes: "In particular, Pushkin's simplicity is very close to me, as if it innate to him, and we have to reach it. This simplicity is well-known by everyone and at the same time it is very difficult to say what exactly it is. What does it mean? People's simplicity. In the decadent circle it is called clarity; Dostoevsky for whom Pushkin's simplicity was an elusive star, called entirety... For me – it is the best of Pushkin (2 illeg.), when I think about Pushkin" [Ibid, 317]. Thinking about Pushkin, about the nature of his talent, Prishvin came to the idea of the essence of true talent at all. "The artist is a human being who has kept himself in his heart as a child and can make a distinctive look at the world that first infant gaze and then pass its stuff through the complexity of adult thinking person. The more one may keep this baby, the more the creator has simplicity, integrity, clarity. I'm not saying that the writer should be simple: Gogol, Dostoevsky not just ordinary writers, they are brilliant. But

Gogol and Dostoevsky would have abandoned all their genius with pleasure, if they could. "I" of Pushkin – that is "we", and it doesn't feel like speaking on one's own account without shame, we should learn from the simplicity of Pushkin" [Ibid, 330].

Classical writers as representatives of Russian folk culture

Recorded on August 19, 1937 Prishvin pairwise contrasts Pushkin – Tolstoy and Gogol – Dostoevsky. The basis of the antithesis – a feature of attitude and outlook of these writers. "If taking a verbal art, then Pushkin – Tolstoy are characterized by joie de vivre, which is closed by personal tragedy of the master. In contrast, in Gogol – Dostoevsky the nature, happiness and all the life of the planet and the universe exists as a medium and condition of the person suffering [Ibid, 340].

On October 19, 1937, the day of the anniversary of the Lyceum, an entry is made on Pushkin, more specifically, about the only two values of life that are important to Pushkin: will and peace. By sympathetic tone of the entry it is noticeable that the writer by himself solidary with Pushkin. "Pushkin said about

the only two values: will and peace" [Ibid, 253].

On January 12, 1938 Pushkin's name appears in the diary in connection with the arguments of the relation of the writer's contemporaries to the heritage of the past, including the artistic heritage. For him it is undeniable that such unique phenomena as the creativity of Pushkin, Russian folk culture, versatile activities of Peter the Great, Lomonosov are immortal and unforgettable.

Recorded on April 8, 1938 the writer reflected his thoughts on the role of the poet in society, on the truth of his assessments of historical events, his intuition, artistic flair. And again he turns to prove his assertion on the identity and creativity of Pushkin. He compares the position of Tsar Nicholas I and poet Pushkin in relation to the Decembrist uprising and its consequences. "An armed uprising of officers (Nicholas I): Five people hanged, and Pushkin almost went crazy with anger ("Prophet"): what Nicholas was to have done? Someone said, to be deceived, but may be, in fact it means just to wake up from sleep, which is called the truth? Otherwise, how to explain the illusions and dreams of freedom of Pushkin in their attitude to the "truth" of the king Nicolas I: except as Head of the State Nicholas was not right,

that he executed five of the officers who spoke with a weapon against the system, which they were are obliged to protect? Nevertheless, we still sympathize Pushkin shocked by that penalty, calling it the king killer. And this is particularly acute sympathy to the poet today" [Prishvin, Prishvina, 2003, 134].

In this example Prishvin proves that it is only the poet who is able to see the highest truth of history; his illusions and dreams of freedom are true, more real than the righteousness of the king, the logic of his actions (poetic philosophers of unity interpreted similarly [Khokhlova, Dvornikova, 2012, 78-101]). The righteousness of the poet becomes apparent not immediately, but in the lives of future generations.

Role of Pushkin's works in the formation of the writer's outlook

Prishvin rightly mentions Pushkin among classical writers (Tolstoy, Gogol, Dostoevsky, Turgenev), who were "included in life and influenced it," and this influence was beneficial both for their contemporaries and descendants (in the records on August, 9, 1930, April 23, 1932, etc.).

Particularly high in terms of humanistic, moral and patriotic education,

as well as the impact on the writer himself, he appreciates Pushkin's novel "The Captain's Daughter". On April 7, 1933 he wrote in his "Diary": "read Pushkin's "History of the Pugachev rebellion" and "The Captain's Daughter". Finally I attained the age of understanding "The Captain's Daughter" and also myself, where I came from in the literature. Establishment of peace in the harmonic simplicity ("dreams and essence" – converge). Pushkin sends Onegin and his general "hero of our time" to Pugachev (Shvabrin) and leaves himself simple, that prevails in "The Captain's Daughter". And now read – like at home... it is the birthplace; my homeland is not Yellets, where I was born, not St. Petersburg, where I improved to live ... my homeland, unsurpassed in a simple beauty and the most amazing – its organically combined goodness and human wisdom – this is my motherland embodied in Pushkin's "The Captain's Daughter" [Prishvin, 2008, 144]. This rendering of paradigmatic work by Pushkin strikes with its deepness, originality, truth, poetry.

Also original interpretation of Prishvin may appear known Pushkin's "The Tale of the Fisherman and the Fish". It is contained in a letter to Prishvin's friend B.D. Udintsev, which is recorded in the "Diary" on April 23, 1940.

He relates the images of the "Tale" with the characters of himself and his family. "All we have happened as a continuation of the famous tale of the Fisherman and the Fish. You may have noticed while reading this story, since it is not finished, because the role of... the Old Man is not disclosed. Indeed, the evil old woman rightly punished, distressed fish went back into the sea, but for what the old man was punished if he just spared goldfish? Should not be forgotten that wonderful fish has forgotten a human good and threw the old man to the wolves of old woman. That should not be!" [Prishvin, 1990, 68]. This fairy tale the writer and his beloved woman V.D. Prishvina continued by the example of their own life. Old Man and the Goldfish married, created a family and began to "disclose to the miserable humanity the secret of eternal youth and beauty.... The Magic Fish became a woman, performed by embracing desires creativity to creative life, gathering earth abundance in the same unity, in which the droplets of water are collected in its native element – in the ocean" [Ibid].

So images of Pushkin's "The Tale of the Fisherman and the Fish", originally reckoned by Prishvin, helped him understand the complexities of his personal life, to decide on the old, left wife (the

old woman) and appreciate his one true love, poetically and figuratively calling his beloved the golden, wonderful, magic fish.

The problem of personal and state origin in the diaries of M.M. Prishvin

One of the most pressing and affecting writer's problems for many years has been a problem of despotism and its victims. It arises in the "Diary" much earlier of the ominously bloody 1937 in the records relating to the period of World War I, made between 1914-1917.

From the first months and years after the establishment of Soviet power, comprehending the realities of modern life, Prishvin began to notice, as it more clearly showed signs of disrespect, the ruthlessness of the authorities in relation to the personality, to the individual. On June 16, 1918 he wrote that society "... loses compassion for the individual and show the triumph of a pan-human being" [Ibid, 70], that "...at the Bolsheviks the feeling of mass dominates above the sense of personality" [Ibid, 68] and cannot agree with this position. At the same time appeared the first allusion to Pushkin's poem "The Bronze Horseman". Prishvin recalls Eugene, who "spoke

like a madman to the Bronze Horseman" Take notice, Your High Comradeship! You came, and I'm your shadow, with you, I will walk in the footsteps behind you, your shadow" [Ibid, 69]. So on the images of Pushkin's poem for the first time Prishvin had an attempt to rethink the poem and in accordance with new realities of life to re-evaluate its essence conflict newly and ironically.

New impetus to the solution and evaluating of these problems was given to the writer with the perfect journey with a group of colleagues to the North, to the construction of the White Sea-Baltic Canal named after Stalin, started on the initiative of the Soviet despot for new violence against nature – the connection of the White Sea with the Baltic, more precisely, with Lake Onega. Construction was carried out by special camps of prisoners, during which, according to the authorities, they had to go through the process of re-education, rehabilitation and engage in normal life. Stalin expected glorifications at him from writers for the vast scheme, wisdom and innovation.

But Prishvin failed to praise a person in supreme authority, and the text of his essay written for the collection of articles "Canal named after Stalin" was rejected.

However, from that time until the end of the writer's life themes like power and personality, the individual and society, collectivism became the subject of ongoing reflections and outright records in the "Diary". Repeatedly and casually allusions arise in this connection from the aforementioned Pushkin's poem. These problems seem to Prishvin so significant and important that he makes an attempt to cover their "legally" in the novel "The Czar's Road", on which he has worked 16 years, from 1932 to 1948, long re-writes and so will not see printed during his lifetime. Innermost thoughts frankly unbosomed only in the "Diary".

Especially numerous became the writings on this subject since the mid 30s: Prishvin could not but respond to the state terror, propagated by Stalin in unimaginable scale, to a regime of fear that gripped the country, the unprecedented repression, humiliation of personality in all its possible manifestations until destruction, to the Stalin cult of lies, sophisticated cynicism and hypocrisy. Under these conditions, Prishvin approves the absolute value of personality, proclaims a postulate of a free person as an inviolable foundation of the society. In addition, he often operated the universal philosophical categories of freedom and necessity, good and evil, "must" and

"want" in all their complexity and ambiguity. He considers their characters in Pushkin's poem "The Bronze Horseman".

In 1937 this problem is completely engrossed the writer: "We should bring this to the fact that all impressions coming to me from life, have been settled for that two categories" [Ibid] – he writes on November 1, 1937. And in the records on 10 and 25 November he explains his position. He believes that a human "must" lead to a leveling of the person ("the person will not exist"), and "want" is a manifestation of free will, a man with a sense of its inherent value. "And every child is given a contest of his combat of "want" with "necessary", and the winner become such a child who has his "want" for others switches in the "necessary": this is the real winners and creators". On January 30, 1939 the writer admits: "Slowly about myself I'm developing the same theme of "The Bronze Horseman": "the matter of the mind" – is "The Bronze Horseman"; "the matter of heart", "identity" – i.e. Eugene" [Ibid, 70]. Here the mind and the heart are opposed.

On August 5, 1939 "The Bronze Horseman" is mentioned again, "where set up the problem of inhabitant, and it contains all the modernity" [Ibid]. He is

concerned about the fate of a separate, unique, irreplaceable person living under the pressure of totalitarianism. He thinks about it all the time, being in different circumstances, watching the various phenomena of social life, the life of nature, recalling the events of universal and Russian history: the clash of dissenters with the government of the Peter the Great, the history of all revolutions and mass uprisings against despotism, which ended in the establishment of new despotisms, even bloodier than the former; "necessary" prevailed against the industrialization of our country, militarization, military education, nationality and so on". And for the sake of all of it the "abundantly shed blood" – that is "necessary!" – He writes on October 1, 1937, and on April 2, 1938 he confides: "I cannot concern myself with the Bolsheviks, because they have made so much violence, that they hardly could be forgiven in the history. And with the fascists I can't..." [Ibid]. And on September 22, 1938 he writes: "Does it matter if it is Mussolini, Peter, Hitler: Mussolini goes due to Abyssinian, Hitler – due to Czech, Peter – due to pitiful Eugene. And we all, inhabitants, sympathize Abyssinian – Czech – Eugene. And it is wonderful when this feeling is personal, vivid and direct" [Ibid]. Here Prishvin clearly

stated his preferences, although it is unusual to name Peter the Great in such a "company".

Recorded on September 7, 1938 we may observe some another perspective: "We are all involved in a big deal. Alteration of all the world is occurred... "great deal" has no consideration of the persons, and in fact the human world just consists of persons [Ibid]. On October 8 the position is being clarified: "If they want to justify some abomination, they say "great deal", and after the "abomination" is explained as an inevitable step towards a distant goal" [Ibid]. On October 10, 1938 the writer gives an actual example. "If the construction of big skyscraper is permitted by the destruction of small houses and upset of several hundred families living in them, the skyscraper in relation to these ravaged creatures is an aggressor exactly the same as Germany and Czechoslovakia or as the Bronze Horseman against Eugene" [Ibid, 71]. Prishvin believes that "the most burning issue of our time in the whole world" – is the fate of everyman, of Eugene, of an ordinary person who is under the authority of the despot, and concludes on the need to speak out in defense of Eugene against the Bronze Horseman.

In the foreground the writer observes the personality. "... Everyone,

even the smallest stream, everything about itself must decide for itself and be itself within its geography and biography and personal name..." [Ibid]. In late 1938 he makes philosophically generalized conclusion about the ratio of "want" and "must". "One's own personal is exactly a child, preserved by an adult, and a person's life is a struggle for its own Want (be oneself) with Must (to be like everyone). And so all the life is a movement in a circle: the centripetal force – a desire to be like everyone else, and centrifugal – a desire to be oneself" [Ibid].

At the end of January 1939 the problem appears more complicated. "It is after all the man is called good, who does not devote himself to some "idea", for instance, a common cause, and in each case knows how to act. Also a good man need to have inner freedom (and not being duteous): Great Volga, Great Deal, the Bronze Horseman ... The concept of "great" includes cruel, as if a great deal is justified by cruelty. "Great deal" is an abstract deal, because it consists of small things, by the destruction of their features" [Ibid, 69]. In connection with these speculations there is a recording on May 19, 1939: "A gear is replaceable, but a person must be irreplaceable, and they (the Bolsheviks – R.A.) treat man as a gear, and expect that there are a lot

of them, and everyone may be replaced "[Ibid, 71].

On the 16th and 19th June 1939 Prishvin again reflects on the heroes of Pushkin's poem "The Bronze Horseman" and the tragedy "Boris Godunov". "I" – that's all Eugene could say to Bronze Horseman... Eugene and unspeakable words, which frighten all the lords. That's, perhaps, is the power of Eugene that his curse does not go into a word, and you cannot catch a unique Eugene, seduce, use him. Not a word, but like a storm pour forth his thought, and "Lord" has "boys with bloody eyes". "Eugene – is the "people keeping silence", and matters of Boris seem himself a fuss. Eugene – is the Death that holds culture, harboring the great monuments of the spirit into the ground, so that they then get up and blame the winners" [Ibid, 72].

Thus, by combining the experience of two of Pushkin's masterpieces: the tragedy of "Boris Godunov" and the poem "The Bronze Horseman" Prishvin claims thunderous force of silence of personality, with his terrible potency, bearing a threat to the tyrant. "So it's very good that Eugene's speech was not printed: it's probably much in silence, terribly, as a matter of the case of Peter, the matter of silence" [Ibid, 82].

Silence, as rightly noted by the writer, was to determine the course of actions of the Soviet people to the authorities after all the turmoil experienced in the mid 30s. Recorded on July 30, 1939 this transition is noticeable from the interpretation of Pushkin's works to the evaluation of topical problems of modern social life: the moral status of conduct of his contemporaries, actual and potential victims of Stalin's despotism. "All the individual, personal groans, cries, complaints and attempts to comprehend the trouble to go and throw the protest up in the air in motion or join in group, join the conspiracy, all that, everything has been gradually replaced by consciousness of something irresistible about what one should be silent. Then, as if everyone conspired about it, shut up about the main and began to escape on one's own and do what they can. In such a created silence of everything intimate, the course of the great historical process of conversion of the human world gradually began taking shape" [Prishvin, 2009, 796]. And on August 5 of the same year, as if summing up his thoughts, Prishvin wrote: "The Bronze Horseman", which raised the problem of the inhabitant, contains all the modernity" [Ibid, 797].

Writer gives personality to a conflict – the power, deep philosophi-

cal meaning. He admits that "the power of the universal law of development in that the forces of the new Great overwhelm the old Small. Nevertheless, this universal application of the law has an incomprehensible exception: this Small, doomed, reveals in itself such a resistance force that it becomes the background for the very future. Thus, we know everything, that in "The Bronze Horseman" the future is not for Peter, but for Eugene [Ibid].

However, the writer is far from idealizing of the Small, individual. He makes two types of "little man": Eugene from the poem "The Bronze Horseman" and servant from the poem "The Upas Tree". There he sees the antipodes with respect to the need, to Must, to power. The position of slave – unconditional obedience, complete submission to authority. Another type of behavior in Eugene being a personality after bygone suffering capable of the protest, rebellion against authority, to oppose it. "The slave, – writes Prishvin – must have different ideals than the tsar – what they are, what said Eugene to the Bronze Horseman?" [Ibid]. The position of Eugene appeals to the writer. "The Bronze Horseman" – "He", the state, Eugene – "I", the soul, we, and of course for the future, "take notice!" Eugene is right: he

is a prophet (emphasis – R.A.); so that the Horseman – is a present, it is a necessity, authority, "he", "they" – the coasts, and Eugene – a flowing water" [Prishvin, 2006, 302]. Consequently, in the behavior and fate of Eugene the truth of life takes a triumph, its highest sense, the engine of progress. Prishvin considers personality as universal, it "includes the ability to act independently, regardless of the accounting of its usefulness... and often even against what everyone believes to be a benefit for society" [Ibid, 282].

Shortly before his death the images and collisions of "The Bronze Horseman" continue to be of Prishvin's interest. On March 23, 1952, he wrote in the "Diary": "I recollect "The Bronze Horseman": private and public beginnings are presented so that the author sympathizes with Eugene, but recognizes the need for the Bronze Horseman" [Ibid]. Opposition between "power" and "personality" here evaluated on the example of Pushkin's poem in its complexity, ambiguity: both the power – not "pure" evil, but the evil leading to good, and personality – the good, a breakthrough for better, a symbol of inner freedom and independence, an ability to resist despotism.

Thus, by means of opposition of the heroes of Pushkin's poem Prishvin historically, true, objectively, multifac-

etedly managed to comprehend, understand modern life, its "pricky" problems, its tragic situation.

Conclusion

Learning lessons from the great Pushkin heritage continued with repeated reference of the quote of Pushkin's final poem "Monument" in the "Diary". First Pushkin's final poem appeared in the "Diary" of Prishvin on September 17, 1935 after the experienced trouble, which matters he did not disclose. Recorded only the writer's conclusion in the form of addressing to himself. "Bear, bear in mind, Michael, the commandment: Do not get oneself above the boors before and do not contest the fool" [Prishvin, 2009, 798-799].

In the order of self-discipline, he made a commitment to repeat this verse every day 30 times in the "Diary", possibly deepening the theme. The next day – on 18 September Prishvin began executing his plan. Having repeated Pushkin line, he specifies, details its interpretation. "Do not contest the fool or do not cast pearls before swine, because it destroys the peace organization in the loving attention. Do not contest the fool or take care of occupied height" [Ibid, 825]. On the third day, 19 September,

specifying a line, he gives the interpretation a deeper philosophical meaning. "Do not contest the fool! Keep inner balance everywhere, at every place" [Ibid, 835]. Later in this recording writer concludes that the hypocritical society for self-preservation the honest and sincere person should "wear a mask and build a mask" [Prishvin, 1990, 78].

About the mask as a way to protect the identity in an alien and dangerous environment, as a freedom of choice of behavior, Prishvin wrote in the "Diary" as far back as 1930. "Do not open your face – this is the first condition of our life. The look and mask are necessarily required" [Prishvin, 2006, 876]. On November 20 of the same year: "The game with two faces (masking) has now become almost mandatory for everyone. I want to live with one face, opening and covering it, conforming with the circumstances" [Ibid, 67].

Chosen lifestyle of the writer being a hunter out in the sticks, in the Russian province, was also a kind of disguise, it allowed him not to be seen, to conduct its frank secret diary and preserve it. He admits in the diary that his mask of nature lover, half-marginal life was a cloak, a kind of foolishness, which are rooted in the tradition of Russian literature and possess a high sense in the Russian cul-

ture – to fight evil by means of art. "Creativity is a great disguise, great hiding or even the creation of a face, identity, unity, enclosing the evil" – he writes in the "Diary". [Prishvin, 1990, 78]

Generally, the theme of mask in the culture of the XX century has been one of the most significant, but in Russian literature of the 30s manifested its social implications. The mask becomes one of ways of saving lives in a terrible world of gulags, complete disappearances.

Another way to survive Prishvin saw in cutting oneself off the society, "to move deeper and deeper into the wilderness", to pretend to be a simpleton. "If we build a mask, the best to build the English (sincerity, simplicity)" [Ibid, 69], – he notices.

Reflections on Pushkin's lines contributed to the determination of life position of the writer, his worldview. Thus, in the recording of the September 20, 1935 was obvious that he feared that Pushkin's postulate, taken to the extreme, can be harmful to human being, bring him to apathy, isolation from the life, that is unacceptable.

Continuing interpretation of Pushkin's aphorism in the record on September 23 Prishvin stressed that the advice of Pushkin helped him rise above

the little things in life and think about the main thing in it about that "great trouble", which it called.

The seventh entry was made on September 24. It is distinguished by a philosophical depth and conceptivity. "Do not contest the fool" – is indirectly related to the struggle for one's identity: you should have your own initiative in life, possess own initiative at bottom; but if you missed it, then you will be taken to do what you want. And I suppose that herein is the main division of the people: one lives alone, other is a slave. And we want to do not so that all are free, but free of nature people do not fall into bondage and vice versa: natural slaves should not take upon themselves the matters of free people... The slave in the nature on free position is certainly a despot" [Prishvin, 2009, 75]. Based on the words of Pushkin, Prishvin formulates one of the most cherished principles of his life: he values most of all a person's ability to independence, to confrontation the circumstances.

On October 17, when Prishvin cites Pushkin's aphorism for 26th time in the "Diary", he justifies its fairness in a half-joking form. "Outraged to extremes that yesterday Shcherbakov did not mention me among the writers, from which it is necessary to wait for something, I

rushed to him to scold today, but remembering "do not contest", in the calmest, but very coldly manner listed all my kinds of literary activities. The effect was great, Shcherbakov was ashamed to the extreme, underground collapsed, and housing was provided to me" [Ibid, 786]. (It is referred to an apartment in Moscow, which Prishvin long attained from the Union of Writers).

On October 30, 1935 expired a kind of penance voluntarily imposed on Prishvin by himself, and on November 1, he made the last record in this regard, as it summed up the reflections. "The End of penance "do not contest": although anger remains, there is no need to contest: after all, if there is an anger, we must learn to endure, and it can be done

in different ways: nobly or despicably" [Prishvin, 1990, 76].

Having considered the relation of Prishvin to Pushkin's creativity, having shown his role in shaping the world outlook of the writer, his position in life, we have seen how deep, multifaceted, functional, truly inexhaustible the creative legacy of the great Russian poet and how the reference to him by percipient, wise writer Prishvin as reader, recipient was fruitful and helped him to understand better and more accurately than many contemporaries assess the events of personal and social life, the key issues of that labor, turning time – the first half of the twentieth century, in which he had to live in Russia and survive physically and spiritually.

References

1. Khokhlova, L.V., Dvornikova, N.A. (2012), Mythmaking and poetry: the language problem in the Russian spiritual culture [Mifotvorchestvo i poeziya: problema yazyka v russkoi dukhovnoi kul'ture], *Context and Reflection: Philosophy of the World and Human Being*, No 4, pp. 78-101.
2. Prishvin, M.M. (2007), *Diaries: 1914-1917* [*Dnevnik: 1914-1917*], Saint-Petersburg, 698 p.
3. Prishvin, M.M. (2008), *Diaries: 1918-1919* [*Dnevnik: 1918-1919*], Saint-Petersburg, 560 p.
4. Prishvin, M.M. (2006), *Diaries: 1930-1931* [*Dnevnik: 1930-1931*], Saint-Petersburg, 705 p.

5. Prishvin, M.M. (2009), *Diaries: 1932-1935* [*Dnevniky: 1932-1935*], Saint-Petersburg, 1008 p.
6. Prishvin, M.M. (1990), Forests to "The Czar's Road": From the diaries of 1931-1952 [*Lesy k "Osudarevoi doroge": Iz dnevnikov 1931-1952*], *Nashe nasledie*, № II (14), pp. 63-82.
7. Prishvin, M.M. (1986), *Collected works* [*Sobranie sochinenii*], vol. 8, Moscow, 757 p.
8. Prishvin, M.M., Prishvina, V.D. (2003) *We're together: Diary of love* [*My s toboi: Dnevnik lyubvi*], Saint-Petersburg, 254 p.

Интерпретация личности и творчества А.С. Пушкина в «Дневниках» М.М. Пришвина

Алиева Раиса Раджабовна

Кандидат филологических наук,
доцент кафедры истории русской литературы,
Дагестанский государственный университет,
367000, Российская Федерация, Дагестан,
Махачкала, ул. Гаджиева, 43а;
e-mail: dagalieva@mail.ru

Аннотация

Данная статья посвящена интерпретации творческого наследия великого русского поэта А.С. Пушкина в «Дневниках» М.М. Пришвина. В ней раскрыто благотворное влияние личности Пушкина, высоких идеалов свободы, истины, добра и красоты его творчества на формирование характера, жизненной позиции, нравственных, эстетических, философских убеждений Пришвина. Своеобразие дарования Пушкина: искренность, простота высокой пробы определяется им как «целокупность». Размышления о Пушкине, природе его дарования привели Пришвина к пониманию истинной сущности творческого таланта, его роли в жизни общества.

Пришвину удалось благодаря влиянию Пушкина исторически истинно, объективно, многоаспектно осмыслить, понять современную жизнь, ее «болевые» проблемы и трагические ситуации. Пушкин для Пришвина был олицетворением духовной мощи России, ее национальной культуры.

Ключевые слова

Сила творческой личности, «целокупность», деспотизм и проблема «маски», философские категории свободы и необходимости, грозная сила молчания личности, сила сопротивления Малого, два типа «маленького человека», оппозиция «власть» и «личность», великая маскировка, пушкинский афоризм.

Библиография

1. Пришвин М.М. Дневники: 1914-1917. – СПб.: Росток, 2007. – 698 с.
2. Пришвин М.М. Дневники: 1918-1919. – СПб.: Росток, 2008. – 560 с.
3. Пришвин М.М. Дневники: 1930-1931. – СПб.: Росток, 2006. – 705 с.
4. Пришвин М.М. Дневники: 1932-1935. – СПб.: Росток, 2009. – 1008 с.
5. Пришвин М.М. Леса к «Осударевой дороге»: Из дневников 1931-1952 // Наше наследие. – 1990. – № II (14). – С. 63-82.
6. Пришвин М.М. Собр. соч. в 8 т. – Т.8: Дневники (1905-1954). – М.: Худ. лит., 1986. – 757 с.
7. Пришвин М.М., Пришвина В.Д. Мы с тобой: Дневник любви. – СПб., 2003. – 254 с.
8. Хохлова Л.В., Дворникова Н.А. Мифотворчество и поэзия: проблема языка в русской духовной культуре // Контекст и рефлексия: философия о мире и человеке. – 2012. – № 4. – С. 78-101.