



CONTEMPORARY LITERARY PROCESS

СОВРЕМЕННЫЙ ЛИТЕРАТУРНЫЙ ПРОЦЕСС

DOI: 10.22363/2312-9220-2024-29-3-450-462

EDN: DUHPKI

UDC 82-192

Research article / Научная статья

**Deconstruction/reconstruction of Soviet myth
in T. Kibirov's poem
“Love, Komsomol, and Spring”**Lyubov G. Kihney 

*Yaroslavl State Pedagogical University, Yaroslavl, Russian Federation
Moscow University named after A.S. Griboyedov, Moscow, Russian Federation*

✉ lgkihney@yandex.ru

Abstract. The article is dedicated to strategies and tactics of engaging with the ‘Soviet text’ in T. Kibirov’s poem “Love, Komsomol, and Spring”. It identifies that the conceptual sphere of the Soviet era, as represented in the poem, was formed as a system of ‘frames’, consisting of constant and variable components. The work proves that the invariant aspects are implemented at the level of composition, while the variable ones are connected with themes and images of contents of the frames. A detailed analysis of semantic structure of the poem allowed for identification of the main principles of construction of the frames as a series of intertextual references, to songs in particular, forming the semantic field of Kibirov’s poem. The study consistently reveals and describes all the components of these frames, concluding that they are connected with ideological mythology of the Soviet era represented in the Soviet life and art of corresponding periods. Additionally, the research locates Kibirov’s position on the axis of tradition, demonstrating his complex relationship with conceptualism (indicated at the level of framework of the text). The main proposition of the article is to demonstrate Kibirov’s ambivalent view on the ideology and propaganda projects of the Soviet period. It proves that Kibirov was the first to employ the method of ‘double perspective’ on Soviet ideologemes, balancing between ironic detachment and personal involvement in the worldview context of the age.

Key words: Kibirov, conceptualism, Soviet myth, sociocultural frames, ideologeme, Soviet history, reception mechanism

© Kihney L.G., 2024



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

Acknowledgements and Funding. The study was supported by a grant from the Russian Science Foundation No. 23-28-00995, <https://rscf.ru/project/23-28-00995/>.

Conflicts of interest. The author declares that there is no conflict of interest.

Article history: submitted February 10, 2024; revised May 20, 2024; accepted June 20, 2024.

For citation: Kihney, L.G. (2024). Deconstruction/reconstruction of Soviet myth in T. Kibirov's poem "Love, Komsomol, and Spring". *RUDN Journal of Studies in Literature and Journalism*, 29(3), 450–462. <http://doi.org/10.22363/2312-9220-2024-29-3-450-462>

Деконструкция/реконструкция советского мифа в стихотворении Т. Кибирова «Любовь, комсомол и весна»

Л.Г. Кихней 

*Ярославский государственный педагогический университет, Ярославль,
Российская Федерация
Московский университет им. А.С. Грибоедова, Москва, Российская Федерация
✉ lgkihney@yandex.ru*

Аннотация. Статья посвящена стратегиям и тактикам освоения «советского текста» в стихотворении Т. Кибирова «Любовь, комсомол и весна». Выявлено, что концептосфера советской эпохи, представленная в стихотворении, формируется как система «фреймов», состоящая из константных и переменных элементов. Доказано, что инвариантные составляющие реализуются на уровне композиции, переменные – связываются с мотивно-образным наполнением этих фреймов. Определить механизмы их формирования позволил подробный анализ семантической структуры стихотворения: был выявлен ряд интертекстуальных, в частности, песенных отсылок, формирующих смысловое поле кибировского стихотворения. В работе последовательно выявлены и описаны все составляющие фреймов, сделан вывод о том, что они связываются с идеологической мифологией советской эпохи, реализуемой в советском бытии и искусстве соответствующих периодов. Также в исследовании определено положение Кибирова на оси традиции, показаны его комплексные отношения с концептуализмом (заявленные на уровне рамы текста). Главное положение статьи заключается в фиксации амбивалентного взгляда Кибирова на мировоззренческие концепты и пропагандистские проекты советской эры. Доказано, что именно Кибиров впервые применяет технику «двойного взгляда» на советские идеологемы, балансируя между ироническим отстранением и личной включенностью в мировоззренческий контекст эпохи.

Ключевые слова: Кибиров, концептуализм, советский миф, социокультурные фреймы, идеологема, советская история, механизм рецепции

Благодарности и финансирование. Исследование выполнено при поддержке гранта Российского научного фонда № 23-28-00995, <https://rscf.ru/project/23-28-00995/>.

Заявление о конфликте интересов. Автор заявляет об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

История статьи: поступила в редакцию 10 февраля 2024 г.; отрецензирована 20 мая 2024 г.; принята к публикации 20 июня 2024 г.

Для цитирования: *Кихней Л.Г.* Деконструкция/реконструкция советского мифа в стихотворении Т. Кибирова «Любовь, комсомол и весна» // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Литературоведение. Журналистика. 2024. Т. 29. № 3. С. 450–462. <http://doi.org/10.22363/2312-9220-2024-29-3-450-462>

Introduction

The poetic works of Timur Kibirov have rightfully garnered significant attention from critics and literary scholars. His lyrics are examined in the context of postmodernist frameworks (Levin, 1995; Epstein, 2005, p. 437–448; Lipovetsky, 2008, p. 575–576) and within the Moscow Conceptualism School (Zorin, 1991; Gandlevsky, 1994; Nemzer, 2005). Several studies are dedicated to specific aspects of his artistic world (Bagretsov, 2005; Nurmukhamedova, 2008), as well as to the themes and poetic styles of individual works (Boytsova, 2020; Leibov et al., 2020). It seems both relevant and important to highlight among these aspects the issue of Kibirov’s artistic reflection on Soviet discourse. This core issue, in our view, forms the focus of the present article, the study of which is based on the poem “Love, Komsomol, and Spring” (1987).

Functions of the framing components in the text

In the frame of the analyzed text, there is a dedication to one of the most prominent representatives of conceptualism, Dmitry Alexandrovich Prigov, whose addressed message is explicitly mentioned twice. The first time it is done in the aforementioned dedicatory index. Moreover, this dedication in the table of contents of the collection “Poems” is moved to the title: “Love, Komsomol, and Spring. To D.A. Prigov” (Kibirov, 2005, p. 855). The second mentioning of Prigov is found in the text of the poem itself, namely in its final line: “And Dmitry Alexandrych is right there” (Kibirov, 2005, p. 831).

Additionally, in the frame of the text, there is an addressed reference to another well-known Moscow conceptualist, Sergey Gandlevsky. The first line of his famous poem “Homeland, Legend, Heroism...” (Kibirov, 2005, p. 823) about a pioneer who heroically saved a train from disaster is taken as an epigraph.

Such an explicit intent to communicate with fellow conceptualists indicates that the author positions himself within the realm of conceptualism, which was characterized by a commitment to deconstructing the Soviet myth, the manifestation of which was total irony over socialist reality and its debunking as a utopia.

We will return to the conceptual significance of the dedication to Prigov at the end of the article, but for now, let’s focus on the meaning of the epigraph, which outlines the thematic domain of the poem.

Kibirov seems to take a ‘whirlwind tour’ through the history of the *Motherland*¹, starting from the times of the Civil War and ending with Perestroika. In doing so, on his ‘tour’ he captures different stages of perception of the Soviet era through the eyes of the young, refracted through the ‘crystal ball’ of sociocultural *legend*, i. e. myth.

How is the Soviet myth formed and transformed?

To answer this question, Kibirov conducts a semiotic experiment. The goal of this experiment is twofold: it is simultaneously a reconstruction and a deconstruction of the Soviet myth.

The poet divides the entire Soviet era into five periods, numbering them as follows:

1. 1920s (Civil War, establishment of the Soviet state);
2. 1930s;
3. late 1950s – early 1960s (‘Thaw’)
4. late 1960s – early 1980s (‘Stagnation’)
5. late 1980s (Perestroika) [it is worth noting that the poem was written in 1987].

Thus, that division forms the compositional structure of the text. It is remarkable that the 1940s are omitted from this historical list, which is understandable as the heroism and tragedy of the Great Patriotic War (World War II) do not dispose the author to either ironic modality or deconstructive experiments.

All periods, numbered by the author, in the textual space of the poem are juxtaposed and unfolded like frames, organizing socio-cultural information into a clear system. In this system, there are constant (fixed) and variable (renewable) elements. The fixed elements form the compositional blocks of Kibirov’s text, setting a peculiar set of ‘slots’, while the variable elements – motifs and images – fill those ‘slots’.

Constant compositional blocks and stable motif-image elements

The circular composition created by anaphoric and epiphoric formulas can be attributed to the constant elements of the text. The description of each period of Soviet history begins with the words: “They sit embracing on...” and ends with: “...the dawn rises over the renewed land”.

Among the constant elements that compositionally frame each period are our heroes – the Komsomol members, their poses, and the unchanging pastime

¹ Here and elsewhere, italics is mine. – L.K.

of reading foundational party works, which creates an inescapable grotesque-comic effect. For example: “...They snugly read / ‘The entire Short Course of the History of the VKP(b)’. And they summarize” (Kibirov, 2005, p. 826).

The principle of material portrayal is also preserved: at the beginning of each period, the clothing of the Komsomol members is described, which, being a symbolic element of time, changes, but the method of external characterization of the heroes remains unchanged. One of the portrait details of the youth – his curly forelock – remains consistent from period to period.

Going forward, in each period, we observe the homogeneity of spatial segmentation: the space surrounding the Komsomol members is divided into axiologically opposed blocks. However, this is not so much spatial as it is a conditionally temporal world modeling. *Behind* them – negative phenomena and events directed against the Soviet project, against which the progressive forces of the country, including our heroes, struggle. *Ahead* – the bright present, projected into the future.

The antinomy of these mini-frames, repeated from period to period, is emphasized by identical textual formulas. This is how the mini-frames of ‘hostile resistance’ are ‘circled’:

– at the beginning: “And behind them clouds gather, / flashes of lightning gleam”;

– at the end – repeated: “Clouds gather, evil winds howl”.

The same principle of ‘circularization’ is observed in the design of mini-frames depicting the bright ‘present/future’:

– at the beginning: “And before them a bright dawn...”;

– at the end – repeated: “The dawn rises over the renewed land”.

The commonplace symbolism of these formulas is rooted in the collective unconsciousness thanks to the figurative parallelism, organically inherent to Russian folklore (cf.: “*Evil winds* have blown...” from the song “Oh, not an evening, oh, not an evening...”) and classical poetry (cf. with the poem by A. Fet “*Clouds gather*, blowing in the crimson glow...”) and has transitioned into the repertoire of revolutionary songs, constantly heard on the radio and becoming a kind of backdrop to Soviet life (cf. with the song “*Ahead, towards the dawn...*”, lyrics by A. Bezymensky).

The narrative development within each period occurs according to a clearly defined algorithm:

– listing (in a negative connotation) of the enemies of the Soviet country (Table 2, Column 2) and representation of their misdeeds (Table 1, Column 1);

– naming (in a positive connotation) the leader relevant to the given period (Table 2, Column 1) and representation of epochal achievements (Table 1, Column 2)

In addition to this, each frame contains recurring images that pass from period to period, such as “fields turn golden”, “...Various sausages in the shops!”, “Budyonny on a black mare”, etc.

Variable compositional blocks and changing motif-image elements

One of the most striking changes is the transformation of the appearance, living environment, and intellectual pastime of the Komsomol members. They sit and embrace each other – depending on the period – either “on a cart”, “on a bench near the parachute tower”, “on the steps of the student dormitory”, “at a residential community meeting”, or “on Arbat Street”.

The works that the Komsomol members read also change. The titles of these works signify one of the specified periods. They include Lenin’s “Tasks of the Youth League” (1920), Stalin’s “Short Course of the History of the VKP(b)” (1938), Khrushchev’s “Materials of the XXII Congress” (1961), reports of the XXV or XXVI Congress of the CPSU (1976, 1981). Breaking away from this paradigm of party documents is the novel “Children of Arbat” by A. Rybakov, published in 1987. This novel, which narrates the Stalin era, had a bombshell effect during the Gorbachev period and became a landmark work of the late 20th century, marking the end of the Soviet era.

In this way, the author fills in the ‘slots’ in such a manner that the reader can not only observe the full-scale shift of the epochal paradigm vertically but also enjoy the reconstruction of the *temporal* horizon. The depiction of each period is assembled from significant, recognizable details. It seems that Kibirov, by reconstructing the ‘substance of existence’ of each period, works with the mechanisms of both individual and collective (public) memory.

As a result, each period emerges as a living mosaic, capturing its time and evoking a multitude of everyday and aesthetic associations in readers.

In the symbolic system of portraying our Komsomol heroes, material details play a significant role. In the first period, these include: a cart, an old leather jacket, a red kerchief, a holster, to which virgin fingers habitually reach (!), a gym shirt, whitened in heated battles, a bullet-ridden budenovka, a hand wrapped in bloody bandages... All these details already create a recognizable picture of the Civil War.

Let’s consider why this picture is so familiar to us. The reason is that it is permeated with vividly poster-like associations rooted in the collective consciousness. Immediately come to mind are the posters by A. Samokhvalov “Long Live the Komsomol! To the Seventh Anniversary of the October Revolution” (1924), A. Strakhov-Braslavsky’s “The Emancipated Woman, Build Socialism!” (1926). Also falling into the same category is the well-known poster by M. Bri-Bain “Every Komsomol Girl Must Master the Combat Techniques of the USSR Defense!” (1932) and even the canvases of K. Petrov-Vodkin, often depicting his heroines in red scarfs.

Painting associations are overlaid with musical memories from different eras – the famous “Song of the Cart” (1937, music by K. Listov, lyrics by M. Ruderman), the chanson song “Chubchik” (1930s, arrangement by

P. Leschenko), “Song of Shchors” (1936, music by M. Blanter, lyrics by M. Golodny). In this series, there is an interesting intertextual connection with Bulat Okudzhava’s “Song about the Komsomol Goddess” (1966). For example, in Okudzhava’s work: “...But slender fingers habitually touched the holster” (Okudzhava, 2001, p. 150); in Kibirov’s poem: “...But virgin fingers habitually reached for the holster” (Kibirov, 2005, p. 823), indicating almost literal quotation. Moreover, in the second period, Kibirov portrays a girl with a reference to the same “Komsomol Goddess”, dressed like Okudzhava’s heroine in the peaceful 1930s (cf.: “In a blue t-shirt, a Komsomol girl walks” (Okudzhava, 2001, p. 151)).

However, Kibirov complements the image of the Komsomol girl of the 1930s with “a t-shirt with badges of DOBROLET and DOBROKHIM and BGTO”. These badges serve as signs of the time: the first badge represents the Society of the Voluntary Air Fleet, founded in 1923 (the predecessor of Aeroflot), whose goal, especially fully realized in the 1930s, was the development of civil aviation. The second badge indicated membership in the relatively little-known today Voluntary Society for Assistance to the Construction of Chemical Industry Enterprises. This society existed for only two years (1924–1925) and may be familiar to contemporary readers from a scene in Ilf and Petrov’s “The Golden Calf”, where Koreiko evades Ostap Bender’s pursuit by hiding under a gas mask during anti-chemical defense exercises, clearly organized by members of this society. The third badge, the most famous one, decoded as “Be ready for labor and defense”, was awarded to teenagers who passed sports standards. This badge, like the sports complex itself, was introduced in 1934. Thus, material details become socio-cultural signs of the progressive movement of time.

The appearance of the young man is equally symbolic. If during the Civil War his attributes are a bullet-ridden budenovka and a gym shirt “whitened under the sun... in heated battles”, then in the period of socialist construction, “he wears a white summer tunic and cap, and his boots shine in the hot sun”, reminiscent of the police uniform of the 1930s, but evoking associations with the ceremonial portraits of comrade Stalin.

Interestingly, besides serving as a hallmark of their time, clothing in subsequent periods becomes a characteristic reflection of the gradual spiritual transformation of the Komsomol members and the Komsomol idea itself. Thus, during the ‘thaw’ period, the Komsomol girl is seen in pants and high-heeled shoes, while the Komsomol boy wears a cowboy hat, whitened by the winds of the virgin lands. In the ‘stagnation’ period, she wears crimplene, and he wears a turtleneck and a Hungarian jacket. Finally, during the period of Perestroika, she is in cooperative-made clothes, and he is in branded attire, wearing “Salamander” shoes.

By highlighting the details of clothing, the author emphasizes that in the last period, these items mean much more to their wearers than just things. Expensive branded jeans were a symbol of the West and a coveted freedom; they elevated

their lucky owners to unprecedented heights. However, since they were scarce and expensive, domestic ‘varenka’ tie-dye jeans, boiled in bleach, were sold in cooperative shops (another hallmark of Russian life in the late 1980s). Equally significant is the mention of the shoe brand. “Salamander” shoes, which appeared in the late 1980s, quickly became a rare piece of footwear. The word “Salamander” itself became synonymous with high quality and comfort.

Thus, in this final ‘material’ overview, the author manages to present not only the distinctive appearance of the Komsomol members of the Perestroika era but also a shift in their consciousness. Clothing ceased to be merely clothing; it became a symbol of lifestyle and social success.

In the depiction of this couple, who sit embraced, studying party documents, there is a sharp irony that intensifies with each successive period. The Komsomol members are portrayed as puppets of their time, remaining constant figures: their psychological profile and *modus operandi* remain unchanged, only their costumes and the paradigm of their socio-cultural perception shift. These changes are driven by the directives of the party leadership, which governs the country and whose works they read and take notes on.

However, Kibirov does not limit himself to merely describing the Komsomol members. He uses the framework provided by each period to portray Soviet history with epic and encyclopedic breadth.

To illustrate, let’s present the realities of the negative and positive mini-frames of all five periods in Table 1.

Table 1

Periods	Negative Mini-Frames (Column 1)	Positive Mini-Frames (Column 2)
1. Civil War	Black barons, barons Wrangel, Ungern, atamans Semyonov and Tyutyunnik, and Faina Kaplan, and the burnashi gang, and the hated Kolchak, Makhno, destruction, sabotage.	...in communes, peasants gather, and the fields turn golden. And Budyonny rides out on a black mare. And crystal palaces glow, brass bands play, and a worker commands a shining machine in a snow-white overall designed by Lissitzky and Rodchenko... And they finish off last bourgeoisies in the Amazon area with Comintern troops. Labor Day shines over the land. Airplanes and dirigibles fly in the sky, Tsiolkovsky’s rockets soar...
2. 1930s	The kulaks shoot at the lit windows of the village council and the reading hut. Dynamite is well hidden under every rail and furnace, and saboteurs in overcoats and pince-nez are already striking a match to the fuse, glancing around. <...> And the White Finns.	...peasants gather into collective farms and the fields turn golden. And Budyonny rides out on a black mare. Skyscrapers rise. And Dunaevsky’s songs. And with a song the worker over-fulfills the plan and receives a medal. A ballerina spins. Fadeev writes books. Everyone receives medals. <...> Over the planet flies Chkalov. Aviators and pilots, bombs and airplanes. Chuk and Gek fly to Mars to help Aelita.

Table 1, ending

Periods	Negative Mini-Frames (Column 1)	Positive Mini-Frames (Column 2)
3. 'Thaw'	Lenin's rules of party life are fiercely violated by degenerates in GPU uniforms. Hipsters and zhevags creep out, threatening to poison boys and girls with Coca-Cola. Across the ocean, SEATO, CENTO, NATO, ASEAN, and Tshombe, Franco, Salazar, and Hungarian counter-revolutionaries, and neo-Nazis, revanchists, the Ku Klux Klan, ...and jazz musicians, Baptists, and Shepilov who joined them.	...into collective farms, peasants gather, and the fields turn golden, and Budyonny rides his black mare in a movie. And there are bright, spacious homes without any extravagances in them, and an orchestra plays pop songs by Pakhmutova. A worker, dressed in nylon and corduroy, assembles combines for harvesting good corn across the entire planet. A guitar strums by the bonfire. <...> And there's no money. And crews soar up into the Andromeda Nebula.
4. 'Stagnation'	The Chinese (The yellow) crawl up to our Damansky, and Zionists intrude on our Egypt, while Czechoslovakians raise a hand against the whole socialist bloc. And the Yankees refuse to go home, no way! An ungrateful Jew rushes off to OVIR (Office of Visas and Registration). <...> The BBC squeals. And Sakharov threatens the Motherland with war.	...peasants gather to master the trenchless method, brigade contract, and they drain the swamps, and the fields turn golden. And Budyonny rides his black mare in dreams of boys. With improved planning, with elevators, houses are being built. A band plays a melody in modern rhythms. With a new proposal, a worker came forward... <...> Rockets fly to Venus before the Americans come there. And the cheerful BAM belted the planet, and the planet welcomes the bright Labor Day, all blooming with flowers.
5. Perestroika	The times of stagnation distort life-giving Marxism, and bureaucrats, bribe-takers, thieves, and drunkards, and even drug addicts, and mafia, corruption, unfinished construction, and formalism, and bottlenecks, and remnants of nationalism, and the extensive method, and other negative phenomena... and vegetable warehouses...	...peasants intend to implement family contracts. And fields turn golden, a worker sits down at his personal computer. And everywhere, cooperative apartment buildings are rising up. Daring rock bands are playing. And "Clubs of amateur singing" are playing, too. And Budyonny has already been exposed by the mean "Ogonyok". <...> ...banners, Coca-Cola, strong ruble!

All events, all mentioned names, and phenomena become semiotic markers, symbols of their time. Kibirov strategically places epochal signs, familiar then and recognizable today, doing so masterfully, remarkably broadening the scope of Soviet history. Behind each image lies a historical collision, behind each name a spiritual drama.

The meaning of the poem goes much deeper than it appears at first glance. While it may sound like propaganda slogans, and phrases like "the fields turn golden" or "Budyonny on a black mare" might suggest utopianism, conformity, and the puppet-like nature of collective consciousness, the encyclopedic scope of its imagery contradicts any straightforward interpretation. The author presents a truly "comprehensive lexicon" of Soviet reality, encompassing not only utopian ideals but also its real-life achievements. Simultaneously, the poem demonstrates how these achievements are reflected in mass culture, such as Soviet songs and posters, as well as in literature and art, hence the specific names of authors, works, and characters mentioned: Lissitzky, Rodchenko, Dunaevsky,

Pakhmutova, Fadeev, Chuk and Gek, Aelita, the Andromeda Nebula, “Children of Arbat”, and so on.

The author sets himself a dual task. The first task is related to understanding the patterns of the passage of time, reconstructing the main tendencies of the Soviet era in all their possible completeness and specificity. The second task is to identify the mechanism of ideological manipulation, the peculiarities of the impact of ideological PR strategies, and the brainwashing propaganda machine.

And the second task Kibirov solves with the help of the tool of total irony, balancing on the edge of factography, newspaper-poster truth, and grotesque. Moreover, the grotesque is revealed only in a comparative light.

Thus, all the leaders initially appear as epochal heroes, *welcoming* the progressive forces of the country. Their strictly positive connotation is emphasized by constant epithets like “*red-bannered*” and/or “*inspired*” (see positive mini-frames in Table 2, Column 1). However, in subsequent periods, each of them is subjected to ridicule and ostracism, reflected by the constant epithet “*detestable*” (see negative mini-frames in Table 2, Column 2).

Table 2

Periods	Leaders in positive mini-frames (Column 1)	Leaders in negative mini-frames (Column 2)
1. Civil War	...and Trotsky greet the fighters.	And the detested Trotsky spews bloody foam...
2. 1930s	And Stalin, the red-bannered, inspired Stalin greet tank crews.	...and the detested Stalin...
3. 'Thaw'	Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev on the Mausoleum greet missionaries from all nations in the 80th year, in communism...	The hated libertarian Khrushchev disarmed his homeland...
4. 'Stagnation'	...and awarded, and thrice awarded, four times our inspired Brezhnev. He greet everyone and kisses them all.	...and Brezhnev, all hated...
5. Perestroika	From the TV screen, Mikhail Sergeevich, red-bannered, inspired, wise, Greet the foremen of Perestroika... <...> Daring Yeltsin...	

Fluctuating assessment of leaders, reflecting the relativist settings of official ideology, were mocked by Dmitry Prigov in the poem “Fisherman’s Day”:

Here's Fisherman's Day – it's Fisherman's Day
The fisherman on this day is unmatched
And akin to divine joy
The fisherman on this day forever
But on the very next day, the fisherman
On a day, let's say, Tank operator's Day
He already looks at a Tank operator
And himself – just some kind of a fisherman.
(Prigov, 1989, p. 85)

In the light of “Fisherman’s Day”, as well as other similar compositions by Prigov (“Here is the Newly Elected President...”, “The Locksmith Steps Out into the Winter Yard...”, and many others), it becomes clear why the analyzed poem is dedicated to D.A. Prigov. It’s not just about the general conceptual circle of themes and ideas, but also about the poetic methodology that Kibirov essentially ‘borrows’ from Prigov. Kibirov, as clearly seen from Table 2, employs the same principle of ambivalent axiological play, which has been repeatedly tested by D. Prigov in relation to official ideologies. That’s why the poem ends with the line: “And Dmitry Aleksanych is right in the mix!”, shifting the entire text’s semantic unity into the pastiche (imitative) register.

Conclusion

In summary, in the poem “Love, Komsomol, and Spring”, Kibirov presents not so much the epoch itself as its reflection within the framework of the hypothetical mass consciousness. Moreover, the main characters themselves serve as a kind of derivative of ideology – an ideological theme among others. The author demonstrates that public consciousness seems to be constructed at the intersection of these mythologemes, consists of them, and can be reduced to them.

The collision of various ideologemes, presented in the pragmatic context of modernity, undoubtedly leads to an ironic-parodic effect. However, it seems that Kibirov’s aesthetic task is not exhausted by this; he manages to tap into certain sociopsychological regularities. Firstly, the poet demonstrates the nature of mass consciousness itself, its fluidity, correlated with an amnesic component. Secondly, Kibirov exposes the mechanisms linking mass consciousness to ideological myths, reconstructing the logic of mythological consciousness from both within and without.

To be a myth bearer is only possible within the mythological system itself; beyond its boundaries, the myth loses its power and is subjected to ironic diminishment. The uniqueness of Kibirov’s technique lies precisely in his construction of a distinct axiological deixis: the observer’s value position simultaneously entails being situated within two value paradigms.

This ‘double’ vision technique was also tested in the poem “Through Farewell Tears” (1987), where the phenomenon of Soviet songs is artistically ‘explored’. In this poem, irony is expressed truly ‘through farewell tears’, and the lyrical subject balances between acceptance and rejection. On the one hand, the poem is essentially composed of cumulative series, including cliché quotes from Soviet songs, and on the other hand, these ideological motifs seem to sprout from memory and refer back to the personal past of the subject.

Thus, mass consciousness itself suddenly acquires a personal, existential dimension here. Hence, in the analyzed poem, emerges a personal theme: it is noteworthy that the focus is not only on the *Komsomol* but also on *love*. The ‘complication’ of the ideological theme with the theme of love precisely indicates the personal attitude of the speaker towards the unfolding images.

It seems that this technique of double vision on the Soviet myth was indeed used in Kibirov’s analyzed text, as confirmed by subsequent poems. In fact, this strategy represents Kibirov’s poetic discovery! In other words, there is no conceptualist ‘mercilessness’ towards the Soviet past here, but rather a value-laden ambivalence. The author, while ironically distancing himself from ideological themes, nonetheless understands that he himself is to some extent their bearer.

References

- Bagretsov, D.N. (2005). *T. Kibirov: Intertext and creative individuality*. Yekaterinburg: Ural University. (In Russ.)
- Boytsova, A.V. (2020). The image of time in T. Kibirov’s poem “Love, Komsomol, and Spring”. *Proceedings of VI (XX) International conference of young scientists “Actual problems of linguistics and literary studies”*. Issue 20. Tomsk: STT Publ. P. 250–251. (In Russ.)
- Epstein, M.N. (2005). *Postmodernism in Russian literature: A textbook for universities*. Moscow: Higher School Publ. (In Russ.)
- Gandlevsky, S.M. (1994). Timur Kibirov’s works. In: T. Kibirov. *Sentiments. Eight Books*. Belgorod: Risk. P. 5–10. (In Russ.)
- Kibirov, T. (2005). *Poems*. Moscow: Vremya. (In Russ.)
- Leibov, R., Lekmanov, O., & Stupakova, E. (2020). “Lord! Forgive the Soviet Union!” Timur Kibirov’s poem “Through farewell tears”: *Reading experience*. Moscow: United Humanitarian Publ. (In Russ.)
- Levin, A. (1995). On the influence of solar activity on Russian poetry. *Znamya*, 10, 218–220. (In Russ.)
- Lipovetsky, M.N. (2008). *Paralogies: Transformations of (post)modernist discourse in Russian culture in the 1920s–2000s*. Moscow: New Literary Observer. (In Russ.)
- Nemzer, A. (2001). Timur from the Pushkin team. In: T. Kibirov. “I don’t know where you go, I go to Russia...”. Moscow: Vremya. P. 5–28. (In Russ.)
- Nurmukhamedova, R.A. (2008). *The lyrical subject in the poetry of Timur Kibirov*. (Ph.D. Dissertation abstract). Moscow. (In Russ.)
- Okudzhava, B. (2001). *Poems*. St. Petersburg: Academic Project. (In Russ.)
- Prigov, D. (1989). Fisherman’s Day. *Novy Mir*, 12, 85. (In Russ.)
- Zorin, A. (1991). View from the hall. In: Rubinshtein L. (ed.) *Personal file No.: Literary and artistic almanac*. Moscow: Soyuzteatr. P. 246–271. (In Russ.)

Bio note:

Lyubov G. Kihney, Doctor of Philology, Professor, Leading Researcher of the scientific laboratory “Receptions of Soviet discourse in Russian lyrics of the second half of the 20th – early 21st century”, Yaroslavl State Pedagogical University, 108/1 Respublikanskaya St, Yaroslavl, 150000, Russian Federation; Head of the Department of History of Journalism and Literature, Moscow State University named after A.S. Griboyedov, 66a Zeleny Prospect, Moscow, 111396, Russian Federation. ORCID: 0000-0003-0342-7125. E-mail: lgkihney@yandex.ru