

Poetry between the words, either the unity of the beginning or the end (David Hovhannes's collection of "New Chronicle")

¹Suren Abrahamian, ^{2*}Mihran Hovhannisyan, ³Shoghik Boris Khachatryan, ⁴Roza Melkumyan and ⁵Armen Manukyan

¹DSc in Philology, Leading Research Fellow, Institute of Literature after Manuk Abeghyan of National Academy of Sciences of the

²Junior researcher, Institute of Literature after Manuk Abeghyan of National Academy of Sciences of the

³Ph.D in Philology, Institute of Literature after M. Abeghyan of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Armenia Textology Department, Junior Researcher

⁴Ph.D. student at the Institute of Literature after M. Abeghyan of NAS of RA

⁵Ph.D in Philology, Institute of Literature after M. Abeghyan of NAS of RA

¹surenabraham@mail.ru, ²mihranhovhannisyan@inbox.ru, ³shogher.kh@gmail.com,

⁴roza.melkumyan@edu.isec.am and ⁵manukyan-armen@mail.ru

¹ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6738-864X>, ²ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0359-4193>, ³ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-7593-9788>, ⁴ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-8629-3728> and ⁵ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3050-1055>

Correspondent author: Mihran Hovhannisyan, mihranhovhannisyan@inbox.ru

Abstract

This study is dedicated to the examination of the work of the Armenian poet Davit Hovhannes, as well as to the questions of the development of Armenian poetry in general and to what extent the development of new poetry was conditioned by the movements taking place in public life.

Therefore, we leave aside from our criticism non-literary interpretations of the imagination, because in them the researchers focus not on complete works, but on isolated verses from the context, which cannot provide the content of the whole.

That is why in the Armenian poetry of the beginning of the 21st century, we have few opportunities to talk about such a novelty, which strives for completeness and pretends to be interpreted as a unified poetic system. In general, such a starting point presupposes that the "object" of interpretation be meaningful, and at the very least, uniquely self-sufficient. David Hovhannes's latest book, "New Chronicle", is endowed with this possibility of interpretation.

Keywords: David Hovhannes, chronicle, poetry, language, culture, system.

THE ESSENCE OF POETRY

The material of the analysis is the research of the formation process, literary-historical identity and significance of David Hovhannes's poetry system, who is one of the significant names of modern Armenian poetry.

It should be noted that the book of David is the bearer of one of the Armenian literary trends of recent decades, which, although it has a decades-long history in our poetry, but needs to be defined and analyzed from a purely literary point of view.

We will not "deprive" the poet of the strong thought of the "exciting and tragic experience of self-criticism", which was "dictated by serious thinking" [Metsarents, M., 1907] under the guidance of the

Poetry between the words, either the unity of the beginning or the end (David Hovhannes's collection of "New Chronicle")

Armenian writer Misak Metsarents (which is also David Hovhannes's conviction), nor will we disturb Armenian literary critic Alexander Topchyan (why no, also us) "not depriving him of the not easy pleasure of reviewing the books of his poet" [David Hovhannes, *Chronicon* (Chronicle), p. 450].

The questioning, however, on which the orientation of modern criticism depends, or one of the directions of criticism, as David Hovhannes notes, is expressed in "uncombed thoughts", passionately written prefaces and epilogues. By their significance, these suggest that the nightmare of poetry does not end after turning the last page, but continues even after that, predetermining the tomorrow of David Hovhannes's poetry. To be more truthful, we can add the following, asserting that this tendency towards poetic unity, which stretches through the creative decades to our days, proceeds along the same system: the path of negation and negation, which legitimately has an opposition within itself. One poetic cycle negates and complements another, perhaps from collection to collection, from book to book in the time stretching, but also in the course of negation, it reveals a unity of the beginning and the end. Its cornerstones, purely as structural closed frames, are also David Hovhannes's last collections, "*Chronicon*" [Chronicle, 1996] and, already completed, "*Nor Chronicon*" [New Chronicle, 2007]. The very title *Chronicon* already suggests that the collection encompasses a specific period of time. In Epstein's encyclopedic article on the term "chronicle" (or "chronicon"), the following formulation is posited: "Although the chronicle is relatively rare as an independent genre, within numerous works it constitutes a system for integrating historical time into the artistic plot"¹. In this case, it is the poetic time itself that becomes a system, directed not outward toward historical space, but inward toward itself.

One of David Hovhannes "self-judgmental" interviews, in keeping with the controversial nature of his line of poetry, is titled as follows: "My beginning is in my end" ("*Garun*", No. 1-2, 2008). The poem, the poetic line in general, according to David Hovhannes interpretation, "has something self-destructive in it", which is expressed in such a self-reference: "...the beginning of my destruction is buried in my end", which means the following: "My poetry has always touched the hidden, the tragic, the dramatic". In short, the pearl, with spiritual vision, sees in the mud, or the poem, which testifies to the poet and his time, is "placed" in a context, assimilates temporality into a unified time. Therefore, in this case, not only the poem becomes impossible, but also the poem is recreated from the opposite "edge". This means that literature moves towards anti-literature, poetry - anti-poetry, speech - anti-speech through the process of reflection and interpenetration. Moreover, this contradiction—or more precisely, the aspiration to unify the clash of times—is manifested not only at the level of content or text, but also within the poetic form chosen by Davit Hovhannes. "When studying the poetry of Davit Hovhannes and of this period in general, one is left with the impression that the element of free verse has subjugated our syllabic poetry of that era, forming transitional, intermediary forms"².

The "profundity" that exists between words and lines is not a spatial unit where words and lines are "separated" from each other, but a super-dense intermediate space (intermediateness), which is the place of the poem (speech) place. As a "structure", such a poem is divided as follows: as an expression of mood, complete with the unity of the original and subtext. As a result, the poetic series, as if they have no "end", continues in the field of diversity of meanings, contrast of perception, growing from "structure" to a purely literary metaphor, and in the second sense, as a "structure" word image, having a purely objective "correspondence", it is finished as a final unit. This assumes that the starting point is the structure of a classical poem. How, then, does the denial of classical literature take place in a

¹ Likhachev, D. S. (1971). *Poetika drevnerusskoy literatury* [Poetics of Old Russian Literature] (2nd ed.). Leningrad.

² Jrbashyan, A. (2024). *Ankakhutyan shrjani hay banasteghtsutyany taghachapakan dzevern u zargatsman mitumnere* [Metrical Forms and Development Trends of Armenian Poetry in the Independence Era]. *Hayagitakan handes* [Journal of Armenian Studies], Yerevan, p. 97.

structure where, in the realm of the "external" structure, the perception of the poem aspires to mere objectivity. Even, we can say, in some sense, it carries the romantic dream of neo-classical conversion, but at the same time, it destroys the meaning of the subject in the hidden white space between the words. This happens because another metaphorical meaning appears in the system of the poem, which, however, is integrated with the text and cannot be transformed into a response to existence without it.

The phenomenon is, of course, complex, but it is interpretable and aimed at the new. Especially for decades, David Hovhannes's poetry, surviving time, recreates contemporaneity in such a way that "inside" it hides the poet's tragic ambivalence and anxiety, the sharp contrast against the light and shadow of time. The poet prefers to "open" poetic series and collections with prologue-poems, defining his aesthetic considerations (M. Heidegger calls the same phenomenon "writing a poem from a single poem", where "every movement of speech flows back into the origin of the hidden"³) calling them "frontal" poems.

This may not be a very successful wording, but David Hovhannes's prefaces and epilogues are also interesting from an interpretive point of view. Therefore, turning again to the poet's interpretative advice, let us quote a key reference that, apart from being interesting, has a starting point from the point of view of perception. In the foreword to Slavik Chiloyan's newly reprinted book "We don't say how much we know", David Hovhannes understands the latest period of poetry in terms of the movement of three "downward" stages. It is a movement that passes through "interesting metamorphoses"... to the decline of poetry, as "a vast empire descends from expansion to final destruction."

Those three great phases "clearly carried within them powerful charges of revolution and rebellion against the power of the day, against the ruling regime.... lived in the highest combination of life and poetry" [Slavik Chiloyan, "*Chenq asum – inchqan gitenq* [We don't say how much we know]", Yerevan, 2005, page 7 (David Hovhannes, "Man does not die, man is killed", article-preface). Those three great cycles, according to David Hovhannes, are associated with three great names. He notes that "The first one, whose written birth manifesto was the "Declaration of Three", reached its fullness in the 30s of the last century in the person of Eghishe Charents, and ended with the tragic death of Charents.

The second, the post-war phase, marked the work of Paruyr Sevak, and it was Sevak who wrote his manifesto for himself ("*For and against the foundations of realism*"), and not long after that he died tragically. The herald of the third stage was the generation of Armenian "new poetry", which appeared in the second half of the 1960s [Paruyr Sevak, *Yerker* [Creations], p. 6].

I should add that David considers the poem "*After us strong and victorious boys will come*" (1965) as the manifesto of the third stage, which is later confirmed by the critic of the generation, Alexander Topchyan. However, as David Hovhannes notes that "Sevak wrote his manifesto for himself", the same word can literally be attributed to his poem, especially since David Hovhannes considers "*The Life of Chilo*" equivalent to the poem "*After Us...*" as a manifesto of new poetry: In his opinion, this was "oral and unwritten... and that generation also had its tragic victim - Slavik Chiloyan" [2, p. 6].

THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF WORLD LITERATURE AND THE WRITING ART OF DAVID HOVHANNES

David Hovhannes, though intuitive, applies a deeply felt mind to criticism to analyze and understand the specificity of the literary process in a period associated with the re-evaluation and history of poetry in the previous century. Therefore, adding that his parallels may sound subjective, but they need a serious examination, so that "eventually everything will be put in its place, and everyone/every generation/ will finally get what they deserve. Especially the last one [Chiloyan, *Chenq asum-inchqan gitenq* (*We don't say how much we know*, Yerevan, 2005), p. 2]". Therefore, considering the examination of

³ Heidegger, M. (1971). *Poetry, Language, Thought* (A. Hofstadter, Trans.). New York: Harper & Row.

Poetry between the words, either the unity of the beginning or the end (David Hovhannes's collection of "New Chronicle")

these observations as a key question, let's try to make a few additions to clarify Hovhannes's thought.

First, what David Hovhannes says about stages captures several features of modern poetry: the negation and interpenetration in the system of creation in general that exists between the artistic beginning and time /reality/. It strives for completeness and at the same time rejects it, revealing the poet's tragic rebellion, which can be said to be a rebellion of poetic madness. So, as Albert Camus comments (*Camus, The Rebellious Poetry*), that ascetic/perhaps and generational/craziness in the field of creation pushes the poet to move downwards to interpret the impossibility of the world's integrity, and therefore the impossibility of the poem/as well as the Thing/, as much as it "interprets revolution and rebellion from the point of view of aesthetics". Moreover, "revolt, from this point of view, is the creation of the world... a part of the aesthetic demand" [*Literary magazine*, 22 February, 2008, p. 4], which, according to Camus, defines art.

Consequently, every revolt/negation/ is a revolutionary act that, bearing within itself the "demand for the metaphysical wholeness of the world", the "creation of a substitute world", makes poetry /the Thing/ impossible, recording only the movement that re-creates the Word in order to destroy it again. This was unique both to the work of Teryan and Charents, which covered the first decades of the previous century, as well as the post-war period of Paruyr Sevak, so the Armenian "new poetry" is formed in the direction of the same movement. What, then, is the pattern?

In order to understand the course of the "new poetry" movement, let's say that denial and rebellion are so integrated into literature that they strive for combination. But the Armenian criticism of the previous decades had moved the issue and examined it as a dead end of appropriating or rejecting the deposits, and recorded its evaluations only by this criterion, mistaking the most essential point, that is, consent and remorse follow renunciation. To understand, let's take the example of Teryan and Charents. The process according to which Teryan and Charents can be interpreted is possible only with the philosophy of "immutability" [Charents Y., *Yerker* (Creations), vol. 4]. Therefore, the poetry of Teryan and Charents of the 10s of the 20th century carries the aesthetics of "unchangeableness".

"The world of fine art" is the world of the eternal, lasting and permanent, and the "world of history" is temporary, transitory, and vain. Therefore, Teryan and Charents, rebelling against the impossibility of perceiving the wholeness of the world, take shelter in the sphere of speech/Thing/, one can say, outside of history, to the source of the work of communication in the sphere of literature. Why? Because history was merciless towards the fate of the person, the nation, the human being, dividing the unity of the destiny of the person, the nation....

The tragic individual-creator, who is the witness of eternity, was looking for an impermanent "place" in this transitory world, which is the place of speech. Teryan, for example, discovering the eternal world of the "Golden Tale", passing from the world of "twilight" to the world of loneliness of dream, searching for the impermanent in the abyss of his being, recreates it as a complete world in order to convey this to people's conversion on that path /"Dreams of Twilight" to "Return"/.

It is a different matter; however, that Teryan's return is not taking place. His conversion to "this reality" was impossible as a poetic turn, from which the poet's new tragedy is born, then "escape and repulsion" on the path of death/dismay, which led him to his last odyssey, to the "unknown path"/ to the south: Orenburg/. The clash and rebellion of Charents, although they have similarities with Teryan, but in the sense of transition, it has several twists in it: the discovery of the integrity of the artistic world/ from "Three Songs", from the "Rainbow" series to "The Burning Fire". After this, the collapse of fate drives him to destroy the "world of speech" in order to invade the "world of history". The world of signs - Teryan's "*Yerkir Nairin*", "*Thief's way*" spheres are collapsing, and the writer is trying to choose the path of conversion, he said, like Teryan, to make the transition of return to match the history. And no matter how tragic the reality /story/ was, the tragedy of Charents, from the poem "*Crowds Mad*" to "*Loveless Romance*", "*Yerkir Nairi*", was a poetic rebellion, a transition from lyricism to epicness. But the conversion from lyricism to epicness is also a tragedy of the decline of poetry /Thing/, from which

Charents' remorse is born. Therefore, Charents and the revolution are as identical as history and Charents are as identical, but also tragic. Therefore, a new stage of transition/movement/ is born, which in Charents' work has the character of unity, which strives for symbiosis/fusion/ with the philosophy of "the road", which is so unified and multi-meaning as a combination of history and creativity in the *"Book of the Road"* /1933/ book. And so that my words don't end up being long-winded, I'll just add that through the stages of transition, the poet strives for the image of a complete world that is "possible" in the field of creativity. And "outside" him, in the historical world, as David Hovhannes says about Slavik Chiloyan, "poetry is only his life", which is also the source of the poet's tragedy. Repentance and consent take place in a transition between the world of art and the world of history. Therefore, the artistic world is impermanent, and the writer's world is ultimately tragic.

The second stage described by David, the Sevak region, has the same transition tendency, which, according to his description, bears the effort of the "rebellious Sevak". Sevak's passion of denial, with its phenomenological significance, revolts against the immobility of nature, the deception of art, so the starting point of the movement is speech /Thing/.

This is merely a comparative re-creation of the essence of poetry through the sign, not outside of history, but, in opposition to history, creates a "world of rational unity" in harmony with its essence. This is where Sevak's definition of "aesthetic ignorance", the orientation of the dictating character of the poem, the theory of art of "funny science" that leads to the movement in the direction of the new perception of "poetic non-poetry" originates [5, vol. 3]. But the paradox is that Sevak's news was so forward-looking that it was "enough" not only to get his generation out of the stupor, but also to take the poetic sounding names hanging on his "rope" with him.

Opposed to Sevak's poetry for two decades, until the 80s of the previous century, subservient to classicism and the overload of mere poetry deposits, the era bore a literary direction of the period after Sevak, until such poetic cuteness, torrential beauties died out, enclosing a whole era. And the metamorphoses of Yeghishe Charents and Paruyr Sevak paved the way for another movement, *"New Poetry"*, whose firstborn, as David Hovhannes notes, "is the person adopted by society", but which is "rejected by that same society", just "homeless"...Chilo".

If he was not a "damned poet" (as the critic described him), he was a "damned agitator" who "with his work predestined the disintegration of the clay-footed Soviet giant (and poetry) until the tragic end of both" [*Chiloyan S.*, p. 6]. This was a unique conversion, characterized by the transition from poetry to the apoetic situation, or it was a new milestone in the perception of speech? The debate and internal "positioning" has existed for three decades, although the poem of the "third" period following Paruyr Sevak speaks on behalf of the "generation", but each of them knows that he is alone...

And if David Hovhannes considers poetry to be a "bite" and expresses his anger, with an internal contradiction, through a movement that can be called the opposition of poetic form and structure, or, which is the same, opposition of sign and structure, when the poem is born from an apoetic situation and aspires to the infinity of speech, which accumulates in the intermediality of the unsaid, words and lines (David Hovhannes himself calls it "space"). Then the other poets of the generation, each in its own way, formulates its own process of movement, which, by its nature, is opposite and originates from another sphere of the Thing and thus emerges as the sphere of the unity of historical time.

Therefore, to speak only about genealogy, the question of origin is the same as speaking and bearing the burden of internal contradictions, which characterizes the path of poets of the later period following Paruyr Sevak, which is opposed by the course of poetic and apoetic movement. In the end, these two directions are clear purely in terms of aesthetics, which, starting from the 70s of the previous century, was expressed not only in separate collections, but also in published articles, in particular, Henrik Edoyan's *"Word Search"* (1971), *"Second Chance"* (1971), Hovhannes Grigoryan's *"How the poem disappeared"* (1970) [5], the latter of which has purely manifesto value as an expression of "apoetic beginning", and the first as an expression of "poetic situation" or "unity of poetic beginning", where time

Poetry between the words, either the unity of the beginning or the end (David Hovhannes's collection of "New Chronicle")

is united in the poetic reality and rules the word-metaphor, image-metaphor, recreates the "space of time" in the mythical totality of the world. This means, destroying the poem, recreates the "poetry of the word", where the non-poetic meaning of the word is not separated from the poetic one. Therefore, in the unified structure, the word assigns a spiritual function that is unique to "authors who write with metaphors", in particular, to the poetry of Henrik Edoyan, then also to the poetry of the 70s, especially to the poetry of Artem Harutyunyan, later to the poetry of the 80s, to the poetry of Hakob Movses and etc.

The issue is a subject of a separate study, and here I can only add that this is closed poetry, where metaphor, as a system of perceiving the "inner form" of the word, includes the "poetic beginning" - unified and endless, however, it is complex as a "construction" (Edoyan), and the study requires a long effort. Therefore, these "two directions" have a comparative nature in the course of their movement, but they also "group" those poets, the first group of which Alexander Topchyan characterized with valid arguments as "polemists", and the second group as "metaphorists". But leaving the effort to expand the questioning for another continuation of the analysis, for now let's analyze several features of the "apoetic beginning" that theoretically interpret David Hovhannes' "experiment of self-criticism", that is, the *"New Chronicle"*.

Part 2; Poetry in life

How is the poem established, if the "apoetic beginning" is the source of David Hovhannes's poetry? To make it clear, let's define in advance that this can be analyzed by the combination of poetry and apoetic situations, between each other - by movement, by "dividing" the antrohel, which in the poetry of David Hovhannes fuses the transition and mutual agreement between poetry and antipoetry... How does it happen?

In order to make the phenomenon more understandable, let's state that the interpretation of the question implies an examination of David Hovhannes poetic path. And the general circle of fate, which emerges through the great and the small /and in each other/, comes to "repetition" that expands the circle. Therefore, the "repetition" occurs "within" the poetic system, where the "repetition"⁴ develops into a pattern.

David Hovhannes "does not reject" such a theory of transition, dividing the course of his poetry into three big cycles, which include two periods of transition. Purely poetic transition stages in David Hovhannes's poetry can be mentioned the collections published in the previous decades, which cover two transition periods. The first period includes the collections *"Crown of Songs"*, *"Lost Past"*, *"New Life"*, *"Anxieties"*, *"Mother Armenia"* published in 1974-1988. The second period covers the other collections from 1988 to the beginning of the 21st century, from the *"Disaster Zone"* collection to the *"New Chronicle"*. But there is also a way of not easy analysis between the stages of transition, that "inside" the general system of David Hovhannes's poetry works with the character of "purely textual" structural unity of pattern. Between these stages of transition, the "series" of poems *"After Us"* /1967/, *"Urban Winter"* /1969/, *"Eternal Armenian"* /1989/, which draw three transition periods, including and interweaving the internal poetic movements, which and as we mentioned, David Hovhannes calls "frontal" poems.

The general thing that can be said about the idea of the unity of these inner divisions is that the transition takes place in a course of movement that, as "repetition", seeks an inner agreement with the sphere of Speech, because the repetition is not what is said or what is to be said itself, but appears in the internal contrast of writing. Sometimes, between the writing /what is said in the poem/ and the secret of the writing /appearing in the subtext/, the PO-EM is born, which can be analyzed as a mere "composition" of metaphor.

⁴ Kalantaryan, Zh. (2016). Mijtekstaynutyun [Intertextuality]. In Grakanutyanyan tesutyany ardi khndirner [Current Issues in Literary Theory] (pp. 139–141). Yerevan.

David Hovhannes says so, that is, "poetry is a metaphor", and gives an example of Dylan Thomas's line, that is, "Man, be my metaphor". But there are two "splits" between the spoken and the "unsaid", that is, the sphere of the word covers the objective world, and then interprets the world and history through a mere sign /metaword/. And this means that the non-poetic beginning is merely the beginning of the poem and, however pure and bare (in the sense of the objective meaning) the word is said, repeating itself as "structure", in the field of his /bare word - sign/, the metaphor finally appears as an echo of what was said, which is merely David Hovhannes's individual-poetic cornerstone.

Aesthetically, between poetic lines, it is expressed in a transition that can be seen within the frame through transposition. Thus, "within" the first poetic phase, the transition from the *"Past Lost"* series to the *"New Life"* series is a turn that implies a purely poetic movement.

"New life" is the search for a new artistic essence, the turning point, the expression of the "poetic beginning", the repetition of whose essence, through decay, brings to light the transition to the environment of history, when the text of history itself is the discoverer. Especially *"New life"*, as defined by David Hovhannes, is Dante's *"vitanova"*, where the poet's self is alone. We see the same thing in the "alarm-like repetition" of the *"Anxieties"* series, which is already divided by the internal movement of transposition of infinity, which is characteristic of David Hovhannes's poetry in general. It turns out, however, a framework within which the unified structure of the poem, purely with the "external"-subjective meaning of the sign, aspires to a new neoclassicism, through an internal shift, however, destroying the sign, it leads to a poetic revolution in the structure of the metaphor, which recreates the new tragedy of the poetic self. Therefore, the poem, as a unity of structure, aspires to a new neo-classicism, but at the same time, "inside" the system, it denies the aesthetics of classicism.

The course of this movement, therefore, in the books *"Chronicle"* and *"New Chronicle"* deepens the rupture that existed in the previous decades in the first books of David Hovhannes. The poet reconciles the rupture by commenting on another transitional sphere, where the three stages strive for inner unity, and where the poetic self, its essence, merges with the creative self already in the poems from *"After Us..."* to *"Eternal Armenian"*, that is, purely in the field of creativity. But we add an important feature, that is, David Hovhannes interprets the Armenian and time as the ontological perceptual inseparability of the character, fused and unified. But at the same time, the image of the "eternal Armenian", as he says, is not a collective image, but the essence of the poetic self, homogenous with the text of history, who is "looking" for his place of solitude in the context of the past, past and future. The poem begins with the very "passport" line: "Here I am, the eternal Armenian", and expresses a structural unity, where the pure structure is assimilated to the poetic essence, interpreting the unity of transition / movement/. Therefore, the poet says: "There is a certain geography, and a game of magical numbers, the enumerations, the queues are made according to a very specific number: 33 are the years of Christ's life, there is a certain symbolism" ["Garun", 2008].

Therefore, the sacred essence of speech is not a different place, but a whole, identical to the historical text, which is divided only between the sign and the signified. Therefore, the text of history divides the poet, because it is a place of transience and a sphere of contradictions, where the recognizable and the unrecognizable deny each other ("the top and the bottom are mixed"). Therefore, the self-destructive nature of history, which appears in the biographies of the "eternal Armenian man" (I am a dead child, I am a broken mother, I am a mad father, I am a plane wreck, I am a broken head), through the contradiction of "repetition", by destroying the opposite essence of signs, show the poet's rebellion against God and, then, repentance (reconciliation). The phrase "I have become God by essence" in the poem "Eternal Armenian" echoes the strength of the rebellion and the tragedy of the poetic self, because the poet, striving for a complete picture of the world, the perception of the sacred essence of speech, reaches the tragic collapse of the poetic self, because in that sphere the same poem and writing become impossible. Therefore, the break, when the poet, in the process of movement, "returns" to describe the text of the story, tragically condemns the poetic self to the dissolution of speech until the end of his /poem/.

Poetry between the words, either the unity of the beginning or the end (David Hovhannes's collection of "New Chronicle")

This leads to the expression either "new chronicle writing" or "apoetic beginnings", titling the series "Poems not for print". This is the commitment of the non-text, that is, the anti-text, in the reference. Therefore, the most essential thing that can be perceived is that writing is the expression of the impossible, because its weakness is that in this reality it is possible to perceive it only with the "sound of silence", which, understandably, is not possible at all. Not possible because of evolution in the first place because things are no longer the image of God. And, if in this case the poet becomes the creator of things, then the text of the story is bound to the response of the description, which sounds like a property of things and history.

The personality of the poet considers it impossible to cross the mark in the chaos of those voices, therefore the poet's ego, experiencing the end of things and history, dissolves the text of his /story/ in its essence, although the poem ends in the process. But things also have a destiny, so the poet is their reflection through himself; he reconciles feelings with history and destiny. Therefore, in chaos and reality, the poet, reflecting the contradictions of the sign, transforms himself into a mirror to express the sign. In other words, one should re-examine him/the poet, but by interpreting his world, respond that the poet, in this case, expresses the "text of the sign" and by expressing it, he himself is transformed into a mirror depicting the sign.

Therefore, the poem testifies to the text of the story, which is, in fact, more than the poem. And the poet, expressing "the original of the sign", through the act of his biography expresses the mere sign, as a mirror reflects it. This theory of denying the poem, which implies an aesthetic shift, has a polemical /examination/ nature in the poetry of David Hovhannes, one edge of which is aimed at denying the aesthetics of classicism, but through the same denial, recreating a new one, which is the path of antipoetry. The poem of the period following Paruyr Sevak - "new poetry" movement, it has an expanding and at the same time destructive character. In the poetry of David Hovhannes, this starting point of the poet's creed is expressed in a paradoxical opening speech / written in 1978/.

The essence is as follows: "*Poetry is what is not poetry*" [Hovhannes D., p. 456], which also defines the section "*Poems not for printing*". But, in general, defining the "chronicle" of new poetry, David Hovhannes records his aesthetics of the "return of poetry" and rejects the immortal "poetry" that has feminine charms, non-masculine orientation, which makes impossible the very poem from Dante to Charents, to Sevak and "new poetry".

References to history, the nature of things, and politics are not accidental. Charents, in the last part of his biography, reliving history, "like a witness Narekatsi in ancient times", wrote that "in my days, history looked at every word", therefore "every word of the poet was either a noble flight or a dark adventure" [Charents Y, p. 365]. Therefore, the poem is merely a "journal of the days" he lived, not poetry.

The poet has a biography, and the drama of the biography is the drama of history, as the last creature of the poet's fate, so it dates the day-hour-year, a typical example of which is the work "9. VII. 1936" by Charents.

It says "And those wordless, nameless titles// became terrible and bottomless like death" preserving the meaning of the unspeakable /wordless "said"/ in the context of another sentence - the word that carries-preserves the metaphorical structure already of the expression /path-destiny -story/reaction.

David Hovhannes, coming to the opposite meaning of what was said, in harmony with the call of his anxiety and experience, endows the poem with a date to record /and testify/ the text of history already as a part of the biography of the poem. It means that it does not end with the essence of poetry, but splits the poem, interpreting the act of splitting as a record of the continuation of the anxiety-living of the poetic identity. "*Anxieties*" III-XI (and continuing) series is, therefore, David Hovhannes's "journal of days", an endless "cover" of the poet's feelings, which has a "face" similar to days: sometimes cruel, merciless, sometimes desperate, sometimes rejecting.

This is similar to the life we live, that is, it is contradictory. The poet's intrusion into the sphere of contradictions gives birth and re-expresses the inner chaos of time/century, divides the gates of hell with the "navigation" of the lived, as if Charon is rowing across the river to the "lower empire" of time /the poet borrows the expression from Saint-John Perse/. There, the modern-day money owner who has suddenly become a "birdan agha" (a man who suddenly became rich) rejoices, exulting in the Sodom-Gomorrah of abundant sins. You cannot call this otherwise than an endless "*Walpurgis night*", which, according to the poet, has become "chronic". The moral earthquake, the collapse, the political tomorrow without ideals /blockade, emigration, "white massacre"/, and in all this - the mad party of the crook, the laughter, the chattering of the teeth, which devours the crumbs of hope for the future. What is this? It is a round dance in the Aragats hillside, or a feast, which, as David Hovhannes says, "a feast at the time of the plague, 452/".

The unknown swindler who "came out of the hole in the wall" is the "hero of our time" who "has the devil nestling inside". And around us, a Yerevan /homeland/ is being destroyed to rise up "an immoral Yerevan", a modern-day "Babylonian" that "gives birth to many-fathered bastards", whose "colorful second-hand clothes are clothes of a wanderer" [*Hovhannes D.*, p. 454-455]. In other words, "time has slipped out of the way" and far away is the "Canaan of the soul". And as if against all this, as a fall of fate, it seems that the poem is powerless. But the poem sounds like a fading echo of pain, sonorously mournful, "thundering" in the ruins of the earthquake "from the bottom of my heart /"Earthquake"/, a reference to the message of the liberation struggle in the series "Artsakhakank", then weaves the passionate melody of "Requiem". This is how the non-poetic world grows into "chronology" and in its "mirror" reflects the poem's rebellion against itself, its impotence to express the whole. Therefore, the poem is a creation that expresses the poetic self's "anxiety and pain, anger and sorrow, exasperation and disappointment that exists above and beyond the poetic line" [*Hovhannes D.*, p. 452].

Time, politics and history are, therefore, the "authentic salt" of David Hovhannes' poem, which he interprets as "exact science", where the word "with the precision of mathematics" expresses documentary and authentic truth. And if the poem, in the opinion of the poet, is "jolly science", then not in the sense that Paruyr Sevak understands, he said, it is an expression of "scientific ignorance".

In this case, in the creative process, the word appears in response to the structure of the text, but it is "jolly science" in the case when the authentic word and the story grow into a single text, so the non-poetic structure and the structure are inseparable. This non-poetic beginning, as Sevak would say, "unpoetic poem", is the starting point of David Hovhannes. Therefore, the poet and the scientist, the aesthetician and the chronicler, just as in Khorenatsi's characteristic perception, appear in one character, they are intertwined. And the poem, as according to Sevak and Hovhannes, is "a beautiful science".

According to the Nietzschean perception, the poet is a "jolly scientist" who, according to Hovhannes, rejects poetry, considering it "science". But, at the same time, in the context, the "white space between the words" is called a gap, which "enfolds the words with its full whiteness", considering the poem as a metaphor in the structural system /whose internal structure is divided purely chronologically/, also preserving the "poet's dream". But, in this case, the common and identical to Paruyr Sevak's poem is only that the rhythm of the poet's poem is "dictating", its structure is unified, endless. Therefore, antipoetry is the refuge of poetry, "the book of exit", when the beginning of movement and time is known, but the process is unknown, because the intermediacy is dated and the "white space" between them is continuous.

David Hovhannes can "create" such a /breakable/ structure of the text through text-words, non-text and word-text, the unique unity of which is "*Atsu*", "*Political Dictionary*", "*Typical of a Rogue*" and some works of "*Anxieties*", as well as the poem "*Party Game*", each of which has a unique way of analysis. Not giving in to the "temptation" of interpretation of individual works, let's add in a general sense that D. Hovhannes's merges the chronology of the word with the course of history, that is, "calls things by their names" rejecting the "word-demiurge", but survives the "word-hard" to sing "the life /"Anxieties"

Poetry between the words, either the unity of the beginning or the end (David Hovhannes's collection of "New Chronicle")

XI/. Meanwhile, "flowers of evil grow in poetry", and although impersonal lines are not alien to the poet either, the revolt is universal and the remorse is still...unpredictable.

Therefore, the poet's "laughter is the laughter of sorrow, bitter laughter and bitter comedy" and he has "non-poetic" and "spurious" vocabulary, which rise "their disobedient head from the bottom of the line and violate the virginity of the pious citizen's eardrum" [*Hovhannes D.*, p. 458].

The poet cannot let "the word sleep in the dictionary" (*Hovhannes D.*, p. 458), because "words harden like bone-like lumps, signaling the death of poetry. Meanwhile, the "caravan" of "discrediting the poet-making a poet" criticism needs pills, sleeping in the cobweb of "sneaky words". That is why D. Hovhannes simply announces that "the king is naked". But "poetry is self-sufficient and does not need to be justified" [*Hovhannes D.*, p. 460], although before reaching its irresistible end, in the poetics of David Hovhannes's poem there is an open space /intermediateness/ where "the Word is silent". Meanwhile, in creation, the word as a "sign of chronology" is "lonely" and indifferent to the multiplicity of the word, which, however, is complex in the structure of the poem. In other words, the word is dissolved and "in death, the thing, that is, the Word, convulses" [*Hovhannes D.*, p. 453], because "we have lost the soul, we cherish the body" [*Hovhannes D.*, p. 453].

We ascribe qualities to the word against which the poet rebels. In the "Poems not for printing" series, David Hovhannes expresses rebellion in the poem of the same name through the process of debate and rejection. He declares that "This is not the age of poetry// nor do we live in the land of poetry" (*Hovhannes D.*, p. 104). But: "It is the age of Aesop// the land of the Aesopian language" (*Hovhannes D.*, p. 104), where "reading with the context, living with the context -// and the context has become the beautiful trap of our song// called poetry (*Hovhannes D.*, p. 104)".

Poetry, then, is not a series of beautiful lines, but a cherished moment of life, a collision of fate, and a "random Darcho" cannot beg, turn the line, because he sees only the outside, a false and ugly plague spreading around - the plague of poetry. And "non-poetic poetry", as David Hovhannes comments, is poetry, but "not for printing". As he said, "poetry is an intimate work, more intimate than sexual intercourse..." when "you are with yourself and you are with God" [*"Garun"*, 2008, No. 1]. Therefore, the poem is the "place" of the poet's loneliness, the certificate of freedom, where no Darcho can invade, who only sees Homer's "blindness", Byron's "fury...".

David Hovhannes's protest is, of course, a gruesome protest and has a long history of creative experiences, an exceptional example of which is the poem "Boghok ar Moghok".

The poet mentions the time of creation of the writing - 1988-2005, almost twenty years, when the endless disaster, stagnation in our poetry continues, of course, leading the poets on the path of separation, which is already a question of the creative path, understanding the crisis as the starting point of the creative process. On the one hand, there are "slaves of the word noble", who sing "to the master", on the other, who predetermines the victim of the generation with its fate.

There are poets, too, who, as Chilo says, "bark here, bark there," at themselves and at others. In a word, "different and similar destinies" - yesterday, "in exile or in prison", on whose heads the "hammer and sickle" sword shone, and later, the accident, maybe the bullet. But everyone is alone before his century, his judgment and his poetic conscience. David Hovhannes's "reviews" are so transparent that there is no need to analyze the characters mentioned separately, who are the bearers of the above-mentioned ways of "new poetry". The essential thing in our case is his understanding of poetry, which is expressed "in bare words", as if "someone else knows it" and "there is nothing to say" even, but it is said as a "complaint".

That's what the medieval Armenian poet Frick complained, this is the medieval "battle of God" against the fallac (fate), as the author of *Trtunjq* [*Grumble*, Petros Duryan] says mercilessly in the last part of his fate: "Let me become a curse and get stuck in your side, let me call you "raging God".

Finally, Vahan Teryan says: "I saw my enemy standing, I said: take my sun." And Charents, Sevak... But

they are said to be "filled with life's emotion and hope" [*Hovhannes D.*, p. 81]. Because the poet lives as a "literary proletarian" and cannot be "cut off from the ground of reality". And the poem, according to David Hovhannes, is a concern, a duty, and the poet is a citizen, who is hindered by "Darcho" eternal, "the fly aristocrat" ("Flies and I"). And "urgent questions arise", they don't let him sleep, the poet-citizen is divided by the course of time and history / Karabakh issue, Perestroika [Перестройка].

They divert the "shameful flies", open the door to adventures, but the nature of the poet is the tragic essence, who is not given the freedom to forget his duty to his family, society, himself... Of course, the tragic and difficult is the essence of the fate of the poet, but "he is not a hero", nor a "statue", but he has emotions, his own type of madness "in this tragic game of life" / "Instead of an answer"/. Therefore, the conflict in David Hovhannes's poetry is in the rhythm of polemics and dialogue, and being purely crisis, in the process of rejection, it grows into a questioning of the poet's identity and type. But that way is the confirmation of the only regularity of de-classing, discarding the fathers' contribution, living things and one's time, which, as an answer, is not directed to the poet's father, the "wonderful gardener" of our literature, but to the monologue-interpreting nature. The preface is taken from Hrachya Hovhannisyan, where the father predicts the poetic fate of his son, saying:

The way I went, you will pass in peace,
The wind of hate will not blow you away,
But the breeze of love will not caress, alas...

The blessed fate of the poet, but, alas... David Hovhannes, who has passed the halfway point... "Lives in a new place", where there is more noise, torment and burning. The troubled soul is at war within itself against the lies and pain of the world and has not brought any repentance, will not bring peace to the poet's soul. The poet never paid attention to the "official lie", "struggled his way" and sang his way without writing a single line that was not proven by his life. On the poetic path, as a result, he earned hatred, although "the wind of love is not unknown to him", he was sometimes given his cup of that sweet poison... David Hovhannes rejects the fathers for their «great naivety», probably for the father's dream, which was also a poetic dream. David Hovhannes' rebellion and rejection is, therefore, a filial rejection, but, first of all, a questioning of the poetic path, poetic destiny and worldview, which is different, his "memorized text" is different, therefore he openly says:

Oh, no, I reject that unfair letter,
My blood, which is your old blood, is a witness.
But I do not want to open a blood feud.
-No, but I bless... that unfair letter.

And in the last octet of "Anxieties", taking the preface again from H. Hovhannisyan, he describes the transition /movement/ in such a way that it becomes clear that the poetic negation and transition are united, and the preface says the same; "*And blessed you, and not blessed.*" Therefore, the octave describes the "inner" drama and movement of David Hovhannes's work.

Thus - a misty, poisonous morning
You will remember your lost and past life,
You will feel vague and sweet nostalgia,
You will want to cry inconsolably and like a child,
And you will be at peace with things, rain, people,
You will go to mingle with the autumn birds.
And you will return to the Word and the Life

Poetry between the words, either the unity of the beginning or the end (David Hovhannes's collection of "New Chronicle")

- Be blessed and not be blessed. [Translation by me]

David Hovhannes, as we can see, is the same "restless" in modern Armenian poetry - rebellious, self-denying, whose poetic fate is a complete expression of the "new poetry" movement.

And although the poet believes that the "self-sufficient" poem is so transparent, a part of life that it has ceased to be a mere catharsis, but the addition of "indirect" in "self-criticism" is. The poem, as an act of cognition, is the "place of action" of the sign /writing/ where the Book is created. And the Book, as a poetic identity, was created, although it was created as a "chronicle", but a poetic "chronicle", which is the name of the "road" itself.

This contradictory path, with its rejecting nature, with its frenzy of anxiety, has a deep rhythm and breath of life, which sometimes sounds complicated, relentless, introspective, rich in folds and multi-layered in David Hovhannes's poetry. Therefore, the poet concludes the book with his special passion, anticipating the many-named /or anonymous/ view. And those anonymous (with a thousand names) views are still "ruminating on poetry - crooked and illusory".

It "turns" out of fear, looking for itself in the mirror of time. And looks for an inverted mirror, advises not to read the book ["New Chronicle"], because this is not their book. Although it can also be said that they have a thousand names, and at the same time, as David Hovhannes says, they have a name. "Politicians and soft ladies of the Armenian World, smart young men and young ladies accustomed to easy things, who are masters of catching fish in the murky waters of "poetry", honorable secret advisors sitting on soft cushions of high state positions, singers in palaces..." [Hovhannes D., 460]. Each is an "eternal" character, an editor-Dr. Darcho, an "honorable" Necromancer, who seeks poetry outside his world to soothe his treacherous passions, to hide his apocalyptic existence, his impenetrable nakedness, his organizational nature... Meanwhile, David Hovhannes also creates their time, interprets their essence in the essence of time, bypassing the shackles of poetry, but creating it all for the sake of poetry.

REFERENCES

- [1] Hovhannes, D. (1996). *Chronicon* [Chronicle].
- [2] Chiloyan, S. (2005). *Chenq asum – inchqan gitenq* [We Don't Say How Much We Know].
- [3] *Grakan tert* [Literary Magazine]. (2008, February 22).
- [4] Grigoryan, H. (2008). *Bac drneri or Mheri qarayrum* [Open Day at Mher Cave].
- [5] Sevak, P. (1972). *Yerker* [Creations] (Vol. 3).
- [6] Camus, A. (2013). *The Rebellious Poetry* (Astghik, Trans.).
- [7] *Garun* [Spring], (1). (2008).
- [8] Charents, Y. (1987). *Yerker* [Creations] (Vol. 4).
- [9] N. S. Leskov. Moscow; Likhachev, D. S. (1971). *Poetika drevnerusskoy literatury* [Poetics of Old Russian Literature] (2nd ed.).
- [10] Durian, P. (2011). *Banasteghtsutyunner* [Poems] p. 10.
- [11] Teryan, V. (1972). *Erkeri zhoghovatsu* [Collected Works] (Vol. 1).
- [12] Jrbashyan, A. (2024). *Ankakhutyan shrjani hay banasteghtsutyanyan taghachapakan dzevern u zargatsman mitumnere* [Metrical Forms and Development Trends of Armenian Poetry in the Independence Era]. *Hayagitakan handes* [Journal of Armenian Studies], p. 97.
- [13] Heidegger, M. (1971). *Poetry, Language, Thought* (A. Hofstadter, Trans.) Harper & Row.
- [14] Metsarents, M. (1907). *An Attempt at Self-Criticism on the Occasion of Tsiatsan* [Rainbow].
- [15] Kalantaryan, Zh. (2016). *Mijtekstaynutyun* [Intertextuality]. In *Grakanutyanyan tesutyanyan ardi khndirner*

[Current Issues in Literary Theory] (pp. 139–141).