

National Research University Higher School of Economics

as a manuscript

Daria Lugovskaia

**V. F. KHODASEVICH – LITERARY CRITIC: POETICS AND
GENESIS OF AESTHETIC VIEWS**

Dissertation Summary
for the purpose of obtaining academic degree
Doctor of Philosophy in Philology and Linguistics

Academic Supervisor:
P. F. Uspenskij, PhD

Moscow 2022

SUMMARY

V. F. Khodasevich is famous primarily as a poet and memoirist, a researcher of A. S. Pushkin's life and work. In 1905, his critical essays, simultaneously with the first poems, began to appear in *Symbolist*. By the end of the 1930s, he had a reputation of one of the most renowned critics of Russian emigration. Khodasevich's criticism and poetry have the same stages of their formation and evolution. These stages are most noticeable while studying his critical articles.

The subject of this study is the stages of the evolution of Khodasevich's criticism. The research explains how aesthetic ideas were formed as well as had influence on poetry, on the author's memoirs. The research analyzes critical articles and essays written by Khodasevich from 1905 to 1939. It is about one hundred articles described in appendix to the dissertation research. This material shows how critic Khodasevich formed his aesthetic views, what literary models he followed in different periods and how his reputation of a leading critic of Russian emigration was created. The results of work allow us to understand the nuances of Khodasevich's involvement in the contemporary literary process and interaction with the literary tradition of the XIX century.

The object of this research is Khodasevich's critical essays written in 1905-1939. The texts created before 1927 were collected and published by J. Malmstad in the second volume of the ongoing eight-volume collection of the poet's works. The essays created after 1927 had to be found in the daily editions of *Vozrozhdenie*, the Paris newspaper. Most of its issues have already been digitized by the Princeton University Library, some issues are available at the State Archive of the Russian Federation. The author of the dissertation does not analyze Khodasevich's historical and literary essays about Pushkin, the chapters of the book *Derzhavin*, published in *Vozrozhdenie* and *Sovremennye zapiski*, and all publications under the pseudonym "Gulliver" in the *Literary Chronicle* column. Despite this fact, this material is a necessary background for research.

The relevance of the research

For ideological reasons, Khodasevich's work became available to researchers relatively late, from the second half of the 1980s. From that time, a number of basic works on the biography and work of the poet have appeared. Now it is impossible to imagine studying Khodasevich's writings without fundamental works of N. A. Bogomolov, S. G. Bocharov, V. I. Shubinsky, I. Andreeva, D. Bethea. There is a variety of well-known works on the poetry of Khodasevich (Y. I. Levin, N. A. Bogomolov, P. F. Uspensky), several significant works on memoirs. Khodasevich's essays have not been studied as a corpus of texts, in which the evolution of the author's aesthetic views is traced. However, certain aspects of the criticism of the emigrant period have been studied in sufficient detail. There are the polemics between Khodasevich and Adamovich, criticism of the futurists, Khodasevich and the young poets of emigration among them. It is impossible to study these themes without the works belonged to O. A. Korostelev, N. A. Bogomolov, L. Livak, A. Y. Sergeeva-Klyatis, J. Malmstad, I. Ronen.

The critical articles written by Khodasevich before emigration were not investigated deeply. Nevertheless, they were commented on by J. Malmstad and R. Hughes in the second volume of the eight-volume collected works of the poet. The works about Pushkin were analyzed in I. Z. Surat's monograph *The Pushkin Scholar Vladislav Khodasevich*. Other articles about the history of literature did not draw the attention of researchers. In the works of N. A. Bogomolov, O. A. Kling, a detailed analysis of the publishing policy of symbolist magazines of the beginning of the century (*Vesy, Zolotoe Runo*) is presented. However, Khodasevich's cooperation with symbolist publications, the strategy of his entry into the literary field (in terms of P. Bourdieu) has not been described by philologists. In the works of G. Tikhanov and L. Livak, an attempt to contextualize the work of Khodasevich in emigration was made, but in general, the articles were not considered in the context of literary tradition – this aspect can be called the most important for the author, who spoke about the “conservation” of culture. The aesthetic views of the critic were not described in interaction with his poetry and

memoirs. The publication of critical articles was not considered as one of the mechanisms for entering the literary field and building a certain writer's reputation.

The research can be considered relevant due to the fact that Khodasevich's critical essays have not been studied in details. There have been no attempts to determine the genesis of the critic's aesthetic views and their evolution throughout his writings from 1905 to 1939.

Research goals and objectives

The main goal of study is to research genesis of the aesthetic views of critic Khodasevich.

To achieve the goal of the study, the following main objectives were formulated:

1. To describe Khodasevich's criticism of the 1900s, determining how it correlated with the works of the most famous symbolist poets and critics; which of the significant contemporaries could the author focus on in the 1900s, when he was developing his own aesthetic views;
2. To explain how Khodasevich's aesthetic views changed in the 1910s;
3. To explain how Khodasevich's criticism changed in 1917-1921, during a difficult historical period of Russian history, when the poet supported the October Revolution, but two years later he got disappointed in its prospects;
4. To characterize Khodasevich's creative method of the emigrant period, explaining models of which he could focus on, generating new views and building a reputation of the first critic of the diaspora.

It should be mentioned that the dissertation examines two subjects: how the aesthetic views of the critic were formed and what literary and biographical models he was guided by. **The methodology of this research** is informed both by the traditional methods of textual criticism and historical method. We have studied the essays of Khodasevich, written before 1927. They were published in his collected

works. We view the *Vozrozhdenie* newspaper, placed both in electronic form and in the State Archive of Russian Federation. To identify the context, in which Khodasevich's essays of 1908-1914 appeared, the *Utro Rossii*, *Rul'* newspapers and others were viewed. The historical approach is the main one in the study, but other methods are also used in the implementation of a number of objectives. The description of how Khodasevich's literary reputation was formed suggests an appeal to P. Bourdieu's theory of the literary field. It is important to keep a certain biographism in mind for analysis Khodasevich's texts, since in parallel with his work on critical articles, he created memoir essays, in which he acted as a literary historian and used the facts of his own life to emphasize his connection with the tradition of the XVIII-XIX centuries. The description of the formation of identity, the selection of certain facts of his biography is based on studies of the biography building in Soviet documents in the work of Sh. Fitzpatrick. Fitzpatrick's work is used with an obvious correction for the features of the material we study.

Khodasevich's criticism has not yet been studied as a corpus of texts associated with the poetry and memoir of the author and with the literary context of the epoch. Researchers have not yet covered the strategy of the author's entry into the literary field, the evolution of the critic's views and the choice of certain topics of reviews, literary models. The coverage of these issues is the **theoretical significance of the work**.

The material studied and prepared during the work on the dissertation can be used in lectures and seminars on the history of Russian literature of the late XIX – first third of the XX century; the history of Russian literary criticism of the late XIX–XX centuries; culture, literary history of Russian emigration. This is the **practical significance of the research**.

The following propositions are to be presented at the thesis defence:

1. The early criticism of Khodasevich (1905-1907) was written under the obvious influence of the poetics of V. Y. Bryusov's essays. These texts, according to the plan of the novice author, were supposed to prepare the literary reputation of

a critic, close to the symbolists, and ensure his entry into the literary field. Biographical circumstances, the beginning of literary activity in the journals of Bryusov's competitor S. A. Sokolov and the literary pseudonym "Sigurd" had a significant influence on this.

2. In the second period of Khodasevich's work as a critic (1908-1910), his views were democratized: he focused on the mass reader, turning to the literary tradition of the XIX century. During this period, the basis of poetics of emigrant criticism was formed.

3. The period of 1917-1921 is an intermediate stage in the evolution of the aesthetics of critic Khodasevich. During this period, he changed "democratic" views for traditionalism. He oriented towards the aesthetic ideals of the XIX century, to the Pushkin's poetics.

4. In the criticism of the emigrant period (1922-1939), Khodasevich focused on a number of literary models. He used them both in criticism and in memoirs. A. I. Herzen, P. A. Vyazemsky, G. R. Derzhavin, V. G. Belinsky are among his significant predecessors.

5. The emigrant period is characterized by "politicized" attention to the form of a literary work: formalism, futurism, according to Khodasevich, are associated with "meshchanstvo" (narrow-mindedness), with Soviet literary politics and the cultural situation that developed after the New economic policy era. In contrast, Khodasevich put forward traditionalism, orientation to normative poetics as the main part of aesthetics of the literature of emigration. The task of emigration literature is politicized – to preserve the "culture of Peter and Pushkin".

6. Khodasevich evaluated the authors by meeting the aesthetic criteria. In such a ranking of literature in his critical essays, in asserting the right of a critic to influence literature and the cultural situation in emigration, he approached Belinsky's literary model.

7. Khodasevich acquired the reputation of one of the most influential critics of emigration by combining modern aesthetic, attention to form and traditionalism.

8. It is possible to find a correspondence to the processes that took place in criticism, in the poetry of Khodasevich.

The content of the dissertation

Structure. The dissertation research consists of an introduction, four chapters, each of which is divided into paragraphs, conclusion, list of references and sources, and an appendix.

The introduction describes the topic, material, goals, objectives of the study, provides a review of the literature on the topic of the dissertation.

The first chapter is devoted to the critical articles of Khodasevich written in 1905-1907. It explores the mechanisms of critic's interaction with the significant contemporaries, V. Y. Bryusov, S. A. Sokolov, the process of formation of a symbolist poet and critic's reputation.

The first paragraph describes the beginning of Khodasevich's literary career as a critic, the symbolist "lifecreation" (*zhiznetvorchestvo*) and his attempts to take a place between the symbolist writers.

The second paragraph describes the publishing policy of the *Iskusstvo*, *Pereval*, *Zolotoe Runo* magazines, in which the first publications of the critic appeared. *Zolotoe Runo* adhered to the same literary and aesthetic views as Brusov's *Vesy*, differing in a large number of young authors. Starting his literary career, Khodasevich clearly relied on Sokolov's authority, but Bryusov's criticism and poetry remain his literary reference point. The use of the pseudonym "Sigurd" helped Khodasevich to get out of this difficult situation. Pragmatics and genesis of the pseudonym are described in the third paragraph of dissertation. The articles signed by Khodasevich corresponded to the policy of Sokolov's journals, and Sigurd expressed a position close to *Vesy* and Bryusov's reviews. Before the publishing of *Molodost'*, Khodasevich and Sigurd changed places: Khodasevich became a critic who clearly coincided with the poetics, aesthetic views of Brusov. Apparently, such a position seemed to him more advantageous on the eve of the release of his first book of poetry. The pseudonym itself emphasized that its bearer can "read" the cultural codes of the symbolists. The release of the first book, the

situation with the symbolism in Russian literature showed Khodasevich that his strategy would not bring him success. Therefore, already in the 1908, he would come to revise his aesthetic views like Blok and Brusov at the same time.

The second chapter, “Critical articles written in the late 1900s-1910s”, is devoted to the second stage of the evolution of Khodasevich as a critic. It highlights the ways Khodasevich overcame the crisis of symbolism and the process of searching for a new literary strategy during this period. This stage of the evolution partially corresponded to the processes that occurred in his poetry: Pushkin’s perspective of the *Schastlivyj domik* would be increasingly evident in Khodasevich’s latest articles of 1915-1922. This part of the work consists of five paragraphs.

The first paragraph refers to the change of literary strategy by Khodasevich in the late 1900s–early 1910s. At the turn of decades, the critic was constantly published in several Moscow journals for mass reader (*Rul’*, *Moskovskaya Gazeta*, *Utro Rossii*, *Severnyj vestnik*). The thematic field of his reviews was expanding – there were essays about poetic translations, about poets of the XIX century (for example, *Countess E. P. Rostopchina. Her life and lyrics* (1908), *Fragments about Lermontov* (1914)), travelogues – genre, which was popular in this time. A similar democratization occurred in the poetics of Khodasevich’s essays. Previous articles were written exclusively for a symbolist audience. The latest essays created in 1910s specialized on mass reader. Similar processes occurred in the criticism of Bryusov and Blok in the second half of the 1900s. In the 1910s, several thematic lines coexisted in Khodasevich’s reviews – along with reviews of books of symbolist poets, there were more and more articles against “decadentstvo”, which “disgraced symbolism”, the author turned to the traditions of social criticism of the second half of the XIX century.

The second paragraph analyzes Khodasevich’s criticism of life creation in essays appearing on the pages of newspapers – *Pritonchik. Na Kuzneckom, Devicy v plat’yah, Misticheskaya karamel’*. The communicative purpose of the texts was to criticize the numerous epigones of symbolism, decadence as a way of life of

philistines (“meshchan”) and became the symbol of “meshchanstvo”. These feuilletons and the review emphasize a very important turn in the poetics of Khodasevich’s criticism: an appeal to extra-literary reality and to the evaluation of the reviewed text from the point of view of its relevance to modernist poetics. The transition from the description of everyday life to the evaluation of a literary phenomenon would become a recognizable technique in Khodasevich’s essays by the mid-1920s. Criticism of decadence gradually acquired social pathos, turned into criticism of “meshchanstvo”, a broad concept by which Khodasevich understood the vulgarization of reality. This concept, the most important for the criticism of the emigration period, crystallized around 1914.

The third paragraph is about a group of essays, which can be conditionally described as “criticism of progress”. These are texts about the development of the North Pole and about the first flights. An analysis of the literary context of the turn of the 1900s-1910s shows that aviation and any technological progress were associated with a carnivalized atmosphere, publicity, and huge prizes. Therefore, technical progress was put by Khodasevich on a par with “meshchanstvo”, hobbies of “aestheticizing youth” (“estetstvuyushchaya molodezh”). These texts are also connected with the concept of “meshchanstvo”. Essays on progress can be called another step from decadence to the “poetry of the present day” – to the poetics of the “Schastlivyjdromik” and to the criticism of the mid-1910s. The same paragraph describes the changing attitude of the critic to the poetry of the I. Severyanin: from a positive assessment to the article “Obmanutye nadezhdy” (1916), where the poetry of the egofuturist is recognized as a model of “meshchanstvo”.

The next paragraph analyzes Khodasevich’s report *Nadson* (1912). This report he read in a Literary and artistic club (“kruzhok”). In this text, Khodasevich refers to the aesthetic principles of criticism of utilitarian radicals, declaring that “intelligentsia” “has always put boots beyond Pushkin” and overcoming the crisis of symbolism is possible only with the appearance of “citizen poets” (“grazhdanstvennyye poety”) who “will raise their voice again, calling for a fight”. The language of Khodasevich’s report seems very ambivalent: on the one hand,

several recognizable phrases from the essays of Pisarev and Zaitsev address the reader to the aesthetics of the 1860s. On the other hand, with a closer analysis of the addressee's instance, the language, recognizable quotations used by the critic, it turns out that the report reproduces only those politically radical intentions that were already in the texts of the symbolists (mainly, Blok), written after 1907 and relevant a few years earlier. The appeal to aesthetics of the 1860s-1880s, as is known from an anonymous review of the report and from the memoirs of Khodasevich himself, was not understood by the audience. The author came to the point that this strategy was not successful. However, the "civic" line would be used in several essays of 1912-1913 and would stay in a significantly transformed form in the post-revolutionary and emigrant texts.

The last paragraph is devoted to the article *Russian poetry. Review* (1914). In the essay, Khodasevich makes a "review" of the collections of 1914 and builds a "hierarchy" of modern poetry. At the same time, the composition, a number of expressions used by Khodasevich in the essay, the chosen genre of the "review" repeat some Bryusov's articles. Building a hierarchy of modern writers, Khodasevich identifies three criteria that "good" poetry must meet: authenticity of experiences, "inner truthfulness"; "merging of form with content"; modernity of poetry, its organicity to the experiences of a person of the XX century. But being modern, poetry should not be reduced to describing "an unnecessary fascination with progress". Having transformed, these criteria would remain in the emigrant essays of the critic.

If we continue the line of comparison between the prose of Blok and Khodasevich, which takes place in the dissertation, then we can call the first two stages of the evolution of criticism as "thesis" and "antithesis". Essays of the post-revolutionary period and emigration are a "synthesis" of developed aesthetic views, a natural stage of Khodasevich's evolution.

The third chapter of the dissertation examines the complicated period for the poetics of the critic – 1917-1921. With the release of the second book of poems, *Schastlivyj domik* (1914), Khodasevich took a more definite place in the

literary field. His critical essays were published in famous newspapers (*Russkie Vedomosti*). In the essays of this period, the “civic” theme was preserved, and a new line was included. Khodasevich hoped for the “improvement” of literature, increasing the cultural level of the mass reader. There are three thematic groups of essays written in 1917-1921: cultural perspectives brought by the revolution; essays about proletarian poets, in which Khodasevich still saw literary potential; articles about Pushkin. At the same time, in a number of subjects discussed in the chapter, Khodasevich, in his evolution, again followed the models of Bryusov and Blok. This is especially noticeable in the last critic’s articles about Pushkin, *Okno na Nevskij*, the speech *Koleblemyj trenochnik*. The essays published during this period are close to the literary strategy of Khodasevich’s report about Nadson, but after revolution critic turned to agrarian imagery borrowed from Nekrasov’s lyrics. The evolution of Khodasevich’s aesthetics can be described by dividing it into several stages: acceptance of the revolution, enthusiastic hopes for mass education, for the destruction of “meshchanstvo”. So, at the beginning of 1918, Khodasevich began serving in Soviet institutions, lecturing on poetry in the Proletcult, reviewing collections of proletarian poets. During the years of the NEP, he disappointed in the changes brought by the revolution – all new social, literary phenomena are called “meshchanstvo”. In terms of rhetoric, the essays analyzed in this chapter are very close to the literary strategy of the Nadson report, but in them Khodasevich turned to agrarian imagery borrowed from Nekrasov’s lyrics. In the texts of 1919–1921, the Pushkin perspective is emerging and intensifying – the figure of the poet symbolizes the entire heritage of literature of the XVIII-XIX centuries. In 1920-1922, the essays gradually developed the poetics of future Khodasevich’s emigrant criticism built on a combination of traditionalism and social orientation: the critic became a figure who, according to Khodasevich, could not only shape the aesthetic tastes of contemporaries, but also influence the cultural and historical process. The Nekrasov line, agrarian imagery, democratization of literature – Khodasevich would no longer use all these aesthetic theses from post-revolutionary essays: in emigrant texts, he denied everything “mass” and ideologized, collectively called as

“pisarevshchina” by him.

The fourth chapter is the biggest part of the dissertation. It is divided into six paragraphs. The years 1925-26 can be considered a milestone for the formation of an emigrant identity, when Khodasevich moved to Paris. In his texts, cautious criticism of the cultural policy of the Soviet government was replaced by more confident speeches. The first paragraph is a brief overview of the essays of 1922-39 and the circumstances of working in emigrant newspapers – in the newspapers *Dn'i*, *Poslednie novosti*, *Vozrozhdenie*, where Khodasevich published most of the essays from 1927 to 1939.

In the second paragraph, through the prism of biography the stages of Khodasevich's formation as an emigrant critic, the process of searching for a new, emigrant identity are described. Memoirs show how Khodasevich structured his “documentary self” (in the terminology of Sh. Fitzpatrick). On the one hand, careful satirical criticism of the Soviet government was supposed to make him an “anti-Bolshevik author” for emigrant reader. On the other hand, the appearance of memories about Khodasevich's work for new government (which is not a typical plot for emigrant authors), the selection of facts in the essays should have left the potential possibility of returning to the USSR. This perspective Khodasevich mentioned in letters before 1926. As can be judged by the memoir essays, by the letters of Khodasevich, in 1925 – in the spring of 1926, he abandoned the idea of returning to Soviet Russia and began to build a reputation as an emigrant critic. The analysis of critical essays created in the second half of the 1920s showed that the building of an emigrant identity, the search for place in the literary field took place simultaneously in memoirs, in reviews of this period and in poems included in the *Evropejskaya noch'*.

The third and fourth paragraphs analyze Khodasevich's essays about futurism as well as the polemics with G. V. Adamovich. These two most important subjects are combined in dissertation research: they are connected by the ideologization of the formal side of the work by Khodasevich. These criteria for evaluating a literary text, is, on the one hand, related to the text's relationship with

the literary tradition, and on the other – has a political connotation.

The essays of the late 1920s, when the polemics with Adamovich about the tasks and poetics of emigrant literature were most lively, demonstrating extremely clearly how Khodasevich's political beliefs influenced his aesthetic views.

One of the most important topics of emigrant essays is the criticism of formalism. In Khodasevich's understanding, "formalism" is any art, in which the author's attention to form outweighed his attention to content. In fact, Khodasevich uses the same scheme in all critical essays: he associates increased attention to "form" with "meshchanstvo", "bolshevism" and distance from Pushkin in the aesthetic sense and "The Russia of Peter and Pushkin to the Russia of the boor" in politic sense. From the second half of the 1920s to the second half of the 1930s, the critic applied this scheme in his reviews on texts of writers of emigration (D. E. Svyatopolk-Mirsky, E. Bakunina, M. Aldanov, Y. Mandelstam) and the metropolis (I. Ehrenburg, V. Kataev, V. Kamensky, etc.). The most frequent objects of criticism were B. L. Pasternak and V. V. Mayakovsky. According to Khodasevich, they destroyed the "Russia of Peter and Pushkin", the classical tradition in their art. The opposition of futurism and Soviet engaged art to the "Pushkin perspective" does not seem self-evident – to create this antithesis, Khodasevich used the concept of "meshchanstvo" from the criticism of the 1910s. The exclusive attention of the authors of the reviewed essays to the formal side of the work was perceived by Khodasevich as a politicized criterion – such writers oppose themselves to the Pushkin tradition. Khodasevich included them in the logical series "futurists and formalists – the NEP", which "vulgarized" the revolution, "meshchanstvo". Nevertheless, the critic himself put forward one of the most important requirements for the reviewed texts in his essays is a combination of form and adequate content, "aesthetic taste", originality. And there we can notice the inconsistency of the author's views. On the one hand, formalism, futurism in literary works. On the other hand, the writer often pays special attention to the form of the reviewed texts – in his articles the terms "plot", "form" are quite common. Finally, Khodasevich's interest in the figure of Derzhavin is very close to

the scientific works of formalists (here we can only talk about the coincidence of the topic, but not the methodology and pragmatics of referring to the figure of the poet).

Finally, from the analysis of all Khodasevich's essays on futurists and formalism, we can identify several key oppositions for the critic that "work" in any reviews.

Futurism — normativity (orientation to the poetics of the XIX century, Pushkin tradition). Bolshevism — imperialism (orientation to the tradition of the XIX century, the literature of the "Russia of Peter and Pushkin").

"Meshchanstvo"— nationality. Khodasevich's nationality is identical to elitism of literature, since it is genetically related to with Pushkin's poetry. "Meshchanstvo" is "vulgarization", this aesthetic line.

The fifth paragraph describes the literary models that Khodasevich could use, building the identity of a traditionalist, relying on the precedents of subjectively significant writers. G. R. Derzhavin, P. A. Vyazemsky, A. I. Herzen, V. Y. Bryusov, V. G. Belinsky that were among them were singled out. Correlating himself with the biographies of these writers or with the poetics of their criticism (mainly in the cases of Herzen, Bryusov, Belinsky), Khodasevich inscribed his own life and work into the literary tradition. Thus, he fulfilled his declared mission of emigrant literature – to preserve the literary tradition of the nineteenth century. Related to this task, there are all the aesthetic criteria that Khodasevich imposed in his articles. In the essays of the emigration period, he built a "pantheon" of literary predecessors and contemporaries, largely focusing on the poetics of Belinsky's articles, in which critic used the same method. In the concept of criticism as a tool influencing literary and socio-political reality, we consider the influence of Belinsky's aesthetic views, revised, partially transformed under the influence of symbolist aesthetics and personal preferences of Khodasevich.

For description such aesthetic views, we use the term "imperial project" of the critic. This term means the idealization of the literature of pre-revolutionary Russia as well as Khodasevich's understanding of the literary and political process

in the realities of the XVIII-XIX centuries.

Finally, in the last, sixth, paragraph, biographical essays “political” memoirs are considered again. In these texts, in a number of critical essays as well as Gulliver’s publications under the heading *Literary chronicle* (“*Literaturnaya hronica*”), we noticed the author’s potential intention to return to the USSR in 1935-36, associated with the death of L. B. Kamenev and the end of Soviet cultural policy (associated with the concept “meshchanstvo”, too). In his criticism and memoir essays, Khodasevich consistently interpreted the experience of his service to the Soviet government in images related to the cultural realities of the XVIII century – first of all, with Derzhavin, another poet and official. This view of Soviet reality from emigration is a formal way of returning to the traditions of the XIX century, what in previous chapters we called the “imperial project”.

Such a combination of traditionalism, orientation to recognizable literary models, the desire to preserve the classical tradition, pre-revolutionary culture in a form purified from the “meshchanstvo” of decadence and futurism distinguished Khodasevich from most contemporary critics.

The conclusion of the dissertation summarizes the most important results of the research and outlines some prospects for continuing the work. A general conclusion is made about the stages of the evolution of Khodasevich as a literary critic and the genesis of his aesthetic views.

The **appendix** to the dissertation contains a bibliography of Khodasevich’s critical essays of 1905-1939. In the list of publications did not include historical and literary articles about Pushkin, chapters of the book *Derzhavin*, the *Literary Chronicle*, since a detailed study of this material remained outside of the dissertation.

The content of the dissertation is reflected in several articles and reports, the work on which was carried out as part of the study at the Graduate School of Philological Sciences of the Higher School of Economics.

The list of publications and conferences

April 2021 – International Conference of Young Philologists in Tartu. Theme of the report: «V. F. Khodasevich on the “Soviet service” and the reputation of an emigrant critic: the pragmatics of editing “political” memoirs».

March 2021 – International Conference “EMIGRANTICA CONTINUES: in memory of O. A. Korostelev”, IMLI, Moscow. Theme of the report: «The “Soviet Service” and the reputation of an emigrant writer: the pragmatics of V. F. Khodasevich’s work on “political” memoirs».

December 2019 – International Conference «”Poetry” and “truth”: fictional and non-fictional in the History of literature», HSE, Moscow. Report «The pragmatics of using a pseudonym in the essays of V. F. Khodasevich: accumulation of “symbolic capital” in journals in 1905-07».

1. Lugovskaya D. A. V. F. Khodasevich’s articles of 1908-1914: criticism of progress, "philistinism" and the search for a new aesthetics // MATICA SRPSKA (MATICA SRPSKA JOURNAL OF SLAVIC STUDIES). 2021. No. 99. Pp. 251–264.
2. Lugovskaya D. A. "How to overcome the crisis of symbolism with the help of "populist ideals"? V. F. Khodasevich’s criticism of the early 1910s and the report "Nadson" // Studi Slavistici. 2021. XVIII. Pp. 67–85
3. Lugovskaya D. A. V. F. Khodasevich in 1905 – 1907: the strategy of criticism and the formation of literary reputation // Russian literature. 2020. No. 3. Pp. 199–208.
4. Lugovskaya D. A. The history of the creation of V. F. Khodasevich’s memoirs about M. Gorky // VII International Conference of Young researchers “Textual and historical-literary process”. Collection of articles. M., 2019. Pp. 128-142.